



University  
of Glasgow

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study,  
without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first  
obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any  
format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author,  
title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>  
[research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk)

"Individualism and the Doctrine of Christian *κοινωνία*  
with special reference to the Social Life of the  
Middle Ages."

J. Ramsay Thomson.

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of Divinity in the  
University of Glasgow for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



ProQuest Number: 10647158

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10647158

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

# Contents.

Preface.	Page	1
Introduction : I The Problem Stated		2
II Individualism and Christian <i>κοινωνία</i>		20
Chapter 1. : <i>κοινωνία</i> in the New Testament		
I The Meaning of <i>κοινωνία</i>		33
II Instances of <i>κοινωνία</i> and allied terms in Scripture.		46
III The Origin and Function of <i>κοινωνία</i>		59
Chapter 2. Individualism and <i>κοινωνία</i> in Monasticism		
Early Stages		78
The Rule of St Benedict		88
Monasteries and Libraries		113
Some Consequences of Monasticism		116
The Monasteries and the Mass		121
The Development of Chantries		129
The Adoration and Cult of the Virgin		136
Thomas Aquinas		140
The Social Aspect		149
Chapter 3. Medieval Gilds		
Frith Gilds		165
The Gild Merchant		166
"          "          : Dumbarton		189
"          "          : Edinburgh		191
"          "          : Cambridge		198

## Contents (continued)

Gild of the Kalends	201
Adulterine Gilds	202
Religious Gilds	202
The Taking of the Census	203
Analysis of Returns 1388/9	212
Conclusions from Analysis	228
Chapter 4   Gilds after 1389	238
Legislative References	241
The Suppression of the Gilds	248
Grammar Schools	264
The Craft Gilds	269
Scotland	282
Conclusion	286
List of Books Consulted	318

## Preface.

Although in form and subject-matter this thesis may at first sight appear to be historical, its standpoint is theological. It is true that Chapters 2, 3 and 4 are submitted as an objective study of Monasticism and of Medieval Gilds, respectively. But the impetus to the study was to see whether these phenomena approximated to the theological conception of Christian *κοινωνία*.

Where the same figure of reference to a footnote appears more than once on one page, it means that the same footnote applies to each.

Acts of Parliament and other documents are quoted as a rule with spelling modernised. Where the old spelling is retained, this is clearly indicated. Acts of Parliament are quoted from 'The Statutes of the Realm' and seem singularly deficient in punctuation. This deficiency has been retained where the Acts are quoted.

The thesis was almost in its final form before 'The Common Life in the Body of Christ', by L.S.Thornton, came to the writer's notice. The viewpoint and argument of this thesis were reached entirely independently of this work. Beyond actual quotations given, the writer is not indebted to it - but nevertheless is deeply impressed by it.

"Individualism and the Doctrine of Christian *Koinonía* ,  
with special reference to the Social Life of the Middle Ages".

-----

Introduction.

"The 'raison d'être of the Church lies in its commission to proclaim to the world the message of the personal God who addresses every individual in His Word as "thou", and who wills that we should also treat one another in the same way; the God who, since He enters into fellowship with us, is also the ground of our fellowship with one another. It is only through the Gospel of Jesus Christ that we know what true personality is, that true personality and true community are one and the same thing." (1)

Without accepting this description of the 'raison d'être of the Church as in any way adequate, the writer of the above is quoted as approaching the crucial issue of the social and religious life of the present age, namely the issue of true community. The issue is theological in the widest sense. It is concerned with community or the communal aspect of human life. The relationship between the individual and the spiritual communion, in the first place, and the social community, in the second place, is far from being clarified in the thought of the present age. In so far as our Western civilisation, with its offshoots, has been the product of spiritual and religious forces, it has been built up on a theological hypothesis of spiritual individualism. This hypothesis, with its

(1) Emil Brunner: *Communism, Capitalism and Christianity*,  
pp. 7-8.

hitherto accepted and unquestioned assumptions, is now being called in question. Is it true psychologically as an adequate conception of human nature and the essential personality of man? Is it true genetically? Is human society made up of the association together of complete, self-integrated individuals, as the 19th century scientist conceived the universe to be made up of the association together of indivisible and unfusible atoms? Is it true spiritually? Is this individualism, which is the theological hypothesis of our Western civilisation, the revelation of God in Christianity? Is this 'the faith once delivered to the saints'? Is this the teaching of the New Testament?

In questioning the above mentioned hypothesis, the answer to all these questions is being given in the negative. The hypothesis, of course, has only been briefly indicated. But the questioning of the hypothesis has been occasioned by the experienced fact of the threatening decay and even collapse of our 'Western civilisation' from within.

Emil Brunner, continuing his line of thought, makes the following statement:

"In short, the Church must above all take seriously its original task; really to create true community, a living fellowship - such fellowship in which every individual feels that he is valued as a person and in which there is true meeting between persons. The Church of the Reformation was a Church of the Word, and that was its great mission in history. But it was not a community-church. No more so was the pre-Reformation Church, which was a church of the cultus but not a living fellowship. But community,

concrete, local, brotherly fellowship, is the real essence of the Church. Preaching alone is not sufficient to create this, while the Sacrament apart from this fellowship becomes an incomprehensible mystery. At the present time, when words have most notoriously lost their true value and the spoken and written word is prostituted by propaganda, the spoken and written word of the Church too is incredible and ineffective if it is not accompanied by manifold efforts to create real centres and cells of community life. But where the Church does this - as it has begun to do here and there - it does more towards the solution of great social problems than by all its social manifestos and proclamations, however necessary these are also in their time and place". (1)

We may, therefore, be moved to ask, 'Is there some doctrine, some fundamental doctrine, of the Christian Faith that the Church of the West has not embodied in its life and practice, and perhaps not even in its thought and teaching?' 'Is spiritual individualism fallacious because it is incomplete?'

We are induced, also, to ask that question by a further consideration. It has been said "Whenever the Church misses out some aspect of the Gospel, some terrible thing rises up to take its place." (2)

This was exemplified, a few years ago, in Scotland when the Church of Scotland was neglecting the doctrine of the communion of saints, particularly the communion with the 'saints departed' in the Eucharist. Spiritualism flourished and grew and seemed to make amazing headway. When the Church re-emphasised the neglected doctrine, spiritualism waned.

It may also be noticed that when any essential aspect of truth is omitted, the 'evil thing which rises up to take its

- (1) Emil Brunner: Communism, Capitalism and Christianity p.17.
- (2) Quotation untraced.

place' contains in perverted form the particular aspect that has been neglected. It is from the matrix of western civilisation that "Communism" has arisen. Does it contain, in perverted form, the aspect of the Christian faith that Western culture has not embodied, or to which it has not even borne witness? It may even be asked, 'Is the rise of Communism the judgment of God for our practical neglect of an essential aspect of His revealed truth and gospel?'

It may also be pointed out that the movements of Nazism and Fascism contained this same curious element of togetherness, or community, in which, so to speak, the individual lost himself and became, through the movement of the man<sup>55</sup>, harnessed to the powers of evil. Again the evidence points in the same direction.

Take next the subjective aspect. There are certain promises made to Christians in the New Testament. The fruits of the Spirit are Love, Joy and Peace. (1) Jesus promised peace; (2) He bequeathed joy; (3) and love was the very spirit of the life that He shared with His friends. Are Peace, Joy and Love experienced by the average church member, or even the average sincere Christian, of to-day on the level of their everyday life? I think not. To some few these gifts of the Spirit may have come and dwelt with them; most of us have known them at times. But on the level of everyday life and experience, year in, year out, the promises have just not been realised. The promises were not given just to particular

(1) Galatians 5<sup>22</sup>; Romans 14<sup>17</sup>.

(2) John 14<sup>17</sup>; 20<sup>19,21</sup>; Acts 10<sup>36</sup>; Ephesians 2<sup>14-17</sup> etc.

(3) John 15<sup>11</sup>, 16<sup>20</sup>, 16<sup>22</sup> etc.



people or at particular times; the gifts were to be universal and constant within the Church. Other promises might be similarly traced and would yield similar results. Can we say that to a considerable extent the goods promised in the New Testament have not been delivered in the religious experience of the West? If so, may we again ask, 'Why?' And in reply, return to our original question, 'Has some fundamental aspect of the Christian Gospel been omitted from the presentation of Christianity in Western civilisation? And has this element being omitted, prevented these gifts of the Spirit being conveyed from God to man?

What is the 'gospel' as presented by the Church in the West? What is our message of evangelism? Is any generalisation at all possible, keeping in mind our many differences? May we say that the evangelical message is an individual 'Get right with God', though the method or means of attaining that end may vary with the different branches of the Church? Do we not conceive our religion as a personal contact with God, or dedication to God, or contract with God in consequence of the forgiveness of our sins in Christ? Is not the object of each and every branch of the Church in our Western world, "individual salvation", irrespective of whether it is to be attained by faith, or works, or any other means? If so, would it not follow that the development of individual personality, or of personal, individual spiritual attainment was the 'summum-bonum' of the Church, to which its members are urged one way or another to approximate

to as best they can? The Church, therefore, would consist of the collection of individuals who have been baptised into Christ and who together, within the spiritual fold of the Church continue or develop the spiritual pilgrimage of their souls? How often are our congregations just collections, or fortuitous concourses of individuals, like the fortuitous concourse of atoms of last century science? How often does the church work of pastors and office-bearers alike, consist largely in chasing after lost or wandering sheep to keep the collection of individuals together? And how often is 'spreading the gospel' conceived as trying to win a few more individuals into the collection? The whole evangelical effort for 'conversions', and the 'personal challenge' attitude of one section of our modern church life, is completely individualistic and spiritually atomistic in its outlook. But are other sections who adopt a different outlook, or different methods, any less individualistic in actual fact?

From the individualistic angle, what is the attitude to the spiritual nurture and growth in grace of the people? Does it not develop into a kind of sanctified moralism, whether justification is viewed as being obtained either by faith or works? Do people not think, in consequence of the Church's teaching, that the object of religion is to make men moral - moral in the widest sense of the term? We preach upright conduct and upright living as if they were the objects for which religion existed. The outlook becomes not only individualistic but moralistic. The independence and responsibility of the

individual human soul is stressed. Is righteousness the end and object of religion? Are we right in conceiving righteousness as an individual and personal quality and attainment? While righteousness is more than mere moral attainment, we may notice that it is spoken of by Jesus as something to be sought after. (1). John the Baptist came 'in the way of righteousness'. (2). Righteousness is regarded as a gift, (3) and linked with the peace and joy that are conferred by the Holy Ghost. (4). That which is fruit or gift is not correctly focused if it is made the end for which religion exists. The Shorter Catechism comes nearer the truth when it states, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever." (5).

The counterpart of spiritual individualism is found in other spheres of modern life. Economically it found systematic expression in the Manchester School of 'Laissez-faire' which propounded an economic doctrine of individualism and personal freedom. If every man sought his own economic good, the economic good of the community would inevitably result. (6) Politically it became enshrined in the policies and outlook of Liberalism. Psychologically it was assumed in the analysis of Freud and the psycho-analysts. Scientifically its outlook found a counterpart in the atomic theory, and in the scientific spirit of the 19th century.

- (1) Matthew, 5<sup>6</sup>, 6<sup>33</sup>;
- (2) Matthew, 21<sup>32</sup>;
- (3) Romans, 5<sup>17</sup>;
- (4) Romans, 14<sup>17</sup>;
- (5) Shorter Catechism, Question 1.
- (6) Writings of Adam Smith and others.

But what of to-day? The economic theories of "laissez-faire" are thoroughly discredited; the political star of liberalism has set; the insufficiency of Freudian psychology is becoming more and more recognised, while the communal factor in human life and consciousness, including the instincts of the herd, are being more and more reckoned with in Jung and especially in Trotter's, "Instincts of the Herd." Scientifically, the atomic theory is shattered and the ultimate nature of matter is recognised to be much more 'fluid' than was at one time supposed. Theologically, we still cling to an outworn individualism; it is partly because no other alternative is clearly before us; it is partly because we recognise that in it is a real element of truth, though it may not be the whole truth; it is partly because the essential relationship between individual personality and the corporate life, with the spiritual experience of the redeemed community in communion, has never been clearly defined. The theological controversy between Augustine and Pelagius, concerning, among other things, the origin of the soul was never resolved, clarified and crystalised into dogma owing to the incidence of the barbarian invasions and the liquidation of the Roman Empire. The doctrine of the Person of Christ was completely and exhaustively dealt with in the early centuries; but the doctrine of the nature and person of man, with many of the issues which were brought forward by Augustine, have never yet been completely and comprehensively dealt with and resolved.

And now a new difficulty confronts us. It is a difficulty which is seldom self-consciously realised and is therefore the more serious. We have been brought up, nurtured and trained in a civilisation whose ethos is essentially individualistic, whose tastes, thought, outlook, standards of measurement and scales of values are basically individualistic.

"The Church of to-day is judged by whether she is sending forth from her altars men and women of noble character, inspired by high ideals, ready and willing to spend and to be spent in the unselfish service of their fellowmen".(1)

This individualism, which has been the climate of our intellectual, literary, scientific and spiritual thought for generations, has affected our language to such an extent that it can scarcely describe any 'other'; it has affected mental concepts with which we think, as well as the medium by which we must of necessity convey those thoughts to others. The mental categories, which are the counters or coinage of our thinking, are so saturated and tainted with this basic monadistic individualism that our thinking is thwarted and foiled almost before we start. Our very tools, our mental concepts, are infected with the very thing we would investigate, and they cannot be sterilised. The language and mental concepts which we must of necessity use, betray us, because they beg the question, or assume the conclusion even in the process of analysis.

We cannot measure the value of a hypothesis by the same measuring line the validity of which in that hypothesis is

(1) Quotation untraced.

being called in question. The recognition of this difficulty, however, may avoid much misunderstanding or mis-conception.

Do we begin as isolated, independent individuals? In point of fact we begin as babies introduced into the close social unit of the family. The greater the integration, spirituality and harmony of the home the better is the prospect for the development of our personalities. The greater is the integration of the home into the spiritual, economic and social community, the greater will be the stability of its internal life and development. Where the development and culture of the home is weak the development of individual personality is stunted, and the growing child, as in primitive communities, becomes more and more identified with the life of the tribe, and comes to be completely governed, dominated and controlled by that tribal life of which he is part, and which is part of him. Personality is something that has to be attained. Individual spiritual personality is not a starting point, but a somewhat advanced stage of spiritual development. Its natural process of development in a Christian community is from the centre of a series of concentric circles, the innermost of which is the home, then the Church or congregation, then the social community and the widest, probably, the nation.

What was the basic conception of method in Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom of God? As Israel was a nation called out of the ancient world to be a chosen people of God and to enter into a covenanted relation with Him, so Jesus called into being

the New Israel, as the people who were to be the 'leaven' of the Kingdom of God upon the earth. Israel was called, in the first instance, in their corporate capacity as a nation, not individually. We would submit that the interpretation of the Gospel in individualistic terms misses out a very vital aspect of Jesus preaching of 'the gospel of the Kingdom of God'.

This particular aspect of the Gospel in the early church will be dealt with more fully in Chapter I of this thesis. Meantime, how the traditional viewpoint has influenced the interpretation of the parables of Jesus may be briefly noticed. The parable of the lost sheep is cited as illustrating God's care for the individual human soul in its wandering and in its need - which is true. But the background is too often forgotten that the shepherd's real work is the shepherding of the ninety-nine, who are the flock as a whole, and that the flock, in the first instance, is not built up as a collection of lost and rescued sheep. Another case in point is the popular interpretation of the parable of the Prodigal Son, which is not two parables but one. It certainly shows God's care and forgiveness for the penitent sinner, but that is not the <sup>purpose</sup> of the parable. The publicans and sinners had drawn near to Jesus; the Pharisees and scribes murmured that Jesus had received them. (1) The parable was part of Jesus' reply. The prodigal was the personification of the publicans and sinners, collectively; God, when they accepted the gospel of the Kingdom of (1) Luke 15.

God from Jesus, received, pardoned, and welcomed them. The elder brother is the personification of the Pharisees and scribes, who would not enter the 'Kingdom of God' because the publicans and sinners were accepting it, and were welcomed. The parable stops where the father pleads with the elder brother to come in. Did he come in? We are not told. Why? Because that was where the Pharisees stood. Jesus awaited their answer. The parable was His pleading with them. Only they could complete it. We know they did not go in. The elder brother was the real prodigal - just as the Pharisees made themselves the real outcasts of the Kingdom of God. His sin was the refusal of brotherhood, the denial of the community of his father's house. This was the sin of the Pharisees. While the individual aspects of the parable are true, in essence it is not individualistic but corporate; it is addressed primarily to groups and to the responses of groups; Jesus defends one group of his hearers against another group. And the fundamental sin is the denial of brotherhood.

If there is some aspect of the Gospel omitted from our Western presentation of Christianity, what doctrine is it, and how should it be formulated?

An issue so fundamental as this cannot be concisely stated nor briefly expressed. We have suggested that it is in the sphere of the individualistic aspects of the gospel that the deficiency occurs.

"The first outstanding characteristic (of the gospel),"



says Troeltsch, "is an unlimited, unqualified individualism. The standard of this individualism is wholly self-contained, determined simply by its own sense of that which will further its concentration on God. It is bound to go all lengths in obedience to the demands of the Gospel. Its basis and its justification lie in the fact that man is called to fellowship with God, or as it is here expressed, to be the child of God, and in the eternal value of the soul which this filial relation confers. The individual as a child of God may regard himself as infinitely precious, but he reaches this goal only through self-abnegation in unconditional obedience to the Holy Will of God.

It is clear that an individualism of this kind is entirely radical, and that it transcends all natural barriers and differences, through the ideal of the religious value of the soul." (1)

This is taken as fair example of the individualistic religious outlook of our age.

The different doctrines of the faith are like the colours of the spectrum into which 'white light' can be broken up. The revelation of God, the truth of God is one and indivisible. Only in its completeness is it fully true, is it completely satisfying, and does it answer to the uttermost of human need. But in order that mankind may understand it, it must be broken up and studied bit by bit in the several doctrines of the faith, just as white light is broken up into the colours of the spectrum that we may more carefully examine its nature.

When, however, these different elements of the spectrum are reunited, white light is restored. If one colour is omitted, white light will not result from the union of the others. When we re-unite the doctrines of the Christian faith, including the doctrine of individualism we just do not get 'white light'. The

(1) Ernst Troeltsch: "The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", I 55.

dazzling brilliance of the Gospel in its completeness is denied us. It might be affirmed that the doctrine of individualism is fallacious; we prefer to approach it from the angle that it is incomplete. But being incomplete it has usurped a place it should not hold and thus has opened the door to all manner of error.

An ellipse may be regarded as revolving round two foci. If one focus is withdrawn, the other may become central, with the result that the path of the ellipse becomes the special case of the circle. The loss of one focus has more far-reaching effects than just its own withdrawal.

Correspondingly, if the experience of 'community', if a spiritual corporateness, as an essential element of the Kingdom of God and means of its attainment, is removed, the remaining element of individualism becomes central and the whole path, movement and progress of life is modified and changed thereby. From one angle, individualism and spiritual corporateness may be regarded as the twin foci of the gospel of the Kingdom of God that Jesus preached and around which it moved and had its being.

We may also say that the Church which Jesus created had also to revolve round two foci, namely, in this case, the *ἐκκλησία* and the *κοινωνία*. (1) (The *ἐκκλησία* is here understood as the external 'order' of the Church, the Ordained Ministry and sacraments etc. - the Church in its visible,

(1) Compare Ch. I, p.

external organisation.) Throughout the ages the ἐκκλησιαστικὴ aspect of the Church has been fully cultivated, developed and preserved. It is the submission of this thesis that the aspect which is designated by the term κοινωνία has virtually been 'lost in transit'.

We seek, therefore, first to trace the meaning and significance of κοινωνία in the New Testament. We seek to distinguish between the secular κοινωνία, which in varying degree is frequently encountered in the ordinary life and association of the world, and the deeper, spiritual, Christian κοινωνία, which we submit was one of the early distinguishing marks of the Church and one of the fundamental elements of the Kingdom of God. 'κοινωνία' we regard as a word which was 'baptised' into the Christian faith and the Christian life, and its connotation therein is vastly deeper and more far-reaching than in its pagan or worldly setting. We then seek to show 'how' and 'when' this aspect came to be omitted in the presentation of the Christian faith to the inhabitants of Western Europe. (Chapter II) The question is immediately asked, "But did it remain omitted?"

In the Middle Ages there are two social and religious movements which appear at first sight, and from a distance, to embody this element which we claim to have been omitted, - namely, the monasteries and the guilds. A considerable detailed study has been necessary, but has resulted in conclusions which confirm our initial hypothesis. There is no

attempt to write or trace the history of the monasteries or of the gilds as such, but rather to view and study their life *Something akin to a history of the gilds, however, has been necessary* and development from this viewpoint or focus. The question before our minds throughout is this. "Do these movements embody in the social life or practice of their age, the fundamental principles of Christian *Koinonía* in the sense that is described in Chapter I of this thesis as belonging to the New Testament?" The analysis of these two movements is contained in Chapters II and <sup>and IV</sup> III. In the course of our analysis from this point of view we submit that several interesting discoveries have been made, which we have not found recorded or noticed elsewhere. These are dealt with as they occur in the text and do not affect the main thread of the thesis. In the concluding chapter, or 'Conclusion', we seek briefly to bring the issue forward to the present day, and to suggest certain converging lines of modern thought, which seem to be reaching forward to a new synthesis.

It was our original purpose to trace this aspect of theology and doctrine through the Reformation controversies and theology. Thereafter we hoped to follow the problem in detail through the religious developments of the intervening centuries down to the present day. We hoped to trace it, as to some extent we have tried to do in the Middle Ages, (a) through the theology and explicit teaching of the Church, and (b) through its realisation (or non-realisation) in the spiritual life of the Church and the social life of the

community. Then, reaching the present day, we hoped to analyse what changes, modifications, or transformations the acceptance of this New Testament doctrine in all its intensity would entail for our modern Western civilisation and way of life. All this is obviously far beyond the scope of a thesis of this nature. To such a line of thought we can only contribute certain steps upon the way. This we endeavour to do.

Some other points, however, must be noticed. A doctrine of this nature, unlike the doctrine, say, of the Person of Christ, is best studied, not in the discourses of theologians, but in its practice in the lives of men. It is not something to be accepted in thought, but something to be practiced in life. It is therefore in the corporate, social and religious life of the people that the doctrine is to be traced, if it is to be traced at all. It is an attitude to life and to others, rather than a 'Credo'. Consequently in our examination of the Middle Ages we have studied the social and religious life of the people rather than the controversies of the theologians.

It is from the Middle Ages that our modern world has sprung. The seeds of that period bear their fruit to-day. The vestiges of the life of that period still influence our outlook and lives to-day. Whatever changes the Renaissance and the Reformation brought, whatever forces they released, they did not repudiate the past, nor could they cut themselves off from it, rather they re-formed, and developed what in the

Middle Ages had been started, or which, from the Middle Ages, they had inherited.

It may be suggested that this particular aspect of Christianity with which we are concerned is preserved in the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church in its conception of 'Sobornost'. This is probably true. An investigation carried out from the angle of 'Sobornost' might be as rewarding, or more rewarding, than the one we have undertaken. The practical need to limit the scope and range of our researches compelled us to omit any investigation into the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church in this respect or to its transmission throughout the ages. Some 'thread' of enquiry is necessary. The conception of 'κοινωνία' was available; it also occurred in the scriptures of the New Testament. It seems to point in the required direction. It is possible that the aspect of the faith towards which we are turning our attention might be more adequately expressed under a different designation. Nevertheless for an enquiry of this kind some definite 'thread' had to be followed. 'Christian κοινωνία' seemed the best designation available, as any translation of it, or other description, became ambiguous and charged with secondary emotional associations.

Another point must also be noticed. If (as we seek to show in Chapter I) κοινωνία is an essential element of ultimate truth, then in so far as we approximate to ultimate truth by any other path, κοινωνία will inevitably reappear.

This accounts for the appearance of *κοινωνία* time and again in Christian history without any traceable tradition transmitting it. But on this very account its appearance is often transitory, or partial, or limited in its scope. When the full experience of truth begins to wane, or passes, the *κοινωνία* also tends to evaporate, because it has not been consciously built-in to the fabric of the doctrinal framework. Thus the power of *κοινωνία* has appeared, for example, in evangelical revivals, even while they preached 'individualism', and it has been by means of *κοινωνία* that their most effective work has been done. This may appear at first sight to complicate the issue, but, in reality, it does not do so; it merely emphasises the fact that a fundamental discovery of Truth is bound also to imply a fundamental discovery of *κοινωνία*. If our submission is correct, *κοινωνία* is itself an aspect of that ultimate truth.

II

Some brief consideration must be given to what we conceive to be the fundamental differences between individualism and Christian *κοινωνία*, and how they came, even in some respects, to be alternatives to one another. We must also seek to indicate, if possible, the relationship between the individual and the community in its christian setting; that is, how the individual and the *κοινωνία* are mutually related in the conception and practice of the christian faith. Obviously both alike contain elements of truth. It is their inter-relationship that is the problem. This is in itself a vast subject and can only here be dealt with in an introductory manner.

To start with a geometric symbol. Imagine a plane which is the sphere of humanity. Above it is God. Individualism conceives each person connected individually with God by means of a line stretching upwards. Their contact with God, of course, is achieved through the mediation of Christ with or without the help of the Virgin Mary and the Church as the case may be. The 'lines' meet in God and have an affinity one with another through their common meeting-place, their common devotion, and their common aspirations. But each person is connected with the Godhead by this individual 'line' to his soul.

The other viewpoint conceives a many-sided pyramid with its base on the plane of humanity and its apex reaching upwards to contact with God. From the base of the pyramid magnetic



forces radiate. Through these humanity is drawn into vital contact with the pyramid in the first instance, that is with the community of christians in its spiritual corporateness, and through that corporateness which is represented by the pyramid, they find themselves in living contact with God. The experience is so vivid, and its transforming power so intense, that they feel as if the power of God had come to them alone and to them specially, and frequently they do not recognise the corporateness of the medium through which it has been transmitted. Contact with the base of the pyramid is the means by which those of the plane of humanity find contact with God. The pyramid, which represents the *Koivwvia*, is therefore the means and channel of christian expansion, or as might be said, Christian *Koivwvia* is the means and weapon of evangelism. The illustration must not be pressed too far, for like all illustrations after a certain point it breaks down, and the personal relationship between God and humanity can never be adequately expressed by an mathematical symbol. We use it to try to make clear our meaning in respect of one aspect of that relationship only.

Our Lord formed a 'community' of his disciples. It was by means of such a 'community' method, after the failure of certain other methods, that Jesus in the third year of His ministry saw the vision of how His mission would be accomplished. As the centre of this 'community', which was to be a spiritual community, He instituted the sacrament of communion. Meeting

together around this centre, to the community of the disciples the Holy Ghost was given. It was given to them 'corporately'. On this corporateness Jesus had laid much stress. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (1) There is the presence of Christ with the individual soul, but the presence of Christ in the Holy Ghost with the 'community in his name' is of a richer and deeper nature. The corporateness releases spiritual forces which are otherwise untapped. 'If two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven'. (2)

Other people are brought into contact with this spiritual fellowship; they are to some extent received into it and infected with its spirit; through the fellowship, whose life they have begun to share, they find themselves in living contact with Christ and dedicate themselves to Him. In other words, they join the community, taking the badge of discipleship, not as an emotional experience but as a considered rational judgment or decision; once in the fellowship they become infected with its spirit, and in its life gradually learn what it means, and become changed men, finding in the end the transforming glory of the love of Christ which they are now able to receive unto themselves. The true individualism of their redeemed personality out of the communion of the

(1) Matthew 18<sup>20</sup>.  
(2) Matthew 18<sup>19</sup>.

corporate life is born, and grows towards the 'measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' In other words, the fellowship is both the means and weapon of evangelism and the way of attainment of true Christian personality.

The process is not arbitrary. It is the consequence of the fundamental nature of humanity.

A young German ~~was~~ asked "How do you become a Nazi?" "Oh", replied his friend, "It is simple. You put on the badge raise your arm, and shout 'Heil Hitler!' You join the crowd and you are in it. Later you will learn what it means, and what it will do to you. But you are committed; it will make you a changed man!"

It is the same mechanism enlisted for the powers of evil. It is a weapon of evangelism which the Church has largely missed and Nazism and Communism have found. In the vision of Revelation there are twelve gates into the heavenly Jerusalem. (1) The gate that is open to our age and generation is the gate of community and fellowship. The world is hungry for fellowship as it has seldom been. The Church is not offering the true deep fellowship that should be at the heart of the gospel; nor is she embodying it in that central place in her life that the gospel put it.

There is a vast difference between the association together of a number of people who are individually united to Christ, and the communion together of the same number of people

Revelation 21<sup>12,21</sup>.

who through their common fellowship, and bond of love one with another, find their life in Christ, and their devotion and service to Him. The spiritual intensity, power, effectiveness or attainment of a group, united heart and soul in love one for another in worship and prayer, is infinitely greater than the sum total of the individual spiritual values of the members of the group if reckoned separately as individuals and added together. (The above statement may be questioned, but we are accepting it as axiomatic. To prove it would involve too lengthy a digression.) The corporateness involves a tremendous spiritual plus. It is that 'plus' which infects, enlists and transforms others. It is the consequence of Christian *κοινωνία* ; perhaps it may be called the presence of the Holy Spirit; or perhaps it may be described as the dwelling place on earth of the Holy Spirit, who comes in especial measure to the 'room that has been prepared for Him.' The corporateness, of course, is not just an external association in worship, it is a fellowship together of those who 'were of one heart and of one soul.' (1) It is this deep common emotion, this sameness of outlook, devotion and imagination that gave the great cohesive force to the *κοινωνία*. Scientists have noticed that the molecule of hydrogen, which consists of two atoms of hydrogen have a much stronger binding force holding them together than the molecules of more complex substances containing a variety of atoms. The reason is supposed to be that the hydrogen atoms are identical and can replace one another, with a singleness and simplicity

(1) Acts 4<sup>32</sup>.

corresponding to those who are of 'one heart and one soul' in Christ.

Where this 'at-one-ment' with one another and with Christ is first an inner reality in the spiritual community or communion, it becomes a consuming fire, drawing others into its vortex by an irresistible attraction, expressing itself in conduct, in service, and in the transformation of the social community itself. This is the leaven of the Kingdom of God; it is the pearl of great price which men must give up everything to obtain.

This inner spiritual communion, this human corporateness in Christ which is at the heart of the gospel, must not be confused with its outward manifestations or attempts at expression work. The spiritual reality of the true *κοινωνία* may embody the Spirit of Christ, but to make that incarnate in a fallen world may be beyond the wits of its members. Nevertheless the requirement to do so is an impulse that comes from God. Of such a category comes the sharing of goods in Acts and similar experiments. We miss the significance if we think of the sharing of the goods as itself the important thing. This only occurred, and had meaning, because it was the expression of an inner spiritual reality that lay behind it, and it was done in order to further that antecedent spiritual reality or communion. When it ceased to fulfil this purpose and to be an expression of an antecedent reality, it became valueless, - or worse. The 'end' is not this, or

any other, particular material expression, though some form of material expression is an absolute necessity to the Spirit's life. The 'end' is rather the fostering, preserving and developing of the living communion itself, in which God is glorified, through which the world is convinced that God has sent the Christ, (1) and through which the souls of men are gathered into the fold of Christ. The 'end' is the life of the communion or community as such functioning to the glory of God and to the enjoyment of His presence.

For individualism on the other hand, the association of soul with soul is external. The soul is united to Christ and seeks to love others in obedience to the command of Christ. The 'end' has been the salvation of the individual soul. Therefore to many the highest spiritual life has appeared to be that they should seek with one end and purpose their own soul's salvation. The individualistic gospel has been preached with an accent of spiritual selfishness - "Save your own soul". It has often found expression in moralism, externalism, and social gospels and organisational activities, while within the heart is often barren, legalistic and even pharisaical. The individual good is the measure of all things. The benefit to the individual is the criterion. We may help one another in order to be helped ourselves as individuals, or to please God as individuals or to acquire 'merit' with God for ourselves as individuals.

We submit that between the two outlooks there is a great gulf fixed, and that the individualistic interpretation of the gospel is the shallower.

(1) John 17<sup>21</sup>.

A few further points may be noticed. The one explicit condition which Jesus put upon men receiving the forgiveness of God was that they should forgive others. On this He was repeatedly insistent. It appears in the Lord's prayer; it appears in His subsequent teaching; it appears in His dramatic reply to Peter's objection and criticism; it appears in the parable of the unjust steward. When we consider it, it is a somewhat curious condition. We might have expected individual faith or personal belief. But the condition is, "You must forgive others". It is also the spiritual condition which must be fulfilled if the spiritual *κοινωνία* of His Church is to exist at all! The *ἐκκλησία* can exist without it, but not the *κοινωνία*. Was the spiritual communion of the group in loving communion with each other and with God, the measuring line of value to Jesus?

Does not the whole teaching and emphasis on 'love' in the teaching of Jesus and in the Gospel according to St. John point to the same general conclusion?

"Whoso loseth his life for my sake shall find it ...."(1) What did Jesus mean by those words? Was He only speaking of martyrdom? Is there not a sense in which the disciple of Jesus may 'lose himself' in the fellowship of the Christian community for Jesus sake, and in so doing may find his true personality?

(1) Matthew 10<sup>39</sup>.

Personality, even individuality in the truest sense, is something to be attained. It is not something with which we start. Out of the living experience of the true Christian communion personality, or individuality, is attained. But this is the natural product of the vital Christian organism, the Body of Christ; it is not its teleological purpose, nor is it the criterion by which its value or effectiveness may be measured. The end is the Glory of God which finds its realisation in the establishment of the Kingdom of God upon the earth and within which humanity should find its spiritual home and salvation - Соборност - *κοινωνία* - communion - with Christ in the midst.

There is still another viewpoint. Each individual person is, or becomes, a member of the living Christian *κοινωνία* in the same way as our several members are part of our bodies. The human body is made up of its individual members but yet has a unity - and 'life' - over and above the mere sum of them all. From their union with the body the members draw their own life and strength and usefulness. St. Paul, in using this illustration, seems in the first place concerned to combat the disintegrating influence of those who would either separate themselves from the *κοινωνία*, or who would regard enviously others who, with different functions, served therein. The background, however, is clear: the 'Body of Christ' is the Christian community, or Church, of which we are members, with the 'community' and individual aspects thereof related to each



other as the particular members of a human body are related to each other and to its indwelling life, or to its 'Head'.

If this type of illustration is traced biologically, we find that in simpler forms of life there is less differentiation of function among several members and less integration of unity in the life of the whole. As we ascend the scale of the animal kingdom we find two concurrent lines of development which are closely interrelated. As we mount to higher forms of life we find a growing differentiation of function, coupled with an increasing integration of the unity of the whole organism. In man this process reaches its highest pitch of development. The greatest possible differentiation of function among the several members of the body, is coupled with the closest integration of these same members in the unity of the whole that has yet been achieved in the animal kingdom. In the development of the healthy organism increasing differentiation of function is concurrent with an increasing integration of unity. In the Christian experience of the West we have had spiritually a vastly increasing differentiation of function on individualistic lines, without any increasing integration of unity or Christian corporateness. The consequence is a spiritual and moral disintegration in an ever increasing degree.

One of the problems of modern life is the integration of personality. Life with its many activities, interests, emotions and conflicting forces requires to be unified and

and integrated. It is a trite saying that religion can do this. In actual fact, it seldom does, except in a partial degree. Much of the present discontent and dis-satisfaction with life arises from this lack of true personal integration within the personality itself, with a consequent lack of a sense of security that follows from it.

But the individual cannot be self-integrated until or unless he is also integrated into the spiritual communion of the Body of Christ. This social and spiritual integration with others is the necessary counterpart and condition of self-integration. The Church, as ἐκκλησία, in itself cannot offer this fellowship, only the Christian κοινονία of the New Testament can provide it.

In this also is 'security' to be found. There is the 'security' of association, which, on the lowest level, the sheep gets in the heart of the flock; there is the security of mutual helpfulness that is the necessary expression of

; there is the security of love and faith which come from others and from Christ, and in the common fellowship of our neighbour and Christ we find the perfect love that casteth out fear, and the peace of heart when human conflicts cease. But the external experience is the condition and ground of the internal attainment of the same goal of integration.

Thus are the individual and the community related. It is, or should be, an organic relationship, the source of the spiritual life of both being common. It is not an external,

or formal arrangement or agreement or contract. It is something that must be experienced in life, in communion, and in the soul. It is an attitude and a sentiment; it is an outlook and an experience; it is the Way and the Life that leads to living fellowship in the Holy Spirit with the Truth.

Lest the above should be in any way misunderstood let me hasten to add that it in no way affects the doctrine of the atonement, the Christian doctrine of salvation or an other fundamental doctrine of the faith. It is concerned with the fruit of Christianity as manifested in the corporate lives of men; with the means and weapon of evangelism; and of the relation between the individual and the communion within the fold of Christ.

A final comment may be made on the relationship that is conceived between the Christian communion and the social community, or even nation, within which it lives. It is again regarded as 'the leaven'. In addition to its function of attracting into its own fellowship, it would seek to embody in the life of the social community those fundamental principles of human brotherhood which had been learned in the worship and devotion of Christ. This would involve in the modern age far-reaching requirements in an economy that is fundamentally individualistic in its foundation and in its outlook. It would rebuke much that was tolerated in the Industrial Revolution; it would rebuke the bitterness and greed of so much that emanates from Trade Unionism; it might ask the question whether

the residuary legatee of the surplus profits of industry should not be the living community rather than the shareholders, the employers or the employed.

Such questions, and others, are hidden in the particular aspect of our Western civilisation whose early stages we have set out to study.

Chapter 1.

κοινωνία in the New Testament.

I The meaning of κοινωνία.

Before considering the origin and function of κοινωνία in the New Testament, it is necessary to consider what exactly it is that came to be designated by this term. The word only occurs in Acts and the Epistles, never in the Gospels. This may only mean, however, that the sense of κοινωνία rose to self-consciousness after Pentecost, and that its theological, or philosophical, implications were only made explicit in the writings of St. Paul. The fact that the writers of the Gospels did not read back the more developed thought of St. Paul, (which in part at least was no doubt before them) into their earlier narratives is an indirect testimony to the historicity of the records.

κοινωνία is used with a slightly varying significance, but also with a deepening significance, throughout the New Testament. It would seem as if it must take its place with those words which were taken by the early Christians from the common speech - the κοινή - of the day and were baptised, so to speak, into the Christian Church, there to serve in some distinctive sense, the cause of Christ. Outwith the New Testament the meaning of κοινωνία is that of a partnership, but sometimes in a very deep and intimate sense. For example there is the proclamation of a (1) Prefect P. Oxy. XII 1408<sup>25</sup> / (AD 210-14) where reference is made to the different method of

(1) Moutton & Milligan: Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, p. 350.

sheltering robbers - οἱ μὲν γὰρ κοινῶν [οὐντες τῶν  
 ἀδικημάτων] υποδέχονται, οἱ δὲ οὐ μετέχοντες μὲν κα[  
 .....]"some do so because they are partners in their misdeeds  
 others without sharing in these yet ....."

