

sufferer, but it was otherwise when they began to talk, for like many other people who offer sympathy, they lacked both tact and understanding.

They had a simple, cut-and-dried philosophy of life, and they proceeded to preach it to their suffering friend. "Calamity," they said, "is the punishment of sin. The reward of virtue is prosperity. Job is a great sufferer, therefore he must be an extraordinary sinner. Let him confess and repent his secret crimes, that God may take away the punishment and restore him to His favour."

It is strange how this erroneous idea clings to men's minds even now; how adversity and pain are thought of as God's punishment, the marks of His anger or displeasure with the sufferer. It was so in the first days of the Gospel: "Lord, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"

The world just now is paying the penalty of false ideals and ignoble ambitions cherished on the part of many; but for the victims, for those who suffer most, the innocent on whom the lash of cruelty falls—for them the pain is part of the mystery of God's providence, not necessarily or directly a punishment of personal sin. All suffering is not the result of sin on the part of the sufferer.

Job knew this. He was deeply conscious of his own integrity. Not that he was unduly self-righteous, but he knew that he had been guilty of no wrong-doing which approached the measure of his suffering. And it is because, while he clings to his integrity, he also clings, though with terrible struggles and questionings, to his faith in the God whom he has known in better days, that at last he emerges to a new vision of faith.

"Suffering," said Job's friends, "is the punishment of sin; prosperity the reward of virtue." "It is false," replied Job, "for, on the one hand, the wicked often prosper, and, on the other hand, I, for one, am an innocent sufferer."

And then, throughout the poem, Job strives after a solution of the problem of suffering—the problem which vexes and tries him more than the suffering itself. Why does a God of infinite love and power permit his creatures to suffer? Why is the operation of pain seemingly so indiscriminate that the innocent suffer with the guilty? Why does God's faithful servant suffer what his very friends believe to be a retribution for an evil life?

Believing God to be the immediate cause of all things, yet knowing no other theory of Providence than that which satisfies his friends, he can't help thinking him unjust.

At the same time, he cannot give up his faith in the God of his past experience. And so there seems to this troubled soul to be, as it were, a dual Deity, and in his perplexity he appeals to the God whom he has known in the past as against the God who now seems so unjustly to be causing him affliction.

And it is in the course of this debate with Providence, in which Job threads the mazes of doubt, defiance and despair, that he gives utterance to some of those thoughts which have woven themselves into the religious experience of the ages:—

"Though he slay me, yet will I trust him."

"Even now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and he that voucheth for me is on high. My friends scorn me, but mine eye poureth out tears unto God."

"I know that my vindicator liveth, and that he shall stand at the last upon the earth."

And then, when he has heard the very voice of God discoursing on the mysterious ways of Providence, his eyes are opened and he describes in the triumphant words of the text, the vision which has opened to his soul.

What happened to open the eyes of Job was this: He found, by the evidence of his spiritual senses, that in the midst of all his privation and suffering, he was encompassed by the love and the goodness of God.

There came, in the language of the drama, "a voice out of the whirlwind," and it was the voice of God. It did not account for Job's afflictions; it did not explain the mysteries of God's providence; it did not solve the perplexing enigmas of life as these were pressing on him. But what it did was this: it satisfied Job that God was with him, and that, albeit in some inscrutable way, his pain was playing its part in God's all-wise and loving purposes.

Then Job answered the Lord and said: "Behold I am of small account, what shall I answer thee? I have uttered that which I understood not, things too wonderful for me, which I knew not. I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee—wherefore I loathe my words, and repent in dust and ashes."

(Continued on page 528.)

Archbishop Cranmer

A Study for Churchmen

FEW historical characters have been more misunderstood, and none perhaps more misrepresented than Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, from 1533 to 1556. Roman Catholic historians have almost uniformly traduced him. Anglican Catholics have almost uniformly misjudged him. A Protestant historian has probably done more to prejudice English opinion against him than all the Roman and Neo-Catholic writers combined, for it is Lord Macaulay who is chiefly responsible for the popular view of Cranmer. In his History of England, he painted Archbishop Cranmer as a man who was unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, a coward and a time-server in action, a placable enemy, and a lukewarm friend; and his characterization in the Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History of Cranmer as a merely supple, timid, interested courtier, has passed into almost universal opinion. And so the idea in the mind of the average Churchman about Cranmer is, that while possessing many amiable and excellent qualities, he was in the main, if not a traitor and a hypocrite, at least a time-server without character, a Churchman without principle, a cowardly leader, an arch-bishopal Mr. Anything, and a political Mr. Facing-both-ways. Froide, the English historian, has left it on record that Macaulay's unfairness to Cranmer first suggested to him the project of writing history.

It is time that a reaction should set in, and that a juster opinion of this great English Churchman should prevail. As a matter of fact, Cranmer was a man born, as it were, out of due time. He had to fill a very trying, and oftentimes a very thankless, position, and even his detractors have reluctantly admitted that he played his part to the best of his ability under circumstances of almost incredible difficulty. A man of retiring and academic habits, he was suddenly thrust out into the hurly-burly of ecclesiastical-national life, and forced to play a part entirely distasteful to his temperament in the most tremendous crisis of England's Church.