κοινωνεῖν and μετέχω are practically synonymous,  
 except that of the two verbs (1) κοινωνεῖν "implies more  
 distinctly the idea of a community with others. It is always  
 used of active participation, where the result depends on the  
 co-operation of the receiver as well as on the action of the  
 giver. Compare the touching inscription which a doctor puts  
 up to his wife, who has herself studied medicine. Cagmit IV  
 507<sup>b</sup> 19  $\omega\varsigma$  (ωι η)ς μου [χ η] σοι ἐκοινώνησα "

'as with you alone I shared my life'.  
 κοινωνία (substantive) like the verb is used especially  
 of the closest of all human relationships, that of the marriage  
 contract, in the time of Augustine.

"κοινωνία by itself means 'a relation between individuals  
 which involves common and mutual interest and particip-  
 ation in a common object'. Treated in abstraction, the  
 word could not be more adequately defined. None the less  
 every concrete instance of κοινωνία, so understood, does  
 in fact draw its whole significance from the character of  
 the 'common object' in which men so participate". (2)

In the New Testament the term κοινωνία and its corres-  
 ponding verb κοινωνεῖν are used in slightly varying senses  
 and are differently translated in the Authorised Version.

κοινωνία is variously rendered as "distribution",

- (1) Moutton & Milligan: Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament,  
 p. 350.
- (2) Thornton: The Common Life in The Body of Christ, p. 74.

"contribution", "fellowship", "communion", while the verb is rendered as 'to be a partaker' or even 'to communicate'.

It is as if St. Paul, starting from the content of 'partnership', which *κοινωνία* implied, used it with ever deepening meaning in the course of his spiritual expositions.

As the corresponding verb has two senses: (1) 'to have a share in', (2) 'to give a share to'; so we are prepared for a two-fold meaning of *κοινωνία* : (1) 'fellowship' as recognised and enjoyed, (2) 'fellowship' as manifested in acts which give it expression. (1)

The common, or *κοινή*, conception of *κοινωνία* as simply a business partnership, is speedily lost sight of in St. Paul in its developing connotation as a mystic fellowship. Even where the term is used in the sense of contribution it has the idea that the contribution is itself an expression of the deep spiritual fellowship which <sup>lies</sup> behind it.

*κοινωνία* arose to full self-consciousness within the Church in that experience of the disciples which is recounted in Acts as immediately following Pentecost. As an ESSENTIAL feature of the Christian experience its emergence was coincident with that experience itself. As Kittel points out,

" *κοινωνία* means not the community, the Fellowship of Christians in a concrete sense, which at this stage had not yet separated itself legally as a cult from the Jewish community, but that which had already presented itself as a circle of real and living fellowship. Nor does it mean just a fellowship of goods, for Acts 2<sup>44</sup> states that they had ALL things

in common. This means spiritually the fellowship of the brotherly relationship one to another which proves itself and works itself out in the life of the community." (1)

The sharing of material goods is therefore not the essence of the experience, but is simply an expression of *κοινωνία*. It is the **EXTROVERT** aspect of a spiritual reality, and cannot be divorced from the mystic or spiritual experience of which it is the expression. Correspondingly, when St. Paul uses the term in the limited sense of the contribution or the distribution of alms, he does not conceive of it just on the level of a business partnership, but on the established background of an experience of Christian fellowship of which this is an outward and material expression.

"Each act of Christian almsgiving was a witness to the central principle of fellowship in the Christian society. Most conspicuously is this the case with the great collection for 'the poor saints at Jerusalem' upon which St. Paul expended so much labour and anxiety. He regards this as of supreme importance, as the external pledge of the living fellowship of the whole Christian Church. The Gentiles had enjoyed fellowship with the spiritual blessings of the Jews: it was but right that they should offer a return of fellowship such as was in their power. (Romans 15<sup>26</sup>). The stress which the apostle lays upon this collection is only explained when we regard it as the emblem and the instrument of the corporate fellowship of the locally scattered Christian Society". (2)

This same thought is developed by Kittel when he says:

"Between Jewish and Gentile Christians there consists according to Paul closely binding ties, in that the gentile Christians have a share in the spiritual possessions of the primitive community, (Romans 15<sup>27</sup>), and so are reciprocally obliged to help them out with material goods (Romans 15<sup>27</sup>). The living participatio

(1) Kittel, p. 806.

(2) J. Armitage Robinson, Hastings D.B. I, p.461.



in one body in Christ (Romans 12<sup>3-4</sup>) in the fellowship of the saints passes over into the thought of active help. (Romans 12<sup>13</sup>)<sup>a</sup>.

This spiritual background in the meaning of *κοινωνία*, beyond its use in the limited sense of 'contribution', is indicated in the common translation of 'fellowship'. "They continued steadfastly .. in fellowship .." Acts 2<sup>42</sup> is the first description given us of the newly baptised converts after Pentecost when they numbered already about 3,000. It is here linked with the celebration of the sacrament - with the breaking of bread house by house. It leads to the practical climax, "all they that believed together held all things common". This use of the term to indicate that personal friendship and human fellowship into which faith in Christ admits the converts is found also in I John 1<sup>3</sup> - "that ye also may have fellowship with us". It is more than just personal friendship; it is that deepening spiritual fellowship which mutual faith in Christ creates. St. Paul uses *κοινωνία* in this sense.

Kittel states "Fellowship with Jesus Christ leads inevitably over and into fellowship with one another, for which Paul uses *κοινωνία*. Philomen v. 17, appeals to the close tie between Philomen and himself as *κοινωνία*, hardly restricted here only to the ties of friendship (or partnership) but including a spiritual tie in a common faith". (1)

St. Paul uses *κοινωνία* \* however, in a very much deeper sense also, and with a much more profound significance than what has been indicated above.

"The having a part in Christ which is fundamentally and fully shared in the faith, is realised and experienced in heightened form in the sacrament". (2)

(1) Kittel, p. 808.  
(2) Kittel, p. 808.

St. Paul uses  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  for that 'communion' one with another which is the human side of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It indicates a deep spiritual fellowship, - a communion of saints - realised in and through the worship of the sacrament. In the common experience of sacramental worship there is deepening of fellowship one with another to which Paul applies the term  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ . The experience indicated is not found in the mere partaking, for which he uses  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ , but is that deeper mystic sense of union or communion one with another.

Scholars have differed as to whether  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$  are synonyms or indicate different conceptions. Westcott in his commentary on the Hebrews states " $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$  present different ideas". (1)

Moulton and Milligan state

"Ellicott's contention that the difference drawn between  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$  'cannot be substantiated' is borne out by the evidence of the inscriptions where the words are practically synonymous". (2)

Trench does not include either word in his study of New Testament Synonyms. (3)

Is the solution not to be found somewhere between the two extremes? In the inscriptions and the current use of  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  the words were practically synonymous. But  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  was adopted by the Christian faith, baptised so to speak into its distinctive vocabulary, while  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$  was not. The former is, therefore often used with a deepening significance which never came to attach to the latter. But this does not always

(1) Westcott: Hebrews p. 52.

(2) Moulton and Milligan p. 350.

(3) Trench - Synonyms of the New Testament.

obtain, for *κοινωνία* is not always used in its deepest connotation. There are times, therefore, in New Testament usage where a distinction between the terms can scarcely be drawn; there are other times, when the theme touches deeper spiritual levels, that Westcott's finding must be maintained that the words are used to present different ideas. (1)

In its sacramental use, communion one with another cannot be separated from communion with Christ, which is the basis or ground of the very existence of this human communion itself.

The conception of *κοινωνία* in its human aspect to which Paul now reaches out is something very much deeper, more comprehensive and more spiritual than the use of the term as it appears in the *κοινή* inscriptions. It is a *κοινωνία* of the body of Christ, and of the blood of Christ.

At first sight one might be tempted to interpret the 'body of Christ' as referring to the *ἐκκλησία* - the true Church, the New Israel. Paul did refer to the Church as the body of Christ and even as the bride of Christ. The primary thought is that of the one loaf of bread, which, being broken, all share in.

"Thus the loaf was nothing less than 'fellowship with the Body of Christ.'

This interpretation is borne out by the apostle's next words. You are God's new Israel; Israel after the Spirit . . . to partake of the Eucharistic Cup is to be in fellowship with the Blood of Christ, and to partake of the Eucharistic Bread is to be in fellowship with the Body of Christ . . . fellowship in the New Covenant made by the death of Christ; fellowship in the Body of Christ, that living corporate

(1) cf I Corinthians 10<sup>17-21</sup>.

corporate unity of which, to his view, Christ is at once the Head, and in a deeper fuller sense, the Whole". (1)

But the union with Christ to which Paul refers in this passage as taking place at the sacrament has a much further significance. The two elements of the sacrament - the bread and the wine - suggest at once the ideas of the Body and the Blood. In fact, if our records are accurate, such a reference originated with Jesus Himself. But both are one. Different aspects they may be. Different fundamental ideas they are not.

In the sacrament Paul regarded himself as in *κοινωνία* with the living Christ, "having the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto His death, and knowing Him and the power of His resurrection". (2)

The nature of the presence of Christ in the sacrament is an age-long controversy on which the Church Catholic itself is divided. With the details of this question, or controversy, we cannot deal, but would simply state that Paul regarded himself in the sacrament as being in communion not only with the Church as the Body of Christ, but with the living person of our Lord Himself, crucified and risen. Christian *κοινωνία* which began on a human level through a common faith in Christ, and love for the Saviour, rises through the offering of common sacramental worship into a new mystical *κοινωνία* with the risen Christ Himself.

" τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ carries our thoughts from the incarnation (Philomen 2<sup>d</sup>), through the crucifixion (Colossians 1<sup>st</sup> 2<sup>d</sup>), on to the heavenly

(1) J. Armitage Robinson, Hastings D.B. I, p. 462.  
(2) Philomen 3<sup>rd</sup>.

glory of the Redeemer (Phil~~imon~~<sup>321</sup>). The cup and bread are here (I Corinthians 10<sup>16</sup>) styled "a communion of Christ's blood and body"; in His own words (I Corinthians 11<sup>25</sup>) "the new covenant in my blood", - a communion on the basis of the covenant established by the sacrifice of the Cross". (1)

In this passage (I Corinthians 10) Paul goes on "to show how vital to the church was the fellowship of the Lord's Table, that was being violated by attendance at idol feasts". (2)

These idol feasts were a link with the past so far as the Corinthian converts were concerned; but they are also a link with the pagan yearning of humanity for 'union' with the gods they worshipped.

The Golden Stool of Ashanti, believed to hold the soul of the nation, was virtually an object of worship. When the women of Ashanti sent a wedding gift to Princess Mary, it took the form of a Silver Stool, the replica of the other. When it was handed over for transmission, the spokeswoman said:

"This stool we give gladly. It does not contain our soul as the Golden Stool does, but it contains our love. The spirit of this love we have bound to the stool with silver fetters, just as we are accustomed to bind our own spirits to the base of our Golden Stool". (3)

A sense of union and a desire for union with the object of worship is here the central note.

This yearning for union with the object of worship, or communion with the spiritual world, deeply permeated the mystery cults which began to abound in St. Paul's day and developed more fully later. It was a cultural expression of this elemental yearning of pagan religions. In speaking of the

(1) & (2) G.G. Findlay: Expositors' Greek Testament, p. 864.  
(3) The Golden Stool by Edwin W. Smith, p. 15.

Mystery Religions. Allan Menzies writes: "By partaking of these rites a man was believed ..... to form a special union with the deity, in whose nature he was made to partake". (1)

This universal yearning of humanity, however inarticulate it often was, found its completion, realisation and true satisfaction in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. In the idol feasts, however, there was a comparable communion with demons. St. Paul denies the reality of idols themselves, but finds in their ceremonies a background of evil spirits with whom the worshippers at these feasts attain a sort of spiritual fellowship. It is as if Paul conceived a certain spiritual conflict between light and darkness, good and evil, Christ and devils; that with this conflict of the spiritual realm the soul of man would have a certain *κοινωνία*.

The essential crux of that *κοινωνία* was in the sacrificial feasts either of Christ or of idols. But just because participation in these feasts resulted in this "fellowship", participation in both became incompatible. Through the external worship of the sacrament on the one hand, or the idolatrous feast on the other, something of the essential nature and life of Christ on the one hand, or of demons on the other, was conveyed and imparted to the worshipper, whose attitude at such a time was one of sensitive receptivity. This is *κοινωνία* in one of its deeper but essential aspects.

The New Testament use of *κοινωνία* reaches its most profound significance in its references to the Holy Spirit.

(1) Menzies: History of Religion, p. 300.

The 'fellowship' of the Holy Spirit in the Benediction is  
κοινωνία . The Trinitarian Benediction only occurs  
once (II Corinthians 13<sup>14</sup>), but so profoundly did it express  
spiritual truth that it has passed into almost universal use  
in Christendom. The fact that it is an elaboration of the  
usual personal note and greeting with which Paul signed his  
epistles, does not detract in any way from its value. The  
circumstances of the Church at Corinth were such as to call  
forth this elaboration of Paul's usual greeting to give us  
this jewel of Pauline thought and spiritual insight. The  
very order is remarkable. It is the grace of Christ which  
leads us towards the love of God, and the love of God leads  
us to that communion with Him through the Holy Spirit and  
also to that love of man which is a holy fellowship fostered  
by the Spirit. It is noteworthy that in Philemon 2<sup>1-2</sup>,  
the same steps are followed, 'consolation in Christ', 'comfort  
in love' (which is of God), 'fellowship of the Spirit',  
leading on that community or fellowship one for another which  
is begotten of love, 'having the same love, being of one accord,  
of one mind'. In his reference to II Corinthians 13<sup>14</sup>,  
J. Armitage Robinson writes

"The final salutation runs at first in its accustomed  
form, 'the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ'; but it  
is expanded to meet the occasion and its needs: 'the  
God of love' suggests the addition, 'the love of God';  
and the true sense of membership which the One Spirit  
gives to the One Body is prayed for in the words 'the  
fellowship of the Holy Spirit'. It is clear, then,  
that the genitive here is subjective and not object-  
ive; and this is confirmed by the parallel clauses.

'The grace' which is 'of the Lord Jesus', and 'the love' which is 'of God' are paralleled with 'the fellowship' which is 'of the Holy Spirit'". (1)

*κοινωνία* would seem to be as closely allied to the Holy Spirit as 'love' is to God. As St. Clement of Rome states:

"The common gift of the one Spirit is regarded as the bond of Christian unity". (2)

That sharing of the Divine Life, which is suggested in the mystery of the sacrament is conveyed through the *κοινωνία* of the Holy Spirit, a fellowship which embraces not only God but also man.

"Fellowship is not an aggregate of individuals, nor is it an organism. In fact fellowship is no concrete thing at all. It is, rather, that Primal synthesis and relationship and apprehension of all distinct concrete things which is their final unobservable Oneness". (3)

This leads us directly to the relationship between *κοινωνία* and *ἐκκλησία*. If *κοινωνία* is 'no concrete thing at all', *ἐκκλησία* certainly is. The latter has its worship, organisation, ministry, sacraments and the diversities of gifts which in their corporateness make up the organised spiritual life of the community of Christians. It is unnecessary to trace the stages of the developing organisation of *ἐκκλησία* to indicate the difference between these two aspects of early Christian life as depicted in the New Testament. The *ἐκκλησία* is the outward form, the extrovert aspect, the visible incarnation of a spiritual reality whose inner spirit, almost whose life-giving blood-stream, is

(1) J. Armitage Robinson: Hastings D.B. I, p. 460.

(2) Swete: History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, p. 12.

(3) Karl Barth: Epistle to the Romans p. 443.



*κοινωνία* = a fellowship that is both divine and human. Both together, the introvert aspect of its throbbing life in *κοινωνία*, and its formal outward, visible expression in *ἐκκλησία* constitute the "Body of Christ" upon the earth. The two are aspects of the one corporate reality. Either alone will wither and become unfruitful. True growth, true witnessing requires both. They may be distinguished but not separated. The weakness of either is the impoverishment of both. Both are comprehended within the one English term "Church". But the Church in any true or ideal sense must contain in balanced harmony these two essential elements of its New Testament counterpart.

The distinction between these two aspects of the 'Church' is further exemplified by the gifts of the Spirit which St. Paul describes as being given to each.

Of the *ἐκκλησία* he writes: "Now there are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit. To one is given .... the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge; to another faith; to another the gifts of healing; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another interpretation of tongues - all these the selfsame Spirit divideth to every man severally as he will". (1)

In the corporateness of the *ἐκκλησία* they are united, whereas the fruits of the Spirit in *κοινωνία* are "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance". (2) These also are shared by all. The difference in the nature of the gifts, or fruit, corresponds to the different aspects of the 'Church' or early Christian community to which they were given.

(1) I Corinthians 12:4ff.  
(2) Galatians 5

II Instances of κοινοῦν in the Septuagint.

- Lev. 6<sup>2</sup> ". . . the soul which shall have sinned . . . and shall have dealt falsely in the affairs of his neighbour in the matter of a deposit or concerning friendship . . . "
- Wi. 8<sup>18</sup> "To be allied unto wisdom is immortality . . . and in talking with her a good report".  
(Lit.: 'in fellowship of words'.)
- III Ma. 4<sup>6</sup> "Girls who had entered the bridal chamber quite lately, to enjoy the partnership of marriage, exchanged pleasure for misery".

Instances of κοινοῦν in the Septuagint

- II Chron. 20<sup>35</sup> "Afterwards Jehoshaphat King of Judah entered into an alliance with Abaziah King Of Israel, who did very wickedly".
- Job. 34<sup>8</sup> ". . . I have not sinned nor committed ungodliness, nor had fellowship with workers of iniquity".
- Prov. 1<sup>11</sup> "Come with us, partake in blood, and let us unjustly hide the just man in the earth".
- Ec. 9<sup>4</sup> "Who is he that hath fellowship with all the living?"
- Wi. 6<sup>23</sup> "Neither will I go with consuming envy; for such a man shall have no fellowship with wisdom".
- Si. 13<sup>1</sup> ". . . he that hath fellowship with a proud man shall be like unto him".

Si. 13<sup>2</sup>

" . . . have no fellowship with one that is mightier and richer than thyself; for how agree the kettle and the earthen pot together? for if the one be smitten against the other it shall be broken".

Si. 13<sup>17</sup>

"What fellowship hath the wolf with the lamb? so the sinner with the godly".

II Ma. 5<sup>20</sup>

"Therefore the place itself that was partaker (συμμετασχων) with them of the adversity that happened to the nation, did afterward communicate in the benefits sent from the Lord".

14<sup>25</sup>

" . . . so he married, was quiet, and took part of this life".

III Ma. 2<sup>31</sup>

"Some of those who were over the city therefore abhorring any approach to the city of piety, unhesitatingly gave in to the king and expected to derive some great honour from a future connection with him".

4<sup>11</sup>

"Thus they could hold no communication with his forces".

IV Ma. 7<sup>6</sup>

"O priest worthy of the priesthood, <sup>o</sup>there didst not pollute thy sacred teeth, nor make thy appetite, which had always embraced the clean and lawful, a partaker of profanity.

#### Instances of κοινωvός in the Septuagint

Es. 8<sup>13</sup>

" . . . having by various and subtle artifices demanded for destruction . . . Esther the blameless consort of our kingdom with the whole nation".

Si. 6<sup>10</sup>

"Again some friend is a companion at table, and will not continue in the day of thy affliction".

Si. 41<sup>18</sup>

"Be ashamed . . . of unjust dealing before thy partner and friend".

42<sup>3</sup>

". . . be thou not ashamed . . . of reckoning with thy partners and travellers".

Ma. 2<sup>14</sup>

". . . The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant".

Is. 1<sup>23</sup>

"Thy princes are rebellious, companions of thieves".

Prov. 28<sup>24</sup>

"He that casts off father or mother and thinks he sins not; the same is partaker with an ungodly man".

Mal. 2<sup>14</sup>

". . . yet she was thy partner and the wife of thy covenant".

---

Instances of *Koiv WV/a* in the New Testament

Acts 2<sup>42</sup>

"They continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship".

Rom. 15<sup>26</sup>

"It hath pleased them . . . to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem".

I Cor. 1<sup>9</sup>

"God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord".

10<sup>16</sup>

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?"

II Cor. 6<sup>14</sup>

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship ( $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\eta$ ) hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion ( $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\iota\alpha$ ) hath light with darkness?"

8<sup>4</sup>

"Praying . . . that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints".

9<sup>13</sup>

". . . and for your liberal distribution unto them".

13<sup>14</sup>

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all".

Gal. 2<sup>9</sup>

". . . they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship".

Eph. 3<sup>9</sup>

"To make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God".

Text here is doubtful. Textus Receptus has  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\iota\alpha$  . . . The R. V. and all critical texts read  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\iota\alpha$  (dispensation) supported by B. N. A. C. D. K. F. L.

Phil. 1<sup>5</sup>

"For your fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now".

2<sup>1</sup>

"If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies ."

3<sup>10</sup>

"That I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings".

(Some mss. omit the definite article here, e.g. Souter's N. T. following N. A. B.)

Phm. 6

"That the communication of thy faith may become effectual".

Heb. 13<sup>16</sup>

"But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well-pleased".

I John 1<sup>3</sup>

"That ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ".

1<sup>6,7</sup>

"If we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son cleanseth us from all sin".

---

Instances of the verb - ΚΟΙΝΩΝΕΩ - in the New Testament.

Rom. 12<sup>13</sup>

"Distributing to the necessity of the saints".

15<sup>27</sup>

"For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things".

Gal. 6<sup>6</sup>

"Let him that is taught share with him that teacheth". (1)

Phil. 4<sup>15</sup>

"No church communicated with me as concerning ~~and~~ giving and receiving, but ye only".

I Tim. 5<sup>22</sup>

"Neither be partaker of other men's sins".

Heb. 2<sup>14</sup>

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same".

I Peter 4<sup>13</sup>

"But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings".

II John v.11

"For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds".

Instances of συνκοινωνεω

- Eph. 5<sup>11</sup> "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness".
- Phil. 4<sup>14</sup> "Notwithstanding ye have well done that ye did communicate with my affliction".
- Rev. 18<sup>4</sup> "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins".

Instances of κοινωνος in the New Testament

- Matt. 23<sup>30</sup> "If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets".
- Luke 5<sup>10</sup> ". . . which were partners with Simon".
- I Cor. 10<sup>18</sup> "Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"
- 10<sup>20</sup> "I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils". (κοινωνος γινομαι)
- II Cor. 1<sup>7</sup> ". . . as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall ye be also of the consolation".
- 8<sup>23</sup> "Whether any do enquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellowhelper concerning you".
- Phm. v.17 "If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself".
- I Peter 5<sup>1</sup> "And also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed".
- II Peter 1<sup>4</sup> ". . . that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature".

Instances of *συγκοινωνός*

- Rom. 11<sup>17</sup> "Thou, being a wild olive . . . with them partakeest of the root and fatness of the olive tree".
- I Cor. 9<sup>23</sup> "And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you".
- Phil. 1<sup>7</sup> ". . . ye are all partakers of my grace".
- Rev. 1<sup>9</sup> "I, John . . . your brother and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ".

Words and Ideas associated with *κοινωνία*  
and related words in the Septuagint  
and the New Testament.

- |  |                            |   |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| (1) Fellowship or<br>partnership<br>with evil: } | II Chron. 20 <sup>35</sup> | "After this did Jehoshaphat . . . join himself to Ahaziah . . . who did very wickedly".   |
|  | Job 34 <sup>8</sup>        | "I have not sinned . . . nor had fellowship with workers of iniquity".                    |
|  | Prov. 1 <sup>11</sup>      | "Come with us, let us lay wait for blood".  |
|  | Si. 13 <sup>1</sup>        | "He that hath fellowship with a proud man shall be like unto him".                        |
|  | 13 <sup>2</sup>            | "Have no fellowship with one that is mightier and richer than thyself".                   |
|  | 13 <sup>17</sup>           | "What fellowship hath the wolf with the lamb?"  |
|  | 6 <sup>10</sup>            | "Some friend is a companion at table and will not continue in the day of thy affliction". |



Is. 1 <sup>23</sup>	"Thy princes are rebellious, companions of thieves".
II Cor. 6 <sup>14</sup>	"What communion hath light with darkness?"
I Tim. 5 <sup>22</sup>	"Neither be partaker of other men's sins".
II John v. 11	"He that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds".
Eph. 5 <sup>11</sup>	"Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness".
Rev. 18 <sup>4</sup>	"Come out of her, my people that ye be not partakers of her sins".
Matt. 23 <sup>30</sup>	". . . we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets".
I Cor. 10 <sup>18</sup>	"Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"
10 <sup>20</sup>	"I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils".
IV Ma. 7 <sup>6</sup>	"O priest, worthy of the priesthood thou didst not . . . make thy appetite . . . a partaker of profanity".
(2) The sharing or contribut- ing of goods, material or spiritual: }	II Ma. 5 <sup>10</sup> "The place itself that was partaker with them of the adversity . . . did afterwards communicate in the benefits sent from the Lord".
	III Ma. 2 <sup>31</sup> "Some . . . expected to derive some great honour from a future connection with him".

Si. 6<sup>10</sup>

"Again some friend is a companion at table".

Si. 42<sup>3</sup>

"Be thou not ashamed . . of reckoning with they partners and travellers".

Rom. 15<sup>26</sup>

"It hath pleased them . . to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem".

II Cor. 8<sup>4</sup>

". . . take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints".

9<sup>13</sup>

". . . and for your liberal distribution t unto them".

Phil. 1<sup>5</sup>

"For your fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now".

Phm. 6

"That the communication of thy faith may become effectual".

Heb. 13<sup>16</sup>

"To do good and to communicate, forget not".

Rom. 12<sup>13</sup>

"Distributing to the necessity of the saints".

15<sup>27</sup>

"If the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things".

Gal. 6<sup>6</sup>

"Let him that<sup>15</sup> taught share with him that teacheth".

Phil. 4<sup>15</sup>

"No church communicated with me .b. but ye only".

4<sup>14</sup>

". . ye have done well that ye did communicate with my affliction".

II Cor. 1 <sup>7</sup>	"As ye are partakers of the sufferings so shall ye be also of the consolation".
Phil. 1 <sup>7</sup>	"We are all partakers of my grace."
(3) Partnership } of Marriage: } III Ma. 4 <sup>6</sup>	"Girls who had entered the bridal chamber quite lately to enjoy the partnership of marriage, exchanged pleasure for misery".
Mal. 2 <sup>14</sup>	". . . yet she was thy partner and the wife of thy covenant".
Es. 8 <sup>13</sup>	". . . Esther the blameless consort of our kingdom . . ."
Acts 2 <sup>42</sup>	"They continued . . in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship".
(4) Partnership } in the Gospel; } I Cor. 1 <sup>9</sup>	"God is faithful by whom ye were called into the fellowship of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord".
Gal. 2 <sup>9</sup>	"They gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship".
Eph. 3 <sup>9</sup>	"To make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery . . ."
Phil. 1 <sup>5</sup>	"For your fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now".
Rom. 15 <sup>27</sup>	"If the gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things".
II Cor. 8 <sup>3</sup>	". . . Titus, he is my partner . . ."
Phma. 1 <sup>7</sup>	"If thou count me therefore a partner receive him as myself".

Rom. 11<sup>17</sup>

"Thou . . partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree".

I Cor. 9<sup>23</sup>

"This I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you".

Phil. 1<sup>7</sup>

". . . ye are all partakers of my grace".

(a) in tribulation: II Ma. 5<sup>20</sup>

"Therefore the place itself that was partaker with them of the adversity that happened to the nation, did afterwards communicate in the benefits sent from the Lord".

Phil. 3<sup>10</sup>

"That I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings".

Heb. 2<sup>14</sup>

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same".

I Peter 4<sup>13</sup>

"But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings".

Phil. 4<sup>14</sup>

"Ye have well done that ye did communicate with my affliction".

II Cor. 1<sup>7</sup>

"As ye are partakers of the sufferings so shall ye also be of the consolation".

Rev. 1<sup>9</sup>

"I, John, . . your brother and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ".

- (b) in faith: Ec. 9<sup>4</sup>  
Phm. 6  
"To him that is joined to all the living there is hope".  
"That the communication of thy faith may be effectual".
- (c) in consolation: II Cor. 1<sup>7</sup>  
"As ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall ye be also of the consolation".
- (d) in Jesus Christ: I Cor. 1<sup>9</sup>  
10<sup>16</sup>  
"God is faithful, by whom ye were called into the fellowship of Jesus Christ our Lord".  
"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"  
I John 1<sup>3</sup>  
"That ye also may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his son, Jesus Christ".  
1<sup>6-7</sup>  
"If we say we have fellowship with Him and walk in darkness, we lie".  
II Peter 1<sup>4</sup>  
". . . that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature".
- (e) in God the Father: I John 1<sup>3</sup>  
". . . truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ".

(f) in the Holy  
Spirit:

II Cor. 13<sup>14</sup>

"The grace of the Lord  
Jesus Christ, and the  
love of God and the  
communion of the Holy  
Ghost be with you all".

Phil. 2<sup>1</sup>

"If there be therefore  
any consolation in Christ,  
if any comfort of love,  
if any fellowship of the  
Spirit, if any bowels  
and mercies . . ."

### III The Origin and Function of Κοινωνία

While the word *κοινωνία* does not occur in the Gospels, it is from the ministry of Jesus that the fact or experience later designated by that term took its rise.

Nevertheless just as the ministry of Jesus itself was prepared for in the history of Israel by the Spirit of God, so there was also an anticipation of this concept of *κοινωνία*. This is most clearly exemplified in the community of the 'New Covenant' of which we learn from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Whatever the date of these scrolls may be, the community, of which some of them tell, acknowledged as their founder the 'Master of Justice', who died about 65-63 B.C.. One of these scrolls is described thus: "This book is none other than the

"customary law' or the 'rule' of the Community of the New Covenant founded by the Master of Justice. The Hebrew word used to indicate the Community, *yadadh*, only occurs once as a noun in the Old Testament: it signifies 'union', 'communion' whence 'community', just like the Greek *κοινωνία* which offers the same meanings. We have already met it in the 'Habakkuk Commentary'; it occurs constantly in the Rule. It is not a word devoid of meaning; between brothers, the members of the sect, there should exist a deep spirit of communion; together they ought to do battle for the Truth, for the Good; they should abandon themselves wholly to the Community . . . . It is not stated that the adherents of the New Covenant lived properly speaking in monasteries; but, to say the least, they formed amongst themselves assemblies, little mystical societies . . . ." (1)

(1) A. Dupont-Sommer: The Dead Sea Scrolls, (1952), p. 45.

In the comparable document, "The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus", the following regulations occur:

"Yet they will keep (the Covenant) in acting according to the tenor of the Law in the time of iniquity and in separating themselves from the sons of perdition; and in preserving themselves from the riches of iniquity. . . . . in setting quite apart the holy things; each loving his brother as himself, and holding by the hand the poor and the needy and the stranger, and each seeking the good of his brother . . . . ." (2)

A further comment on this people of the New Covenant, with its remarkable Christian parallels, may be quoted:

"Everything in the Jewish New Covenant (of the Essenes) heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master . . . appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Master of Justice . . . . In the Christian Church, just as in the Essene Church, the essential ritual is the sacred meal. . . . And the ideal of both Churches is essentially that of unity, community in love - even going so far as the sharing of common property". (3)

Of them also it could be said,

"The *Koinuvia* is not the Church as a visible society nor any particular external manifestation of the Church's unity. It is rather an interior spiritual reality, an activity of sharing or communion, constituting the inner bond of that brotherly concord which, in turn, is realized and expressed in the life of the community". (4)

How did this element arise in the Ministry of Jesus? In what circumstances, or form was it embodied in His teaching? Though the word *Koinuvia* does not occur in the Gospels,

(2) A. Dupont-Sommer: The Dead Sea Scrolls, (1958), p. 66.

(3) " " " " " " " " p. 99

(4) E. S. Thornton: The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p. 450.



how did the conception designated by that term come to be so fundamental in the gospel message? In Jesus' gospel of the Kingdom of God what was the function that this concept fulfilled? What was its function in evangelism? What was its function in the spiritual development of the soul? (Does that last question not beg the issue, by assuming that an individualistic measuring-line is the true criterion of worth?) Is not the true spiritual development of the soul to be found in the glorifying of God in *Koivwv* ?

These, and many other questions, may be asked, but let us turn anew to the life and ministry of Jesus and try to follow this thread therein.

Whatever additional meanings lie behind the Temptations, one factor prominently involved in them was the method of ministry which Jesus should adopt. Those picturesque stories must have been told later by our Lord to his disciples, in part at least, to help them to understand certain methods of ministry, which He had rejected. His purpose to establish the Kingdom of God upon the earth might have been advanced in the ways the devil suggests; but Jesus says, "No". Apart from the stories of the Temptations, we might never have realized that it cost Jesus a struggle to make these decisions.

There is every reason to believe that Jesus began his public ministry thereafter in Judea and in Jerusalem. Any other course, on consideration, would be unthinkable. God,

throughout the centuries, had been preparing Israel for the coming of the Messiah. He had to prepare a nation capable of receiving Him; He had to prepare a people capable of assimilating the imprint of His personality, and of appreciating the essential content of His revelation; He had to lead them to a sufficient stage of spiritual attainment, understanding and vision to make this possible. He had also to create a sense of expectancy. All this God had done, and the 'fulness of the times was come'. With all their faults, the scribes and pharisees were the custodians or trustees of this spiritual heritage of the nation. In fairness, the Messiah should first present Himself to them, and seek to use them, the spiritual leaders of Israel, for His Divine task. To reject them, uncalled, is not the way of God. There is every reason to believe that Jesus first preached the gospel in Jerusalem and gave the scribes and pharisees the opportunity to accept thereof. But they rejected Him.

Jesus then resolved to appeal directly to the common people. He was attended by a few friends, loosely attached, who afterwards liked to describe themselves as His "disciples". But the twelve were not yet called. At first it would seem that this method met with astonishing success, and it seems as if new hope kindled in the breast of Jesus. He continued His ministry to the common people. On the Sabbath days they assembled for worship in their synagogues and there Jesus had the opportunity of speaking to them. This opportunity He

took. "And He was preaching to the synagogues of Galilee". (1)  
A singularly well attested variant reading gives "Judea"  
instead of "Galilee". (2) Perhaps both are correct. As  
the synagogues only met on the Sabbath day, and as Jewish law  
forbade a journey of more than 3 miles on such a day, such a  
ministry must have taken a considerable time - possibly a year.

At length He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought  
up, and, as His custom was, He entered the synagogue. They  
rejected Him. Jesus then seems to have realised that without  
the scribes and pharisees He would not win the common people.  
And the scribes and pharisees He could not win. After all,  
it was the scribes and pharisees who had provided the people  
with such spiritual truth as they possessed and who were the  
religious leaders of Israel.

What was Jesus to do? There were the methods of ministry  
the devil had suggested to Him. There was one other alter-  
native. He could form His own band of Rabbin, His own company  
of religious teachers. With Jesus' insight, He must have  
realised that such a step meant ultimately a complete break  
with the Jewish religious hierarchy; that it constituted the  
nucleus of a new organisation; that it would become in the  
end, His church. As if to postpone the inevitable break as  
long as possible, and also not to carry forward some of the  
harmful traditions of the old 'set-up', He warned his followers  
later, "Do not ye called Rabbin"; He called them "disciples".

(1) St. Luke 4<sup>44</sup> "καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς  
(2) Γαλιλαίας \* τῆς Γαλιλαίας \*  
A.D.W.A.S. etc. 'Ιουδαίας etc.  
N.B.C.L.P.R. etc.

Before Jesus formally called the twelve and appointed them as His disciples, He spent the whole night in prayer to God. May we not infer that the subject of His prayer was not just the choice of the disciples, but the whole implications of this entirely new method of ministry on which He now embarked? From the call of the disciples, which was relatively late in the chronology of His ministry as a whole, it was approximately one year till Galvary. The new method succeeded. At least it fulfilled the purpose of Jesus. Its essential content was *κοινωνία*.

To this group He imparted His deepest truths 'that He might send them forth to preach'. Against the background of a public ministry, with its healing of the sick and other miracles, He taught them His gospel of the Kingdom of God. He laboured to unite them into one corporate community. Not in themselves individually, but in their togetherness, particularly their togetherness with Him, their strength would lie. His conception of *κοινωνία* seems to have been that of ever widening concentric circles.

"The Apostolic College was formed of three concentric circles - each less closely intimate with Jesus than the last". (1)  
Beyond this there was the further circle, including the women friends from Galilee. Beyond this again there was that large company of disciples from whom Jesus chose seventy to go out two by two to spread His message, to preach the Kingdom of God. These seventy must have assimilated a very considerable amount of the teaching of Jesus to be able to undertake a preaching

(1) Godet quoted in Camb. Gk. T. p. 182.

Peter	Philip	James of Alphaeus
James	Thomas	Simon Zelotes
John	Bartholomew	Jude of James
Andrew	Matthew	Judas Iscariot

mission on His behalf. They, with the twelve in their turn, were sent out two by two, which was the smallest possible

*κοινωνία* . It is noteworthy that in the Book of Acts the early church followed this example and sent out its missionaries two by two:- Paul and Barnabas; Paul and Silas; Barnabas and Mark. The number might increase, but a cell of *κοινωνία* was essential.

When Jesus performed His miracles He always tried to do so on the basis or background of *κοινωνία* . e.g. At the raising of Jairus' daughter, He took Peter and James and John with Him - at least to begin with. He sought to ally Himself with human faith, or with the faith of others; e.g. the paralytic borne of four, the centurion's servant, the lepers, the blind men. In each case a *κοινωνία* was established between Jesus and the others through which the power of healing flowed. When Jesus touched the untouchable, His touch conveyed healing and *κοινωνία* ; or did the *κοινωνία* come first?

In the hours of His soul's deepest experiences Our Lord sought the spiritual fellowship of the innermost circle of His disciples, Peter, James and John; - on the Mount of Transfiguration and in Gethsemane.

There is only one recorded instance where Jesus sent a man, who believed in Him, to bear witness to Him alone - the case of the man who had been living beside the Gadarene swine and whom Jesus had cured. To the significance of this

exception we must return later.

After Christ rose from the dead, He always appeared to His friends when they were together in spiritual fellowship one with another - with one recorded exception. He appeared to Mary Magdalene alone beside the garden tomb.

It was only to His friends, to those who in their hearts loved Him and believed in Him, that the risen Christ appeared - again with one exception. He appeared to Saul on the Damascus Road while Saul was still a persecutor. But Saul was sent immediately to experience Christian *κοινωνία*, and it was at the touch of *κοινωνία* that he received his sight.

How far did this conception of *κοινωνία* influence the teaching of Jesus?

In the first place there is the distinction drawn between those who believe in Him and those who do not. His gifts of healing were given, almost, without restriction. Only actual dis-belief hindered them. The dissemination of His teaching was much more discriminatingly given. The Sermon the the Mount was not given to the people as a whole, but only to His disciples, to those who were committed to 'The Way'. Even if we regard those chapters in Matthew and Luke as collected teaching from many occasions, through the logic *α*, they are still given to a select circle and not to the world at large; they are directions as to the Christian way of life to those who are in the way. To be truly understood they must be viewed from the inside of the new *κοινωνία* that Christ had

created as the means and method of His ministry, and to which alone they were truly applicable.

In the formation of the band of twelve disciples, the Pharisees recognised, perhaps more intuitively than by reasoned deduction, a threat to their own positions and authority. It was after this step that their opposition hardened into active persecution. Driven to desperation at His influence with the people and their own impotence against Him, they accused Him of being in league with Beelzebub and of having a devil.

Jesus seemed to regard this taunt as vital. He indicated it as the sin against the Holy Spirit. It darkened counsel and confused the truth.

"Was unto them", said the prophet, "that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter". (1)

"Parables are mentioned for the first time after the scribes had accused Jesus of demon possession". (2)

The parables had a peculiar quality. They were told in the presence of the people and even of His enemies; but while they could be easily remembered, they could be understood only by those who were within the *κοινωνία* of Jesus. To the disciples, to those who were taught by Him alone, He expounded their meaning. In the content of the parables, however, we find practically nothing about *κοινωνία* or the spiritual value of "togetherness". On the other hand, when we turn to the direct teaching of Jesus we find this aspect of spiritual

(1) Isaiah 5<sup>20</sup>.

(2) A. S. Peck: One volume Commentary p. 686 Col. 1.

life prominent. A man must be reconciled to his brother before he brings an offering to the altar in sacrifice to God.<sup>(1)</sup> He threatens divine judgment on whoever is angry with his brother without a cause. <sup>(2)</sup> Jesus insisted on men forgiving one another as the condition of receiving forgiveness from God. <sup>(3)</sup> The unforgiving spirit is the great enemy of *κοινωνία*. In fact the condition of receiving forgiveness from God is the condition of remaining in the spiritual brotherhood Jesus was creating.

The commandment, as the scribe quoted it to our Lord, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God and thy neighbour as thyself" is the positive aspect of the new spiritual fellowship. This, and the need for mutual forgiveness, are as the obverse and reverse of the same coin. It also sums up, with deepening connotation, the essential content of the Ten Commandments whose constant fundamental purpose is to maintain the social consolidation of Israel as the people of God.

In the illustration of the Good Shepherd, the emphasis is laid upon the flock which Jesus tends and His efficiency in shepherding them. The lost sheep is not just found, it is restored to the fold.

In the figure of the vine <sup>(4)</sup> there is an indication of the deeper significance of *κοινωνία*. Fellowship with Christ is the means and source of life and strength and power; it is also the condition of fruitfulness. The same conception

(1) Matthew 5<sup>23-24</sup>.  
(2) Matthew 5<sup>22</sup>.

(3) Matthew 6<sup>14-15</sup>. Mark 11<sup>25-26</sup>.  
(4) St. John 15<sup>1-8</sup>.



is developed by St. Paul under the illustration of the olive tree. (1)

Life is derived from the root and from the parent stem and so the branches are 'joint shareholders in the richness of the olive'. No life exists independently. The Christian draws through the *κοινωνία* a share of a common life in Christ through his Spirit. This conception is more fully developed by St. Paul in his description of the Church as comparable to that of the organic unity of the human body. (2) The whole body speaks, or hears, or acts through its members. But while the particular member is the agent, it is the whole body that functions. But the body in functioning can only do so through the activity of a particular member or members. The experiences and activities of the whole church are in some sort communicated to the individual believer; and the experiences and activities of the individual believer are in some sort communicated to the whole church. The ordinary, or pagan, conception of partnership is here far outdistanced. This is not a mere pooling of individual resources whether material or spiritual. For neither a tree, nor a body, consists in a mere addition of branches or members. Only in the visions of Ezekiel is the living organism so gathered together, and even there they were not living till the breath of the Spirit of God quickened them. Life exists only as shared. The divine life disclosed in the incarnate Christ and communicated through His Spirit manifests itself thus in the life of the Church. The existence of a

(1) Romans 11<sup>17-23</sup>.

(2) Romans 12<sup>4-5</sup>; I Corinthians 12; Ephesians 4<sup>15-16</sup>.

true *κοινωνία* provides the channel of its expression, the facilities of a dwelling-place, or may we say, the opportunity of its incarnation? St. Paul in I Cor. 12 finds in the Holy Spirit the life-giving principle of the union and functioning of the body and its members, which he expounds. Christ is the Head.

Would it follow from this that in losing *κοινωνία*, in its deepest sense, we lose also the Holy Spirit, for *κοινωνία* is the means whereby the Holy Spirit becomes incarnate among men? True *κοινωνία*, therefore, would seem to be, if not the Holy Spirit Himself, at least the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. It is to be remembered, of course, that the Holy Spirit is both immanent and transcendent within it.

Into Christ's teaching something of this deeper mystery itself penetrated. "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them".<sup>(1)</sup> It was not just the simple addition of one person to another like A and B; it was the fusion or real union into a fellowship that was spiritual, A+B. When that is realized a new spiritual principle is enunciated. It is significant that in the realm of *physics*, the laws of Newton or Euclidean geometry are no longer held to be universally true. They are only true when applied to the material world, ~~or the imaginary world of pure mathematics.~~ When applied to the sphere of nuclear physics, to the microcosm or the macrocosm they are no longer applicable

(1) Matthew 18<sup>19-20</sup> \*

-71-  
*postulates*

in the former sense of ~~axioms~~ which cannot be questioned. Other factors enter and those laws may no longer hold. For example, the sum of the angles of a triangle may be more than  $180^\circ$ . Ordinary arithmetic and causality no longer apply. When we step into the deeper spiritual world of eternal things a similar change is experienced.  $(1+1)$  no longer equals 2, for on this level of new life  $(1+1) = 2+$ . In fact  $(1+1) = 3+$ , for the addition of Jesus is not the mere addition of one more. The existence of such a depth of fellowship creates a 'plus' beyond the mere addition of individuals. The doorway through which humanity enters into this new spiritual realm is Christian *κοινωνία* and there this new principle applies.

This new world is a world of power. "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven". 'Agreement' is not shallow, human, consent; it is the union or communion of *κοινωνία*, and the two are no longer two, but three, and the prayer is therefore the "Prayer of Faith" to which the answer is sure.

Into this new fellowship that Christ created there comes another factor. The *κοινωνία* has the power of judgment like the judgment of God. "Whosoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven". (1) In the consideration of *κοινωνία* this verse cannot be ignored. It follows immediately after a reference to the Church (Matt. 18<sup>17</sup>) and

the judgment for good or bad to which it refers is a corporate, not an individual, judgment. It is further evidence of the real dwelling of the Holy Spirit within the true Christian *κοινωνία*. To understand its meaning truly, I believe, we would need to experience the *κοινωνία* from which it speaks, and have the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit who dwells therein. This we do not have.

In the Lord's Supper we have the climax of Christian *κοινωνία*. In its sacramental expression this unseen spiritual reality becomes as it were, incarnate. As it developed in the life and worship of the church, it was here that the outward form of church organisation, with its ordained ministry, and the inward spirit of Christian fellowship and communion met and were one. As Jesus instituted it, it was to be the corner-stone or foundation of the Church's worship, i.e. of the *ἐκκλησία*, and the climax and seal of their *κοινωνία*. It was a communion one with another; it was a communion with Christ. Whatever further meaning and deeper significance, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper may hold (and it holds much) the aspect of *κοινωνία* or communion is never absent, nor is the presence of the Holy Spirit. (1)

But the Lord's Supper is a sharing of the broken Bread as well as of the life-giving cup of the Lord. It speaks of Calvary and of the Cross. The Christian *κοινωνία*

(1) Compare Chapter 2 p.

therefore, involves a fellowship with the sufferings of Christ.

Sin is always anti-social. Sin is ubiquitous in humanity. Whatever meaning "original Sin" may have, it has some meaning. It is a real, if faltering, attempt to 'intellectualise' a profound and far-reaching experience of humanity. It is only 'reckoned with', adequately, by the Cross. The constant selfishness and sin of man is a constant dis-integrating factor reaching to the deeper and more profound levels of *κοινωνία*. The only way in which the 'fellowship' can maintain itself, as a vital and effective reality, is by 'fellowship' with the Cross of Christ being integrated therein. The *κοινωνία* is preserved from the dis-integrating influence of sin by this 'Fellowship with the Cross' - a fellowship that is so assimilated and repeated as to become almost the 'signature' of the true Christian *κοινωνία*. It is a communion of the 'broken Bread', and in this the Comforter is found. The Comforter is that aspect of the Holy Spirit that, through this experience in *κοινωνία*, is realised.

In the heart of the 'Fellowship' there is the Cross; and in the heart of the 'Fellowship' there is also the hope of the Church triumphant.

In view of these tremendous spiritual treasures found in Christian *κοινωνία*, the sharing of material goods becomes trivial. When we pass to the Johannine interpretation

of Christianity we find that the accent is placed on love.

"God is love".

"A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another."

"This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you".

"He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God that he hath not seen".

Love is the cement of friendship; it is the atmosphere of fellowship. It is the essential ingredient in the personal relationships of Christian  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\alpha$ . The latter differs from a mere secular partnership in having necessarily this element of love. It is significant that  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$ , should, like  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\alpha$ , be a word taken from the common use of the times and baptised into a deeper meaning in the fellowship of the Christian Church. St. Paul in I Cor. 13 gives an analysis of  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$  which largely applies to its functioning in  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\alpha$ .

In the "Te Deum", one of the most ancient hymns of the church the importance of  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\alpha$  is recognised.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "The glorious company of the apostles praise Thee.  
 The goodly fellowship of the prophets praise Thee.  
 The noble army of martyrs praise Thee.  
 The Holy Church throughout all the world doth  
 acknowledge Thee".

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "We therefore pray Thee, help thy servants . . .  
 . . make them to be numbered with Thy saints in  
 glory everlasting".

The Christian doctrine of the "Communion of Saints" is

the direct outcome of the experience of Christian *κοινωνία* coupled with the hope of eternal life beyond the grave revealed through Christ. As *He* conquered death, He conquered the power of death to break the *κοινωνία* of His Church.

It would therefore appear that *κοινωνία* is an essential element of the gospel itself, an indispensable step in the journey of the soul to its full and final salvation in Christ. The benediction conveys, as it were, upon the worshippers the three essential elements of salvation,

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ,  
The love of God and  
the communion of the Holy Ghost  
be with you all". (1)

But no sooner do we seem to establish or work out the way in which God moves or works than exceptions immediately confront us. The 'laws of nature' are simply statements of the way in which nature has been observed uniformly to act. There is a natural human desire to map out in similar fashion the spiritual world of God's dealings with men.

But no sooner in the ministry of Jesus do we seem to perceive a uniform and constant principle of action than there is an outstanding exception, which seems even contradictory of the rest.

The man, whose evil spirits entered the Gadarene swine, sought the *κοινωνία* of Jesus and was sent to bear witness alone.

(1) II Cor. 13<sup>13</sup> "No exegetical skill", as Lietzmann remarks, can give us certainty as to the exact meaning of "*ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος*".

The resurrection appearances were all to his disciples in fellowship, except to Mary Magdalene.

The risen Christ only appeared to His friends, and never used the resurrection appearances to convert unbelievers or win over His enemies - except to St. Paul on the Damascus Road.

God is not bound. He is transcendent even over the ordinary custom of His own conduct. He is subject to no rule or law. In ordinary circumstances, like the physics of the man-size world, there is a consistency and constancy of action that can be relied upon. But when other factors enter, when other circumstances emerge, like another dimension entering within the sphere of calculation, He acts with complete freedom. No moral law can be laid down truly indicating the proper course of action in hypothetical circumstances. When the situation arises, the Divine Wisdom has complete freedom in relation to that situation. Therefore, while *κοινωνία* is normal in relation to the life and progress of the Gospel among mankind, God (and God was in Christ and the Holy Spirit) is still free and transcendent above and beyond it.

The position of *κοινωνία*, however, in relation to the ministry of Jesus and the spread of the Gospel is not arbitrary. It is not just a successful method, or the method Christ happened to adopt. It is linked to the essential nature of humanity itself. The power of *κοινωνία* is effective because 'deep calleth unto deep', and there is that in the depth of humanity which responds. 'What is man?' In the creation of humanity there is this factor which, in the



creation of Christian *Koivwvia* Jesus awakened to the fulness of life. 'I am sure that they might have life, and might have it more abundantly', said Jesus. Because of the nature of humanity, that abundant life cannot be realized without *Koivwvia*.

If such is the nature of humanity, what about the nature of the Godhead itself? What is the meaning of the Trinity, unless it be that, in the ultimate reality of the Absolute, there is *Koivwvia*? As the Trinity is the most mature revelation of the nature of God that mankind has received, the presence of *Koivwvia* as an essential element in Ultimate Reality must be acknowledged.

CHAPTER 2

Individualism and Κοινωνία in Monasticism.

Does the doctrine of Κοινωνία occupy the place in the teaching of Christianity in the 20th century which we have sought to indicate that it occupies in the New Testament? Has there been a change of emphasis towards Individualism and away from Κοινωνία? We are apt to think of Modern Individualism as being the product of Christianity itself, or, supremely, the product of the 19th Century. Or, was the conception of individualism, in the modern sense, a product of the Reformation? At first sight the Middle Ages seem to embody something very different and something of the essential nature of Κοινωνία. Particularly does this seem to obtain in the life of the monasteries and of the Medieval Gilds. We therefore propose to study these two aspects of the life of the Middle Ages from the standpoint of how far they embodied in practice, Individualism or Christian Κοινωνία. It may be that the individualism of the modern age, and the doctrinal deficiency of modern Christianity, have their roots in the Middle Ages itself. We, therefore, turn our attention first to a study of Monasticism, seeking to evaluate to some extent its place and function in relation of our modern civilisation, and faith. We do not attempt to trace the history of Monasticism (knowledge of that is assumed), but rather to view its history and development from the standpoint of Individualism and Christian Κοινωνία.

Monasticism began in the deserts of Egypt and Africa. Behind the earliest attempts to form a "Monastic community" there lay the lives of the solitaries or hermits of the desert. From the beginning, the movement - if it could be called that - was marked by a sharp individualism. "The dominating principle that pervaded Egyptian monachism in all its manifestations . . . was a spirit of strongly-marked individualism". (1) It had its roots in renunciation, "the yearning for self-surrender rising at times to a passion" (2) which has so often manifested itself in vital religion.

"Monasticism and Renunciation for long ages were looked upon as interchangeable terms; in the sense that no real renunciation could be conceived of which did not end in some form of Monasticism". (3)

Renunciation is from its very nature essentially personal and individualistic. They renounced the world and the Church. The renunciation of the world is borne out by the "sneer of Gibbon 'at the unhappy exiles from social life'". (4) The renunciation of the Church followed from the peace made with the world in the conversion of Constantine and the subsequent entry of the world into the church.

"The hermit fled not so much from the world as from the world in the Church, from court bishops who fought for richer sees . . ." (5)

- (1) Butler "Lausiac History of Palladius" I, p. 237, quoted by H.B. Workman, "Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", p. 23.
- (2) H.B. Workman "Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", p. 3.
- (3) " " " " " " " " , p. 4.
- (4) " " " " " " " " , p. 5 - quoted
- (5) " " " " " " " " , p. 10.

"It was a veritable stampede from the Catholic Church, as though that great creation of Christian energy were no better than the evil world from which escape was sought". (1) "Over every hermit's cell we might read the legend, "God and my soul"; an ideal altogether outside the ideal of the Catholic Church. To this individualism we owe it that Monasticism, as a system, in its origin lay not only over against the church, but over against the State". (2)

"It is important to note how strongly early monasticism was tinged with unsacerdotalism (not, of course, with anti-sacerdotalism). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that St. Antony never received the Holy Communion for years and years together". (3)

The anchorite sought his own soul's salvation, the spiritual development and culture of his own soul's life. In his renunciation of the world there was also a renunciation of

*κοινωνία*. The latter was regarded in all its forms as part of the world, which was wholly evil and heading for judgment. The renunciation of *κοινωνία*, as pertaining to the realm of temptation and of evil, was complete. It was regarded, in fact, as the mark of the highest spiritual life to have no contact with one's fellows. Evidences abound of the extent the anchorites were prepared to go to avoid human contacts.

"The greatest saints", writes Thomas a Kempis, "avoided the society of man, when they conveniently could, and did rather choose to live to God in secret". He quotes with approval the sayings of Seneca: "As oft as I have been among men I have returned home less a man than I was before". . . The anchorite of whom Postumian heard

- (1) H.B. Workman: "Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", p. 11, quoted Allen, "Church Institutions", p. 139.
- (2) H.B. Workman: "Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", p. 24.
- (3) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 18.

that he had lived alone for fifty years on the summit of Sinai, gave as his reason for refusing any interview with curious travellers: 'the man who is visited often by mortals could not often be visited by angels' . . . 'The deeper insight into spiritual things' writes Cassian, 'can only be gained in solitude'. (1)

'To what purpose?' one may ask: 'To the spiritual culture of his own soul', the monk would reply.

"By definition ascetical theology treats of the human mechanics of moral advance, with what can be termed 'an ascent to God'. In the Gospel the ascent is the ascent of God's Son in whom the Christian has ascended". (2)

So far as the hermits or anchorites of the desert were concerned, *κοινωνία* even Christian *κοινωνία* in any shape or form just was not. It was from this root that Monasticism grew.

"In the first system initiated and directed by St. Antony . . . the monks were mostly hermits in the strict sense of the word. They lived apart and 'out of earshot of one another' coming together at certain times for divine worship.

The second system introduced . . . the conventual type of Monachism . . . under the Rule of St. Pachomius . . . The Rule allowed the monks their full freedom; and any idea of what is now understood by "Common Life" - the living together and doing all things together according to rule - was a feature entirely absent from Egyptian monachism . . . One other feature must also be noticed . . . It is a spirit of strongly marked individualism. Each worked for his personal advance in virtue".

- (1) H.B. Workman: "Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", pp. 32-33.  
(2) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 185.

(1)

When John Cassian visited Egypt he found

(2)

for. However,

131

Gifford Lectures, "Religion and the Rise of Western Culture":

10

- (1) F.A. Gasquet: "English Monastic Life", pp. 4-6.
- (2) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 18.
- (3) " " " " " " , p. 45.
- (4) Christopher Dawson: "Religion and the Rise of Western Culture", p. 49.

The outlook and sentiment, as well as the theology and inspiration of the Christian ascetics of North Africa were introduced into Europe, in a form congenial and acceptable to them, mainly through the efforts and writings of John Cassian.

"Throughout the West, the individualistic ideal propagated by returning pilgrims and wandering ascetics, was gaining ground under the impetus given by noble personalities like Martin of Tours. No foundations for an enduring monasticism could be laid until the West had also acquired coenobitic experience and tradition". (1)

"All the guides to spirituality in which Western Europe later abounded are Cassian's direct descendants". (2)

"The fourth and fifth centuries were witnessing not only the political disintegration of the western Roman Empire, but the doctrinal disintegration of the primitive notions of the Church. In Cassian's generation the doctrine of the Body was maintained with haunting beauty in the Augustinian exegesis of the 'Whole Christ' . . . . And this disintegration of the older corporate sense of the Church, which would slowly be replaced in the West by a more external and social unity dependent on the name and reputation and inheritance of Rome, was influenced by this very spirituality transmitted to the West by Cassian. It is impossible to find in the documents of the Egyptian desert any significant doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. The monks were not protesting against clericalism and hierarchy and sacramentation as Workman sought to maintain. But their deepest thought . . . left the visible church on one side. The works of Evagrius, of Palladius, of Cassian, are almost without qualification individualist. . . . The Egyptian search for God is the

(1) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 11.  
(2) " " : " " , p. 186.





as a useful lever in breaking the attack of the passions. If we isolate the system we sense that something in the Gospel has been twisted . . . . What we so far miss may be summarised in the word grace". (1)

May it not be more correctly described as the omission of the doctrine of Christian *κοινωνία* ?

When we consider the ascetic outlook on 'work' and compare it with the modern outlook on the dignity of labour as preached by say, Thomas Carlyle, (2) we get a most illuminating picture.

"Egyptian thought regarded work not as creative nor even as primarily useful to the community but as an expedient method of keeping body and mind occupied. Cassian held the same stultifying conception. He believed that although work increases the ability for contemplation, cures accidie, and acts as a necessary aid to prayer, it need fulfil no useful purpose.

How much intellectual labour did Cassian recommend? He mentions writing as a form of labour and reading as a customary exercise . . . . through the Middle Ages . . . . the copying of manuscripts was often manual and not intellectual labour". (3)

That this outlook of Cassian was effectively carried forward into the Middle Ages is also shown by the following reference.

"Firenzuola (himself a monk) describes his brethren, ' . . . nor do they care to weary their brains with study of many books, since the knowledge gained therefrom would swell them up with the pride of Lucifer and rob them of their monastic simplicity'". (4)

The renunciation of the ascetics meant for them chastity, poverty and obedience.

(1) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 107.

(2) Thomas Carlyle: "Sartor Resartus", Bk. 3, Chapter 4.

(3) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 62.

(4) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion, Vol. 4, p. 60.

"It was the experience of the coenobites who found that private possessions created too independent a mind and rendered a truly common life impossible which demanded the practice of poverty. " (2)

"The abandonment of property is but the first step; the monk must pass to crush the sin and the desire that proceeds from possession and thence must rise above all things that are not God, above the whole created universe. Beyond poverty is the separation from all created things which is the condition of a pure love of God". (3)

"Obedience practised by the hermits was developed by coenobitic needs into an absolute requirement.

Cassian's monks must fulfil the orders of the elders as though they were the commands of God Himself, and even if the impossibility be commanded, they are to attempt it. Thus the individual will need to take no personal decision in the way of salvation. 'Apart from the orders of the abbot, let us keep no will at all of our own!'. (4)

The place of the Eucharist in the coenobitic life forecasts its development in the Mass.

"For Cassian the Eucharist and offices are aids in the lone pursuit of perfection. The Eucharist was a vehicle for the manna from heaven, a medicine for sin, a cure for fornication; nothing in the Egyptian sources proves that it was more than these".

(5)

The general outlook is summed up in the following quotations:

"Cassian shared the common ascetic belief that the coenobitic life was founded by the apostles in the "communist" church of Jerusalem".

"Cassian believed that the life of the

- |       |                |                 |        |
|-------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| (1)   | Owen Chadwick: | "John Cassian", | p. 53. |
| (2)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (3)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (4)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (5)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (6)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (7)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (8)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (9)   | "              | "               | "      |
| (10)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (11)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (12)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (13)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (14)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (15)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (16)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (17)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (18)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (19)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (20)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (21)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (22)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (23)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (24)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (25)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (26)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (27)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (28)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (29)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (30)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (31)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (32)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (33)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (34)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (35)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (36)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (37)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (38)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (39)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (40)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (41)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (42)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (43)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (44)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (45)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (46)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (47)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (48)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (49)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (50)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (51)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (52)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (53)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (54)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (55)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (56)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (57)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (58)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (59)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (60)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (61)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (62)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (63)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (64)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (65)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (66)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (67)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (68)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (69)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (70)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (71)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (72)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (73)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (74)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (75)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (76)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (77)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (78)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (79)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (80)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (81)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (82)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (83)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (84)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (85)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (86)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (87)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (88)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (89)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (90)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (91)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (92)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (93)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (94)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (95)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (96)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (97)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (98)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (99)  | "              | "               | "      |
| (100) | "              | "               | "      |

coenobite to be 'mediocrity', that of the hermit to be 'sublimity', - the coenobium to be the kindergarten, solitude the senior school to which the soul passes when purified of the great vices. But this needs qualification . . . . a true hermit, he held associates with other hermits and is subject, like a coenobite, to the tradition of the elders:- The lone ascetic cannot submit to the elders but must base himself on private judgment . . . .

If the hermit could safely live alone without spiritual loss, he would there find God in full retirement; and his place in society so remains a necessity of fallen human nature that Cassian could consider one principal advantage of social relations to lie in the enhancement of the desire for loneliness". (1)

The summing up of Owen Chadwick is illuminating.

"In these monastic books (of Cassian) we hear little, surprisingly little, of the gospel, of the earthly life of Jesus Christ, of the revelation of God". (2)

"It is a truism that thought is in certain ways sociologically conditioned. In the fourth century the social outlook drew from the gospel that element which seemed so accurately to fit its spiritual needs - the demand to reject the world . . . .

The text, 'Come ye apart and be separate' in order to find God away from mankind, away from the world, called forth a sure response. . . . .

The too flourishing Church could not inspire secular society, even if the austere theology of the age had allowed, since it came itself under the world - rejecting condemnation of the finer men. Here and there a rare spirit might preach that society must be saved by action, not avoided by escape - these protests could have little

(1) Owen Chadwick:-"John Cassian", pp. 48, 49.  
(2) " " " " " , p. 149.

influence in an environment dominated by a theology which taught that forsaking the world meant not only escape from sin, but abandonment of the secular life of the age".  
(1)

To this may be added the opinion of Abbot Gasquet,

"It seems almost certain, writes a modern authority, that 'in Italy, as in Gaul and Ireland, early monachism was thoroughly Egyptian in its ideals and in its working'".  
(2)

### The Rule of St. Benedict.

The writings of John Cassian and the knowledge of Egyptian monasticism which he introduced into the West, had a profound influence on St. Benedict. A knowledge of the theological writings of Cassian is almost assumed in the Rule of St. Benedict. This Rule became the basis or norm of all subsequent Western monasticism. It embodies the fundamental principles of Monasticism at its best. The sanity, moderation and flexibility of the Rule have been praised by all students of monasticism as eminently suited to its function, and to the function for which it came to be used.

"The monastery is completely self-contained and self-sufficient. . . It has no function in the life of the Church save to provide an ordered way of life . . . according to which its inmates may serve God and sanctify their souls apart from the life of the world. No work done within it, whether manual, intellectual or charitable, is directed to an end outside its walls". (3)

(1) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", pp. 3, 4.

(2) Introduction by Abbot Gasquet to his translation of "Rule of St. Benedict", p. 17.

(3) D.D. Knowles: "The Monastic Order in England", p. 4.

This introspective, individualistic attitude to religion is borne out by a study of the Rule itself. The paragraph, 'Concerning the Manner of receiving brothers', (2) could not be conceived in a less friendly, less personal spirit. It is far removed from any conception of a loving, corporate, communion of Christians, earnestly desirous to propagate their faith and share their spiritual life with others. The 'I - Thou' relationship, of which Buber speaks, is almost rigorously excluded. Once received, the hood of the newly professed is fastened over his head.

"This he wore closed for three days, as a sign of the strict retreat from the world with which he began his new life as a full religious". (1)

It was also a 'strict retreat' from his fellow-monks in the Monastery.

"After the novice has placed his form of profession on the altar let him immediately begin the verse, 'Uphold me, O Lord, according to Thy word, and I shall live, and let me not be confounded in my expectation'". (3)

The supplication is solely for the first person singular.

"A monastery should, if possible, be so arranged that everything necessary - that is, water, a mill, a garden, a bakery - may be available, and different trades be carried on, within the monastery; so that there shall be no need for the monks to wander about outside. For this is not at all good for their souls. We wish this Rule to be read frequently in the community so that no brother may plead ignorance as an excuse". (4)

- (1) F.A. Gasquet: "English Monastic Life", p. 109.
- (2) The Rule of St. Benedict, LVIII.
- (3) F.A. Gasquet: "The Rule of St. Benedict", LVIII.
- (4) " " : " " " " " " , LXVI.

This is followed by a chapter under the heading, "Of Brethern sent on a journey", who are enjoined after their return . . . . "And let no one dare to relate to another what he shall have seen or heard outside the monastery, because this is most detrimental . . . In like manner shall he be punished who shall presume to break the enclosure of the monastery, or go anywhere, or do anything, however trifling, without the abbot's permission". (1)

This may be usefully summed up,

"The sermoniser (Cassian) urged that the monks would suffer spiritually if they travelled far from their cell: the legislator (Benedict) sought to obviate the need for travel by making the community self-sufficient". (2)

The essential individualism of monasticism, and the view that the spiritual journey of each man's soul is to be undertaken alone as an isolated atom, <sup>and</sup> further borne out by Chapter LXXIX.

"No one shall take it on himself to take another's part.

Special care must be taken that under no pretext one monk presume to defend or uphold another in a monastery, even though they may be very near akin. In no way whatsoever let monks dare to do this, because from it an occasion of the gravest scandal may arise. If anyone, transgress in this he shall be severely punished". (3)

"Idleness is the enemy of the soul. And therefore, at fixed times, the brothers ought to be occupied in manual labour; and again, at fixed times, in sacred reading  
" (4)

- (1) The Rule of St. Benedict, LXVII.  
(2) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 177.  
(3) The Rule of St. Benedict, LXIX.  
(4) " " " " " " XLVIII.

The hours of work and the hours of reading are then carefully detailed as if the brothers might not readily undertake either except by compulsion.

"Monks should practise silence at all times, but especially in the hours of night . . . When Compline is over, let no one be allowed to speak to anyone. If anyone be found breaking this law of silence he shall undergo severe punishments, unless the presence of guests should require speech, or the abbot should chance to issue some order. But, even so, let it be done with the utmost gravity and moderation". (1)

"And there shall be the greatest silence at table, so that no whispering or any voice save the reader's may be heard". (2)

"Let leave to speak be seldom given". (3)

"It is of much import that one or two seniors be appointed to go about the monastery at such times as the brethren are free to read, in order to see that no one is slothful, given to idleness or foolish talking instead of reading, and so not only makes no profit himself but also distracts others. If any such be found (which God forbid) let him be corrected once or twice, and if he amend, not, let him be subjected to regular discipline of such a character that the rest may take warning. Moreover one brother shall not associate with another at unsuitable hours". (4)

Not all silence is indicative of lack of fellowship. There is the spiritual silence of the Quakers, which is itself *κοινωνία*; there is the silence of lovers, which can be eloquence itself;

- (1) The Rule of St. Benedict, XLII.
- (2) " " " " " , XXXVIII.
- (3) " " " " " , VI.
- (4) Gasquet: "The Rule of St. Benedict", XLVIII.

there is the silence of dear friends, where speech seems an intrusion. But the silence of the monasteries was not this. Even Ailred felt it came between him and his friend. (1) It was the silence of separation, the silence of discipline, the silence which originated with the monks of the desert as a means of separation from their fellows.

"His vow of retreat had saved his soul". (2)

"The stricter brethren laid special stress upon penitential rules of silence, and so interpreted the Benedictine precept of taciturnitas that they would scarce speak even when license was given in parlour or warming house. Carthusians and Cistercians, later on, laid special emphasis on silence". (3)

With silence the practice of tale-bearing was an essential feature of monastic life, and was an effective factor in destroying or preventing friendship. The monks did not separate themselves from the world in order to form a closer and more integrated community within themselves.

"Let the monk have no familiar friend". (4)

"Then in chapter came the disciplinary business of the house. Any brother conscious of an infraction since yesterday's chapter was bound now to confess it;" (5) "but in default of such confession discipline demanded "proclamation", that is that some monk should accuse the erring brother. . . . The monk who was proclaimed was then bound to throw himself upon the Abbot's mercy in any case. He was strictly

- |     |               |   |
|-----|---------------|---|
| (1) | D.D. Knowles: | "The Monastic Order in England", pp. 242-244. |
| (2) | G.G. Coulton: | "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 78.       |
| (3) | " " :         | " " " " , I, p. 79.                           |
| (4) | " " :         | " " " " , I, p. 301.                          |
| (5) | " " :         | " " " " , I, p. 231.                          |



prohibited from any 'tu quoque'; if by chance he had a counter-accusation against his accuser he must defer this till next day. Then, if the Abbot so decided, he must cast himself upon his face and receive upon his bare flesh whatever number of stripes might be enjoined upon him". (1)  
 For about half-an-hour after chapter, talking was permitted; for almost all the rest of the day (including meal-times) the brethren were bound to silence. 'It is clear that St. Benedict, like other monastic legislators, attached great importance to silence; and the public silence of the monastery, in all probability was hardly broken'. (2)

The 'work of God' in the monasteries consisted in the continuous round of services which were mainly choral with the repeating or intoning<sup>of</sup> the Psalms. Each week the entire psalter was sung. Prayers, other than those in the words of scripture, were not elaborated, and communal prayer was discouraged rather than cultivated. The intensity of spiritual emotion, which can arise through corporate prayer when a sufficiently close communion one with another is attained, was not desired. It was an outward obedience and conformity to the Rule which was required and each must find for himself his own spiritual intensity in following it. Chapter twenty of the Rule is eloquent not only for what it says, but for what it indicates . . . . "Our prayer, therefore, should be short and pure, unless by some inspiration of divine grace it be prolonged. All prayer made by the community in common, however, should be short; and when the prior (that is, the superior) has given the sign, let all rise together". (3)

- (1) G20. Coulton: "Scottish Abbeys and Social Life", p. 26.
- (2) " " : "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 231.
- (3) Rule of St. Benedict: Chapter, 20.

On the other hand an interesting note of solicitude for others occurs in the directions for the reception of guests . . .

"Let special care be taken of the poor and pilgrims because in them Christ is more truly received, for the very awe of the rich secures respect for them". (1)

This is reminiscent of the refrain of the Gaelic Rune,

"Often, Often, Often, comes the Christ in the stranger's guise".

Behind it is the fear of slighting the Christ, rather than love for humanity as such. It is considerably short of the doctrine of Christian *Koinonía* as described in the previous chapter. The angle of mental approach is personal and individualistic. Different views as to the real nature and value of monasticism have been put forward by different theologians. These views may be compared with the essential nature of monasticism which in the above references we have tried to indicate.

Troeltsch's view was that

"this sociological idea arose in a radical religious individualism which developed its universalism in God, and by the fact that those who were united in God then turn back to the world in order to reveal the Divine spirit of love to the brethren . . . . Ascetic meritorious love swallows up individualism: love becomes the chief and fundamental virtue based upon humility, which with its strong psychological tendency towards inwardness and introspection maintains the fundamental Christian individualism, and indeed from this source permits it continually to break out anew. Among other things, monasticism and contemplation were the salvation of Christian individualism, in the only form in which it was then possible to preserve it". (2)

(1) Rule of St. Benedict: Chapter 53.

(2) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, I, p. 111.

"The primitive ideal of monasticism lived on in monasticism. . . . But although monasticism represented the complete ideal so far as it could be felt and realised, in a splendid and overwhelming manner, it had no desire to make those who could not embrace this state feel that they could not be Christians. . . ."

Monasticism took charge of all real Christian social work, so far as there was, or could be any such work at all, and thus prepared the way for its future incorporation into a complete Christian civilisation. Experienced in the discipline and the cure of souls, and also concerned about the salvation of ordinary people, the monks laid the foundation of that individual pastoral care which replaced the catechumenate of the Church, which had become formal and superfluous. They also created the beginnings of the Christian schools - a phase of service, which the Church in her detachment from the world had entirely overlooked. . . . The monks made the scientific labour of thought about Divine things a means of spiritual discipline and of union with God, together with the virtues of asceticism. . . . The laity, therefore, could find in the monastic literature that true knowledge which they could not find in the unrest of the world. The monks lived a life of strenuous labour, while as great communistic productive organisations they still held all things in common. . . . In their organisation by the great Fathers of Monasticism they formed the advance-guard of "Christian civilisation" and from this point of view they became increasingly important." (1)

As has already been partly shown and will later be further indicated, this picture of monasticism is in many respects false and mis-leading. With it may be compared, meantime,

(1) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, I, pp. 162-5.

some comment by John Calvin.

"Monasticism is a most pestilential error - namely, the pretence that there is some more perfect rule of life than that common rule which God hath delivered to the whole church. Whatever is built on this foundation cannot but be abominable". (1)

"Monasticism itself declares that all who retire into Monasteries withdraw from the Church. For how? Do they not separate themselves from the legitimate society of the faithful, by acquiring for themselves a special ministry and private administration of the Sacraments? What is meant by destroying the communion of the Church if this is not?" (2)

Between Calvin and Troeltsch there is the more balanced summing up of Moorman.

"The basis of monasticism is separation from the world. The early monks had fled from the world because they despaired of finding in the rough and tumble of daily life, that strait and narrow way which would bring them to salvation. The only hope lay in a complete separation from ordinary life, cut off from the sights and sounds of Vanity Fair, sheltered from the temptations of the world, alone with God and with a small company of Christian aspirants who were all seeking to tread the same path.

Based on such an ideal Monasticism could offer very little to society outside the cloister. It was not really interested in the world beyond its walls. Even though it provided a good deal of hospitality and poor-relief, it did so primarily in order to save its own soul by the exercise of charity. The monastic contribution to society in early days was therefore only indirect. The world was evil; monastic life was good. For the world itself monasticism had no gospel; the most it

(1) John Calvin: "Institutes of the Christian Religion",  
Book 4, Chapter 13, Section 12)

(2) " " : As above, Book 4, Chapter 13, Section 14.

could do was to offer men a retreat from the world and a way of life for those who aspired to perfection". (1)

The gospel, according to the Rule of St. Benedict, was a gospel of 'justification by works'. This is stated explicitly in the prologue to the Rule itself.

"If we would live in the shelter of this kingdom, we can reach it only by speeding on the way of good works (by this path alone is it to be attained)". (2)

Within two centuries of the death of St. Benedict monasteries were found all over Europe; that is, groups of men living apart from the world trying to put into practice the Rule which St. Benedict had given. The Roman Empire had fallen; the barbarians had over-run her richest provinces. The Pax Romana no longer made life tolerable for ordinary people. The old world was passing and a new era was coming to birth.

"Benedict's life coincided exactly with the crisis of change. . . The Rule contained a subtle blend of old and new". (3)

It came into a Europe where the scope and opportunities of education were yearly narrowing; a society . . . in which all collective organisation was weak; a society made up of self-contained and self-supporting units . . . and continually threatened with extinction by invasion and chaos". (3)

The monastery fitted in to this picture.

"It contained within its walls and fields all the necessities of life and the means of converting them to man's use; it was perfectly adapted to survive all the changes of invasions, and escaped the dangers of

- (1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p.350
- (2) Rule of St. Benedict: Prologue.
- (3) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", pp. 8-9.

dismemberment short of total destruction .  
 . . St. Benedict's monastery is a microcosm<sup>(1)</sup>.