It is easy for us to sit on our velvet cushions of 20th century ease and criticize the courage of those who were sailing the ship in the storm-centre of those Reformation days. Perhaps if we lived a little nearer the times, we would echo the words of a great historian of the Church: The name of Thomas Cranmer deserves to stand upon eternal record, having been the first Protestant Archbishop of this country, and the greatest instrument under God in the happy reformation of the Church in England, in whose piety, learning, wisdom and conflict, and blood, the foundation of it was laid. He was a man of more excellent spirit than the ordinary.

Cranmer was born in 1487. His father was an English country gentleman. He was sent to college at an early age, and there developed a remarkable talent for study. At Cambridge he was well known as a scholar of Jesus College. He became a master of sophistry and the logic of the schools, and was distinguished by a habit for accurate and scientific observation which afterwards became his most salient characteristic as a scholar. It was said of him that he was an ardent observer, "Vehemens observator erat," a fine motto for the Church student.

At that time the new wave of thought that was breaking over the religious world touched England. The publication of the Greek Testament by Erasmus gave an impetus to University life that was epoch-marking. The old Roman foundations in worship and doctrine were rudely shaken, and the world was being awakened out of the deep sleep of the Middle Ages. It is not generally known that the most influential personality in England from 1511 to 1516 was the famous Dutchman, first if not greatest of all Lower Critics, friend and admirer of Dean Colet, and for four years, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Lecturer in Greek in Cambridge University. It was undoubtedly owing to Erasmus that the men who became the foremost promoters of the reformation of England's Church were led to such ardent study of the Bible, and they rooted and grounded our Church upon the Word of God. It is not possible to trace the exact connection between Erasmus and Cranmer, but it is an established fact that

Cranmer became a diligent student of the Scriptures, and that the whole of his influential life may be traced to this foundation and root; the earnest, personal, first-hand study of the Bible. It might be said of him, what Carlyle said long afterwards of Luther: "He gradually got himself founded as on the rock. No wonder he should venerate the Bible, which had brought this blessed help to him. He prized it as the Word of the Highest must be prized by such a man. He determined to hold by it, as through life and to death he firmly did."

In 1529 a chance observation caused him to leap into fame. The matter of King Henry's divorce from Queen Catharine was in discussion at a country house where he happened to be staying, and Cranmer remarked that the question ought to be decided and discussed by the authority of the Word of God, and might be done just as well in England, in the Universities, as in Rome. The remark was carried to the king. It speedily brought Cranmer into favour with Henry VIII., and started him on a path of extraordinary Church influence. But it did more than that. It fortified Cranmer in his position as an advocate of the right of private judgment with regard to Scripture and truth, as opposed to the claim of the Pope of Rome. It gave him a starting point of independence as a patriot and a theologian. And, further, it signalized him as the man for the hour. The king and the nobility alike recognized him as a man who was prepared to stand as an Englishman, and as an English Churchman, against the overshadowing prerogatives of the Papacy. The king was looking for just such a man. He found in Cranmer what he wanted.

In 1529 Cranmer was despatched as an ambassador to Rome, and bore himself well. It was a daring thing in those days to contend with the Pope. But following the example of the great Apostle, he gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with us. He contended firmly these points: 1st. That no one (jure divino) could or ought to marry his brother's wife, and 2nd. That the Bishop of Rome by no means ought to dispose to the contrary.

In 1533, Cranmer, who had been Archdeacon of Taunton, King's Chaplain, and Pope's Plenipotentiary General in England, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, with the pomp and ritual of the Mass, according to the Roman Pontifical.

It was a great epoch in the history of the Church of England. Cranmer accepted the Archbishopric with unfeigned reluctance. Not only did he feel, as he expressed it, very sorry to leave his study; he felt his great inability to accept such a promotion. And further: "He expressly told the King that he could accept it only on one condition; that it should come from him, and not from the Pope, inasmuch as the king, as the supreme governor of the Church of England in causes ecclesiastical and temporal, had the full right and donation of all manner of bishoprics and benefices, and no foreign authority."

The sturdy spirit of the liberty-loving Englishman is beginning to manifest itself, and the king, after a good many talks on the subject, agreed that Cranmer might accept the Archbishopric, making his protestation to protect his conscience. This Cranmer did. "I indeed, bona fide, made my protestation that I did not acknowledge his authority any further than as it agreed with the express Word of God. And this my protestation I did cause to be enrolled." Cranmer Letters, Parker Society, 223-224.

After receiving the 11 Bulls from the Pope, which he gave to the King, Cranmer was consecrated. Later on when he received the pallium, the century-long sign of the domination of the Pope of Rome, he again asseverated that he took the oath under the same protestation. Cranmer has been doubly assailed for doing these things. The Romanists have taunted him for his want of principle as a Churchman. The Anglo-Catholics have taunted him for his time-serving subservience to Henry. It must be asserted, moreover, in all fairness, that throughout this period of his career, Cranmer honestly seems to have held as a conviction the right of the king's supremacy, as opposed to the Pope's supremacy. To some Church minds it seems to be impossible that a Churchman could take such a position. But Cranmer certainly appears to have accepted it, and to have accepted it with conscientiousness. That is, he regarded the Pope's headship of the national Church as a usurpation, and seemed to honestly believe that the king, as head of the nation, was, under Christ of course, the heavenly head, the head of the national Church. "Why," said Doctor Martin, in the famous trial at Oxford, September

(Continued on page 528.)