The monasteries transmitted the Christian faith, they preserved the heritage of Christianity across the dark ages of universal social upheaval and the recurring waves of heathen barbarians. That is our debt to them. The missionary heroes of the age after the fall of Rome converted the rulers or kings of the invaders, but the people as a whole knew not the light. But, in their midst, was the strange community of the monastery living according to the Rule of St. Benedict and it was generally the only form of Christianity they knew. Speaking of the Rule of St. Benedict, Abbot Gasquet says,

"There is probably no other book, save of course the Holy Bible, which with such certainty can be claimed as a chief factor in the work of European civilisation. It is undeniable that most of the nations of modern Europe were converted to the Christian faith and tutored in the arts of peace by the influence of the mode of life known as monastic. The men whose names are connected with the beginnings of civilisation in the various countries of Europe, and their fellow-labourers, were for the most part trained for their mission under the Rule of St. Benedict . . . The monastic system . . . has been proved to possess some strange power of influencing great bodies of men and winning them from the darkness of paganism and the horrors of savagery to the light of Christianity and the blessings of a civilised life. . . The monastic plan was similar to the old Roman plan of civilizing by means of "colonies" planted among the conquered races of the empire. . . The mere life lived among the subjugated peoples induced

(1) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", pp. 8-9.

these latter of their own accord to adopt the manners, the language and the law of their conquerors. There was probably no programme . . . but the influence of the life . . . worked its charm without noise or compulsion. In the same way the monk came with the like lesson of peace and civilisation". (1)

"St. Benedict . . . intended that his monks should supplement his teaching with the teaching of John Cassian", which dealt with spiritual instruction and doctrine rather than with such practical details as in St. Benedict's Rule. "In the event, the wisdom of the past was in large part lost to the New Europe, here as in other fields, and only the teaching of Benedict remained". (2) Throughout these centuries 'the Rule was the one and only warranted norm of monastic life'. (3) "As a portion of its text was read in public every day of the year, its teaching and spirit sank into and coloured the minds of all monks from age to age . . . The Rule, to which obedience had been solemnly vowed, must often have been the only book with which the hearer was familiar". (3) "The spirit of the Rule, that is, the peculiar shade of colour which the gospel teaching assumes as it comes to us from St. Benedict" . . . "has remained one of the great formative influences in the life of the Church". (4)

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the monasteries as the connecting link conveying the Christian gospel from the world of ancient Rome to the settled Feudal economy and social system of the Middle Ages. Between, lay the Dark Ages of barbarism, invasion, or chaos with private wars, personal

- (1) Abbot Gasquet: "Rule of St. Benedict", Intro. IX-XI.
- (2) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", p. 11.
- (3) " " " " " " , pp. 13-14.
- (4) " " " " " " , pp. 14-15.

insecurity, and localised life. With the rise of kingship giving integration to society and the rise of feudalism giving strength and stability to the social structure, the Christian gospel gradually descended from the ruling classes to the common people. But the norm of Christianity was the monastery; the life of the 'Religious' was the highest type of life; it was the only sure way to heaven. - 'the true Gospel life, the real, narrow way'. (1)

"History can tell us nothing of their preaching and teaching . . . what we know of their work is that they lived their life according to the Rule". (2)

The Monasteries, moreover, were not actuated by any missionary zeal, or by any sense of missionary responsibility, in the modern sense of the term. They were a transmitting agency of a cult or Rule, but not a propaganda agency. For the social community gathered around their walls they felt no moral or spiritual responsibility. The parochial clergy, who attended to the spiritual needs of the common people, were regarded as an inferior brand of ecclesiastic and were called 'seculars' in contrast to the Monks who were 'Religious'. Behind the monastic demand for 'exemption' lay the attitude that their way of life was so superior to that of the secular clergy that they could not be subject to the supervision or authority of the latter in any shape or form.

An interesting side-light on this subject of any supervision whatever from the secular clergy appears in the Chronicle of Jocelin:

(1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 309.  
(2) Abbot Gasquet: "Rule of St. Benedict", Intro. XII.



"Cellarer succeeded cellarer . . . and every one of them was burdened with a great load of debt . . . The Abbot, therefore, desiring to provide both for our comfort and his own . . . attached a certain clerk . . . to serve the cellarer both as a witness and a partner in respect both of income and expenditure. And behold! many said many things. Murmurings became more and more frequent . . . Never was such dishonour put upon the Convent! Behold! The Abbot has set a clerk over a monk! Behold! He has set up a clerk to be master and guardian of the Cellarer . . . " (1)

The monk acknowledged no social responsibilities. He lived apart, 'the world forgetting and by the world forgot'. (2) St. Benedict's insistence on 'stability', - that the monk should be bound to his first monastery, was symptomatic of this outlook. Every reform was an attempt to return to a stricter observance of St. Benedict's Rule. The essential individualism of monasticism remained, and the monastery was only a community in a superficial sense. It gave security in an insecure world; peace amidst the confusion of private wars; the facility to possess property, and in fact to become capitalists, in a corporate sense, while individually possessing nothing; opportunity for litigation, an activity, or a sin, which the monks seemed to come <sup>clearly</sup> to love. It gave an overhead corporate seclusion from the world within which individual 'gentler natures of society might be turned to useful account'. (3)

The service rendered by the Monasteries should not be underestimated. Under the Cistercian reform especially they improved tillage and reclaimed waste land; they provided

(1) Butler: "Chronicle of Jocelin", p. 80.

(2) D.D. Knowles: "The Monastic Order in England", p. 683.

(3) Fisher: "History of Europe", p. 176.

hospitality for travellers; they recognised the need add to some extent undertook the work of relieving the poor; in preserving and copying manuscripts they rendered an important service to European culture; (1) they were the transmitting agent, and the only effective transmitting agent, of the Christian gospel from Ancient Rome across that dark and troubled sea of human affairs which we know as the 'Dark Ages' to the more settled life of the Middle Ages. At their best they won the respect and admiration of men. They were as 'light shining in a dark place' and gifts flowed into them. How quickly from their best they became corrupted and worldly is seen in the ever recurring movements of reform. Ardent spirits, also, realised that the monasticism of their age was failing, sought to return nearer to the initial purity and discipline of St. Benedict. Of such are the Cluniac and Cistercian reforms.

But we are considering monasticism, not in its corruption nor in its failure, nor in its degradation in later centuries when it was no longer capable of reform from within; we are considering it at its best, at what for a time it attained, but avoiding the fanciful conception of the 'land which never was' which some authors delight to describe.

The debt for good or ill which modern western society owes to the monasteries is immense. It is nothing less than

(1) Fisher: "History of Europe", p. 175.

the transmission of Christianity itself.

But this transmitting agency of the Monasteries was fundamentally individualistic; not only in its origin in the Rule of St. Benedict and earlier, but also in its entire development and life.

"The monastic order still remained (under Henry I) for the majority of the inmates of the monasteries a way of life and a formation of spirit and mind directed primarily towards the perfecting of the individual, within which he could live and grow continually." (1)

The Cluniac monastery 'was a life primarily liturgical, in which neither manual work nor solitary prayer, had any large part'. (2) Peter Damian wrote in "depreciation of the easy life of a community as compared with the strictness of a hermitage". (3) 'The primary aim', of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 'was a spiritual one, to secure for the individual the means of sanctification'. (4) "It was a life ordered solely for the spiritual good of the individual monk". (5)

Many of the monastic practices can be interpreted as symptoms of evidences of a constant struggle against *κοινωνία*. First the *κοινωνία* of the family had to be repudiated, in the vow of chastity. Then in the claustral aspect of monastic life, in the regulations against visits from relatives, it was developed and in extreme form appeared in such stories as that of the father novice who was utterly indifferent to

- |     |               |                                  |         |
|-----|---------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| (1) | D.D. Knowles: | "The Monastic Order In England", | p. 189. |
| (2) | "             | "                                | "       |
| (3) | "             | "                                | "       |
| (4) | "             | "                                | "       |
| (5) | "             | "                                | "       |

his son's sufferings. Secondly the *Koivunna* of friendship was repudiated.

"Let the monk have no familiar friend. .  
Let him be as Melchizedek, without father,  
without mother, without descent. Let him  
think as if he alone existed in this univ-  
erse - only he and God". (1)

Ailred of Rievaulx seems at first sight an exception. He is one of those rare souls, magnetic with friendship and love that our religion from time to time produces. He was a monk, but his personality far transcended monasticism. He spoke of friendship in almost Johannine terms without realising the fundamental conflict thereon which lay at the heart of Monasticism. "It is seldom a monk ventures to speak of

"It is seldom a monk ventures to speak of friendship so heartily as Ailred of Rievaulx". (2) "Gentleness, radiance of affection and wide sympathy are not the qualities that most would associate with the early Cistercians, but they are assuredly the outstanding natural characteristics of Ailred". Of his friend, the monk Simon who died when still young, Ailred wrote, many years later, a glowing soul-revealing tribute. But in it he said, "I remember how often, when my eyes were straying hither and thither, the mere sight of him so filled me with shame that, returning suddenly to myself, I sternly repressed my lightness of mind, and re-collecting myself, began to think of something of more profit. The rule of our life forbade us to talk together, but his countenance, his gait, his very silence spoke to me". (3)

As has already been indicated the rule of silence was calculated to destroy any deeper personal *κοινωνία*.

- (1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", p. 301.  
 (2) " " " " " " " " I, p. 530.  
 (3) D.D. Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", pp. 242-244.

"Silence was to be complete for most of the day; and at no time were jests or laughter welcome. Buffoonery or idle words or such as move to laughter, ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> condemn in all places by an eternal prohibition; we do not permit our disciple to open his mouth to such speech as that". (1)

For the short period of about one hour per day, restrained, reverent and religious conversation was permitted.

In the diary of Archbishop Odo dealing with his visitations in the middle of the thirteenth century, we read,

"At Mont-Ste.-Catherine (by Rouen) where we visited, at our own expense . . . Item, we found that some keep not silence well; we enjoined a stricter observance. Item, that some will not accuse their brethern (in Chapter) when they break the rule of silence; we bade and enjoined that each should accuse the other, without any acceptance of persons". (2)

Oblate children were ~~children~~ were trained in this from the beginning.

"The school holds its own 'chapter' for scrutiny of faults: one boy accuseth another, if he knoweth aught against him; or if he be found to have improperly concealed anything, he is beaten as well as the offender". (3)

The treatment of the oblates sought to crush out from their lives the experience of *Koivuvv* and the team spirit. Each had his own master whose main instruction was given with the rod. Boys were not allowed to touch each other or each other's clothing, or speak or sleep together. A master slept between each. (4) When once the vows were taken they came

- |     |               |                               |    |    |                   |
|-----|---------------|-------------------------------|----|----|-------------------|
| (1) | G.C. Coulton: | "Five Centuries of Religion", | I, | p. | 215.              |
| (2) | "             | "                             | "  | "  | ? II, p. 220.     |
| (3) | "             | "                             | "  | "  | , I, p. 223.      |
| (4) | "             | "                             | "  | "  | , I, pp. 219-233. |

under the same rule of daily life as the monastery.

The liturgical services were performed for their own sake and not for the benefit of the social community outside the monasteries. The life of the Cluniacs was mainly liturgical. The Cistercians sought the wilderness that no social community from outside the monastery might disturb their peace. Even in the choir each monk had his separate stall.

The management of estates and of corporate property involved for some certain contacts with the outside world. But these were reduced to a minimum, and the relationship was always one of landlord and servant, or 'Religious' and donor.

"A great part of St. Bernard's sermons is strictly practical. One theme is the evil world; evil even in the Church of Christ; the city, with its boasted civilisation, is a mere prison; the cloister is your only heaven on earth. Yet the cloister is but what we ourselves make of it; no vow will save us the labour of working out our own salvation; if, under the cowl, we do not bear the true monastic heart, then we are of all men most miserable". (1)

"The cloisterer helps his brother-man not directly but by his ascetic example". (2)

"The whole world is seated in wickedness; the one Ark is the Church, and the cloister is the safest corner of that Ark. Within are the converted. . . Here is comparative peace, material and spiritual in retirement from an unrestful world; here is real self-denial, steady devotion to beneficent duties, and a serene religious expectation of the final reward". (3)

- (1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 311.  
 (2) " " " " " " , " , p. 320.  
 (3) " " " " " " , " , pp. 384-5.

"The monk cannot attain perfection among his own people . . . - he must flee from the Babylon of common humanity . . . The true monk lived a noble life, but it was not really Christ's life . . . The mediaeval Benedictine, as a whole, entirely failed to realise that the directest imitation of Christ must necessarily imply moving and working freely among the unredeemed multitude: "let us go forth unto Him without the camp". A body which feared contamination of morals or of creed by mixing daily among the unsaved, lacked one essential element of the earliest Christian faith". (1)

"How could Christ, under Benedictine vows, have eaten and drunken daily with publicans and sinners? How could Paul, as a cloisterer, have made himself all things to all men, or been free to preach everywhere in season and out of season?" (2)

We have seen that *κοινωνία* is an essential element of ultimate truth and an integral part of the gospel itself. So far, therefore, as by any other road, or different method of approach, the monks gained contact with ultimate truth, or reached living fellowship with God the factor of *κοινωνία* was bound to reappear and confront them with its problem and existence anew. This, of course, is what happened. And the constant strain or struggle behind monastic life lay in this effort to attain to the perfection of ultimate spiritual life while at the same time eliminating an essential element of that life.

No monastic system endured for long without suffering decay or decadence. The continual movements of reform, even during

(1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, pp. 434-36.  
 (2) " " " " " " , I, p. 434.

monasticism's best periods, speak of the need for that reform, and of the presence of some constant disintegrating or distracting forces. The elimination from their spiritual outlook of an essential element of ultimate truth may have been the basic source of all their troubles.

There seems no doubt that monasticism deliberately, consistently, and successfully filtered out and eliminated *ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ* from their presentation of the gospel and from the Christianity which they transmitted.

As they were the sole transmitting agency at a certain period of ecclesiastical history, Christianity reached the Middle Ages and through them to the modern age of our Western civilisation with Christian *ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ* filtered out of the spectrum of truth and not recognised, or presented, or preached as a fundamental doctrine of the gospel of Christ.

It was because of the tremendous service rendered by Monasticism in the transmission of Christianity to western Europe, from the world of ancient Rome that it was possible for them to do this dis-service and transmit a version, or presentation, of the gospel that was essentially partial, because it had not only omitted, but had filtered out, an essential doctrine of that gospel. This doctrine we have described, or designated, with the title "Christian *ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ*".

Instead, they presented a gospel of individualism, albeit of Christian Individualism. There is a strong accent on the personal, spiritual attainment of the individual. This outlook, which we submit was derived, or transmitted, from the



monasteries, had percolated deeply into the religious outlook of Western Europe. The particular measuring line of the spiritual attainment of the individual may have changed from age to age, but the conception of spiritual and moral attainment being individually considered and measured, has remained. That moral or spiritual attainment can be anything other than individual and personal has even at times been lost sight of. If for the term 'attainment' used above, there is substituted the word 'salvation', the whole question as to what is the Gospel, becomes involved. Is the individualistic interpretation of Christianity the whole gospel? Is it the gospel that Jesus preached? Is it 'the gospel of the Kingdom of God'? The Monasteries would answer, 'Yes'. And, at its deepest level, the monastic individualistic interpretation of Christianity has been almost universally accepted in the West until comparatively recent times.

As has been pointed out in the Introduction, something is lacking in the spiritual life of our Western Culture. When the different doctrines of the faith, as we have commonly received them, are reunited, we just do not get white light. There are explicit promises of the New Testament which are just not fulfilled in the Christian experience of the modern age. The quest of the historic Jesus (which has been undertaken by many more than Schweitzer) is a symptom of this desire to recover a lost truth. The Christianity we have known is like

some modern street lighting; it is excellent for driving or moving about, but having no red in the spectrum gives to everyone a ghostly appearance. Communism has brought the red into the spectrum that the Christianity we have known, has filtered out. It has brought in, in perverted form, the forgotten truth of the gospel.

The aspect of ultimate truth, the element of the spectrum, which we lack, is probably best described by the term "Christian *Κοινωνία* ".

Its comprehensive import and connotation we only dimly discern. In the full depth of its meaning it was part of the New Testament revelation of God. It was not just 'lost in transit'; it was filtered out deliberately during the age of the monasteries. Along with evil of the ancient world, there was thrown out part of the gospel of Christ.

No subsequent age, so far as the West is concerned, has recovered it. The Renaissance and Reformation periods failed to restore it.

As an essential element of ultimate truth it inevitably constantly tended to reappear. But often it was unrecognised, and never was its full challenge to humanity presented as a fundamental doctrine of the faith. That the social life of the Middle Ages was fundamentally individualistic and perpetuated, as well as embodied, this essential outlook of the monasteries, we hope to show. This basic concept, as indicated

above, entered 'into the very bones' of our Western civilization, determining our spiritual criteria, colouring our religious and social outlook, and to a very large extent tempering or tainting the very mental concepts with which we think. Its individualistic outlook has become the climate of Western thought and scarcely can we escape from it. That this individualism is the true interpretation of the gospel has been the unexamined assumption of centuries. This unexamined assumption we now call in question. First we seek to show that it dominated the Middle Ages; and second that its spiritual and social attainments are found wanting.

Even in Monasticism, however, a certain degree of re-appeared, but almost on the level of the corporate unconscious.

"In St. Benedict's conception a monastery existed for the service of God and the spiritual welfare of its inmates and for no other reason. . . But the conception of a monastery as a reservoir of learning, as a centre of order and beneficence, or as the home of a class of men who made continual, and, as it were, official intercession for the rest of society - all this, though not present in the mind of St. Benedict so far as we can ascertain it, came gradually to be substituted for the original idea throughout Europe". (1)

To this may be added the following extract from the Prologue to the Rule of St. Benedict.

"Persevering in the monastery we share by our patience in the sufferings of Christ and so merit to be partakers of His Kingdom".

(1) D.D. Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", p. 20.

It is a *κοινωβία* with Christ on the deepest spiritual level, but <sup>the idea of merit</sup> ~~one that~~ is contrary to the teaching of St. Paul in the New Testament and also to the doctrine of St. Augustine. By this statement the doctrine of Monasticism would seem to be committed to 'justification by works' on an extremely individualistic basis.

The conception of a corporate function being performed by the monks in the Monastery came from without. This came from the social integration of society, which conceived the monks as those members of the body corporate who did the praying, while others did the working, or the fighting. The spiritual life and spiritual treasure of the community were represented in the monks. This conception, coming from secular society, was applied, or imported, into the monasteries; it did not arise from within the monasteries themselves, who, in the first instance, recognised no social responsibility for the community around.

In his summing up on the Monastic ideal, H.B. Workman says,

"Nothing is more instructive to the student of Christian life than to note the contradictions of its own ideals into which Monasticism was driven in spite of itself".

(1)

Further, while commenting on the artificial conflict of soul and body and the monastic denial of *κοινωβία*, he says "Here and there we may find a man of stronger will or more burning enthusiasm than his fellows, who could succeed in destroying all his natural instincts and who was content to mistake the desolation of his heart for the peace of God. If experience is of any value, one thing may be regarded as settled

(1) H.B. Workman: "The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", p. 342.

by centuries of trial: that in all save rare exceptions, . . . Christian life must be built up on the clear recognition that the social instincts of man are divine in their origin - not a demon to be crushed, but a power of the soul of the highest value. The salvation of the unit cannot be isolated from the salvation of society". (1)

### Monasteries and Libraries. Monasteries and Libraries.

Some notice may be taken here of the monasteries in relation to the production of books.

"For a period of more than six centuries the safety of the literary heritage of Europe, one may say of the world, depended upon the scribes of a few dozen scattered monasteries". (2)

"The history of books in manuscript and the production and distribution of literature in Europe from . . . the time of St. Benedict to the time of the printing press . . . a period covering about nine centuries, may be divided into three stages. During the first the responsibility for the preservation of the old-time literature and for keeping alive some continuity of intellectual life, rested solely with the monasteries, and the work of multiplying and of distributing such books as had survived was carried on by the monks and by them only. (529 A.D. to end of 12th century)

During the second stage, the older universities, the organisation of which had gradually been developed from schools (themselves chiefly of monastic origin) became centres of intellectual activity and shared with the monasteries the work of producing books . . . (12th Century to end of 14th Century)

- (1) H.B. Workman: "The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal", pp. 322-323.  
(2) G.H. Putman: "Books and Their Makers during the Middle Ages", I, p. 11.

With the third stage of manuscript literature, book-producing and bookselling machinery came into existence in the towns and the knowledge of reading being no longer confined to the cleric or the magister, books were prepared for the use of the larger circle of the community, and to meet the requirements of such circles were, to an extent increasing with each generation, written in the tongue of the people." (15th century to about 1475). (1)

Against certain aspects of the above it must be noticed that the Universities did not originate from the monasteries. Also, in the event, from the monasteries they received but little support and few students. (2)

"The monks were not learned scholars". (3)

"It was the glory of Cassiodorus (died 575) that he first and pre-eminently insisted on the expediency of including intellectual labour in the sphere of monastic duties". (4)

In Italy where classical culture never entirely disappeared, attention continued to be given to the transcription of manuscripts and those of the monks of Cassiodorus and Benedict gave 'copy' for the first editions of Cicero, Virgil and other classic writers produced by the earliest printers. . . (5)

When . . the very existence of civilisation was imperilled, he transferred his services to the church recognising that there rested the hopes of any continuity of organised society, of intellectual interest, of civilisation itself . . . The continuity of thought and civilisation of the ancient world with that of the Middle Ages was due more than to any other one man to the life and labours of Cassiodorus. . . (6)

(1) G.H. Putman: "Books and Their Makers during the Middle Ages", I, pp. 9-10.

(2) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 148; I/283

(3) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 212.

(4) G.H. Putman: "Books & Their Makers during the Middle Ages", I p.23.

(5) " " " " " " " " " " , p.25

(6) " " " " " " " " " " , ;.27

Until the organisation of the elder universities in the latter part of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th the production and the re-production of literature was practically confined to the monasteries. . . (1)

The conclusion arrived at by Catholic historians generally, is that the literary monuments of Greece and Rome which escaped the devastation of the barbarians were saved by the monks and by them alone. (2)

There was thus the rise of literary interests and literary labours in the early days, when, as has already been pointed out, the monasteries were the transmitting agency of the Faith itself.

This was followed by the period of the maintenance of customs or labours that had once become established. We read that about 1,110 A.D. Fericius, a good abbot who reconstructed Abingdon, that

"he instituted paid professional scribes for writing books and greatly increased the library". (3)

From this we may infer a flagging zeal for the copying of books on the part of the monks themselves, and yet an essential pride in the possession of an adequate library.

Then in later years there came the decline.

"It was certainly the case that, after the invention of printing, there was a time when manuscripts came to be undervalued, neglected and even destroyed by wholesale, but Maitland is of opinion that this time had been prepared for by a long period of gradually increasing laxity of discipline and morals in many

(1) G.H. Putman: "Books and their makers in the Middle Ages", I, p. 31.  
 {2}     "       "       "       "       "       "       "       "       I, p.61.  
 {5} G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", III, p. 582.

monastic institutions . . a demoralisation which naturally carried with it a breaking down of literary interests and pursuits. There had, for some time been less multiplication, less care, and less use of books, and many a fine collection had mouldered away".

(Second-half of 14th Century and 15th Century). (1)

It is significant that

"in the Middle Ages no English nunnery produced a chronicle and that no catalogue of a nunnery library is known to exist". (2)

A study of monasteries and libraries, therefore, confirms our submission that the monasteries were the sole connecting and transmitting link conveying Christianity, and such cultural and intellectual treasures as survived from the ancient world of Roman civilisation to the Middle Ages.

#### Some consequences of Monasticism.

'Chastity', so-called, the denial of family life, had its consequences. Ailred, one of the finest characters of the monastic period, was the son of a married priest. (3) "The European monasteries of the middle ages were often criticised and often reformed. . . Yet the possible loss to society through the enforced celibacy of many of the best men and women in every generation was never a matter of comment in an age which regarded celibacy as the first and the hardest of the human

(1) G.H. Putman: "Books and their makers in the Middle Ages", I, p. 74.

(2) Mitchell and Leys: "History of the English People", p. 64.

(3) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 355.



virtues. . To no one since Eutillius Mametarius in the fifth century did it occur to dispute the value of the monastic life or to regard it as squalid and degrading to man". (1)

The 'oblate' system received the children of the upper and middle classes who could bring rich gifts with them, but not of the poor. There was nothing of the "orphanage" about the system. This also applied to the reception of the monk 'ad succurrendum', -- only the wealthy, who could leave legacies to the monastery, were welcome. (2) The monks did not keep schools for outside boys. Oblates were brought up to be monks. They had practically no choice. How far the oblate system was the counterpart to the law of primo-geniture is not mentioned, to my knowledge, by any historians. Nevertheless what the development of the Empire meant as an outlet for the younger sons of the nobility in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the dedication to a monastery as an 'oblate child' meant as a similar outlet in the centuries before Cistercianism. <sup>Indeed</sup> Though G.G. Coulton remarks, "The wealthy monasteries became the dumping ground for the younger sons and daughters of the nobility". (3) When we ask, "What type of character did monasticism produce?" a clear answer is difficult to come by. While it is wrong to make character formation a criterion, or touchstone, of truth, nevertheless the production of character that is widely and consistently different from the ideal character of Jesus may be taken as an indication of a wrong or

(1) E.A.L. Fisher: "A History of Europe", p. 250.

(2) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, pp. 93, 200, 227, 328, 380, 422.

(3) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 56.

heretical doctrine, or of a gospel with essential elements omitted, or of a way of life that is fundamentally erroneous. A doctrine and a way of life that is well-pleasing to God, consistent with divine revelation, and in keeping with the spirit of Jesus, will tend to produce character that is noble, righteous, loving and inspiring.

"In so far as any faith leads a man to act wrongly, to that extent it must be a false faith". (1)

What of the character of the monks? There is the reference to the character of the early Cistercians mentioned above; there is the treatment of those seeking to enter the monastery as prescribed in the Rule; there is the widespread use of "excommunication", as a means of discipline whereby the offender was 'sent to Coventry', in so effective a manner as to amount to the equivalent of solitary confinement; (2) there is the punishment of the lash (3) and of the constant application of the rod to the 'oblates'. (4) What type of character would this produce? Possessing nothing individually they corporately became rapacious, and were frequently condemned as tyrannical and harsh landlords. (5) Sodomy was rife as is evidenced by the continual regulations against it, (6) and the insistence that young monks sleep between old monks. (7) The monks had

- (1) G.C. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", III, Intro. XIV.
- (2) Rule of St. Benedict, XXIII - XXVIII.
- (3) " " " " , XXVIII, XXXIV.
- (4) G.C. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", Ch. 24.
- (5) " " " " " " , II, pp. 33, 59.
- (6) " " " " " " , III, pp. 96, 261.
- (7) Rule of St. Benedict, XXII.

a great weakness for litigation and many a monastery's finances were ruined thereby. (1) The bitterness of their demand for 'exemption' and the lengths they were prepared to go to obtain or preserve it, suggest that there was much to hide. The Evesham Case does not reveal the christian character of the monks, let alone the abbot, in any inspiring light. The Chronicle of Jocelin is not flattering to the character of the monastery's inmates.

"The monk who strove for a return to the actual Rule . . . or who told the truth at a visitation was likely to suffer for it". (2)

A Clunian visitor's conclusion is

"that it is almost or quite impossible to elicit the truth from English monks". (3)

G.G. Coulton, dealing with the period we are considering, details ten murders of Abbots or Priors by their monks, five additional cases of attempted murder, and one case of an abbot trying to reform his monastery, where the monks 'set upon him, cut off his tongue and put out his eyes'. (4)

"Archbishop Warham's provincial council in 1529 legislated against 'those whom the diocesan bishops may judge, from signs and vehement indications, either to have conspired in the past in order to slay their abbots, priors or the brethren of their monastery, or to be likely in future to conspire or in any way to compass their death'". (5)

- |     |               |                               |               |
|-----|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| (1) | G.G. Coulton: | "Five Centuries of Religion", | III, Ch. 30.  |
| (2) | "             | "                             | " I, p. 256.  |
| (3) | "             | "                             | " II, p. 265. |
| (4) | "             | "                             | " I, p. 257.  |
| (5) | "             | "                             | " II, p. 283. |

When we remember that we may search the Church of Scotland records since the Reformation without finding a church dignitary or official being murdered by his fellow-presbyters, the type of character produced by monasticism begins to be clear -

Jocelin, in his chronicle, reports Abbot Samson as saying:

"I passed through Italy at a time when all clerics carrying letters for the Lord Pope Alexander were seized, and some of them imprisoned, some hanged, and others sent to the Pope with their lips and noses lopped off, to his great dishonour and confusion".  
(1)

Surely the sufferings of the mutilated clerks was more worthy of sympathy than the confusion of the Pope! The whole incident is eloquent of a barbarism which monasticism did nothing to mitigate, if it did not actually foster it.

An exclusive 'fraternity' drawn from aristocratic families, the monks often came to be outnumbered greatly by the number of servants of the monastery. (2) One of the joys of the medieval heaven was to behold the tortures and sufferings of the damned in hell, and this sadistic indulgence was regarded as one of the sources of heavenly bliss. (3) It is an eloquent comment on the widespread nature of the type of Christian character produced by Monasticism. We must also remember that 'the civilisation of the Middle Ages is an ecclesiastical civilisation'. (4) The large responsibility of the Church therefore for social conditions and social outlook cannot be evaded.

- (1) Chronicle of Jocelin: Translation by H.E. Butler, p. 48.
- (2) D.D. Knowles: "The Monastic Order in England", p. 440.
- (3) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 419.
- (4) " " : " " " " " " , I, p. 441.
- (5) R. Trevor Davies: "Medieval England (1066-1500)", p. 71.

The Monasteries and the Mass.

"The Mass, as distinct from the primitive Eucharist, was mainly a monastic creation; or rather an evolution concurrent with monastic evolution. We may almost say that Christ made the Last Supper, and the monks made the Mass". (1)

"In the individualistic ethos of the desert the Eucharist began to lose the notion of a corporate offering and to be regarded as a vehicle for individual reception. In the scattered references among the 'Conferences', Cassian regards it only in this light". (2)

The Mass developed during the centuries when Monasticism was the main and almost the sole transmitting agency of the Christian Faith. From the sixth to the twelfth centuries the dominating religious influence in Western Europe was Monasticism. If the Mass is identified with the primitive Eucharist, its origins can easily be traced back to a more primitive date. But the Roman Mass is something much more than this, and has distinctive features of its own. Many significant details are mediaeval additions. The dates in its development are of interest.

"The reign of St. Gregory the Great (590-604) marks an epoch in the history of the Mass". (3)

"The First Roman Ordo (about 770) shows us a comparatively early stage in this development". (4)

"The older system of assistance and communion or co-celebration was replaced in the early middle ages by a separate Mass

- (1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 124.
- (2) Owen Chadwick: "John Cassian", p. 67.
- (3) A. Fortesque: "The Mass", p. 172.
- (4) " " " " " " , p. 174.

said apart by each priest. This change, which had far reaching effects on liturgy, Canon Law, even Church architecture, was the result of theological speculation. Each Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice has a definite value before God; therefore two Masses are worth twice as much as one. In the West the compacts made between the various monasteries, from the eighth century onwards to offer a definite number of Masses for deceased members had a most decisive influence on the practice of private celebration. The custom of saying each Mass for a definite intention and the acceptance of a stipend for so doing naturally helped in the same direction". (1)

"All our offertory prayers are mediaeval". (2)

After the Lavabo

"the celebrant sums up the whole offertory by the prayer "Suscipe sancta Trinitas". This too is a mediaeval, non-Roman addition". (3)

"Our elevation at the words of institution . . . is a late mediaeval ceremony. Till about the twelfth century there is no trace of it". (4) "The Cistercians adopted it in 1215 A.D.". (5) "The Canon of the Synod of Exeter (1287 A.D.) states: 'The host is raised on high that it may be seen by the faithful congregation'". (6) "To incense the Blessed Sacrament at the elevation is a late adornment of that ceremony. It is found first in a Dominican Ordo of the thirteenth century. In this the deacon incenses the Blessed Sacrament continuously during the elevation. . . It was introduced at Rome about the end of the fourteenth century". "This mediaeval ceremony of the elevation has tended to become a new centre of gravity for the Mass". (7)

- (1) A. Fortesque: "The Mass", p. 187.
- (2) " " " " " " , p. 304.
- (3) " " " " " " , p. 311.
- (4) " " " " " " , p. 338.
- (5) " " " " " " , p. 340.
- (6) Norman: "Handbook of the Christian Liturgy", p. 280.
- (7) A. Fortesque: "The Mass", pp. 344-5.

"Down to about the twelfth century the normal way of receiving Communion was under both kinds everywhere". (1)

"When the celebrant turns to the people to greet them, he kisses the altar as a sign of respect before he turns his back to it. The prayer *Placeat tibi*, which can be traced back to the ninth century was merely a private ejaculation as he did so". (2)

The term 'Mass' is used exactly for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper first by Florus of Lyons. (860 A.D.) (3) When we consider the place of *κοινωνία* in the Eucharist and later in the Mass, we notice it is strongly emphasized in the letters of St. Ignatius; (4) that it appears in the Liturgy of the Faithful in the Eucharist of the first three centuries (5). Then if we follow the symbol of the Kiss of Peace we find that "it was replaced at an early date by symbolic actions and is usually confined to the ministers". (6)

The withdrawal of the cup from the laity to which the Reformers took great exception, was in effect the withdrawal of another expression of *κοινωνία*. The sharing of a cup is the symbol and expression of the union and communion of worshippers, who are united in the worship of the Eucharist, supremely by means of the shared cup, not only with God in Christ but with one another. One cannot therefore agree with Adrian Fortesque that it is a matter of indifference, or of small importance, whether communion is under one kind or under both kinds. (7) He notes significantly,

- (2) A. Fortesque: "The Mass", p. 377.
- (3) " " " " " " , pp. 247 and 293.
- (4) " " " " " " , p. 400.
- (5) " " " " " " , p. 14.
- (6) " " " " " " , p. 36, II (3).
- (7) Norman: "Handbook of the Christian Liturgy", p. 209.
- (8) A. Fortesque: "The Mass", pp. 376-7.

"Down to about the twelfth century the normal way of receiving communion was under both kinds everywhere". (1) "However from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Communion under one kind spread rapidly till by the fourteenth century it became practically universal in the West. The Council of Constance (1414-1418) made what was already an old custom into a law and Trent confirmed and defended it". (2)

The change took place at the period of greatest monastic influence and reflects the outlook of separation between the 'religious' and the common people.

This separation is also further noticed in the Secret where the private prayers of the officiating priest and the singing of the congregation both go on at the same time - two simultaneous actions, independent of each other. (3)

The Roman Mass has no Epiklesis, or <sup>we</sup> Invocation of the Holy Spirit. (4) It was early in the Eucharist. (5) 'It is certain that the Roman rite once had an Epiklesis of the Holy Ghost'. (6) It was removed early, probably by St. Gregory (590-604) (7), at the very beginning of the period of the Monasteries. The significance of its omission, however, is not in relation to the consecration, with which A. Fortesque is mainly concerned, but in relation to *κοινωνία*. The <sup>voc</sup> invocation of the Holy Spirit involves *κοινωνία*, and from

- |     |               |             |         |
|-----|---------------|-------------|---------|
| (1) | A. Fortesque: | "The Mass", | p. 377. |
| (2) | "             | "           | "       |
| (3) | "             | "           | "       |
| (4) | "             | "           | "       |
| (5) | "             | "           | "       |
| (6) | "             | "           | "       |
| (7) | "             | "           | "       |
- p. 380.  
p. 313.  
p. 73.  
pp. 402-7.



any general doctrine of Κοινωνία the Church, (or Western Christendom, to be more exact) under monastic influence, was steadily moving away.

The great influence of the Monasteries on the Mass, however, lay not in the detail of its celebration but in the doctrine and theological speculations which became attached to it. It is the doctrinal significance of the Mass as a whole, and the significance of detail as expounding that doctrine, that raise questions of controversy and of fundamental difference.

Regarding the evolution of the Mass, however, from the angle of Κοινωνία we may notice the following points.

(1) From being a common meal shared by Christ with his disciples, Our Lord facing his 'fellow-communicants', it became a sacrificial oblation, in which the officiating priest turned his back to the worshipping people, and made his own prayers at the altar. The celebration of the Mass, with the priest's back turned to the people, is a significant break in the Κοινωνία of the service.

(2) The prayers (for the most part) ceased to be common prayers and became the personal offering of the celebrant alone. While the priest said in a whisper, 'The Secret' at the altar, the people sang psalm entirely distinct from it. (1) This separation of the worshipping priest at the altar from the attendant congregation, which persisted right through the Canon, led to great irreverence.

(1) A. Fortesque: "The Mass". pp. 311-14.

"Kings and magistrates habitually transacted business in Church during Mass". (1) "In Strassburg Cathedral the Burgermeister's pew was a recognised business office for town affairs during Mass". (2)

(3) The doctrine of transubstantiation led to the elevation of the host becoming the climax of the service. (3)

It was at the elevation that the bell was rung, - at first to call people from without to come and see it. (4) This custom of looking at the Host was a mediæval practice. (5) People therefore entered to look at the Host and departed without waiting till the end of the service. (6) The service became purely individualistic, the element of

NO IV IV IAS was just no longer there.

(4) The conception of Masses as propitiatory sacrifices led to their multiplication. It led to a traffic in Masses by the Monasteries - to their sale and endowment - until it became a grave scandal to religion. (7) But these Masses were said by monk-priests without any congregation being necessary. Even where the contract was conscientiously fulfilled, there is no conception in this multiplication of Masses of an attendant congregation. Before his little altar, the priest, whether accompanied or unaccompanied by deacons, celebrated alone.

- |     |               |                                       |
|-----|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| (1) | G.G. Coulton: | "Five Centuries of Religion", p. 129. |
| (2) | " " :         | " " " " " " , p. 130.                 |
| (3) | A. Fortesque: | "The Mass", p. 345.                   |
| (4) | " " :         | " " " " " " , p. 342.                 |
| (5) | " " :         | " " " " " " p. 345.                   |
| (6) | G.G. Coulton: | "Five Centuries of Religion", p. 130. |
| (7) | " " :         | " " " " " " , p. 131.                 |

The numerous altars in the great Cathedral Churches arose from this practice. Only the officiating priest communicated. In the Canon of the Mass, he made the sacrifice. Κοινωνία was not! It was pure individualism.

(5) The practice of the worshippers sharing in communion was separated from the Mass and did not regularly accompany it. The elevation of the Host in the sight of the people took the place of their sharing the bread and wine as the climax of the service. The fact that the celebration of the Mass did not necessarily imply the communion of the worshippers, meant that the Mass became in effect a presentation of the Eucharist from which Κοινωνία had been eliminated. It became the private oblation of the celebrant or of those for whom the celebrant acted.

(6) The withdrawal of the cup from the laity, even when participating in communion, was a further step in this direction. The mediaeval reason given for its withdrawal is not acceptable. No scandal of careless handling has arisen from its retention in the Reformed Church. Rather may we see in the shared cup a witness to Christian Κοινωνία, a spiritual factor for which Mediaeval Monasticism had no place.

(7) This separation of priest and people in the celebration of the Mass is further enhanced by the use of Latin rather than the vernacular. (2) This meant that the vast

(1) A. Fortesque: "The Mass", pp. 376-81.  
 (2) " " : " " , pp. 126-8.

bulk of the worshippers, or of the people, just did not understand the Mass.

Behind their influence on the Mass there is the general outlook of the Monasteries on religion and on life. Christian *κοινωνία* was not accepted as a fundamental doctrine of the faith. This resulted in a neglect, or weak appreciation, of the nature and function of the Holy Spirit. It resulted gradually in the transformation of the Eucharist into the Mass. The fact that there is no Epiklesis of the Holy Spirit in the Roman Mass is deeply significant; the fact that the personal view and adoration of the elevated host is substituted for the sharing of communion as the climax of the service, is deeply significant; the fact that, even when communion is given, the cup is withdrawn from the laity is deeply significant; the fact that the celebration of the Mass neither implies nor requires the presence of a worshipping congregation, but can be an act of the priest alone is deeply significant. We may therefore consider the Roman Mass as what the Eucharist becomes when *κοινωνία* is eliminated from it. As *κοινωνία* was filtered out of the life, doctrine, and Christian practice of the Monasteries it came gradually also to be filtered out of their supreme act of worship - the Mass. In this respect the Mass, as it developed in the Middle Ages, is a fundamental expression of the religious outlook of the Monasteries. There is the separateness from the common people; there is the supreme individualism; there is the lack of *κοινωνία*. There is the conception of the priest or monk, in their

individual capacity, doing something that, in its sacrificial aspect, is pleasing and acceptable to God. The doctrine of justification by works which appeared in the Prologue of the Rule of St. Benedict, found its place at length in the celebration of the Eucharist, when under the influence of the monasteries it was presented in the form of the Mass.

### The Development of Chantry.

The direction and development of religious devotion as expressed in the gifts of the wealthy is illuminating. Only the wealthy could give such gifts as are likely to leave their mark on history. It is an open question how far the spiritual attentions of the church were confined to those of wealth and influence. The yeoman and the serf came last in the queue for spiritual attention and the church's interest in them seemed often confined to the collection of tithe and heriot.

The earlier of those magnificent Medieval gifts to the church consisted of the foundation or endowment of Monasteries. As medieval wealth was mainly in the form of land, endowments meant endowment with lands. The motive behind many of these has been expressed thus:

"Monasteries were sometimes founded by men of bloodthirsty and immoral lives, who seemed to have reasoned with themselves in this way: 'I love Christ and His law. But I find it quite impossible to serve Him myself. The temptations of the flesh are too strong for me. So I will found this house, in order that other men, who are able to do so, may lead pure and holy lives: and I trust that God, who knows my

weakness in temptation will have mercy on me for the sake of the holy lives I have enabled other men to live". Some such thought as this seems to be at the back of many a monastic charter granted by the warriors of the early Middle Ages". (1)

When such foundations or endowments of land were given, the serfs who dwelt upon the land and tilled it were not regarded as persons but as property, and as such were accepted by the Church. For example, King David I in his charter to Dunfermline Abbey in 1150 A.D. states,

"I grant to the abbot and monks that they possess all the men with all their monies on whatsoever land they be who were on those lands on the day whereon the said lands were offered and given to the abbey". (2)

The giving of gifts for the foundation or endowment of monasteries was usually accompanied by the request, or even condition, that the founder and his family should be constantly remembered in the prayers of the monastery. (3) Following the development of the Mass, which was due to the initiative of the monks, these ceremonies, or obits, came to be devoted, or given, to certain persons who were specifically named in them. It was believed that the celebration of mass for a particular person was of great spiritual value to their souls. It was purely individual and personal and had no reference to, or dependence on, the worshipping congregation, who might, or might not, be there. The important point was that the priest celebrated mass for the particular departed soul.

(1) Davies: "Medieval England", p. 86.

(2) Cited by G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p.8

(3) Baskerville: "English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries", p. 20.

"About 1240 Sir Peter Manley founded a chantry chapel at Meaux to be served by two priests and two clerks; and about the same time Ralph de Willington built a chapel in the abbey of Gloucester and endowed two chaplains who were to do nothing but celebrate daily for the souls of the founders and their forebears.

Such was the chantry system in its early days and it is easy enough to see that it was open to abuse . . . " (1)

Gradually the chantry system grew until one of the great motives behind the building of these vast cathedrals was the provision of altars at which such masses could be worthily celebrated.

"The volume of ecclesiastical building in the twelfth century was truly astonishing.

37	originated under	Benedictine Rule.
25	"	" Augustinian "
18	"	" other orders.
14	"	" secular canons.

All were built within a century, in addition to smaller churches constructed in nearly every parish, and that by a population estimated at little over two million.

Most of the English bishops, unlike those of the Continent, used the monastic churches for their cathedrals. English Cathedrals were long and low, in effect two churches, one for laity in the nave, and one for monks in the eastern limb". (2)

"The great churches belonged more to communities than to the general public but yet they had parochial responsibilities. These vast structures were erected not to serve as places where huge crowds might assemble for worship (for every cathedral city was well supplied with parish churches) but rather to accommodate a small group of

{1} Moorman: "Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century".  
{2} A.H. Gardiner: "Outline of English Architecture", p. 19.

men who lived their lives under the shadow of the cathedral church in enjoyment of the wealth and splendour which were attached to it. The laity as a whole were no doubt allowed, and even sometimes encouraged to attend the daily offices; but for the most part the members of the Chapter lived a life of superb detachment from the cares of pastoral work, while the proceeds of their prebends enabled them to employ subordinates to relieve them even of the burden of supporting the daily round of worship. In some of these cathedrals part of the nave was actually used as a parish church, and in others there were nave altars set aside for parishioners . . . As A.H. Thomson has pointed out "The neighbourhood of parish churches to our older Cathedrals recalls the fact that the Cathedral, if it was the Mother Church of the city or diocese, did not necessarily continue to provide parochial ministrations". (1)

Similar to the secular Cathedrals were the collegiate churches. . . The whole monastic system was closely bound up with the idea of claustration, of the monk's separation from the world, and it can hardly have suited their ideal to have lay people wandering about their churches. The attempt to make the same building therefore serve both monks and laity was not generally a success. At Leominster a visiting bishop found that the prior was in the habit of locking the church doors and so preventing the laity from entering their own church". (2)

The development of chantries continued and when munificent gifts to the monasteries as such began to decline with the coming of the friars and the gradual spiritual deterioration of the monasteries themselves, the gifts of the wealthy tended

- (1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century", p. 18.  
(2) " : "Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century", p. 22.



to be devoted to the establishment of chantries for the benefit of their own souls. This was done through the establishment of Collegiate Churches (Colleges), sometimes through the monasteries and by other means. For example, at the side of the high altar of Hexham Abbey there is a specially constructed Chantry Chapel for Prior Leschman. His tomb is there with the effigy of the Prior surmounting it. Beside the tomb is the chantry altar and all is enclosed in such a way that there is room for the officiating priest alone. The whole construction is medieval. The masses said there were to be for the benefit of the departed Prior and none other. It was entirely individualistic.

With the fourteenth century there came the great development of religious guilds. These were really co-operative chantries. In the new classes of merchants and craftsmen that were rising up in the towns the church found a new source of income. By combining together and paying regular subscriptions the members were assured of certain masses for their souls at death. The number of masses and other spiritual benefits (candles etc.) varied according to the wealth of the guild. Membership of the guilds did not extend below the class of artisans; it was normally beyond the reach of serfs or the poorest people.

"No one of servile birth could join a guild".  
(1)

(1) Mitchell and Leys: "History of the English People", p. 88.

The one example of a poor man's gild at Norwich by its very pathos, emphasis its exceptional nature and to a large extent its futility. (1) The gilds, however, were only doing in a co-operative way what the wealthy could buy for themselves. The essential content and outlook was individualistic. As in the monasteries men combined that, through their association together, their own soul culture might be the better accomplished, so in the gilds they combined together in order that in the end additional spiritual benefit to the soul of each one individually might be obtained. The object was individualistic; the association together was teleologically conditioned with a view to this individualism. It is interesting to note that the College of Corpus Christi in Cambridge was probably founded in order to maintain the supply of priests to meet the needs of the chantries supported by the founding gilds. The chantry duties, being then no longer entrusted to the monasteries, were to be carried out by priests specifically employed for this sole purpose.

"What the conscious aim of the gilds may have been in founding the College (of Corpus Christi) we do not know, for they have not recorded it.

Perhaps they were less influenced by a love of learning, pure and simple, than by a desire to found a college of priests to whom the duty of offering regular prayers for the departed brethren and sisters might be fitly entrusted". (2)

- (1) See Chapter 3 below. and *Toulmin Smith: English Gilds* p 40-42  
 (2) Mary Bateson: "Cambridge Gild Records": Preface X.

The chantries were supposed to bring spiritual benefit to those on whose behalf the mass was said, not to the gild or monastery in its corporate fellowship together. Any preliminary co-operation or 'sharing' was for the purpose of getting something that was not shared. Wealth could buy this. The primary issue in the next world was the alternative of heaven or hell, which were, of course, very real to the medieval mind. But there is also the idea that the feudal gradation of society could by such means be continued in the life beyond. We hear of no masses being said for serfs. We hear of no chantries being donated to the poor. Could the chantry system carry the individualism of the Middle Ages, with its carefully graded feudal society, into the life beyond? It was hoped so.

"A monastery . . . was like a cathedral, a great chantry foundation in which intercession for the dead never relaxed". (1)

"It is to be feared that the religious did not always fulfil all their obligations towards souls". (2)

With the decline of belief in purgatory and in the efficacy of prayers for the dead the power of the chantries waned. And when in the act of I Edward VI, Ch. 4. 1547 these beliefs were explicitly repudiated by Act of Parliament, the final dissolution of the monasteries and the religious guilds had come and with them the pensioning off of all chantry priests.

(1) Baskerville: "English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries", p. 22.

(2) " : As above, p. 23.

The Adoration and Cult of the Virgin.

The Adoration and Cult of the Virgin.

The development of the adoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the consequent elaboration of what is often called Mariolatry, occurred during the period of the Monasteries. It was developed in Medieval religion to extraordinary lengths. "Very early", and as a natural consequence of monastic ideals and discipline,

"Christ the Mediator becomes Christ the Judge; and another must needs be found to mediate between us and Christ, as Christ had stood between us and the Father. Jesus had taught the love of the Father; it becomes the Virgin's mission to teach the love of Christ". (1)

The Cistercian Order was specially devoted, if not dedicated, to the Virgin Mary and stood under her special protection. (2)

"The cult of the Virgin was fully systematised by the beginning of the thirteenth century. . . The greatest monastic reforms had boasted her special patronage . . The Cistercians, of course, were first in the field; and St. Bernard's known devotion to the virgin carried immense weight with all finer spirits . . . But Bernard with the greatest men of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had opposed the (3) new doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary; (4) and later legend on that account held him up to the rebuke of the multitude". . . "The Friars, when they came, could boast . . that our brethern undertake greater . . labours for souls than other Religious who are content with merely saving their own souls and that they enjoy the blessed Virgin's special protection". (5)

- |     |               |                               |               |
|-----|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| (1) | G.G. Coulton: | "Five Centuries of Religion", | p. 138.       |
| (2) | "             | "                             | p. 367.       |
| (3) | "             | "                             | p. 142.       |
| (4) | "             | "                             | pp. 142, 293. |
| (5) | "             | "                             | p. 142.       |

The legends attached to the cult of Mary are innumerable and extraordinary. There was the Mediaeval belief that

'Mary could actually change by her prayers the purposes of her Son', and 'the Mary of these legends binds not only the will of her child but the actual decrees of the Trinity'. (1)

After enumerating instances of special rewards for devotion to her cult, G.G. Coulton adds

"It would be very difficult to find an example of similar rewards given for special devotion to the Holy Ghost; indeed, Abailard got into trouble for dedicating his monastery to the Paraclete". (1)

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit was in large measure a doctrine of *κοινωνία* in its ultimate essence, while the doctrine of the intercession of the Virgin Mary was virtually a substitution thereof. The neglect of the one synchronised with the rise and development of the other. The extent and passionate intensity with which the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary was adopted and cherished reveals that it was meeting, or attempting to meet, some deep fundamental need in the spiritual life of mankind.

The development of the cult is marked by a most elaborate attempt to eliminate the element of *κοινωνία*. The 'mother-child' relationship is of a different nature and ethos. In the doctrine of the Virgin Mary, the bearing of a child is separated from copulation. The former is virtuous; the latter

(1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", p. 156.

is sinful. The latter is part of the sin of the flesh that must be overcome, or forgiven, for the soul's salvation. Mary bore Jesus without the experience of copulation. She was host. In fact the Apostle's Creed states that Jesus was 'conceived by the Holy Ghost'. Conception was not the act or experience of Mary. The divine seed implanted in her she bore, and gave birth to God ( *Θεοτόκος* ). The first step in the elaboration of the cultus was the denial of any subsequent copulation in the life and experience of Mary. This was followed by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception which was only formally adopted in the middle of last century, the delay being largely due to the attitude and letter of St. Bernard. Copulation involves *κοινωνία*. The doctrine as stated permits the Adoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, minus *κοινωνία* and minus sex, which was regarded as sinful. It was, therefore, at the same time a means, an expression and a consequence of the elimination of *κοινωνία* from the presentation of Christian truth. The monk had repudiated or sacrificed the *κοινωνία* of the family; the yearning for the feminine was transferred to, and compensated for in, the adoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

In a chantry chapel in the North Transept of Ely Cathedral there is an alabaster altar screen of the fourteenth century workmanship. It is of singular and outstanding beauty. It depicts the priesthood of the ascended Christ. Our Lord is

depicted in priest's vestments - crowned as in His glory. His head and eyes are upraised towards heaven while his arms are raised in prayer, though His right hand has a downward reference also as conveying blessing to the worshipper. The official notice at the entrance to the chapel states that it is "almost unique in Western Christendom. The theme is common in the Byzantine tradition of the Eastern Church. . . It is the only example of this doctrine from the period (in Western art). The lack of presentation thereof in Medieval art may explain the comparative neglect of the doctrine.

Greek capital letters below the screen give the first portion of Hebrews 7<sup>25</sup>.  
(Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.)

It would be more correct to say that the neglect of the doctrine was the cause of the lack of presentation thereof in Medieval art. From the starting point of humanity the intercessor was in the first place, to the medieval mind, the Virgin Mary. The doctrine here depicted, through Byzantine influence, was relegated to the background.

The neglect of the fundamental conception of Christian *κοινωνία* led in various ways to the development of the doctrine of the Blessed Virgin Mary which in turn modified, at least in practice, the full doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the doctrine of the priesthood of the ascended Christ.

Thomas Aquinas.

As *κοινωνία* is, from its very nature, something which will embody itself in the social and religious life of the people something that will be embodied in their conduct, their social life and, if possible, their social system, so it is in these spheres that we have looked for it in the life of the Middle Ages, rather than in the spheres of the doctrinal and theoretical discussions which pertain to these centuries. It is not that the doctrine, as expressed, is unimportant, for the social and religious life of the people may well be the product of the doctrines and beliefs of the age. It is also true that the doctrine may be conditioned by the social life and social setting in which it has developed and may be, in fact, an unconscious rationalisation and philosophical justification of the social life itself.

Much medieval thought was conditioned, and perhaps determined, by the feudalism in which it lived. Also, feudalism itself may at first have been the embodiment of antecedent doctrines and ideas. The mutual interaction, therefore, must always be watched and allowed for.

We have already shown that the religious outlook transmitted to the Middle Ages by the Monasteries was essentially and fundamentally individualistic. It involved also the corollary of individualism, namely that there are grades or stages in personal spiritual attainment. Without an essential functioning *κοινωνία* <sup>such</sup> and spiritual attainment remains a personal



individual possession. The highest grade of spiritual life was that of the hermit or the ascetic, while members of coenobium came very near to it. Were they not solely engaged in their own individual soul culture? They were the "religious"; the ordinary parochial clergy were the "seculars", a somewhat lower grade. Those who could wear the monk's gown "ad succurrendum", and have individual masses said for their souls, were on a higher spiritual plane than the sorts who could have neither. These grades of spiritual life within the church had their counterpart in the grades and classes of Feudalism. How much the one influenced, conditioned or caused the other, it is extremely difficult to say. In time, the religious ideas came first, in the form in which the monasteries transmitted the Christian faith. The atmosphere of feudalism was the ideal climate for their firm establishment in the West. And just as the New Testament idea, or vision, of Christian  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}$  was not embodied in Monasticism, so neither was it embodied in Feudalism. The Church was essentially, the  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$  and its head was the Supreme Pontiff. Socially there was 'no land without a lord, and no lord without land'. (1)

All this was mirrored in the thought and philosophy of the Middle Ages. As this thesis is primarily concerned with the social and practical religious life of the period, a short reference chiefly to St. Thomas Aquinas may suffice. Aquinas

was the dominating theological figure of the period and

"was the best interpreter of the spirit of his times and of its deepest aspirations".

(1)

Moreover

"it was the conditions of the Middle Ages alone which, silently and surely, determined the doctrine of St. Thomas, and indeed made it possible".

(2)

"The story (of the doctrine of the Sacraments) . . belongs to the history of dogma; here also St. Thomas set the standard".

(3)

St. Thomas' conception of society is essentially architectonic

(4)

and patriarchal.

(5)

The unity is ascribed to the wisdom of

the divine architect of the world.

(6)

"The graded social system and the scholastic habit of thought correspond to and condition each other. In both cases the individual parts are not independently related to the altruistic values and principles; they are related to them only through the medium of a whole, in which externally they are bound together in an architectonic system in which they share only in a very external modified quantitative manner".

(6)

"There is no uniform moral ideal, which would imply the same formal goal for the training of each individual. There is, rather, a distribution of parts, classes and services in an architectonic whole, which mutually complete and support each other, whose inner unity lies in the ecclesiastical authority, which relates the whole to the Divine Will, executes this Will,

(1) A.P. D'autreves: "Aquinas: Selected Political Writings", Intro. XI.

(2) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches I, p.

203.

(3) " " " " " " " " "p.235

(4) " " " " " " " " "p.273

(5) " " " " " " " " "p.287

(6) As (4).

distributes the various parts, and assumes responsibility for the whole.

The ordered variety of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is meant to respect upon a higher plane, in the realm of grace, the harmonious variety of the natural order and of the order of the state". (1)

From this background it is not surprising to find the Thomist conclusion,

"... Inequalities are most evident in the relations between master and servant, and in differences in property, official position, and the various secular callings. In this respect it is the duty of every man to remain within his own class, and to serve others gladly. The Christian virtues are not progress and change, but the preservation of healthy organisations and contentment with one's present position in relation to the whole". (2)

A further quotation from Troeltsch's exposition of Thomism may make this more clear. There is

"the need to incorporate and approximate the life of Society within the world to the ultimate values and principles of the living sociological organism of the religious life. The sociological organism of the religious life itself becomes the Papal Theocracy, which, directly or indirectly, becomes the all-inclusive determining sociological fundamental form of human existence . . . . Like the whole of scholasticism this way of thinking is essentially architectonic . . . . Thus the ascent of humanity and the ascent of the individual soul towards the Absolute End are constructed on architectonic lines.

The idea of Society is . . . also architectonic in its conception . . . . It ascends from one plane to another through its graded social organisation, from serfs to freemen and nobles and burghers, and thence to monks and priests, right up to

(1) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", I, p.276.

(2) As above, p. 291.

the supreme positions in Church and State.  
(1)

Such is the background of Aquinas' attitude to serfdom and slavery. This attitude is clearly stated in his "Commentary on the sentences of Peter Lombard". Peter Lombard writes

" . . . (2) As we have shown, servitude began in consequence of sin. But men are cleansed from sin by baptism. Therefore they are freed from servitude.

(3) Furthermore: a greater bond absolves from a lesser, as the new law absolved from the observance of the old. But man is by baptism bound to God: and this obligation is a greater bond than that by which one man is bound to another in servitude. Therefore man is freed from servitude by baptism". (2)

To this Aquinas replies,

" . . . Baptism does not take away all the penalties which derive from the sin of our first parents, as for instance the inevitability of death, blindness and other such evils. But it regenerates in the living hope of that life in which we shall be free from such penalties. Therefore, from the fact that a man is baptised it does not necessarily follow that he should be freed from servile condition, even though this is a consequence of sin.

To the third objection we reply that the greater bond does not absolve from the lesser, unless the two be incompatible, since error and truth cannot be found together. . . But the bond with which one is bound in baptism is compatible with the bond of servitude, and does not in consequence absolve from it". (3)

- (1) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, I, p. 274.  
(2) Aquinas: "Selected Political Writings", p. 181.  
(3) " : " " " , p. 185.

To this may be added his further statement on slavery.

" . . . Slavery, by which one man is subject to another, exists in respect of the body, but not of the soul, which is free. Now in the state of this life we are freed by the grace of Christ from the defects of the soul, but not from those of the body; as we see from the words of the Apostle (Rom. 7:25) where he says of himself, that 'with the mind he obeys the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin'. So, therefore, those who through grace become the sons of God are free from the spiritual slavery of sin, but not from the slavery of the body through which they are bound to earthly masters". (1)

This aspect of the punishment for sin, however, is only to afflict some people, while others are to benefit from it. The above passages embody a complete denial of the doctrine of Christian *Koivunv* as we have envisaged it in the teaching of the New Testament. (2)

Aquinas, however, is not unaware of the importance of the community, and of its profound influence on the spiritual wellbeing of man.

"When we consider all that is necessary to human life, it becomes clear that man is naturally a social and political animal destined more than all other animals to live in community . . . the companionship of his fellows is naturally necessary to man". (3)

Here Aquinas caught a glimpse of a psychological and spiritual truth which had wider implications than apparently he recognised or accepted. There is a further reference which is capable of being varyingly interpreted.

- (1) Aquinas: "Selected Political Writings", p. 179.
- (2) Above, Ch. I, Also St. Paul's letter to Philemon.
- (3) Aquinas: "Selected Political Writings", p. 3.

"The common welfare of the city and the individual welfare of one person are distinguished not only by a quantitative but also by a formal difference: for the common welfare is different in nature from that of the individual, just as the nature of the part is different from that of the whole. So the Philosopher (I, Politics, I) says: 'they are in error who say that the city, and the family and other similar groups, differ only in size and not specifically'". (1)

Perhaps this is best interpreted, however, in the light of the constant recognition that the relationship, is that of an externally-imposed architectonic unity rather than that of an emergent sharing of 'the common life in the Body of Christ'.

"The purely architectonic unity of Society and culture is still further expressed in the fact that the stages of development of the individual, as of humanity, not only in length cohere merely externally, but that also in breadth the individual groups possess only an acquiescent, indifferent, purely external, modified relation with the meaning of the whole; that the whole alone realises the idea of the Divine life-organism; that, however, particular classes and individuals have a very unequal share in the real ideal and the ultimate end, as indeed even the bliss of heaven has its various phases and degrees." (2)

A further truth, which is not followed up, is exemplified in the following quotation.

"... the object of human society is a virtuous life. . . . Now the man who lives virtuously is destined for a higher end, which consists . . . in the enjoyment of God; and the final object of human association can be no different from that of the

(1) Aquinas: "Selected Political Writings", p. 165.

(2) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", p. 276.

individual man. Thus the final aim of social life will be, not merely to live in virtue, but rather through virtuous life to attain to the enjoyment of God. . . . But the enjoyment of God is an aim which cannot be attained by human virtue alone, but only through divine grace . . . . Only a divine rule then can lead to this end - such government belongs to Jesus Christ our Lord. . . . It is from Him that the royal priesthood derives; and what is more, all the Faithful in Christ, being members of Him, become thus, priests and kings". (1)

We have a foreshadowing here of even the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers.

Anent Kingly Government, we have the dictum

"... the good of the community is greater and more divine than the good of the individual". (2)

While affirming that the object of law is the common good, he writes,

"Since every part bears the same relation to the whole as the imperfect to the perfect, and since one man is a part of that perfect whole which is the community, it follows that the law must have as its proper object the well-being of the whole community . . . . Law, strictly understood, has as its first and principal object the ordering of the common good". (3)

"Just as the good life of men on this earth is directed, as to its end, to the blessed life which is promised us in heaven, so also all those particular benefits which men can procure for themselves, such as riches or gain, or health or skill or learning, must be directed to the good of the community". (4)

"For the wellbeing of the individual two things are necessary: first and most

- |     |          |                                |             |
|-----|----------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| (1) | Aquinas: | "Selected Political Writings", | p. 75.      |
| (2) | "        | "                              | " , p. 49.  |
| (3) | "        | "                              | " , p. 111. |
| (4) | "        | "                              | " , p. 79.  |

essential is to act virtuously; the other and secondary requirement, is rather a means, and lies in a sufficiency of material goods, such as are necessary to virtuous action". (1)

The logical deduction from the premises of these last two quotations Aquinas did not take. It would have involved the attempt to realise the essential requirements of a true Christian

*κοινωνία*. But such a conception was outwith the requirements of Christianity as it was presented to his age and generation. He recognised no moral or spiritual obligation to provide for the serfs that 'sufficiency of material goods' that would have made 'virtuous action' and true spiritual life possible.

But, it may be objected, 'It is unfair to look for in Aquinas a spiritual outlook and religious attainment that his age had not reached, or to expect of him that democratic or 'universalist' outlook which only in the modern age we are recapturing. Such ideas were foreign to the accepted spiritual climate of his age, even if they did occasionally appear in heretics and rebels'. Exactly! It is the submission of this thesis that the doctrine of Christian *κοινωνία* as described in Chapter I was not transmitted to the Middle Ages, and in fact had no essential place in the presentation of the Christian faith in the West in the age of Aquinas, nor was it in any way truly embodied in the social life and structure of the Middle Ages.

(1) Aquinas: "Selected Political Writings", p. 81.



The Social Aspect.

The underlying principle of Feudalism may be briefly described as that of a division of social functions.

"God's house which men think to be one, is threefold; some pray in it, some fight in it, and some work in it. In order to allow the first two classes, the clerks and the soldiers, to accomplish their superior work, they must enjoy a monopoly of the sole existing capital, the land, which alone ensures them a domination founded on their natural mission, and guarantees their economic independence. The other classes must hold themselves fortunate if, in exchange for the spiritual and material protection extended to them, they are permitted to enjoy the produce of this capital. Their labour is but the legitimate payment for the patronage thus granted to them.

At the time of . . . the disorders of the last invasions . . . it was the Church which had safeguarded and still preserved civilisation. It was the warriors . . . the feudal knights . . . who saved the Christian West from complete dissolution. . . The military and ecclesiastical classes had at the same time . . . succeeded in getting the soil of the west into their hands". (1)

The idealism<sup>145</sup> and sense of trusteeship indicated above, was, however, completely forgotten in the actual social life of the Middle Ages. Instead, the basic individualism transmitted through the monasteries was embodied in an architectonic, class-conscious structure in which, on the foundations of the toil and bondage of serfdom, the religious and the nobility enjoyed and transmitted the civilisation they had inherited.

(1) Boissonnade: "Life and Work of Medieval Europe", p. 119, f.

The Christian doctrine of *κοινωνία*, where each served all and all served each, might, if truly realised, have made the 'feudal contract' function in an undreamt of way, and have inaugurated a period of unparalleled peace and happiness for mankind. But it was not to be.

The actual social aspect which we find in the Middle Ages is something very different. We seek briefly to indicate, rather than describe, what that was. It was a social life far removed from the outlook and basic conceptions of Christian *κοινωνία*. In the social framework or fabric of feudalism we see what the ultimate fruit of individualism can turn out to be. "By their fruits ye shall know them". Feudalism on its fundamental individualistic basis failed to satisfy the ultimate needs of humanity. It was swept away. Our modern civilisation which is also on a fundamentally individualistic basis, both spiritually and philosophically, is also failing to satisfy the needs and the hunger of humanity. Before it is swept away, it may be reasonable to ask whether the fault lies, not in the structures of the social systems concerned, but in the basic individualism which each in its own way has enshrined? In other words, does the fault lie in the failure to embody or make incarnate in the social life or social system concerned the basic conceptions of the doctrine of Christian *κοινωνία*? As we consider the social aspect of Medievalism the lack of this outlook and doctrine is obtrusively prominent.

"While to-day a man's . . . duty to the Church is purely optional, . . . in the Middle Ages the allegiance demanded by the Church was just as great and just as indisputable as that demanded by the state. Every man was subject to the secular power which had certain rights over his property and his labour; but he was equally in the power of the Church, which not only deprived him of a considerable proportion of his living, but also claimed to control his life and to give him his final passport either to unending joy or to unspeakable and eternal anguish". (1)

After 1200 A.D. the supreme influence of the Monasteries ceased. (2) They continued, of course, to have a great influence on the life of the nation particularly on their social life. (3) Many abbots were also Feudal Barons. (4) But their 'credit in men's eyes' was less, and they were no longer alone.

The friars, who came in the thirteenth century, were essentially individualistic. (5) Their peregrinations prevented any effective central control. Within fifty years of their appearance in England they were already a corrupt, discredited mendicant fraternity. The story of the friars after 1260 A.D. is neither edifying nor inspiring. (6) From the point of view of *Κοινωνία* they have nothing to contribute worthy of our attention.

The thirteenth century marked the rise of Universities.

- (1) Moorman: "Church Life In England in the 13th century", p. 2.
- (2) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", p. 690; Moorman: "Church Life in England", p. 254.
- (3) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", p. 692.
- (4) As above, Appendices VI and XV; Coulton: Vol. II, Ch. 3.
- (5) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 145.
- (6) As above, Ch. XI.

To this movement the monasteries contributed but little. Few monks found their way to the universities. Grosseteste, by his patronage of the Franciscans at Oxford, (1) was the means of turning them into the most learned fraternity in Europe. The universities, from their very nature and function, from the fact that scholarship is necessarily personal and individual, tend in the first instance to be individualistic in outlook. The cultivation and development of corporate life in the universities is superimposed on the individualism, rather than the individualism emerging from it. The experience of, or yearning for, a more intense corporate life is a common or constant feature of the universities. May not this be taken as another example of the fact that as we approach Truth in any comprehensive sense, the factor or presence of *κοινωνία* somehow makes its appearance? Or else it has to be reckoned with, because it is an essential element of ultimate truth. How far the scholarship acquired at the University ( or the *κοινωνία* experienced therein, for that matter) is regarded as being used thereafter for the enrichment or development of *κοινωνία* in the social or religious life of the Middle Ages, depends on our conception, and perhaps on our interpretation of that life.

"Co-operation was not a very prominent characteristic of Church life in the thirteenth century. Churchmen of all ranks,

(1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century" pp. 370, 382.

from the two Archbishops to the humblest parish priest, were so concerned with their rights and privileges that any idea of subordinating these to the welfare of the Church as a whole does not seem to have occurred to them. And the friars picked up the same habits". (1)

Life in the Middle Ages was not a static life. (2) While development was not rapid, it was real. By 'development', of course, 'change' is meant. The Middle Ages themselves registered that change, not as progress, but as decay. To regard the changes between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries as progress is to apply a nineteenth century concept to medieval thought and life. A record of change, therefore, should not in itself imply a judgment of either progress or decay. The roots of modern civilisation are to be found in the Middle Ages. The period involved the rise of the towns, the beginnings of industry and extensive trade, and the beginnings of Capitalism, particularly under the influence of the Cistercians. So far, however, as the life of the common people was concerned, the influence of the Monasteries and of the Church was almost as great, and perhaps sometimes even greater, than that of the secular feudal baron. The attitude, therefore, of the 'spirituality' to the monks and the common people is one of considerable importance. The attitude in question must also be considered in relation to the distribution of population itself between the different classes of the country.

English statistics are chosen because of convenience and

(1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century", p. 399.

(2) J.D. Mackie: "The Earlier Tudors", p. 1.

availability of evidence. The country was socially homogeneous. It had no division like the Lowlands and Highlands of Scotland. If not in the forefront, it was at least in the stream of European Western Civilisation.

### The thirteenth Century

'is commonly regarded as the greatest of all in medieval history'. (1)

The following statistics from that century may be taken as the background of the social life of the period.

'The population of England was about three million'. (2)

'The total number of monks was	7,652
" " " " Canons "	3,927
" " " " Friars "	5,352

---

Total 16,931

Add to this about 7,000 Nuns and about 1,400 men and women living under rule in the Hospitals'. (3)

('Hospital is here used, as often in the Middle Ages, in the sense of 'hospice'.)

'The total number of parishes must have been somewhere in the region of 9,500'. (4)

Even if the number of full-time parochial clergy in orders - apart from the religious houses - is only reckoned as equal to the number of parishes, we reach the astonishing total of about 35,000, or approximately 1 in every 86 of the population.

- (1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p. 1.  
 (2) " : " " " " " " " " " , p. 52  
 (footnote)  
 (3) " : As above, p. 412. Appendix - List of Religious Houses with numbers is detailed.  
 (4) " : As above, p. 5.

'Dr. Coulton estimates that the ratio of clergy to laity in the Middle Ages was about two per cent'. (1)

Translated into modern terms this means that the parish of Carluke with its present population of 11,415, (2) would have had to support, in one way or another 132 clergy (on the lower estimate). At present the parish is adequately served spiritually by eight clergymen of all denominations.

These men were not usually 'producers' in the economic sense. They lived on the surplus production of others, presumably, in return for services rendered. They were not, therefore, factors in production. (3) The above figures, also, must not be taken as including the entire Monastic population, not more than one-third of whom were professed monks or canons. (4) The others, who served the Monasteries in various ways, must be reckoned as producers.

We must add to this the ranks of the nobility or land-holders who were also non-producers. There were 1,400 Barons and 7,871 Knights in 1088, which fell to 5,000 in the twelfth century. (5) It was reckoned that three-quarters of the population of England were Anglo-Norman villeins reduced to serfdom from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries. (6)

"Even in 1381 . . . about half the population of England were bondfolk . . . even the free peasants were scarcely anywhere full citizens with a place in the constitution".  
(7)

- (1) Mookman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p.52.
- (2) Third Statistical Account.
- (3) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", p. 686.
- (4) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p.256
- (5) Boissionade: "Life and Work in Medieval Europe", p. 127.
- (6)       "                 "       "       "       "       "       "       " , p. 136.
- (7) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 7.

It was on the basis of their labour, taxes and poverty that the remaining fraction lived well. Now well, a single typical example may suffice to indicate.

"At the greater festivals the Bishop was accustomed to entertain his friends . . . The actual amount consumed on Easter Day was  $1\frac{1}{2}$  carcasses of salt beef,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  carcasses of fresh beef, 5 pigs,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  calves, 22 kids, 3 fat deer, 12 capons, 88 pigeons, 1,400 eggs besides bread and cheese, beer without stint and 66 gallons of Bosbury wine . . . Even supposing that there were 80 persons present to share in this repast the amount seems to us more than ample". (1)

On the other hand, of the villein it was said in the twelfth century,

"He never drinks the fruit of his vine nor tastes a scrap of good food. . .  
'If he have fat goose or hen,  
Cake of white flour in his bin,  
'Tis his lord who all must win'.  
He may keep only what is strictly necessary". (2)

Despite the fact that feudalism was not basically a money economy the financial side can also be illuminating. Prices must be reckoned in relation to the cost of living, which in the thirteenth century is the cost of food.

"The average price of wheat in the second-half of the thirteenth century was  $5\frac{1}{4}$ d. per quarter, and of oats  $2\frac{2}{3}$ d. The standard wage for a vicar was £3-6-8d. per annum. . . A skilled workman received about 3d. a day or  $1\frac{1}{6}$ d. a week, and the labourer half as much . . . It was reckoned that a friar cost 4d. a day to feed". (3)

- (1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p.178
- (2) Boissionade: "Life and Work in Medieval Europe", p. 146.
- (3) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p.205



The labourer had to feed himself, his wife and family; the friar was vowed to poverty! We may also note that "the monasteries were as a body very wealthy. It has been calculated that their aggregate income was £11,066, or almost a sixth of the total actual revenue of England in 1086". (1)

"In 1291, 31 parishes in the diocese of York were valued at £554; 61 in the diocese of Lincoln at £545". (2)

Parish tithes were provided not only to supply religious ordinances but also for the relief of the poor. Where parishes were appropriated the rights of the poor were grossly neglected. Take only one example, which is typical. The value of the appropriated parish of Merevale in 1456 was divided as follows:

"£32-15-4d. for the monks.  
£10-13-4d. for the vicar (who did the work of the parish).  
3-4d. for the parish poor.

If the strict rule of the early church had been followed, these poor would have received £15 per annum; as it was, the pope was content to secure them just one-ninetieth of that sum". (3)

The treatment of the serfs and of the common people - who, as has been shown, were the majority of the population - is in keeping with the above example. The main source of ecclesiastical income was tithe, which was levied on all income. Let the peasant, or serf, have ever so little, he still had to pay tithe on it. In addition to the produce of the soil,

(1) Knowles: "Monastic Order in England", p. 100.

(2) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p. 135.

(3) G.C. Coulton: "Scottish Abbeys and Social Life", p. 85.

this applied to the young of every kind of animal and to the produce thereof, even to honey and the down of geese. The tradesmen and artisans were also expected to pay one tenth of their income, with no allowance for expenses. (1) The right of heriot, also, lay sorely on the poor.

"When a man died, his widow and children had not only to part with their best animal to the lord of the manor, but they had also to surrender their second best animal to the church". (2)

The Church also claimed the odious tribute of 'mortuary' by which the clergy seized the beds of their dead parishioners. (3) The poor by this system were kept poor and sometimes reduced to greater poverty than they had known. In the Satire of the Three Estates, when 'John, the Commonweal' complains of these exactions, the Parson, for the Church, replies:-

" . . I say that law is gude,  
Because it has been lang our consuetude!" (4)

That is contemporary evidence.

The poor, naturally, have left no records. It is from other sources we must try to glean the truth.

The almsgiving of the medieval church has been greatly exaggerated. The giving of alms to the poor is not prescribed in the Rule of St. Benedict, as the monastic ideal was one of claustration. From an early date, however, prayer, almsgiving and hospitality were regarded as the three chief duties of the

(1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", pp. 118-119.

(2) " : As above, p. 130.

(3) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 79.

(4) Sir David Lindsay: "Satire of the Three Estates", Part II.

(5)

Monasteries. (1) But the motive of almsgiving was not to relieve poverty but to acquire spiritual merit for the donor. (2) This had a profound influence on the efficacy of what was done. Even the rule of the Monasteries that scraps of food left at table by the monks be given to the poor, meant that only those hanging around the Abbey walls could receive them. This led to the term 'abbey lubbers' which appears even in the vagrancy laws of Edward VI. (3) The provision of corrodies cannot be reckoned as genuine poor relief.

Even the monastic custom of alms of food from the table was often more honoured in the breach than in the observance. We have the record of three chief nunneries in one diocese, where the Abbesses were ordered by a visitation to remove hunting dogs from within the precincts on the grounds that alms, which should have been given to the poor, were devoured in feeding these dogs. (4)

We have also, in 1542,

"In two Cuper leases the monks bind the tenant to do certain extra work for them for which he shall be rewarded by receiving his daily food 'from the convent's leavings'" (5)

As this should have been given to the poor, one can understand the strenuous resistance of the Monasteries to visitation, which was the only means by which such abuses could have been

(1) G. Baskerville: "English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries", p. 19.

(2) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, pp. 339, 381.

(3) G. Baskerville: "English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries", p. 32.

(4) Mitchell and Leys: "History of the English People", p. 163.

(5) G.G. Coulton: "Scottish Abbots and Social Life", p. 103.

checked.

"In more than one ballad of the time the abbey is held up to approbrium as a harsh landlord and as contributing to the misery of the poor". (1)

The attitude of the poor to the church can also be an indication of how far the church fulfilled her obligation of caring for them. This attitude does not bear out the elaborate idealisation of medieval charity by certain writers. (2)

"Already in the eleventh century . . . the working classes of the towns . . . hate a church . . . which exploits the manorial rights through its tithes, which uses the wealth of the church not for the poor but for the church itself. . .". (3)

A sentence from canon law is quoted:

"The laity are always very hostile to the clergy". (4)

And another contemporary writer refers to "that ancient hatred which has subsisted between peasants and parsons". (4)

"In every popular rising the English monasteries were attacked". (5)

In the Peasant's Revolt (1381) this antipathy is very pronounced. In Cambridge the mob attacked the College and Hospital (i.e. Hospice) of Corpus Christi which was a most detested ecclesiastical corporation for the supply of Chantry priests. The cry with which they burned their property was,

- (1) H.A.L. Fisher: "Political History of England", V, p. 370.
- (2) Mitchell & Leys: "History of the English People", p. 121, ff.
- (3) E. Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", I, p. 349.
- (4) G.G. Coulton: "Medieval Village", p. 236.
- (5) " " : "Five Centuries of Religion", IV, p. 499.

"Away with the skill of the clerks! Away with it!" (1)

"The abbots' enclosures . . . the rigour displayed by them . . . convey to our minds one of the reasons why the dissolution of the monasteries aroused so little opposition in England". (2)

If the Church and the monasteries had been remotely faithful in their task of caring for the poor and providing some semblance of poor relief, this attitude would not have obtained.

But their failure to provide for the poor extended to more than alms. The Waldensian sect arose in the first instance because

"monks and parish clergy had not been wont to give the Gospels to the people, nor even to preach the Gospel". (3)

The following statement by Cardinal Gasquet is untrue and is unsupported by the evidence:

"To the Holy Mother Church all were the same; and within God's House the tenant, the villein and the serf stood side by side with the overlord and master". (4)

To this G.G. Coulton replies:

"It is sometimes asserted, but without attempt at corroborative evidence, that within the walls of the Medieval Church no distinction was made between rich and poor. The fact is, that nobody might sit in the chancel but lords and 'patrons', who were generally, in earlier days, the local squires". (5)

The reception of a monk "ad succurrendum", which was supposed to grant a sure entrance into paradise, applied only to the rich, never to the poor.

- (1) (Lindsay and Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt", p. 164.  
(Mary Bateman: "Cambridge Gild Records".
- (2) G.G. Coulton: "Medieval Village", p. 226.
- (3) " " : "Five Centuries of Religion", II, pp.110-111.
- (4) Cardinal Gasquet: "Parish Life in the Middle Ages", p. 7.
- (5) G.G. Coulton: "Medieval Village", p. 281.

"The monks had never, so far as our records show us, admitted the poor to any such privilege; no man could hope to take the frock on his deathbed unless he had something substantial to give for it". (1)

The poor could go to hell. There is, in fact, little evidence that the three-quarters of the population of England who were serfs, were regarded as the true field of the Church's work, or as a spiritual responsibility upon her conscience. Nor was the obligation recognised to bring to them the salvation of Christ. (2)

The travellers and pilgrims whom the monasteries entertained and to whom they extended hospitality, were in no case serfs. The serf was attached to the land in respect of which he was bound to give menial service. He could not go on pilgrimage. If he went away, he could be returned to his master. One of the cherished privileges of the rising boroughs was that if a serf remained in the town a year and a day

"without being claimed, then he cannot be reclaimed by his lord, but may remain free in the said town". (3)

The serf was regarded as 'a definite part of Church property' (4) rather than as a 'person' in the spiritual care of the Church.

"The serf might often buy his freedom; but it was seldom given to him. It was on Church estates that bondage lasted longest". (5)

- (1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", I, p. 93.
- (2) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the 13th Century", p. 70.
- (3) C. Gross: "Gild Merchant", I, p. 8.
- (4) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 8.
- (5) As above.



service came in the end to be despised.

"The idea of a Christian civilisation, of a spirit which should penetrate, mould and renew the common life, was entirely absent; for that very reason there was no idea that the church might initiate any social reform". (1)

"The work of Christ tended to be limited to the provision of a means whereby individual souls secure entrance to paradise after the death of the body, and neither the cosmic nor the community aspect of the Christian salvation was allowed the place accorded to it in the New Testament". (2)

- (1) E. Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches",  
I, p. 126.  
(2) John Baillie: "The Belief in Progress", p. 192.



Chapter 3.

Mediaeval Gilds.

As we seek to study the Mediaeval scene from the point of view of the emergence or functioning therein of Christian *κοινωνία*, or anything approaching thereto, considerable attention must be paid to the subject of the mediaeval gilds. We have tried to show that the soul of man ever yearns for community, or communion, not only with Deity, but also with his fellows. Truth, when it is reached, will be found somehow to contain this element of *κοινωνία*. The experience, therefore, of this real Christian communion on the level of common life would be a means of approaching nearer to Truth.

Did any such experience emerge in the social organisation of the Middle Ages? At once our thoughts turn to the Gilds, as being on a distant view, the nearest approach to this in the centuries in which they flourished. A study of the Gilds in some detail must therefore be given.

The word "gild" is of Saxon origin and meant "a rateable payment". (1) Gilds have been divided into four categories (1) Frith Gilds (or peace-gilds), (2) Merchant Gilds (*Gilda mercatoria*), (3) Religious Gilds, (4) Craft Gilds. (2) The Frith-Gild, Anglo-Saxon in origin, has been described in considerable detail by Brentano in his 'History and Development of Gilds'. Against this, however, must be set the

- (1) Toulmin Smith: "Early English Gilds" - Intro. XIX.
- (2) Catholic Encyclopedia on Guilds (in a different order).



"It spread rapidly in England and from the reign of John we have evidence of its existence in many English boroughs. It was regarded by the townsmen as one of their most important privileges. Its chief function was to regulate the trade monopoly conveyed to the borough by the royal grant of 'gilda mercatoria'. It has been asserted that the Gild Merchant and the borough were identical. The Gild Merchant did not give birth to craft fraternities, nor have anything to do with their origin; nor did it delegate its authority to them. In fact there seems to have been little or no organic connection between the two classes of gilds". (1)

This is a considerable modification of the position he puts forward in the Gild Merchant, (2) published 1890, where he states:

"Craft gilds are first mentioned during the reign of Henry I, about half-a-century after the first appearance of the Gild Merchant. The latter included Merchants proper and artisans belonging to different trades; the craft gild at first included only artisans of a single trade. . . The craftsmen thus associated remained in the common Gild Merchant; but the strength of the latter was weakened and its sphere of activity was diminished with every new creation of a craft fraternity". (3)

We may note also that

"Dr. Gross proved that Dr. Brentano's conclusions on the conflict of merchant and craft gilds had been too hastily formed, and that English history could not be safely constructed from continental analogies". (4)

When the Mediaeval Borough was established, usually by Royal Charter, it frequently also received the right to have

- (1) Charles Gross: Article on Gilds, Encycl. Britt. 11th Ed. (1911).
- (2) " : Gild Merchant, I, Ch. 7.
- (3) " : " " , I, p. 114.
- (4) Mary Bateson: Cambridge Gild Records, Preface VII.

a 'gilda mercatoria'. (1) It is from particular instances that the nature and function of this 'Gild Merchant' is deduced.

The Charter of Ipswich (1200) gives the right to have a Gild Merchant, and the right of internal jurisprudence. It has the curious provision that the burgesses may elect

"four of the more lawful and discreet men of the borough . . . to see that the provosts of that borough justly and lawfully treat the poor as well as the rich". (2)

Then follows a general note

"In many charters we have a clause, 'We grant a Gild Merchant with a hanse and other customs belonging to the Gild, so that no one who is not of the Gild may merchandise in the said town, except with the consent of the burgesses'. (2)

"The object of the gild was the maintenance and regulation of the burgh's trade monopoly". (3)

Nevertheless

"we may learn from the chartularies that the monks were the earliest 'gild brethern' and had exclusive privileges of trade and of fisheries when burghs had scarcely an existence". (4)

That the trade monopoly of the burgh easily developed into a trade monopoly of the Gild is shown in the following quotation:

"They ordain that the aldermen ought to have for the profit of the Gild the monopoly of buying and selling certain kinds of stone and marble . . . and that no inhabitant of Ipswich shall buy or sell within the bounds of the town, any of the said wares, except only the alderman of the gild for the use and profit of the fraternity". (5)

- (1) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", Vol. II.
- (2) " " : " " , Vol. I, p. 8.
- (3) " " : " " , Vol. I, p. 208.
- (4) Chalmers: "Caledonia", Vol. II, p. 782.
- (5) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", Vol. I, p. 25.

The Gild Merchant claimed a complete monopoly of buying and selling. Only they could sell retail, and only they could buy wholesale. While minor modifications occurred, that was the substance of their claim and their authority. There was a virtual exclusion of foreigners; i.e. foreigners to the town or borough. (1) There was a severe distinction between the rights of freemen and non-freemen to trade in the town. Non-freemen pay higher taxes for stances, higher taxes for all they bring into the town, and are precluded from the exercise of certain trades. (2)

We notice also that 'Burgesses' and Gildsmen

"were both used in several instances of one and the same grant of municipal privileges". (England) (3)

The exclusiveness of the Gild Merchant must also be noticed.

"Notwithstanding the clause contained in many borough charters in favour of villeins, they were debarred from enjoying the privileges of the Gild in some towns" (4) - "notably York, Andover and Lynn, which would not allow those of servile birth to join their gilds". (5)  
"The townsmen of Hereford looked down with contempt upon natives and rustics of ancient time who pay to their lords corporal services of diverse kinds . . . they are not of our condition, neither shall they have our laws and customs. Villeins were expressly excluded from becoming burgesses and holding office in some towns, and from entering the Gild Merchant and craft gilds in others". (6)

"The older the Gild-Statutes, the more favourable are they to men of low rank. Though the citizens were modest and benignant to the poor as long as freedom was to be obtained, yet the

- (1) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", I, pp. 41-50.
- (2) Toulmin Smith: "English Gilds", Usages of Winchester, p. 349 ff. , 14th Century.
- (3) Charles Gross; "Gild Merchant", I, p. 70.
- (4) " " : " " " " I, p. 30.
- (5) Mitchell & Leys: "History of the English People", p. 88.
- (6) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", I, p. 30, footnote.

possession of it rendered them insolent and hard". (1)

"The craftsman was not only excluded from the Gild, he was governed and even oppressed by it". (1)

Other features of the Gild Merchant were,

(a) Scot and lot, - a favourable purchase at a bargain price was bound to be shared with other members of the Gild. (2)

(b) It was the aim of the gild to fix a just price that would be equally fair to buyer and seller. (2)

(c) The Gild Merchant accepted a certain responsibility for maintaining the standard of workmanship, the quality of the goods for sale, and the honesty of weights and measures. (3)

(d) "An ancient law, the date of which is not known, enacts that if a gildsman fall into poverty, the brethren of the Gild shall help him by a donation from the common stock of the Gild, or make a collection for him, and if he die, they shall have him buried". (4)

(e) Quarrels between Gildsmen should be settled within the Gild.

"At Yarmouth there was an annual Gild feast, "at which feast all private quarrels and emulations were heard and ended to the glory of God and mutual love amongst neighbours". (5)

(f) Federation "One of the most striking features of Scottish municipalities was their strong spirit of federation". (6)  
"Edinburgh, Stirling, Berwick and Roxburgh united to form a general Scottish Trade-Gild". (7) In England there has always been a conspicuous absence of federative union of towns". (6)

- (1) Brentano: "History of English Gilds", p. 108, ff.
- (2) Mitchell & Leys: "History of the English People", p. 94.
- (3) Trevor Davies: "Medieval England", p. 106.
- (4) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", p. 208.
- (5) " " : " " , p. 33.
- (6) " " : " " , p. 200.
- (7) Brentano: "History of English Gilds", anent Gild Merchants, p.100.

Regarding the development of the Gild Merchant, Gross quotes instances where "the Gild Merchant seems to have been transformed into a social-religious gild". (1)

Westlake notices "instances of the development of a Gild Merchant into a purely religious fraternity. It was a natural development, for when the primary purpose of a Gild Merchant was served by a larger body, the influence of religion in general and of those beliefs in particular which were the foundation principles of religious gilds were still strong enough to bind together the brethren who had in the beginning placed their business associations under the auspices of religion". (2)

"Gradually in the course of three centuries after the Conquest, these Gilds became merged in the governing authority of the borough and lost their separate identity. Where a separate identity was preserved at all, it took the form of a rather exclusive club for social or convivial purposes, or for the furtherance of a particular trade monopoly, or else emphasised the devotional side of its former state and became transformed into a religious gild". (3)

"It may safely be stated that at least a third, and probably a much greater proportion, of the boroughs of England were endowed with this Gild in the thirteenth century; that, in fact, it was not an adventitious institution, but one of the most prevalent and characteristic features of English municipalities". (4)

Then followed degeneration when

"the machinery of the Gild as a whole easily degenerated into an engine of oppression". (5)

By the fifteenth century

"the gilds . . . endeavoured to seclude themselves and to make the handicrafts the monopoly of a few families . . . Lord Bacon, speaking of these Gilds, justly describes them as 'fraternities of evil'". (6)

- (1) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", I, pp. 161-163.
- (2) Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England", p. 104.
- (3) " : " " " " " , p. 21.
- (4) Charles Gross: "Gild Merchant", I, p. 22.
- (5) " : " " " " , I, p. 50.
- (6) Brentano: "History of English Gilds", p. 149.





This difficulty has led some historians into anachronisms. Even Toulmin Smith, having been unable to discover detailed regulations of a Gild Merchant, such as he desired, in the Middle Ages, includes in his appendix one or more from the seventeenth century. Charles Gross in the second volume of the "Gild Merchant", which is mainly documentary, begins with Alnwick 1672, followed by Andover 1262 and concluding with Youghal 1617 (p. 288).

The Reformation had a profound effect on Religious Gilds, as well as on the outlook and life of the people. A new social 'ethos' was introduced thereby. Its possible effect on the Gild Merchant should not be overlooked, nor its happening ignored as if of no consequence. How profound that influence was could only be shown by an adequate study of local histories, as best revealing the social life of the people. The following reference may suffice here, however. In Scotland the Roman Catholic Church was disestablished and the mass made illegal in 1560.

"The temper of the people was high, so that at Perth, St. Andrews, Paisley and many other places they broke into the churches, threw down the altars and images, and did much damage to the buildings. Biggar was a small and poor town, and for generations the people had lived under the shadow of Boghall Castle. But, here too, the words of Knox began to waken a new independence in farmer and peasant, tradesman and artisan. An English emissary wrote of the Scotland of that period, "You would be astonished to see how men are changed here. There is little of that submission to those above them which there used to be. The poor think and act for themselves. They are growing strong, confident, independent". (1)

(1) D.S. Rutherford: "Biggar St. Mary's", p. 40.

Moreover the fact that an organisation retains the same name over a lapse of centuries is no guarantee that it has remained unchanged.

"We cannot classify gilds satisfactorily", says Miss Mary Bateson, "until we know how far the same gild preserved the same character throughout its whole history, or whether it took on new functions to meet the requirements of a new era". (1)

Claims of antiquity, also, are often greatly exaggerated. The fact that an organisation adopts a name which had been used in a previous century, is no guarantee that it is the same type of organisation as what previously existed. The details of any seventeenth century Gild, or of any gild in the Post-Reformation period, cannot be taken as throwing any light on the work or functioning of a medieval gild, albeit of the same name. To attempt to do <sup>so</sup> is anachronism and not history. It must also be remembered that it was not till the times subsequent to the Reformation that these fraternities could be regarded as strictly secular. (2)

Further details of the functioning of the Gild Merchant in England may be noticed.

The copious records of the Borough of Leicester have been made available through the researches of Miss Mary Bateson. They reveal much as to the functioning of the Gild Merchant in that city. The evidences of the earliest period (1103 - 1327 A.D.) M. Bateson in her introduction sums up as follows:

- (1) Mary Bateson: "Cambridge Gild Records", p. 8.
- (2) Brentano: "Religious Gilds", p. 86.

"No woman's name occurs in the list of gild entries and it is clear that at Leicester women were not admitted . . . The clergy likewise were not gild members and many of the pleas charge gildsmen with trading with the money of the Abbot; masters of the hospitals, the sisters of St. Leonards and others; the reason for their exclusion from the gild was no doubt the fact that they did not lot and scot with the laity".

(1)

"That not all burgesses entered the Merchant Gild, so much is clear. But was every gildsman a burgess? Not if to be a burgess he must be a freeholder, for some of the gildsmen were mere servants living in their masters' houses".

(2)

The privileges of being a member of the Gild Merchant she summed up as

- (1) To escape or pay in part only tolls a stranger paid.
- (2) Brethern had their official guides to help them to buy wool in the neighbouring wountry. Strangers had none but strangers to guide them and the penalty on a Leicesterman who taught a stranger 'the ways of the country' was a year and a day's banishment.
- (3) Gildsmen had an official broker in charge of scales.
- (4) Wool brought in by strangers might be sold to none but gildsmen.
- (5) They alone might sell wax, fish or meat by retail. (3)
- (6) They could be tried by the gild court - a tribunal not severe on its own members.

For the second period- 1327-1509 A.D. - M. Bateson notes,

"The process of coalescence between the two sources of governmental power (Burgesses and Gild Merchant), the merging of their differences into one united governing body which would re-appear as a town-council, was seen to be already far advanced when Edward III's reign opens. The present volume (II) shows the Merchant Gild gradually giving up almost every active function to . . . the Mayor's sessions and the Common Hall. . . The stream of parchment Gild-rolls ceases to flow in 1380 but already they were

- (1) Mary Bateson: "Records of the Borough of Leicester", Intro. LVIII.
- (2) " " : As above, Intro. XXVIII.
- (3) " " : " " , " XXXI.

nothing more than lists of the names of those who purchase the borough franchise". (1)

The following reference would imply also the absence of effective craft gilds during the period in question.

"The authority of the town government over the crafts was but rarely contested within the period treated here. . . . As there was general complaint of weaving, the whole town elected two weavers to examine the weavers' work". (2)

We may note that it was not the Gild Merchant or the craft gild (if such existed) that elected the supervisors.

The difficulty of the Gild Merchant even to maintain its existence is shown in the early part of this period. The oath of the Gild Merchant includes the following:

". . . I will warn my Mayor and the good people of the community if I know of any man outside the gild who is able (to enter)". (3)

While the oath of those who shall enter the gild is given

". . . I will warn my Mayor and the good people of the community if I know of any man who trades in the franchise who is able to enter the gild". (4)

There occurs an interesting record:

"Peter of Worthington charged that he bought and sold against the ordinance of the gild and that he was rich enough to enter the gild: who came and swore that his chattels are not worth 20/- and so withdrew till another time". (5)

In spite of the fact that a detailed control of the market at this time is attempted by the Gild Merchant, (6) these entries show that such control was by no means complete, and that the cost of joining the Gild Merchant outweighed its advantages to

(1) Mary Bateson: Records of the Borough of Leicester, Vol. II Intro. XLIII.

(2) " : As above, Intro. LXX.  
(3) " : " " , p. 32.  
(4) " : " " , p. 32.  
(5) " : " " , p. 30.  
(6) " : " " , p. 20, ff.

many, so that many sought to avoid, rather than seek, membership.

When we come to the third period (1509 - 1603 A.D.), we find that all laws and regulations of trade and markets are now enacted by the Town Council and its officials, not by either Merchant or Trade Gilds. Trade bye-laws are all enacted by the corporation itself. (1) A case of regrating is dealt with <sup>by</sup> the corporation, not by the Merchant Gild. (2) We may also notice that save for a mention of a Boys' Hall (Vol. I, p. 196) and a schoolmaster (Vol. II, p. 143) the Records are silent on education till the reign of Edward VI. The free school, (or grammar school) is first named in these records in 1563, which is post-reformation. (3)

In the case of Cambridge, it was granted a Gild Merchant by John's charter in 1201. (4)

"The fact that we know next to nothing of the Merchant Gild at Cambridge leaves abundant play for the imagination". (5)

Yet

"Cambridge, whose contribution to the history of the 'Merchant' Gild and of 'Craft' gild is singularly poor, can provide examples of the 'social religious' gild in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries". (6)

"Professor Maitland has argued in favour of the belief that at Cambridge no Merchant Gild existed apart from the general body of Burgesses" (7)

We must remember that at Cambridge there was Stourbridge Fair, one of the most famous in the country.

(1) Mary Bateson: Records of the Bor. of Leicester, Vol. III, Intro. XXXVII, ff.

(2)	"	"	:	As above, p. 76.
(3)	"	"	:	As above, Intro. XLIX.
(4)	"	"	:	Cambridge Gild Records, Intro. XIV.
(5)	"	"	:	" " " " " "
(6)	"	"	:	" " " " " I.
(7)	"	"	:	" " " " " XIV.

Legislative enactments may throw light on the position and functioning of the Gild Merchant.

In 1328 an act was passed that fairs shall be limited for the time granted by charter and no longer. (1) This was evidently being disregarded, for in 1331 it was re-enacted with the addition:

"The said Merchants after the said time shall close their booths and stalls without putting any manner of ware or merchandise to sell there". (2)

In neither statute is there any reference to the Gild Merchant or any Gild. Surely this is a significant omission if the Gild Merchant were, as is supposed, in actual control of the markets, especially in towns!

Then in 1335 there followed a statute of far-reaching significance. The terms of its prelude and enactment are illuminating.

"Whereas . . . it was showed to our said Lord the King . . . that . . . great duress and grievous damage had been done to him and his People by some people of Cities, Boroughs, and other places of his Realm which in long time past have not suffered, nor yet will suffer Merchant strangers nor other which do carry and bring in by sea or land, Wines and other livings and victuals with divers other things to be sold, necessary and profitable for the King, his prelates, Earls, Barons and other Noblemen and the commons of this realm, to sell or deliver such wines, livings, victuals nor other things to any other than to themselves of the cities, boroughs, Ports-of-Sea and other places where such wines etc. to be sold shall be brought or carried; by reason whereof such stuff aforesaid is sold to the King and to his people in the hands of the said

(1) 2 Ed. III c 15. 1328 - Statutes of the Realm.  
(2) 5 Ed. III c 5. 1331 - " " " "

citizens, burgesses and other people, Denizens more dear than they should be, if such Merchant strangers and others which bring such things into the realm, might freely sell them to whom they would, to the great damage of our Lord the King and of his Prelates, Earls, Barons, and other nobles of this realm and grievous oppression of the commons: whereupon the said Knights, Citizens and Burgesses, for them and the Commons desired our said Lord the King in this Parliament by their petition that . . . it may please him without further delay upon the said grievances and outrage to provide remedy . . . all merchants, strangers and denizens and all others and every one of them, of what state or condition soever they be, that will buy or sell Corn, Wines, Aver-de-pois, flesh, fish and all other livings and victuals, wools, clothes, wares, merchandises and all other things vendible, from whence soever they come, at what place soever they be, City, Borough, Town, Port-of-Sea, Fair, Market or elsewhere within the realm, within franchise or without, may freely without interruption sell them to what persons it shall please them . . . .

(Then follows details of punishments for disturbances or obstruction of the above liberties and of procedure for redress adding: "notwithstanding Charters of Franchise granted to them to the contrary, nor usage, nor custom, nor judgment given upon their charters, usages, or customs that they can alledge".) (1)

There is no mention in this act of Gild Merchant or Gilds. Yet the Gild Merchant is generally regarded as having received a fatal blow when in 1335 Edward III allowed foreign merchants to trade freely in England. (2)

The act is certainly directed against certain practices which the Gild Merchant sought to establish and in many of the ancient charters permission to have a Gild Merchant was granted.

- (1) 9 Ed. III Cl. 1335 - at York - Statutes of the Realm.
- (2) George Clune: "The Medieval Gild System", p. 36.

This is not evidence, however, that a Gild Merchant either existed or functioned. Apart from the communities which gathered around the castle of the overlord, or round the religious settlement of the monasteries, the growth of towns apart from London itself, before 1335 was not extensive. It may be doubted whether the Gild Merchant as an organised corporation, effectively and effeciently functioning, really existed in any extensive fashion before the date in question. So little evidence of its existence remains! Most descriptions are based on seventeenth century analogies, which is a post-reformation period.

Nevertheless the act of 1335 should not have destroyed any flourishing Gild Merchant; it still had a wide potential sphere of activity. The act dealt with forestalling and destroyed a certain monopoly of markets. It was asked for by a popular petition.

In 1360/1 an ordinance was passed, following a petition, regarding the sale of Herring which gave freedom to buy and sell to fishers and people without hindrance. (1) There is no reference to any gild, but the act might be taken as apparently directed against gild monopoly.

Again in 1362 it was enacted

"that the Merchants Denizens may pass with their wools as well as Foreigns, without being restrained". (2)

Again there is no mention of gilds. But is this act directed

(1) 35 Ed. III 1360-1.

(2) 36 Ed. III c xi - 1362.



against the restrictive practices of the Gild Merchant?

Against this may be quoted an act of 1363 which reads:

"For the great dearth that is, in many places of the Realm, of poultry; it is ordained that the price of a young Capon shall not pass 3d. And for an old 4d. of an Hen 2d. of a pullet 1d. of a goose 4d. and in places where the prices of such victuals be less, they shall hold without being enhanced by this ordinance". . . (1)

There is no reference to any Gild Merchant nor to the alleged function of such in controlling prices.

Two acts of singular interest occurred at this time, again with no reference to the possible existence of the Gild Merchant. In 1363 it was enacted that Merchants should deal in one sort only of merchandise. (2) A few months later in 1363/4 it was repealed, all buying and selling was declared free, except as to the export of Wools and of Gold and Silver. (3)

The following additional legislation may be noticed in which there is no reference to gild, but which would appear to deal with subjects which would be the peculiar province of such gilds, if they were functioning as traditionally represented.

"Forasmuch as Shoemakers and Cordwainers use to tan their leather and sell the same falsely tanned, also make shoes and boots of such leather not well tanned . . . it is asserted that no shoemaker shall use the Craft of Tanning, nor Tanner the Craft of Shoemaking . . . ". (4)

Statute 47 Ed. III Cl is confirmed that "Cloths of Ray (shall be) the length of 28 yards of length measured by the list and 5 quarters of breadth, and that the coloured cloth be 26 yards of length measured by the back, and 6 quarters of breadth at the least . . . ". (5)

- (1) 37 Ed. III C iii - 1363.
- (2) 37 Ed. III C v - 1363.
- (3) 38 Ed. III c - 1363/4.
- (4) 13 Richard II C xii - 1389/90.0.
- (5) 12 Richard II C xiv - 1388.

Again 11 Richard II C 7 gives a recital of statute 9 Ed. III 1 C i whereby foreign merchants, strangers and denizens, 'and all other and every one of them' shall be allowed to buy or sell throughout the realm. A complete charter to trade without let or hindrance. . . to be maintained and fully executed. (1)

Is this evidence that the statute of Ed. III had not been fully observed and that foreign merchants had been obstructed? Is the recital and re-enactment of the statute directed against the obstructive attitude of the Gild Merchants even though they are not named? Or does the obstruction come from the boroughs themselves?

"Justices of the Peace in every county were to fix wages, regulate gains of victuallers and fix the price of hay and oats". (2)

"There was to be one measure and one weight throughout the realm except Lancashire. - Details were enacted for the sale of wool in 14 lbs. to the stone and in good packing." (3)

In all the above there is no reference whatever to the Gild or any Gild-Merchant.

As we approach the Gild Census of 1388 the 'Gild Merchant' seems to disappear from English history. Scanty references alone remain; it does not appear in any of the returns of the census; and until after the Reformation there is no sign of it being an effective functioning force in the social life of the people. When it re-appeared in the new ethos and developing

- (1) 11 Richard II C vii - 1387/8.
- (2) 13 Richard II 1 C viii - 1388/9.
- (3) 13 Richard II 1 C ix - 1388/9.

trade and industry of the post-reformation period, it was something very different, much more effective and influential than anything that had preceeded it. We are not justified by the mere repetition of the name to infer, without further evidence, an organic connection between different periods of history. Many of the earlier Gild Merchants resolved themselves into religious gilds. (1) The Gild Merchants of which we know most were formed after the Reformation and flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For example, Dumbarton Gild Merchant's earliest record is 1686 based on a charter of 1609. (2) It is an unjustified historical anachronism to apply anything from the abundant material of the post-reformation era to the medieval scene so far as the Gild Merchant is concerned.

The unique position of Medieval London, however, requires to be noticed. This is dealt with in "The Merchant Class of Medieval London" by Sylvia L. Thrupp, concisely summarised in the following terms.

"These merchants were the small body of livery-men who were at once the city's governing class and the mainspring of its trading activities . . . The Merchant class was a well-defined group dominating both the greater companies and the government of the city". It is a book in which "the activities of the merchant class are plentifully illustrated, the individualism, the ambition and the objectives of its members clearly shown and the swift rise and fall of its families carefully proven.

Comparison with English towns is dismissed with the truism that even in 1300 London 'was already a metropolis, bearing far more resemblance to the great cities of northern continental Europe

(1) George Clune: "The Medieval Gild System", p. 36.

(2) R. D. Thomson: "The Dumbarton Merchant Guildry".

than to any other English town". The author reiterated emphasis on London as the home of ambitious, and success-worshipping individualists". (1)

Added to the above we may take into consideration the Roman Catholic position expressed by G. Clune in "The Medieval Gild System" where he says

"We shall see later that there were few, if any purely industrial or commercial gilds. All, or nearly all, were religious". (2)

We have considered the Gild Merchant as described by responsible historians and the legislative references of a direct or indirect nature before the Gild Census. If we now examine contemporary writings and records, certain curious features confront us. (The imaginative reconstruction of the Gild Merchant by the more popular and less authenticated historians may be ignored, as may also all reconstructions deriving their data from post-reformation gilds.)

It is in the fourteenth century that we are able to learn most about medieval gilds owing to the census in the reign of Richard II. At that period also some of the best medieval literature was written. Some dates, significant to our purpose, may be noticed:

- (1) English Historical Review, January, 1930, p. 103 - Review of "The Merchant Class of Medieval London", by Sylvia L. Thrupp.
- (2) G. Clune: "The Medieval Gild System", p. 13.

Abbot Samson elected (Chronicle of Jocelin) . . .	1182 A.D.	
William Langland born . . . . .	about 1332	"
Geoffrey Chaucer born . . . . .	about 1340	"
John Wycliffe . . . . .	1384 - 1384	"
The Black Death (First great pestilence) 1348 -	1349	"
Piers the Plowman written (2nd and main text)	1377	"
The Peasants' Revolt . . . . .	1381	"
Canterbury Tales written . . . . .	1386	"
Gild Census, (called for 1388) Lodged 2nd Feb.	1389	"
Piers the Plowman, 3rd text . . . . .	1392	"
Death of Chaucer . . . . .	1400	"
Death of Langland . . . . .	1400	"
'Satire of the Three Estates', by Sir David Lindsay . . .	1535	"

Let us consider the literary references.

In the Chronicle of Jocelin there is no reference to any gild, Merchant or other.

In the 'Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman', there is no reference to any gild. If it is argued that the spheres of the Religious Gilds, or the Craft Gilds, are not dealt with in this poem, the same argument cannot be advanced in relation to the Gild Merchant. Reference is made to the dishonesty of trading, but no mention is made of the existence of a Gild Merchant putting a curb on that dishonesty, or as controlling trade at all. For example,

"Ye mace-men and mayors, that are midmost between  
The king and the commons, now keep well the laws,  
And punish on pillories and penitence stools  
Brewers and bakers, and butchers and cooks;  
Such men, on this mould, can most harm work  
To the poorer people, that piece-meal buy;  
For they poison the people, both privily and oft,  
Grow rich by retailing, and house-rents buy  
With profits that else would support the poor.  
If true were their trade, they would triumph the less,  
And buy them no buildings - be ye well sure". (1)

Also,

"Dread stood at the door, and this doom heard,  
How the king had commanded constables and sergeants  
To fetter Sir False, and to bind all his fellows.  
Then went Dread away, and gave warning to False,  
Bade him flee for fear, and his fellows go with him.

Then False in his fear fled fast to the friars;  
And Guile too was going, aghast for his life,  
But met with some merchants, who made him abide,  
Shut him in their shops, to show forth their ware,  
And apparelled him as a 'prentice, the people to serve.

" . . . . .  
The grocers besought him (Liar) to sell men their spices  
And tout for their trade; their terms well he knew". (2)

In the section dealing with the Seven Deadly Sins, the  
Confession of Avarice says,

"For some time I served old Sim at-the-Stile,  
And was plighted his 'prentice, his profit to serve.  
First learnt I, in lying, a lesson or twain;  
Wickedly to weigh was my first lesson;  
To Weyhill and Winchester I went to the fair  
With all manner of wares, as my master bade;  
If Guile had not given some grace to my ware,  
It had still been unsold, were it seven years since!

Then I drew me to drapers, my duties to learn,  
To stretch out the stuff, till it looked the longer.  
One lesson I learnt as to long striped cloths;  
To pierce them with a needle, and piece them together,  
Put them in a press, and press them thereunder  
Till ten yards or twelve were turned to thirteen!

- (1) Wm. Langland: "Piers the Plowman", Passus III, lines 76-86.  
(2) " " : " " " " , " II, lines 205-  
214; 225-226.

My wife was a weaver, and woollen cloth made;  
She spoke to the spinners to spin it well out;  
But the pound that she paid by surpassed by a quarter  
The standard of weight that the steelyard gave!  
Thick ale and thin ale she thoroughly mingled  
For labourers and low folk; this lay by itself.  
The best ale in bower or bed-room we kept;  
He that tasted thereof was contented to buy it,  
A groat for a gallon; he gave never less;  
Yet it came forth in cups; such craft would she use". (1)

There is no suggestion in the whole poem of even the existence of a controlling or administrative authority governing trade such as the Gild Merchant.

Towards the end of the poem, however, in the section headed 'The Ploughman's Pardon', pardon is offered the Merchants on the condition of their attaining what can only be described as a real measure of Christian *κοινωνία*. This vision, appearing where it does and as it does, is of considerable significance. It reveals the yearning for this lost outlook appearing in the very heart of the Middle Ages.

"Merchants i' th' margin (presumably, the margin of purgatory) had many long years,  
But 'from pain and from guilt' would the Pope none grant;  
For they kept not their holidays, as holy church teacheth,  
And they swore 'by their soul', and 'so God be their help',  
Clear against conscience, their chattels to sell.

But under secret seal Truth sent them a letter,  
Full boldly to buy what best they could choose,  
And sell it soon after and save well the profit,  
Therewith to build hospitals, helping the sick,  
Or roads that are rotten full rightly repair,  
Or bridges, when broken, to build up anew,  
Well marry poor maidens, or make of them nuns,  
Poor people and pris'ners with food to provide,  
Set scholars to school, or to some other crafts,  
And relieve the religious, enhancing their rents;-  
'I will send you Myself then Saint Michael Mine angel,  
Lest fiends should assault you, or fright you when dying,  
To help you from hopeless despair, and to send  
In safety your souls to My saints in their bliss'. (2)

(1) Wm. Langland: "Piers the Plowman", Passus V, lines 201-225.  
(2) " " : " " " " " VII, " 18-36.

In the Canterbury Tales the only reference we have been able to discover is in the Prologue, lines 363 following, and it is singularly insignificant. The reference is to the livery of a 'great and solemn fraternity' and to the dignity of sitting in the Gild Hall on the dias - none of which is germane to the essential function of a Gild. The reference is obviously to the Livery Companies of London. The argument from silence is always a difficult one. Nevertheless, as the Gild Merchant was understood to have affected considerably the everyday life of the people in the towns, some reference to its influence in poems dealing with everyday life would have been expected.

In the 'Satire of the Three Estates' (1) there is no mention or reference to any gild or Gild Merchant. The Third Estate of the realm is described as consisting of 'Merchants'. These were appointed to Parliament by the burgesses of the towns. If the Gild was meant to establish or enforce some standard of honesty in trading, the inference of the Satire is that no such Gild existed. The following extracts are eloquent.

line 655 - The reference is to Deceit.

"He is richt craftie, as ye ken  
And counsallour to the Merchandmen":

Line 680 -

"Dissait: "And I dwell among the merchands,  
My name, gif onie man demands,  
Thay call me Dissait".

Line 1648 -

"The merchandmen, thay haif resavit Dissait,

(1) Sir David Lindsay (Scotland 1535).



As for Falset, my Lord, full weill I ken  
He will be richt weill treitit, air and lait,  
Among the maist part of the craftis men". (1)

Charles Gross gives copious "Proofs and Illustrations" (2)  
without distinguishing, other than by giving dates, between  
pre-reformation and post-reformation documents. The latter,  
being outwith our immediate enquiry, and for the reasons stated  
above, we shall meantime ignore. The former are almost  
entirely in Latin and consist mainly of Borough Charters in  
which the 'Gilda Mercatoria' is mentioned as being granted or  
permitted, and being granted rights and privileges which might  
otherwise have pertained to the Borough itself. It is not  
necessarily evidence of functioning, however.

It is a mistake, moreover, to regard a Gild Merchant as  
ubiquitous in the establishment of boroughs, or to think of it  
as being always in full or effective charge of the trade,  
trading facilities and markets of the said boroughs. Gross  
only confidently claims one-third of the boroughs of England  
as being endowed with a Gild Merchant in the thirteenth century. (3)

While the Scottish scene and experience is by no means  
identical with that of England, some facts culled from  
Scottish local history may be worthy of notice.

Dumbarton. (4) The town was made a Royal Burgh by Alexander II  
in 1222. The original charter is lost, but a copy in the

(1) Sir David Lindsay: "Satire of the Three Estates" (Full  
text, not the acted edition).

(2) Charles Gross: "Gild-Merchant", Vol. II.

(3) " " " " " " I, p. 22.

(4) Notes on Dumbarton are based on original charters surviving  
in that town, which have been examined, with a recent  
translation.

early fourteenth century, recognised as authentic, exists. It has no mention of a Gild Merchant. Now Dumbarton was an important port on the upper Clyde estuary, and, with other Royal Burghs, had a monopoly of foreign trade. A very lengthy confirmation charter was granted in 1609 by James VI, which throws light on the situation long before the time of its granting, and which makes no reference to a Gild Merchant having existed. The Burgh, threatened with extinction owing to flooding and other causes, is being given extensive help to re-constitute its existence. The former charter is confirmed, together with all rights and privileges as may be conferred upon the City of Edinburgh. Every possible official or official position is mentioned time and again, as if enlisting their services and co-operation for the re-construction of the Burgh. The analysis of those officials named, as occurring in the Charter, is as follows:

Provost, bailies, councillors .....	9	times
" " " and community .	7	"
" " " burgesses and community .....	1	"
" " " - As above-, dean of gild, treasurer .....	1	"
" " " burgesses, officers and community .....	1	"
" " " , .....	3	"
----- " " and community .	3	"
----- " " burgesses, community and inhabitants thereof	3	"
----- " " and inhabitants	1	"

The charter gave 'full power and liberty to them every year to

elect and change their provost, bailies, councillors, dean of gild, treasurer, clerks, sergeants, judges and other officers of court, magistrates and members necessary for the common welfare and governing of the fore-said burgh'. It also gave them the right of 'having, enjoying and possessing a merchant gildry with a dean of gild, gild courts, councillors, members and jurisdictions thereto belonging'.

No indication of the duties of the 'dean of gild', mentioned in the Charter, is given, but this can be learned from the records of the Burgh of Edinburgh.

From the above we conclude that prior to 1600 there was no Gild Merchant in Dumbarton.

Edinburgh: In all the Charters and documents relating to the City of Edinburgh from 1143 to 1540 A.D. there is no mention of Gild Merchant. (1) (Twice the term 'Dean of Gild' occurs, but this will be shown later to be a purely religious functionary.)

The following are representative extracts from these documents. (Page and Document number in the undernoted volume, (2) are given.)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Document</u>	
25	VII	Charter by David II 1364. Reference is to Burgesses and community.
19	VI	Procuratory by the Burghs (17 named) for themselves and all Burgesses and Merchants of Scotland - anent King's ransom. Names are detailed and designated: Aldermen, Merchants and Burgesses.
33	XIII	Charter by Robert II 1386 . . "to our beloved and faithful Burgesses and community of our Burgh of Edinburgh . . "

(1) & (2) Charters and Documents relating to the City of Edinburgh, 1143-1540 A.D.

- Charter by Sir Robert Lyon 1398 . . "to my neighbours the Burgesses and community of the Burgh of Edinburgh" - anent grant of trading rights at Leith.
- 55 XXII Indenture by Dene John Of Leith, sometime abbot of Holyroodhouse "to Alderman, Bailies and Dene and community of Edinburgh" "Alderman, Thomas of Berwyk dene of the gilde, Richarde Lamb and Robert of Bonkyl, baylyes of Edinburgh".
- 63 XXV Charter by James I 1428 authorising certain tolls to be uplifted of all ships and boats entering the Port of Leith "with consent of the Burgessis and Merchandis of Edinburgh".  
(Repeated in charter of 1445).
- 68 XXXIII Deed of gift by James II to the Burgh of Edinburgh of his right to land within the burgh in arrear of finance; to the "Provost, Bailies, councillors and community of our Burgh of Edinburgh".
- 69 XXIX Charter by James II 1447 anent rightte hold a fair on the morrow of Trinity Day - "The Provost, Bailies, councillors and community of our Burgh of Edinburgh".
- 71 XXXI Charter by James II 1451 to "Merchants, Burgesses and Community of our Burgh of Edinburgh" - a grant of certain trading rights and privileges and freedom from certain trading taxes.
- 119 XLI Charter by Henry VI of England to the Provost and community of Edinburgh. Having been *to* favourably entertained by Provost and community of Edinburgh, he granted them liberty to traffic in England and to pay no other duties for their merchandise than his subjects the citizens of London did - 1463-4.
- 120 XLII Charter by James III 1466 - "The Provost, Bailies, Councillors, Burgesses and community of our Burgh of Edinburgh".
- 121 XLIII Bull by Pope Paul II 1467 in response to a petition from the Provost, Bailies, lay councillors and community of the town of Edinburgh anent making St. Giles a Collogiate Church.

Page Document  
133 XLVI

Charter from James III, 1471 - "Gift of certain duties of custom for repairing the Port and Haven of Leith", to the Provost, Bailies and community of our Burgh of Edinburgh.

134 XLVII

Letter from James III charging the inhabitants of Edinburgh to assist in fortifying the town - no reference to gilds.

140 XLIX

Letter from James III ratifying certain statutes made by the Provost, Bailies and council in regard to places at which markets should be held within the Burgh 1477. The markets are detailed with the produce to be sold in each street. There is no reference to gilds, or Gild Merchant. . . "charging therefore straightly and commanding all and sundry our lieges and 'subditis foresaidis' and in special the community and inhabitants of the said burgh.

146 LI

1482 Obligation of the community of Edinburgh relative to proposed marriage of James - afterwards James IV.  
". . the whole fellowship of Merchants, Burgesses and community of the same town . . Provost, Burgesses, Merchants and commons of the town . ."

148 LII

1482 Instrument produced by Garter King at Arms 'before venerable, discreet and honourable men . . Provost . . bailie . . merchants and burgesses (named) and several other merchants, burgesses and community of said town" - repeated, but no mention of gild.

157 LIV

1483 Charter by James III granting the office of Sheriffship and rights of holding courts to . . . "the present office-bearers of our Burgh of Edinburgh under written, namely, 'A.... B.... provost, 'C.. D.. E..' Baillies, John Fowland, dean of guild (decanus gilde), T... Y... treasurer, F... W... common clerk . . councillors and the whole community of said Burgh . ."

Repeated as "Provost, Bailies, Clerk,

Councillors and Community 3 times

" " "Provost, Bailies, Clerk

Councillors and Community 7 "

" " above with "Sheriff" added 3 " .

Page Document  
165 IV

- 1482 Charter of customs from the harbour and road of Leith "... Provost .. bailies, John Foulan, dean of gild, T.Y. treasurer, W.. F.. Common clerk, ..... councillors".  
Reference to dean of gild occurs once, further references are all to Provost, Bailies, Councillors and community.
- 172 LVI 1493 Ratification by James IV anent complaint made by the Provost, Bailies, council and community of Edinburgh that certain dues in Leith were not being paid. The above parties were "wronged" - but it was the burgh or community not the Gild, though they were trading dues.
- 188 LIX 1504 Licence by James IV to the "Merchants, neighbours and indwellers of the Burgh of Edinburgh and their servants" to recover merchandise and goods from a ship wrecked.
- 191 LXI Letter of James IV altering the time of fairs (Allhallows and Trinity) to "the Provost, Bailies and community thereof, our Sheriffs within the same . . .".
- 193 LXII 1508 Charter to lease the Borough Muir - designations as in LXI.
- 196 LXIII 1510-11 Charter confirming previous charters - designations as in LXI.
- 199 LXIV 1510-11 Charter anent Newhaven giving rights to regulate trade etc. to "the Provost, Bailies, Councillors, Burgesses and community of the Burgh of Edinburgh".

In all the above there is no reference to Gild.

When we turn from the official charters and documents to the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh in pre-Reformation times the same absence of reference to the Gild Merchant, its powers, functioning or authority, again meets us. For example:

1551 - Landward fleshers are to have liberty to sell flesh above the Tolbooth. There is no reference to a gild. (1)

(1) Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1557-1571, p. 4.

- 1551 - There is a proclamation fixing the price of flesh sold in the Burgh. There is no reference to a gild. (1)
- 1551 - . . . "which day in the presence of Archibald Douglas of Kilspindie, James Campbell dean of guild of the council . . . master . . . 'dekynnes' of crafts, compeared R. H. in name and behalf of "the hale craftsmen of this burgh". Except for 'dean of gild' there is no reference to Gild Merchant or craft gild of any kind. (2)
- 1558 - . . . "When any taxes fall to be paid, all persons having the use, liberty of merchants or free burgesses, i.e. selling of wine or any other kind of merchandise shall pay". There is no reference to a gild. (3)

References to a 'dean of gild' which occur at very infrequent intervals here and in the Dumbarton charter may be explained by the incident recorded in 1559. The dean of gild had been summoned before the council and ordered to take the jewels to his own house for safe keeping and to defend them against all comers. This was ordered by the bailies and council convened. The dean of gild in a letter of protest stated that the duty of the "dene of gildis" was to keep the jewels, ornaments and silver work of the high altar and to be ready to serve them at times convenient. He refused to take them to his house because he was old, having but his wife and some serving women at home and could not defend them. It was beyond his duty as dean of gild, which was as stated above. (4)

The following additional extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh between 1403 and 1528 bear out (1) the

- (1) Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1557 - 1571, p. 6.  
 (2) As above, p. 10.  
 (3) " " , p. 18.  
 (4) " " , p. 40.

effectual control of trading rested with the Magistrates and not with any Gild, Merchant or other. (2) The essential purpose or "raison d'etre" of all gilds was religious. Trading rights or privileges were given for the ulterior religious purpose. Rules etc. anent apprenticeship were for the furtherance of a religious object. (3) There is considerable evidence for the actual absence of any Gild Merchant, as commonly understood, altogether.

31st. Dec. 1428 - List of dues to be exacted at the port of Leith for the repair of the port.  
No mention of Gild Merchant.

18th Dec. 1436 - "It was ordained for the common profit of the burgh that after the coming in of any ship entered in the Tolbooth with wheat, meal, rye, malt, beir, or any victuals or wines, the 'alderman, baillies and the counsale by this vitaille of rationable pryce as thai may and syne distribute be twa distributaris sufficient to answer for thair deid to the commons of the town, and gif ony takkis on hand to bye this vitaille of derrere pryce na is bidden for it in the tolbooth, without consent of the alderman, bailyeis and counsale the commons sall haif it for the price competent as thai bye that tyme other als guid, and as was bidden thairfor in the Tolbooth and thai byars sall pay the merchant as thai haif bocht it and tyne thair fredome for a yeir". (1)

This implies the absence of any functioning Gild Merchant.

1st June, 1439: By the council it was "ordained for common profit that whoever brings victual to Leith shall be welcome to sell their victual as best they may and house it if they list, but the searcher shall see what goods of victual come into the haven, and who dresses them to buy their victual shall swear that they shall not buy more than may suffice for the needs of their household, and that



thereof they shall not sell again for  
winning . . . (1)

This implies no Gild Merchant. It is a regulation against "regrating" similar to what is found repeatedly in English legislation, but the prevention of which is so often regarded as a traditional function of the gilds.

12th Jany. 1450/1 Obligation of the Gild of Skinners to maintain an altar in the Parish Church of St. Giles. This was evidently the purpose of the Gild. 5/- was paid and to be paid for each apprentice.

28th Jany. 1500/1 The which day the provost, bailies and whole council has granted and consented that the Gild court begin on Friday next coming and so continue out through the whole town for the common profit and honour of the Kirk.

10th Dec. 1518 Seal of cause to Merchants of the Aisle of the Holy Blood in the parish of St. Giles, - that they might honour and repair the said aisle - with the right of giving and removing of chaplains - the right of "fraughting" all ships at Leith and sundry rights and dues. - The main theme and object is religious and the trading privileges are for the ultimate religious object as stated.

A later entry also Dec. 1518 "Which day my Lord Provost, president, bailies, council and community has given the Holy Blood Aisle to the fraternity of the Merchants and Gild brethern of this burgh, and they to be patrons thereof and the octaves of Corpus Christi to be their procuration days. And thereto has granted to them divers other privileges as their common seal given to them thereupon purports".

27th Feb. 1519/20 "The same day "Forsemekill" as my Lord Glenbair and Mr. Thomas Hay, secretary to my Lord Governor, show before the provost, bailies, counsel and community of merchants that my said Lord Governor thought it necessary that there should be one staple in the parts of Flanders where that Scots merchants might resort

and have order among them, 'sielike' as other nations have, and desired that the said community of merchants would for their part declare which of the three towns, that is to say, "Camfeire", Middleburg or Bruges, are most convenient to the said staple; with the which desire the said merchants being advised, the men of good of the town for the most part then being present thought the town of Middleburg most convenient town to be their staple". (1)

This shows that there was obviously no Gild Merchant.

9th Aug. 1520 - Provost, bailies and council ordained Wm. Forsyth to pay the dene of gild for "reparatioun of the kirk", the sum of 25 for selling his wine openly in the tavern of Leith. (1)

It may be noted that payment to the Dean of Gild was recognised as payment to the Kirk.

Seal of Cause.

27th Feb. 1520/1 Seal of cause to Websters . . . to uphold the divine service at the altar situated within the said College Kirk of St. Giles

22nd Sept. 1520 Seal of cause to the Walkers, Shearers and Bonnet-makers . . . is for the upkeep of the altar of St. Mark and the chaplain thereof. Regulations as to good work and to all Bonnetmakers becoming members of the gild is "as they do in all things without fraud or guile, to the utility and profit of the said altar".

20th March 1522/3 Seal of Cause to Baxters (Bakers) in similar terms. (1)

The real motive in each case is religious.

Cambridge. From the minute book of the Gild of St. Mary, which later amalgamated with the Gild of Corpus Christi to found Corpus Christi College, we find that the fine paid by

(1) Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh.

new members on entering the Gild was paid in money, wax, grain or malt.

"It appears that certain members of the Gild take these commodities on loan, and the gild members fix the prices of the same for the coming year. The quarter of barley is charged from 3/4d. to 4/-; the quarter of malt is charged from 4/- to 6/-; in one case we are told that 1/4d. of this is 'increment' or profit; in several cases the price of malt is not named, only the amount of the increment varying from 1/2d. to 1/4d. At the close of the year the gild member who has a loan of malt pays for it, or gives malt to the value of that he has borrowed together with payment for the 'increment', which thus seems in the nature of interest for the loan". (1)

Did this Gild thus fix the price of these commodities for the community, or for say Stourbridge Fair, or only for the purposes of the Gild? Does the variation in price indicate that they were following a market price which was independently and freely arrived at? The prices above fixed are without reference to any Gild Merchant fulfilling this duty, and imply the absence of any effective Gild Merchant so functioning. This was a Religious Gild, and as such was included in the returns of 1389. We have already noticed the tendency in the three centuries after the Conquest for the Gild Merchants to emphasise the devotional side and become transformed into Religious Gilds. (2)

H. F. Westlake suggests that

"since the greater part of the information about the earlier gilds is derived from the returns

- (1) Mary Bateson: Cambridge Gild Records, XV, Extracts from Minute Book of the Gild of St. Mary.  
(2) Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England" p. 21.

made to the King in 1389, it may be accepted as a general statement that unless a gild survived the Black Death and continued in existence until that year, its memorial perished with it". (1)

But why should our lack of knowledge of the Gild Merchants before the Black Death be so scanty, without this also applying to all history? Is it not more reasonable to conclude that the Gild Merchant of popular imagination and history did not exist nearly so effectively, nor so universally, as was supposed in the three centuries following the conquest? Is not the highly developed and articulated Gild Merchant of the seventeenth century being read back to the period of the Roman Church supremacy in the Middle Ages, when in that form it just did not exist? There is no evidence of a Gild Merchant in Dumbarton, for instance, before the Reformation and the lamentable decay of the town is additional evidence that none existed. (2) The fact that four Scottish towns, Edinburgh, Stirling, Berwick and Roxburgh united to form a general Scottish trade-gild, or gild-merchant, suggests that its effective functioning as a Merchant was very slight, (3) when we consider the difficulties of travelling and communication at that period.

The Gild Merchant does not appear in that form in the returns of 1389, except one, Coventry, which on examination proves to be a religious gild. (4)

- (1) H. F. Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England", p. 26.
- (2) See above p. 189.
- (3) Brentano: "History of Gilds", p. 100.
- (4) No. 69 in Analysis of Returns p. 217 of this thesis.

Must we not therefore regard the Gild Merchant in its full and mature development as something peculiar to the post-reformation period and to the freedom and 'ethos' of 'Reformed' communal life?

Gild of the Kalends.

The Middle Ages was dominated by the Roman Church and the Gild of the Kalends has a much more Medieval 'flavour'. L. Brentano seems to trace the earliest of the religious gilds to the assembly of the priests of a town on the Kalends of each month

'for divine service, for deliberation on their interests and for common meals . . . The name 'Gilds of the Kalenders' seems to be derived from their monthly meetings . . . Laymen could only be admitted in limited numbers and always in a fixed proportion, e.g. Flensburg in 1382 had twenty-four priests as members of the Gild of Kalenders . . . if the number could not be filled up laymen might be admitted, but only to the number of eight. The layman always remained, however, in a subordinate position. There existed gilds for the higher and lower clergy, the so-called Major and Minor Gilds of the Kalenders. One Gild of Kalenders existed in almost every town . . . Often the president was called Dean'. (1)

This seems to be the mediaeval equivalent of the modern clerical club, or 'Ministers' Fraternal', and little more!

This is borne out by the statutory speech made on taking office the Mayor of Bristol: He said

"Also I shall be helping, supporting and favouring the Prior and his brethern, the priests of the house of the Kalenders of Bristol in all things". (2)

- (1) Brentano: "History of the Gilds", p. 88 ff.  
(2) Toulmin Smith: "English Gilds", p. 417.

- (1) George Unwin: "Gilds and Companies of London", p. 47.  
 (2) " : " " " " " , p. 52.  
 (3) Lindsay & Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt", p. 63.

to control prices. If the Gild Merchant had been actually functioning in the boroughs and markets of England, the machinery for such control of prices was there at hand. No such machinery seemed to exist. Such evidence of prices as we possess shows wide fluctuations during relatively short periods - as wide as any that might occur under a system of "Laissez-faire". We remember also that all fairs and markets were held under charter and had a certain territory assigned to them. Then followed the Poll Tax and the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. It very nearly succeeded and only by the basest of treachery on the part of Richard II was it suppressed. (1) Parliament met in Cambridge in 1388. It was largely concerned with the imposition of added servitude upon the villeins and with preventing any repetition of the revolt. (1)

A few months later the King issued a Writ ordering a census of all Gilds. The writ was in two sections. The first dealt with Religious Gilds; the second dealt with Craft or Trade Gilds. There is no reference either in the writs or in the returns to any Merchant Gild. H. F. Westlake states,

"It does not appear for what purpose this information was required, as the good and reasonable causes mentioned in the writ are not specified". (2)

He suggests the costs of the war, the personal extravagance of the King and the possibility of taxing gilds in general. (2) Only the first of these reasons would the King

- (1) Lindsay & Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt" (relevant chapters)  
(2) H.F. Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England", p. 36.

have been likely to refer to in the terms stated. The reason, however, is something more obvious and of which the nation at the time was deeply conscious. It was the Peasants' Revolt, with the permanent crushing of which those in authority were grimly concerned. This is shown in the attitude of the other legislative acts of this Cambridge Parliament.

The following are the essential sentences in the 'Writs to the Sheriff of every shire in England, to make proclamation that returns shall be sent up by all the gilds'. (1)

. . . "For certain good and reasonable causes brought and made known before us and our council in our last Parliament held at Cambridge, We, strictly enjoining, command you that you do at once . . . let proclamation be made, openly and publicly, that all and every the Masters and Wardens of all gilds, and brotherhoods whatsoever . . . shall send up returns to us . . . as to the manner and form and authority of the foundation and beginning and continuance and governance of the gilds and brotherhoods aforesaid. And as to the manner and form of the oaths, gatherings, feasts and general meetings of the brethren and sisters; and of all such other things touching these gilds and brotherhoods: And moreover, as to all lands, tenements, rents and possessions, . . .

And that they shall be ready to do and undertake what shall be further ordered and appointed in the premises by us and our said council, by virtue of the authority given us by Parliament (Underlining is the writer's). (1)

The second writ, for the Returns of Gilds of Crafts was in similar terms but slightly briefer in detail of possessions etc. to be specified in the return. (1)

The writs are dated 1st November, 1388. The matter was evidently being treated as one of urgency, for a comparatively

(1) Toulmin Smith: "English Gilds", p. 127 ff.



short time was to elapse before the final lodging of the Returns - 2nd February, 1388/9.

Reference to the Statute made at Cambridge in 1388 (1) reveals that in that Statute there is no mention of gilds at all and no authority was given for any such census. A reference to the Rolls of Parliament, which should contain in Volume 3, pages 255-256, any record that exists of statutory authority for the writs in question; reveals nothing. On page 247 there appears among the petitions an entry dealing with the right of foreign merchants in this country. This is the nearest point that this Parliament reached to the subject of Gilds. Nor did any previous Parliament deal with the matter. A reference to the House of Commons Library, Research Department, confirmed the above information with the added note.

"And of course there is no other Parliamentary source after the Rolls". (2)

It would therefore appear that the census was made without Parliamentary authority, and that the statement made in the Writs regarding such authority was untrue.

Can we regard it, therefore, as a panic afterthought, after Parliament had dissolved, due to the fears created by the Peasants' Revolt? Was it due to any information lodged, or suspicion arising, as to the activities of the gilds? We can only surmise.

(1) 12 Richard II, 1388.

(2) Mr. I.N. Grimble: Research Department: The Library: House of Commons. (Letter)

The vindictive, oppressive, "anti- *κοινωνία* " nature of the statute that was made at Cambridge in 1388 reflects clearly the aftermath of the Peasants' Revolt. Some of its provisions may be noticed.

"All statutes of Artificers, Labourers, Servants and Victuallers . . . shall be firmly holden and kept and duly executed". (1)

"No servant or labourer be he man or woman shall depart at the end of his term out of the Hundred, Rape, or Wapentake where he is dwelling to serve or dwell elsewhere . . . " (2)

"Artificers and (people of mystery) or Servants or apprentices which be of no great "have" (or reputation) shall be compelled to serve in harvest". (3)

"Because that servants and labourers will not, nor by a long season would, serve and labour without outrageous and excessive hire . . . (wages of farm workers are then detailed and prescribed by statute)". (4)

"That he or she which used to labour at the plough and cart or other labour or servitude of husbandry till they be of the age of 12 years . . . shall abide at the same labour, without being put to any mystery or handicraft". (5)

"That no Servant of Husbandry or Labourer or Servant Artificer nor of Victualler shall from henceforth bear any sword, nor dagger upon pain of forfeiture of the same . . . but stick . . . shall have bows and arrows and use the same on Sundays and Holydays and leave all playing at Tennis or Football or other games called Coits, Dice, Casting of the Stone and other such importune games". (6)

This statute was not repealed until 1623/4 (7) - well into Reformation times.

- (1) 12 Richard II, C 3 - 1388.
- (2) & (3) 12 Richard II, C 3 - 1388.
- (4) 12 Richard II, C 4 - 1388.
- (5) " " " , C 5 - " .
- (6) " " " , C 6 - " .
- (7) 21 Jac. 1, C 28, 1623/4.

The timing of the Peasants' Revolt, its widespread nature and the common slogans, together with their marvellous discipline maintained in their brief hour of triumph, all point to some sort of organisation behind it. Revolt had been brewing; a spark set it alight, and a widespread organisation functioned. Naturally, the organisation was secret and most of our knowledge of the revolt is derived from its enemies. (1) Within or behind the organisation there are vague hints of the existence of the 'Great Society' or 'Great Fellowship', which may or may not have been the actual organisation of the revolt itself.

"Tantalizingly the secret remains hidden, as the people naturally left no records, and no man, even before the gallows, revealed the truth. What was this Great Society we will now most likely never know, but that it did exist, that it united the people, and was trusted, seems to us indisputable". (2)

Was the census of the Gilds an attempt to discover if any vestige <sup>of</sup> the Great Society remained? And, if it remained under the guise of Gilds? Or, as the Gilds had also often an oath of secrecy on their members, did the King resolve that the details of all such secret societies should be made known? Be that as it may, it is evident that the 'good and sufficient reasons' for the census of the Gilds are to be found in the Peasants' Revolt and the consequences that followed from it.

With reference to the above George Unwin states:

"It is extremely unlikely that all the parish fraternities were as innocent of political

- (1) Philip Lindsay & Reg. Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt, 1381".  
(2) " " " " : " " " , p. 173

intentions as they would have had the government believe. Although there is no positive proof of their intervention in politics, it is significant that they were spreading most rapidly precisely at the time when party feeling in the City was running highest". (1)

Certain other consequences may be briefly noticed. We find that in regard to an Association of Cordwainers in 1337 three men are put in prison

"who 'did conspire and confederate to hold together' - contrary to the enactment of the King that no person should make congregations, alliances, or compacts of the people privily or openly; and that those belonging to the trades, more than other men, should not, without leave of the Mayor, make alliances, confederacies or conspiracies". (2)

The fourteenth century, in which this census was taken, marked the period of the great rise of the Religious Gilds. In earlier centuries, religious devotion had found expression in the founding of monasteries and their endowment and then later in the financing of the friars. The cupidity of both these orders, together with their unfaithfulness to their early vows and ideals, led to a growing anti-monastic spirit. Evidence of this is shown in the marked falling off of religious foundations.

In the twelfth century there were 440 new monasteries in England.

In the thirteenth century there were 296 new monasteries or friaries in England.

In the fourteenth century there were 64 new monasteries or friaries in England. (3)

(1) George Unwin: "Gilds and Companies of London", p. 125.

(2) G. E. Coulton: "Social Life in Britain", p. 362.

(3) Social England, Vol. II, (Ed. H.D. Traill), p. 29. (1274-1348).

We may notice also that as early as 1274 in the History of Merton, Oxford, Bishop Walter laid down that the fellows of Merton College lost all the benefits of his endowment if they entered any order of religion. (1)

When the square Norman Tower of Ely Cathedral fell in 1322 the present Octagon Tower was erected in its place (1322-1342) (2). The financing of this repair is illuminating. Subscriptions and contributions totalled £206-1/- leaving the balance of cost amounting to £2,406-6-11d. to be met from the ordinary resources of the monastery. (3)

Religious devotion sought another outlet of expression and such an outlet was already at hand. The monks evolved or developed the Mass. The Mass, if coupled with a particular name of a deceased person, was believed to bring great blessing and solace to that soul in purgatory. The vivid sense of the hereafter and of purgatory caused a lively desire for the benefit of propitiatory masses. The wealthy could endow chantries and endow priests to do nothing else than say perpetual masses for their souls. This was the purpose and function of the collegiate churches in Scotland where the staff of clergy, except one, would be 'sine cura' - without the cure of souls; while to one the entire spiritual care of the parish would be remitted. (4)

(1) Social England, Vol. II (Ed. H. D. Traill) p. 29, (1274-1343).

(2) Short history of Ely Cathedral issued by the Dean & Chapter.

(3) James Bentham - History of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely.

(4) D.S. Rutherford - Biggar, St. Mary's, p. 26.

"Chantries . . . grew to an extraordinary number . . . but such endowments were naturally beyond the means of a large number of people, and the parallel custom slowly developed of parishioners, or those whose daily life and business brought them together, associating themselves into gilds for the maintenance of a priest to say mass for them, thus providing corporately what individually they were unable to afford". (1)

Or again

The gild "seems to have been instituted to provide those expensive church ceremonies and officers, such as priests, daily masses, masses for the soul, decorations for the altar, which could only be provided by the poorer classes by mutual small subscriptions". (2)

We must also note that

"men working at the same trade who were associated together in all the concerns of daily life, thinking alike and in many cases living close to each other, should desire not to be separated in worship. The result of this was the frequent formation of religious fraternities among members of the same craft, and it is probably true to assert that many of the craft-gilds of a later day had their origin in such religious associations. Thus the difficulty of the classification of gilds becomes obvious". (3)

"The chief care, however, of the Gildmen was always directed to the welfare of the souls of the dead". (4) "On the occasions of a funeral, too, the poor were often fed or clothed, 'for the soul's sake of the dead'". (5)

What was the function and nature of these gilds?

Barnard, quoting from Foulmin Smith, says

". . . in a few these religious purposes seemed to supply the chief motive of their foundation, but the greater number dealt with social life, including religious observances as a usual element". (6)

- (1) F.H. Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England", p. 10.
- (2) " " " : " " " " " , p. 104.
- (3) " " " : " " " " " , p. 22.
- (4) Brentano: "History of Gilds", p. 134.
- (5) T. Smith: "English Gilds", Intro. XXIX.
- (6) Barnard: "Companion to English History in the Middle Ages", p. 207.

This is questioned by Vostlake. He states

"... there are certain indications in Mr. Toulmin Smith's notes, as well as in the preface by his daughter, that he had little sympathy with the medieval church or understanding of the place occupied by such doctrines as those of purgatory, and the efficacy of masses and alms as a means of deliverance therefrom. He thus, I think, mistook the true character of the societies whose records he examined, and denied the existence of the religious motives which, as I shall hope to show, played so large a part in their formation.

That the nature of these societies has been misunderstood in other ways is, to me at least, abundantly evident. A writer in Social England (Vol. II, p. 172), dealing with the fourteenth century and early fifteenth century, says: 'The prevalence of guilds in small country towns is evidence of a wide development of the artisan class'. There could hardly be a less legitimate deduction. In the mind of this writer the word 'guild' is inevitably associated with the idea of the craft, and he seems to have no conception of the parochial guilds as such, though these must have outnumbered by thousands those associations which had craft interests as their objects". (1)

These questions can only be adequately answered by a close examination of the Guild Returns. This must be of a more detailed nature than the excellent summaries contained in the Appendix to H. P. Vostlake's book.

A considerable number of these documents are reproduced and are available in full in Toulmin Smith's book on 'English Guilds'. The following is a detailed analysis of all that are thus available, choosing the most common or salient features, such as may throw light on the function and nature of these guilds.

(1) H. P. Vostlake: "Parish Guilds of Medieval England", Preface V.

11 1 11 11

Analysis of Returns sent English Gilds made in January 1388/9

( Based on those Returns printed in full in "English Gilds" by  
Toulmin Smith - H.E.T.S. 1870 ).

---oOo---

- Abbreviations:
- a = Attendance at Church Services, usually on prescribed days.
  - { b = Provision of Requiem Masses either generally or after the funeral of deceased members.
  - { b.20 = As above, with the specified number of masses provided by the Gild for each member.
  - c = Provision of candles or lights for the Church, other than lights at funerals.
  - A = Burial with the attendance of all Gild members. (A) of representatives only.
  - B = Body to be brought from a distance, if necessary.
  - C = Candles provided at a funeral, with number and weight, if specified.
  - D = Prescribed contributions from each member at funerals.
  - E = Poor members to be buried at the expense of the Gild specifically stated.
  - R = Poor relief given (whether or not contributions gathered and aid given are specified).

---oOo---

Returns made in English in response to the Writ for the Returns  
of Social Gilds.

Notes: Poor Relief Levy is amount from each member per week when required unless otherwise stated. Fractions are fractions of a penny.

Poor Relief Aid is amount given each week.

---oOo---



No.	Date of Foundation	Religious Functions			Funeral Practices			Poor Relief			Remarks		
		(a)	(b)	(c)	A	B	No. lbs.	D	E	Levy		Aid Given	Use of Balance
1	1375		b. 1		A						R 1/4		R if of 7 years standing. Half if wrongfully imprisoned. Poor levy included in annual contribution.
2		a	b. 30	C	A	B	C 5		E		R 1/4		
3		a	b	C	A	B	C 7		E		R 1/4		
4	1360	a		C									
5	1384	a	b	C	A		C 2	1 1/2		1/4	R		To make an image of St. George.
6	1385	a	b	C	A		C 2	6	1 1/2	1/4	R	8	
7	1307	a	b. 1	C	A	B	C 2	16		1/4	R		
8	1384	a	b	C	A		C 2	3	3/4	1/2	R	1/2	For the light.
9	1364	a	b. 1	C	A		C 2	8	2	1/2	R	1/2	For the light.
10		a		C									Levy of 1d. each for a psalter for the dead soul. Barbers. Tunriers. Tailors. R - Amount gathered. Carpenters. The Poor Men's Gild. Masses at funeral only. Saddlers and Spurriers. Wid. per annum.
11	1376	a	b	C	A	B	C 4	1 1/2	1/4	R	1/4	Funds of the Gild.	
12	1360	a	b	C	A	B	C 2	12	1 1/2		R		
13	1375	a	b	C	A	B	C	12	1 1/2	1/4	R		(1)* R
14	1380	a	b. 30	C	A	B					R	3	
15	1385	a	b	C	A	B	C 2	2	3/4	E			
16		a	b. 20	C	A						R		
17	1376	a	b. 30	C	A						R		Rebels against Canon Law to be put out of the Gild. Young Scholars. R given 4 times per annum. Shipman's.
18		a	b	C	A	B					R		
19	1365	a	b. 24	C	A						R		
20	1368		b. 40	C	A		C	1			R		

No.	Date of Foundation	Religious Functions			Funeral Practices			Poor Relief		Remarks
		(a)	(b)	(c)	A	B	No. lbs. D. E.	How	Aid Given	
21		a	b. 12	g	A	C		1 x	R	* Three times a year. Aid - amount collected.
22			b. 26	C	A	C		1 x	R	* Four times a year. Aid - amount collected.
23	1329		b. 20	C	A	C			R	Aid - amount collected.
24			b. 40		A	C			R	
25			b. 12	C	A	C		1 x	R	* Four times a year. Aid - amount collected.
26		a	b. 30	C	A	C 2				
27			b. 30	C	A	C		1 x	R	* Four times a year. Aid - amount collected.
28	1316	a	b. 30	C	A				R	
29	1373	a	b. 60	C	A	C	1d. 2 2lbs. wax.		R	Maintained a priest to serve at the altar. (A wealthy Gild).
30	1372		b. 10	C	A	C	$\frac{1}{2}$		R	
31			b. 24	C	A	C				Return partly destroyed.
32			b. 30	C	A	C	$\frac{1}{2}$			
33			b	C	A	C				Clothing to be worn specified.
34	1367		b. 14	C	A	C				
35			b. 40	C	A	C				
36			b. 15		A	C				Note on clothing: no one with legs bare or barefoot.
37	1359		b. 30		A	C				Ditto.
38	1374		b. 30		A	C	1			

No.	Date of Foundation	Religious Functions (a) (b) (c)	Funeral Practices A B No. 10s. 2 3 4	Poor Relief. Levy Aid Given	Remarks
39		b. 30 C	A C	R 4	30 pence to each on death for masses for his soul.
40		b. 30 C	A		Ditto.
41		b. 30 C	A		Ditto.
42			A B		Ditto.
43		b. 9	A B*		* Only if dying suddenly. Prayers for specified people. Prayers for specified people.
44	1387		C A B C	T	
45	1387		C		
46		b. 7 C	A B C		
47	Eich. II	b. 13	A C		
48	1378		C	R	Goods of Gild = 5 quarters Barley. * Price Xxd. per quarter. Goods = 20 quarters Barley. etc.
49	1307		C A	R 12s per day Sundays	

Numbers	1	2	Gilds of Churches in London.
	4	15	" Norwich.
	16	27	" Lynn.
	28	36	" Bishop's Lynn.
	37	38	" West Lynn.
	39	41	" North Lynn.
	42	46	" Wyneale.
	47		" East Wynech.
	48	49	" Oxburgh.

Returns of Social or Religious Gilds made in Latin or old  
Low-French - reproduced in slightly different form by Mr.  
Toulmin Smith.

(As numbers now differ from Mr. T. Smith's, the page of reference is also given.)

No.	Page	Date of Foundation	Religious Functions			Funeral Practices				Poor Relief.		Remarks		
			(a)	(b)	(c)	A	B	No. lbs.	D	E	F		How	Aid Given
50	137		a		c	A						R		York: founded to keep up a play of the Lord's Prayer.
51	146			b								R	7d.	York.
52	148	1378	a	b	c									2 to 4 bedridden poor supported. Balance in funds spent in repairing Chapel or in gifts to poor.
53	149	1355	a	b	c							R	8d., 6s. or 4d.	Burial benefits if poor.
54	154		a?									R		Main object was a procession of pageants.
55	155	1357	a			A						R	7d. *	* Annual gild dues of £/2d. per annum deducted. Poor, if fit, 1 given 10/- for one year to trade with.
56	160	1358	a			A						R	1/2d. *	* Deduction as above.
57	161		a			A						R		20/- given as above.
58	163	1377	a	b	c	A	B	6 torches						Reduction of annual gild dues from relief given.
59	165	1218	a	b	c		C	13	1			R	2d. three times.	Compulsory bequest for masses of 1/- in the 21 of goods. Wealthy gild.
60	168	1387 (2 gilds united.)			c		G	12				R	2d. per day 12 sick plus food and clothing if poor.	Washer to bequest: his soul to God, his body to burial, altar gift to priest, bequest to gild.

No.	Page	Date of Foundation	Religious Functions			Funeral Practices			Poor Relief		Remarks		
			(a)	(b)	(c)	A	B	C No. lbs.	D	E		F	G
62	172		a	b	c	A		C 4	$\frac{1}{2}$		R	6d.x	* per annum. Each year as many poor were fed (once) as there were members of the gild.
62	175	1374		b	c			C 13		E	2d.x	R	* per annum. Masses for the dead to equal the number of members in the gild.
63	179	1297			c			C 4	$\frac{1}{2}$		R	6d.x	* per annum. Fullers (Lincoln) half-craft, half-religious gild. Returned as religious.
64	182	1323		b		(A)		C 4		E		R	* fullers. Gild dues deducted. Compulsory bequests. Regulations anent employment.
65	184	1343				(A)		C 4		E		R	Fullers. An annual feast. To Tyler to stay in the city unless in the gild.
66	185	1310										R	Help in specific misfortunes.
67	193	1284	a	b		A						R	Palmer. Doves, if needed. Regulations for night watches.
68	212	"Boy's Memory"			c2	(A)		C 9		E		R	Widow watching imperative. Burial of poor strangers with candles.
69	223	1340	a	b		A				E		R	A wealthy gild-chaplain kept. A gild-morant, but little different from religious gilds.
70	232	1343	a	b	c3							R	A wealthy gild-chaplain kept.
71	234	1354	a	b						E		R	Two chaplains kept to say mass daily. 2 poor brethren and 1 sister supported at cost of 5s 6 6d. per annum. A wealthy gild of high prestige.

No.	Page	Date of Foundation	Religious Functions			Funeral Practices				Poor Relief		Remarks	
			(a)	(b)	(c)	A	B	No. lbs.	D	E	Levy		Aid Given
72	262	1377	a	b	c3 (A)							R 7d. and clothing	* Poor freed from Gild payments. No priest to hold office. Indulgence of 40 days. Chaplain kept.
73	269			b		A						R 4d.*	* Plus a Gown per annum.
74	270	1379			c4							R	No person or baker to a member.
75	271		a		c							R	Chaplain kept.
76	333	1384								E			Berwick -on-Tweed. A trading Gild with no specific religious reference. Unique.
Returns of Craft Gilds under writ (b) as reproduced in "English Gilds".													
77	159											1/4 R 3d.	Ordinances lacking: only Charters extent: information for analysis not available. See note below.
78	443	1385	a	b	c	A						13	Regulations as to liveries. On Saint's Day every brother to be on horseback. Members are of different crafts. List of members given. A religious Gild.

Returns of Craft Gilds under Writ (b)

as reproduced in "English Gilds".

New returns were made under Writ (b).

Detailed notes on the foregoing analysis.

Detailed notes on the foregoing analysis. Smith included in his list gilds and details of gilds founded after 1389 and therefore not returned in the census of that year. These have been omitted from our enquiry at the present stage. Those occurring between the census and the Reformation, as well as some of uncertain date are dealt with later. Post-reformation evidences are ignored.

---

No. 59 p. 165: Members swear to uphold the rights of the Church, rights of the lord of the place and to guard all their liberties, within town and without town. (1218 A.D.)

In age or infirmity producing great want brethren shall, in turn, supply him (the member) with needful food or shall find for him a house of religion where he may stay during life.

---

No. 61 p. 172: "6d. per annum poor relief, returnable if possible" is queried by Toulmin Smith. 'Should it be 3s?' he asks. (I think not. 6d. seems correct. A vicar's annual wage was 3s 6 3d. - the writer.)

---

No. 61 - 66 These gilds are all from Lincoln or Lincolnshire.

---

No. 68 p. 212f. Emphasis on brotherly love suggests a real effort towards *NOVITIA*.

---

Some gilds had three or four specified meetings, "Morning Speeches", in lieu of specified attendances at church. e.g. Bishop's Lynn.

Bishop's Lynn gilds also show an absence of care for the

poor or reference to members becoming poor. Were these wealthy guilds?

---

A common pattern was more or less followed by all guilds from the same town.

---

The number of masses for each deceased member are frequently mentioned. Cost of a mass seems one penny. Therefore a collection of 1d. at a funeral for masses meant masses equal to the number of members of the guild.

Guilds appeared to have their own candles at funerals.

Alms at funerals were given to benefit the soul of the departed rather than to benefit the poor.

Where no mention is made of free burial of poor members, it may be because it never happened, all members of that particular guild being wealthy.

Funeral expenses consisted mainly of lights, requiem mass etc., and other charges, which were paid to the Church.

---

Full details of the management of the Guild and of fines on members for non-attendance at funerals, statutory meetings or services are frequently given. Fines are mostly in money, sometimes in wax. (Fines are not dealt with in detail in this analysis.)

---

In some guilds a standard of clothing was prescribed.

Guilds generally had regulations against members going to



law with each other. Quarrels were to be settled within the gild. Many gilds specified expulsion, or even excommunication, for misdemeanors.

Secrecy was frequently enforced under penalty of a fine.

---

Beverley required special notice. "This is one of the very few returns remaining in the Record Office of those that were made from Gilds of Crafts under the Writ (b)". (1) It gives no ordinances but only charters. "There was a Gild Merchant in Beverley which seems to have included the whole of the townsmen". (2)

A Charter from the Archbishop of York with authority from Henry I granted

- (1) Right to a "Hanshus".
- (2) " " toll for 18 marks per annum.
- (3) " of way in and out of town.
- (4) Freedom from toll in Yorkshire as the men of York are.

A further charter grants

- (1) Free burgeage to the town and burgesses.
- (2) That they shall have a Gild Merchant.
- (3) The right of holding pleas among themselves.

Further confirmation charters convey nothing more.

(We would ask: Is this second charter not really given to the town of Beverley rather than to a Craft-gild?)

---

The expenditure of Gilds, where known, is worthy of notice. For example: Gild of the Palmers, Ludlow, as reported to the Commissioners of 37 Henry VIII (3)

- (1) Foulmin Smith: "English Gilds", p. 150.
- (2) " " : " " , p. 238.
- (3) " " : " " , p. 198.

To stipends of 7 priests	238	13	4
" salaries of 2 singing men	6	13	4
" " " 2 deacons	2	0	8
" " " 6 Choristers	1	14	0
" " " Schoolmaster of Grammar	10	0	0
" poor alms people	1	7	0
" ringer of alms bell		2	0
" porter of the gild	2	4	4
" Obits	14	5	6
" Hallowed bread		12	3
" Diverse lights	1	8	0
" money given to poor people		8	2
" reward to warden, overseer	2	6	8
" collector of the possessions	5	0	0
" Sundry payments and rents	35	12	8

Total Expenditure      £ 122   7   11

---

There is a note that the Revenue (largely from rents) does yearly much exceed this sum.

Of this the poor received apparently a total of £1 15 2d.

#### Gild of the Holy Cross, Stratford-on-Avon.

No. 68 p. 212f. Report to the Commissioners of Edward VI.

Salaries of Chaplains	£21	6	8
" " Gild clerk and			
Clock keeper	17	4	
" " Schoolmaster	10	0	0
Gifts to the poor (total)	3	3	4

(Marginal note added, "Let the school go on".)

No. 8 p. 22 An ordinance of this gild (Norwich) is given in great detail and is worthy of notice, not only for what it specifies but also for what it does not specify. At their annual meeting or service,

"In the beginning ye shall pray devoutly for the state of Holy Church and for the peace of the land; for the Pope of Rome and his Cardinals; for the patriarch of Jerusalem; for the holy land the holy cross, that God in his might and in his mercy bring it out of heathen power into the rule of holy church, and that God in his mercy make peace and unity in holy church; and for all archbishops and bishops, and especially for our bishop of Norwich; for all parsons and priests, and all orders of holy church, that God in his mercy save them and keep them, body and soul, and give them grace here order to keep and so to rule holy church and men's souls that it be to God's worship and salvation of their souls and to all Christian men;; for our lord the King, for our lady the Queen, Dukes, Earls, Barons, and Bachelors of the land that God in his grace save them and keep them from deadly sin and give them grace, the Realm and holy church and their own souls so to rule and keep it to the worship of God and to all christian men salvation; for all knights, squires, citizens and Burgesses, 'fraunkleyns', and all true tylers and men of craft, widows, maidens, wives and all the commune and christian people . . . for all true shipmen, and true pilgrims . . ., for the fruit of the land and of the sea and the weathering; for all men taken in false belief who would be in good belief, God give them grace to come to their desire; for our fathers' souls, and mothers', brothers' and sisters' and for all ye brethern and sisters of this gild and for all christian souls. Amen."

We note that there is no prayer for serfs, for those in bondage, for the poor, or even for yeomen.

Certain other details from particular sources may now be noticed. The Gild of the Clerks of Glensford, Bury St. Edmunds, 1065 A.D. was founded to chant at the funerals of the monks of Bury. No layman could have his son trained in letters without leave of the gild. No cleric in the town of Bury may presume to teach the psalter without the leave of the fraternity on pain of a 2/- fine. (1) On the other hand the Gild of St. Margaret, Lincoln 1336 A.D.

(1) H.K. Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England", p. 228.

"must stand by a brother or sister charged with any offence such as theft or homicide in fairs or markets, with counsel and help as if they were all children of the same father and mother". (1)

Brother and sisters of a gild were summoned to the mass at the funeral of a dead member. The task of summoning the members was evidently an unpleasant one, for a Summoner was appointed at a fee of 2/-. (2) Again on July 20th, 1310 free entry was given to the Gild for life service as Summoner; at the same time the fine (i.e. fee for admission) was pardoned for services as proctor in selling gild mill-stones. (3) This Gild passed an ordinance directing the gild chaplains to celebrate two trentals of masses (60 in all) for each dead brother. On 30th April, 1307 the Gild decided that if the deceased left anything in his will to the Gild, then as

"the alderman might appoint, the chaplains should do more or less celebrations according to the amount bequeathed to the Gild. The rule is naive, but its spirit is unpleasing. Individualism has thrust itself in where it seems very much out of place". (4)

On 4th August, 1310 the soul of a dead man was entered as a member of the gild "per finem xld.". (4)

Miss Mary Bateson adds the remark,

"Although ale and the associative principle are rarely to be dissevered, we have not in St. Mary's Gild any direct case in point". (4)

- (1) H.F. Westlake: "Parish Gilds of Medieval England", p. 171.
- (2) Mary Bateson: Cambridge Gild Records - First Membrane Minute Book of Gild of St. Mary
- (3) " " : As above, Notes on Minute Book of Gild of St. Mary's.
- (4) " " : As above.

To which she adds a footnote comparing Gild ale-chambers with the slate clubs and the local friendly societies giving sick pay and providing funeral expenses which were found in every village ale-house in the eighteenth century. (1) The social and convivial aspects of the medieval gild, however, were directly related to their religious life and were very often the sequel to the performance of their religious observances. We submit that any direct or organic connection between medieval religious gilds and local friendly societies in village ale-houses in the eighteenth century is in no way established.

In the Gild of Corpus Christi about 1349,

"two carpenters who entered the society (presumably at a reduced rate) promised to work for the gild when required at a penny less per week than the ordinary rate of wages in the town, provided they were disengaged and were duly warned". (2)

In 1352 these two gilds, Corpus Christi and Gild of St. Mary resolved themselves into the College of Corpus Christi rather than founded the College. (3)

The primary purpose was the foundation of a college of priests which should form part of the University. There also appears to have been a desire to ensure an adequate supply of priests to say the requisite masses for deceased members. The foundation of a college by Cambridge burgesses was a

- (1) Mary Bateson: Cambridge Gild Records: Notes - Footnote quoted from "Webb-Trade Unions", p. 23.
- (2) " " : Cambridge Gild Records, XXI.
- (3) Authority, Prof. Dickens, College of Corpus Christi, Cambridge.

remarkable event and was a more ambitious undertaking than is recorded of any similar <sup>society</sup>. The original scheme seems to have been a modest one - the endowment of a Master and two Fellows. In the story of the Cambridge rising of 1391 there is no mention of the gild, and for some reason or other the college of Corpus Christi was an object of particular hostility. (1)

"The gilds," it is said "increased devotion by providing lights, masses and oblations for (1) the gild's patron and (2) dead members of the gild. There could be no mass without lights". (2)

These, and all funeral benefits were provided by the church with which the gild was connected. They were obtained by means of payment to the church in question either in money or in kind. Funeral benefits were in every case paid, not to the mourners, but to the church for the ceremonies etc. provided. Even the oblations given to the poor on the occasion of a funeral were not given to help the poor, or out of sympathy for them, but solely to benefit the soul of the deceased, and this is explicitly stated in several returns. The real beneficiary throughout was the church.

The poor relief for members of the gild itself has been grossly exaggerated by most historians. A careful study of the above analysis will reveal that it was infinitesimal in comparison with the amount which would accrue to the benefitting church. It is evident from numerous returns that some gilds, at least, limited their poor relief to one person

(1) Mary Bateson: Cambridge Gild Records alio Josselin: Historiola 4.

(2) " : Cambridge Gild Records, XXX.

at a time. (1) All the amount collected was not necessarily devoted to poor relief (e.g. the surplus that went to make a silver image.) (2) The person in need had to be in poverty virtually through 'an act of God', and not due to their own fault - an escape clause which could be widely taken advantage of. The members of some gilds were evidently so wealthy that to fall into dire poverty was not a foreseeable contingency and consequently they had no arrangements for poor relief. (2) The membership of most gilds appears to have consisted of burgesses or better middle class; the poor as such, the serf, who had just won his freedom, could not easily become a member of a religious gild. In fact

"the rule enjoining some small expenditure in charity seems rather than a part of the religious side of the gild work than a definite scheme for mutual insurance". (1)

The 'poor relief' of the medieval religious gild might therefore be justifiably compared to the 'poor fund' administered by the Kirk Session of many Church of Scotland churches at the present time. It is purely incidental to the main function of the church. Correspondingly, the poor relief seems purely incidental to the main function and purpose of the medieval religious gild.

In some cases it ceased altogether. By the year 1493 in the Records of the Borough of Leicester the development of the Corpus Christi Gild is clearly revealed.

"In 1493, four of these records give a full account of the gild's receipts and expenditure.

- (1) Mary Bateson: "Cambridge Gild Records", XXXII.
- (2) Above analysis of Returns.

The receipts were some 842 . . . This rental far exceeded that of the borough-treasury. The gild's expenses were nearly as large . . . there were rents to the king . . . to New College . . . There were the fees to the four chantry priests, and all the expenses incurred in the masses of the chantry. The charitable expenses appear to have ceased". (1)

From the foregoing we reach the following conclusions. The Religious Gilds were formed to provide for the <sup>growing</sup> middle class, particularly of the towns, the religious benefits that the endowment of chantries secured for the wealthy. Through the corporate association of the gild, religious services could be obtained, which would otherwise be beyond the means of individual members. Each church tended to have its own gild, or gilds, just as each church or congregation to-day has its own appropriate organisations. In fact the comparison between some of those medieval gilds and some modern church organisations is not so remote as might at first sight appear. The number of members in each gild is not likely to have been large. Some of them give evidence of being distinctly exclusive. For the most part their transactions were to be regarded as secret, though their membership as such was not secret. While there is no organic connection between the two, the practice in this respect is very comparable to that of Masonic Lodges at the present day.

Returns written in English are on the whole much more detailed and in a better survival condition than the returns in Latin or in Norman-French.

(1) Mary Bateson: Records of the Borough of Leicester, Vol. II, Intro. p. 59.



Attendance of members of the Gild at the burial of a brother or sister was almost a universal obligation of a gild. This was a source of financial benefit to the church owing to the contributions required from each. The obligation of many gilds to bring the body from a distance seems actuated by the same motive, rather than a form of charity or "insurance". The provision of candles at funerals is also an almost universally specified obligation; sometimes specified in great detail. The beneficiary again was the Church.

Again, the almost universal provision of requiem masses for deceased members, usually in addition to the actual funeral service, reveals the real purpose of the gild. Those varied in number according to the financial resources of the gild, which in turn would be determined by the financial resources of its members. Compulsory attendance at Church Services on certain prescribed days (feast days or anniversaries) is common to many gilds. Sometimes the amount of the collection from each gild member is prescribed. This provision is universal in gilds of certain localities and not so universal in other districts. Again the beneficiary is the Church. Each church of a town evidently strove to have a gild. Funeral expenses in practice would be paid entirely to the church which provided the ceremonies. Therefore they must be reckoned, not in the category of poor relief, but as religious contributions from the gild.

Even processions and pageants were religious pageants and were of benefit to the prestige of the church.

The majority of these gilds appear to have been established in the fourteenth century and most of them in the middle of the century.

Is it uncharitable to conclude that at that period, when other sources of income, other than tithes, were drying up, the church devised this means of securing a new source of assured income? The means of such income was the Religious Gild. It would follow from this, that, subsequent to the Reformation, the suppression of these gilds was entirely justified following the repudiation of the mass. No doubt, in the intervening century and a half, the conviviality, which tended to accompany their meetings, helped to bring them into disrepute. But in themselves, in their essential nature, they represented a consequence of the doctrine of the Mass, which at the Reformation was officially repudiated. If the suppression of the monasteries was justified so was the suppression of the Religious Gilds (1547). This, however, is dealt with in considerable detail in the subsequent analysis of the history of Religious Gilds after 1389.

Our main study, however, is the problem of the emergence of Christian *κοινωνία*. From a distance there is an apparent realisation of this in the life of the gilds, which is not borne out by closer examination and scrutiny. We must distinguish here between the pagan or purely secular, *κοινωνία*, which is a partnership or association for common interests, and the deeper Christian *κοινωνία* as indicated in Chapter I

of this kind. Of a degree of secular *κοινωνία* there is ample evidence. In fact the Guild Merchant, where it existed, was largely the mutual association of the burghesses of a town to further the common interests of their trade. It was a secular *κοινωνία*. But a Christian *κοινωνία*, which would have involved a sense of trusteeship, brotherhood and responsibility, on a deeper level, was absent. The ideal of just measure, true quality, fair dealing, honest service and a just price, was just not realized, as the literary evidence of the fourteenth century already quoted abundantly shows.

When we turn to the Religious Gilds we find there a common association for the purpose of the better attainment of individualistic ends. In spite of their partnership together in religion, their individualistic ethos remains fundamental. The funeral benefits are to be secured for each individual soul and it alone will benefit thereby. The basic concept of monastic individualism permeated the whole spiritual outlook of the Gilds. Each soul must find its own solitary salvation. Masses are bought for a person. The intercession of the ascended Christ (1) and the *κοινωνία* of the Holy Spirit are almost entirely absent from their Christian doctrine and outlook. The Christian doctrine that was 'filtered out' of Western Christianity at the time of St. Benedict is in no way re-introduced in the medieval gilds. They embodied a degree

(1) Hebrews 7<sup>25</sup>. See alabaster altar-screen, chantry chapel, North Transept, Ely Cathedral.

of secular Κοινωπία (which, in any case, was never lost) in the service of the distinctively individual and personal conception of salvation which was transmitted through early monasticism. The gilds, with rare exceptions, had a degree of social exclusiveness which was the reverse of Christian Κοινωπία. Serfs, or those of similar social status, could not readily become members of these gilds. The mutual assistance in the case of undeserved sickness or poverty, the common rule not to go to law with one another, may represent wise safeguards to maintain the unity or corporateness of the gild, or may even be an indication of a yearning after some deeper realisation of Κοινωπία. As it stands in these returns, when closely examined, the Religious Gilds ~~were~~ never succeeded in progressing beyond the stage of a secular Κοινωπία.

No Christian doctrine, however, can be neglected without leaving a vacuum of spiritual need within the human soul. If the need is not supplied as Christ revealed, it will be met in some perverted fashion. The almost universal neglect in the West of the doctrine of the Intercession of the Ascended Christ led to the development of the doctrine of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the eternal Intercessor for humanity with God. So throughout the Middle Ages you can find a yearning, often almost unconscious, for a deeper Κοινωπία than the Church, in its medieval doctrine, taught. The yearning came often from the body of the common people. Behind all their discontent, there was a yearning for a something which the

experience of Christian κοινωσία in the social life of the age, or in the communion of the Church, could have supplied.

Socially, in the Middle Ages, each man had his "status", which he more or less accepted. Consequently, in the world of social relations, there was a degree of poise that was both external and internal. Externally there was no struggle for social eminence, preference, or social power such as we see in our small urban communities of to-day. Each person had a place; they did not need to struggle for it, or defend it; it was accorded them willingly as their natural right. This acted, subjectively, by giving a peace of mind, a sense of poise, a sense of belonging at least somewhere and of being in no danger of losing that place. There was an acceptance of social position, with a degree of mental balance or subjective contentment derived therefrom. In contrast, one may think of the social striving, the uncertainty of status, the fear, the struggle, and the fret which just in this connection has so often become a part of modern life. If to this sense in the Middle Ages, there had been added a deep sense of Christian trusteeship and Christian κοινωσία, a wonderful degree of blessing would have been the lot of mankind, and the visionary life that is so often read back into the Middle Ages might actually have occurred. But the ideal, that social position, as well as lands and wealth, should be held and used in a sense of trusteeship for the benefit of the whole community of the people, including the serfs, was a vision which the Middle Ages did not have. The doctrine of Christian κοινωσία, with all that such corporateness and communion would have

implied, was something that, in practice, was denied and repudiated by the Church, <sup>This was shown in</sup> with its practices of monasticism, reserved for one social class alone, "ad succurrendum", appropriations of parishes, sale of masses, heriot, tithe and the vicarage system. These, and other practices as well, were inconsistent with the doctrine of *κοινωνία*. And the doctrine itself was neither accepted nor preached. The hunger in the heart of the people remained. Yet both the secular and religious life of the age came at times so near to meeting that hunger as to supply a sort of 'ersatz' satisfaction for it.

The yearning for something deeper appears in Piers the Plowman - the sense of something spiritual that should be and is not. It appears in the 'Three Estates', where the 'Commonweal' complains that it has been 'overlookit' and in fact 'sair neglected'. Then the dramatist rises to his highest vision when the robes of wealth clothe John the Commonweal; in the love and fellowship, the partnership, or *κοινωνία*, of the Lords Temporal, of the Merchants, and of the Commonweal, is the hope and prosperity of Scotland to be found.

It appears in striking fashion in the Peasants' Revolt (1381). The people there yearned for the new community that their experience of feudalism effectively denied them. They had neither the means nor the resources to blue-print the new society of which they vaguely dreamed and for which they not

only yearned but fought. The preaching of John Ball in this connection is of interest.

"My good friends, matters cannot go on well in England until all things shall be in common; when there shall be neither vassal nor lords; when the lords shall be no more masters than ourselves. How ill they behave to us! For what reason do they hold us thus in bondage? . . . They have wines, spices, and fine bread, while we have only rye and the refuse of the straw. . . We are called slaves and if we do not perform our service we are beaten . . . Let us go to the King and remonstrate with him". (1)

It is alleged that this is the preaching of communism. It is not communism. It reveals the spiritual hunger for true *Koivwvia* which remained in the heart of the people. Almost contemporary with this, though belonging to a very different social class, was the work of Wycliffe. He translated the New Testament into English at Oxford. His whole attitude and doctrine was singularly critical of the current theology of his age.

"Wycliffe, as a thinker, felt bound to find some philosophic basis for his action, and found it in an idealised form of the feudal theory of lordship based on reciprocity of service. This was his famous doctrine of Dominion: the development of a theory originated by Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh". (2)

extent Christian KOIVUVIK, "with all things held in some common". (3) But he was in no sense a communist; nor does

common". (3) But he was in no sense a communist; nor does he seem to have been in any way connected with the Peasants' Revolt.

- (1) P. Lindsay & R. Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt", p. 72.  
 (2) A.D. Trail: "Social England", II, P. 222.  
 (3) " " " " " , p. 164.

The oath of the peasants in revolt was to "King Richard and the True Commons". (1) The first part of the oath is itself an effective reply to the charge of communism; the second part of the oath reveals the passionate desire for the true community of all people, which it was part of the original Christian gospel to bequeath to humanity; How completely this principle was repudiated by the King, is seen in his pronouncement after the crushing of the revolt. It revealed him as the true representative of the barons, secular and spiritual, who alike trod on the faces of the poor. When the men of Essex came to the King to ask ratification of the charters that had been given them, Richard said:

"Oh, miserable men, hateful both to land and sea, unworthy even to live, you ask to be put on equality with your lords. You should certainly have been punished with the vilest death. . . . Says you have been and are, you shall remain in bondage, not such as you have hitherto been subjected to, but incomparably viler. . . ." (2)

No repudiation of this fundamental Christian doctrine could have been expressed in clearer terms. It was acquiesced in by Church and Parliament. The Church in fact sought to justify the practice of servitude. (3)

Certain guild regulations now appear which are obvious consequences of the Peasants' Revolt. Organisations, associations, congregations were strictly forbidden in London

- (1) Lindsay & Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt, 1381", p. 79.  
 {2}     "              ":     "              "              "              ", p. 136.  
 {3} G.G. Coulton: "Social Life in Britain", p. 336.



in 1383 without official permission, which to workmen etc. was usually refused. (1) Also we notice, in Craft-gilds, that high entrance fees and the custom of the masterpiece restricted new entrants, while to sons and sons-in-law of members entrance was made easy. This developed the tendency to monopoly and exclusiveness. No illegitimate might be admitted. Only freemen were accepted. No bondsman's son, or one in servile condition, could be an apprentice. (2)

(1) Brentano: "History of Gilds", p. 146.  
 (2)       "             "             "             ", p. 138.

Chapter 4.

Gilds after 1389.

Nothing seems to have happened to the gilds as the result of the census of 1388/9. As has been pointed out, there were few returns of purely Craft Gilds made at that time, though a separate writ was issued regarding them.

To make up for this deficiency, Toulmin Smith reproduces the ordinances of some gilds founded after 1389. Of these we notice that Cambridge gild ordinances, 1431, show a fully organised religious gild as above. (1)

Stamford - Gild of St. Katherine 1494 was a religious gild also with nothing distinctive from 14th century foundations, other than prescribed bell-ringing at funerals. (2)

Tullers of Bristol 1406 was a craft gild with no religious ordinances. Officers were appointed to prevent 'more wages than of old time' being either given or received; to inspect the quality of work; and to prevent work being done outwith the town. Maximum wage allowed = 4d. per day. (3)

Gild of the Ringers - date uncertain - attached to a particular church for bell-ringing; fines specified for lateness and faults of ringing; peals given for those who left legacies to the gild. (4)

Gild of Reading, of which few particulars are available, T. Smith describes as apparently a Gild-Merchant "The warden of the gild is only a humble servant of the Abbot". (5)

The Tailors of Exeter hold a charter from Edward IV 1466. This was a craft-gild some of whose ordinances should be noticed. The writer's comments are given in brackets.

- |     |                |                  |         |
|-----|----------------|------------------|---------|
| (1) | Toulmin Smith: | "English Gilds", | p. 274. |
| (2) | "              | "                | "       |
| (3) | "              | "                | "       |
| (4) | "              | "                | "       |
| (5) | "              | "                | "       |

Every craftsman worth £20 shall belong to the Gild - Livery to be purchased.

No craftsman shall have more than three servants and one apprentice.

Everyone made free of the craft by redemption (serfs redeemed?) shall pay 20/- 'without any pardon' and give a breakfast when made free of the city - and should only have one servant the first year. (This would in practice preclude any redeemed serf from joining.)

Members are not to entice customers from one another, not to go to law with one another, and to leave a legacy to the gild.

Minutes show that complaints of bad workmanship were dealt with. . e.g. "Dissatisfied customer must take his remedy at law as this craftsman was never a brother of this gild". (This shows that the gild had no monopoly of the craft or trade in Exeter.)

A priest was maintained and religious contributions made.

(The quarrel with the Corporation and the mystery of the Royal Charter and the available minutes are not dealt with here, as outwith the scope of our present enquiry and contributing little to it.) (1)

Bakers of Exeter, 1483 - A craft gild. No baker was allowed unless a freeman of the city and a member of the gild. (2)

The Gild of Berwick-on-Tweed seems altogether unique. It was a trading gild with no specific religious reference at all. It contains many trading regulations. (Was this a Gild-Merchant? Or was it Craft-gilds united? Was it one Gild for the whole town? We can ask, but not answer, these questions.) (3)

- |     |                |                  |                   |
|-----|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| (1) | Toulmin Smith: | "English Gilds", | p. 299.           |
| (2) | "              | "                | " , p. 334.       |
| (3) | "              | "                | " , pp. 274, 338. |

We submit that the further inclusion of post-reformation gilds in Toulmin Smith's collection of records is misleading, as it suggests that their customs, liberties and ordinances may have applied to pre-reformation craft-gilds. There is no adequate authority for this assumption. We have omitted the records of post-reformation gilds from our consideration.

As time went on craft gilds tended to become more and more religious gilds.

"Even more so than the Gild Merchant the Craft Gilds were suffused with a religious and charitable spirit . . . Every gild had its own patron saint; had its own chaplain, its own religious services, prayers, offices, Masses for deceased members, attended their funerals . . . As a rule every gild was wont to maintain lights upon the altars of its patron saint." (1)

"Craft-Gilds in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries - Such fraternities were simply religious clubs and may be briefly described as 'co-operative chuntries' . . . It is not impossible that in some instances the fraternity was from the first a conscious veil for trade purposes; but the main explanation of the fraternities within the crafts is to be found in the religious usages of the age and in local propinquity . . . Performance of pageants by crafts was also a reason for having a gild". (2)

Regarding the Religious Gilds themselves,

"there is nothing to show that the majority of those we found existing at the end of the fourteenth century survived till the Reformation". (3)

Mary Bateson referring to the Cambridge says,

"Little is known of the later history of these gilds (after 1389)". (4)

- (1) G. Clune: "The Medieval Gild System", p. 69.
- (2) Wm. Jas. Ashley: "The Economic Organisation of England", p. 34.
- (3) George Unwin: "Gilds and Companies of London", p. 201.
- (4) Mary Bateson: "Cambridge Gild Records", Intro. XXXV.

"We need not expect to find much evidence in Cambridge of the late survival of gilds". (1)

The same is apparently true of most towns with the exception of London, which was, from now on, altogether unique in relation to other English boroughs. (2) There, from the records of individual craft gilds themselves, we may learn something, but not much. In the legislation of the period, however, we have contemporary documents which deal, not with special cases, but with the country as a whole. They represent the viewpoint of a very considerable proportion of the nation and certainly of those in authority. The legislation would not be passed without some real cause. From the concrete evidence of the acts of Parliament themselves a good deal may often be deduced. We propose, therefore, to trace references, or legislation, in the Statutes of the Realm to the subject of the gilds up to and including the dissolution of the Religious Gilds.

After the census of 1388/9 there is no legislative reference to gilds until 1436/7 when the statute at Westminster (3)

enacted:

"Whereas the Masters, Wardens and People of the Gilds, Fraternities and other Companies incorporated dwelling in divers parts of the Realm oftentimes by colour of Rule and governance and other items in general words to them granted and confirmed by Charters and Letters Patents of the King's Progenitors, make themselves many unlawful and unreasonable ordinances, as well of many such things whereof the cognisance punishment and correction all only pertaineth to the King, Lords of Franchises and other persons and whereby our Sovereign Lord the King and other be disherited of their Profits and Franchises as of things which oftentimes in confederacy is made

- (1) Wm. Cunningham: Preface to "Cambridge Gild Records", IX.
- (2) Sylvia Thrupp: "The Merchant Class of Medieval London".
- (3) 15 Henry VI c 6 - 1436/7.

for their singular Profit and common damage to the people: The same our Lord the King . . . hath ordained . . . betwixt this and the Feast of St. Michael next coming shall bring and do all their Letters Patents and Charters to be registered of Record before the Justices of the Peace in the counties or before the Chief Governors in the Cities, Boroughs and Towns where such Gilds, Fraternities and Companies be. And moreover hath ordained and defended by the authority aforesaid, that from henceforth no such Masters, Wardens nor people make nor use no ordinance which shall be to the diminution of the King's franchises or of other, nor against the common profit of the people, nor none other Ordinance of Charge, if it be not first discussed and approved for good and reasonable by the Justices of Peace or the Chief Governors aforesaid, and before them entered of Record and after by them revoked and repealed if it be found by them not lawful or not reasonable and that upon pain to lose or forfeit the force and effect of all the articles comprised in their said writs and charters by which they might make any ordinances among themselves and moreover to lose and pay £10 to the King for every Ordinance that any of them doth make to the contrary as often as he shall be that by due process and lawful manner convict of record before any of the said Justices of Peace or Chief Governors of Cities, towns and boroughs. And this ordinance shall endure as long as it shall please our said Sovereign Lord the King".

(1)

This would seem to bring up-to-date what was achieved for the moment by the census of 1388. It also gave effective day to day control of the development and organisation of gilds. No distinction whatever is made between Merchant Gilds, Trade Gilds or Religious Gilds. The point to which exception was most particularly taken was the provision which appeared in many gild returns of 1388 whereby gild members were not to go to law one with another, but were to have their differences

(1) 15 Henry VI C 6 - 1436/7.

2025

settled within the gilds themselves. This apparently led to the establishment of something like 'gild courts', thereby encroaching on the rights of jurisprudence of the King or overlord. As this was lucrative, the statute shows that the encroachment was resented. The fact, also, that these Fraternities enjoined secrecy aroused suspicion. The obligation of secrecy is mentioned in many of the gild returns of 1388.

The last phrase of the act just quoted had the curious effect, that, while it obviated the re-enacting of the Statute in subsequent parliaments of Henry VI, it automatically lapsed on the death of that Monarch. Immediate advantage of this technicality seems to have been taken by the gilds. As the transactions were secret it was some time before the extent of these activities would come to light. This led to the almost indignant tone of the legislation on the subject in 1503/4 by Henry VII.

After reciting the statute 15 Henry VI C 6 quoted above, the act goes on:

" . . . which act is now expired and since the expiry of the same divers and many ordinances have been made by many and divers private bodies corporate within cities, towns and boroughs contrary to the King's prerogative, his laws and the common weal of his subjects: be it . . . enacted . . . that no masters, wardens and fellowships of Crafts or mysteries or any of them nor any rulers of gilds or fraternities take upon them to make any acts or ordinances nor to execute any acts or ordinances . . . in disheritance or diminution of the King nor of other nor against the common profit of the people, but if the same acts or ordinances be examined and approved by the Chancellor Treasurer of England and chief Justices of the Bench or three of them:

or before both the Justices of <sup>Peace</sup> ~~Assize~~ in their circuit or progress in that Shire where such acts or ordinances be made, upon pain of forfeiture of £40 for every time they do to the contrary.

And it is enacted that none of the same bodies corporate take upon them to make any acts or ordinances to restrain any person or persons to sue to the King's Highness or to any of his courts for due remedy to be had in their causes, nor put nor execute any penalty or punishment upon any of them for any such suite to be made upon pain of forfeiture of £40 for every time they do to the contrary". (1)

It is noted that in the recital of the previous act (15 Henry VI C 6), it is not quoted verbatim but with verbal changes. Moreover in the earlier act the regulations were to be approved by Justices of the Peace, or chief Governors of Cities; much more important and less easily influenced officials are now specified in this Act. The Acts also reveal a certain antipathy to the Gilds, as if their conduct in general was against the public interest. Far from exhibiting an attitude of Christian *κοινωνία* towards the community as a whole, their conduct is so far removed from it as to incur a legislative rebuke.

This strengthened Statute does not seem to have been effectively observed for it was re-enacted in 1530 in Statute 22 Henry VIII C 4. Then in 1536 an act was passed (2) which began with a recital of Statutes 22 Henry VIII C 4 and 19 Henry VII C 7 that no acts or ordinances were to be made by Gilds or Fraternities without the consent of certain named

- (1) 19 Henry VII C 7 - 1503/4.
- (2) 22 Henry VIII C 5 - 1536.



officials. Then it continued:-

"Sith which time divers Wardens and Fellowships have made Acts and Ordinances that every Prentice shall pay at his first entry in their common hall to the Wardens of the same fellowship some of them 40/-, some 30/-, some 20/-, some 13/4d., some 6/8d., some 3/4d., after their own sinister mind and pleasure. (1) contrary to the meaning of the said Act made in the nineteenth year of the reign of the said late King Henry VII and to the great hurt of the King's true subjects putting their children to be prentice. It was therefore in the said Parliament holden at Westminster . . . established and enacted . . . that no Master Wardens or Fellowships of Crafts or Masters of any of them nor any Rulers of Fraternities should take from henceforth of any prentice or of any other person or persons for the entry of any prentice into their said fellowship above the sum of 2/6d. nor for his entry when his years and his term is expired and ended above 3/4d. upon pain of forfeiture of £40 for every time they do to the contrary, the one half to the King our Sovereign Lord and the other half to the party that therefore shall sue by action of "dett informacion" or otherwise, . . . Since which said several acts established and made (as is aforesaid) divers masters wardens and fellowships of crafts have by "cantell and subtill meanes" compassed and practiced to defraud and delude the said good and wholesome Statutes, causing divers prentices or young men immediately after their years be expired, or that they be made free of their occupation or fellowship, to be sworn upon the holy Evangelist at their first entry that they, nor any of them, after their years or term expired shall not set up or open any shop, house nor cellar nor occupy as freemen without the consent and licence of the Master Wardens or fellowships of their occupations upon pain of forfeiting their freedom or other like penalty; by reason whereof the said prentices and journeymen be put to asmuch or more charges thereby than they before time were put into for the obtaining and entry of their freedom, to the great hurt and impoverishment of the said prentices and journeymen and

(1) Underlining is the writer's.

other their friends. For remedy thereof be it now by the authority of this present Parliament established, ordained and enacted that no Master Wardens or Fellowship of Crafts nor any of them, nor any rulers of gilds, fraternities or brotherhoods from henceforth compel or cause any prentice or journeyman by oath or bond heretofore made or hereafter to be made or otherwise that he after his term or apprenticeship expired shall not set up nor keep any shop house nor cellar nor occupy as a freeman without licence of the Master Wardens or Fellowship of his or their occupation for and concerning the same; nor by any means exact or take of any such prentice or journeyman nor any other occupying for themselves nor of any other persons for them, after his or their said years expired, any sum of money or other things for or concerning his or their freedom or occupation otherwise or in any other manner than before is recited limited and appointed in the said former Act . . . upon the pain to forfeit for every time £40 . . . (the half divided as before to the complainer)".  
(1)

Some of the significance of the above act is dealt with when Trade or Craft Gilds are being considered. (2) The statute reveals a systematic evasion of the law on the part of the gilds, and a lack of real concern for the common weal. It shows also that the King and Parliament did not view the gilds in any friendly or favourable light. The act in fact was designed to protect the common people from the exclusive and monopolising activities of the gilds. It shows that Henry VIII and his Parliament had a greater conception of the welfare of the common people than was embodied in the life of the gilds. In fact sympathy and consideration for the poor is one of the distinguishing keynotes of the legislation of Henry VIII.

(1) 28 Henry VIII c 5 - 1536.

(2) See p.275 of this thesis.

We now come to consider the legislation which culminated in the dissolution of the Religious Gilds.

An Act was passed in 1531/2 which the Marginal Index describes as an Act

"anent evil of conveyances to the use of Churches or Chapels or for Obits, etc." (1)

The reading and meaning of this Act is difficult. The Marginal Index appears to be erroneous, or at least misleading, and is not consistent with the substance and the text of the Act. The substance of the act appears to be that certain 'heritable properties' originally given to

"Parish Churches Chapels Church wardens Guildes Fraternities Cominalties Companies or brederhodes erected and made of devocion, or by common assent of the people, without any corperaction," (2)

for obits were being alienated to private persons, with a view evidently of having them hidden in the event of future confiscation. The act does not prohibit obits; it does not interfere with the proper use of the endowments (i.e. for the masses for which they were given), but it prevents their alienation to private interests. In fact it preserves the chantries. Unfortunately the marginal index, from which the meaning of the act is usually quoted, suggests the opposite.

In successive stages the suppression of the Monasteries was accomplished between 1536 and 1540 (3). It was obvious that the suppression of the Religious Gilds must follow.

- (1) 23 Henry VIII c 10 - 1531/2 - Marginal Index.
- (2) " " " " " " - " - (Spelling not modernised).
- (3) Geoffrey Baskerville - English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries.

The first act dealing with them was in 1545. (1) The preamble and exact terms of the act are worthy of careful notice. (The preamble of an Act of Parliament is valuable contemporary evidence and is not to be brushed aside by 'wishful-thinking' historians as unreliable.)

" . . . "Whereas there have been divers Colleges Freechapels Chauntries Hospitals Fraternities Brotherhoods Gilds and Stipendiary Priests having perpetuity for ever within this your realm of England, Wales and the Marches of the same . . . have been incorporated . . . to have had a perpetual continuance for ever; since which time divers and many of the Donors founders or patrons, or such as pretend to be Donors founders or patrons of the same Colleges Freechapels. . (etc.)(as above) . . of their 'avarouse and covetouse myndes' and of their own authority without your gracious license have of late entered into the Mansion houses manors lands tenements and other hereditaments of the same Colleges . . (etc. as above) . . and have 'expulsed' the Priests Wardens Masters Ministers Rulers Governors and Incumbents of the same out and from possession thereof and they their heirs and assigns do occupy and enjoy the rents issues revenues and profit of the same to their own proper use; and some of the said Priests Wardens . . (etc. as above). . by 'convyne' between them and the Patrons donors or founders . . have also of their own authority without your Grace's license bargained and sold all or part of their Manors, lands . . . belonging to the said Collegesfreechapels . . (etc.) and some . . with the consent of their Patrons donors or founders or such as pretend to be patrons donors or founders, some without the consent of the Patrons donors . . (etc.) . . have now made leases for the term of life or for term of years of their said Freechappell Chantries . . etc. and have not reserved the accustomed rent and ferme that the same hath been used to be letten for, . . by reason whereof divers of the said Freechapels chantries, hospitals and other 'promotions' abovesaid been clearly dissolved 'extincted' or ended contrary to the wills minds intents and purposes of the founders donors and patrons of

the same and to the great contempt of your Majesty and the authority royal. We your Grace's most humble subjects knowing the great . . . expenses and costs which your Majesty incurs . . . beseech your Majesty that it be enacted in the manner and form following. . . . " (1)

Then follow details for the vesting of these properties in the King. In Section 14 there are specific provisions that life interests were to be conserved and that all persons receiving incomes or pensions were to continue to have the same for life.

In view of the frequent misunderstanding of this act, further detailed comment is necessary.

The act, which is a lengthy one, appears to have been drafted in two parts and the outlook as well as, to some extent, the actual enactment is different. The first part of the act is clear and precise. In the preamble, which is quoted above, it is stated that certain endowments of colleges, gilds etc. have been alienated from their original purpose into private hands; thereby certain colleges, chantries, etc. have "been clearly dissolved". "In view of the King's expenses in wars and for the maintenance of the crown" (an unfortunate comment) those endowments which had been alienated from their original purpose between 4th February, 1535 and 25th December, 1545 were to be vested in the King and the sale thereof to private parties was declared null and void. The

(1) 37 Henry VIII C 4 - 1545.

dates referred to Acts of Parliament, the former date being the act for the Dissolution of the Monasteries. Despite the fact that an earlier act (1) was designed to prevent such alienations, the King here is only given those whose ownership had changed from the later date, 1535. Not only were life interests conserved, but payments for original purposes were to be continued. (2) Far from dissolving endowed chantries and other religious activities, the act sought to prevent such dissolution as an action of those in present possession of the said endowments. Associated with the Gilds here are the Colleges, i.e. Colleges of singing men (3), analogous to the Collegiate Churches of Scotland, hospitals (to be understood usually as 'hospices'), chantries, and stipendiary priests. In no way did this section of the act object to these activities or obstruct the work of any.

The other section of the act shows a considerable difference in outlook and is much less clear. It asserts that whereas endowments were not being properly used for the 'intents and purposes' for which they were 'first founded and established' the King, intent to have them used 'to more godly and virtuous purposes', . . . "may at His Highness' will and pleasure, from time to time hereafter make and direct his commissioners to enter into possession, . . . etc."

(1) 23 Henry VIII C 10 - 1531/2.

(2) Section 14 of the Act.

(3) e.g. Frederick Harrison: "Life in a Medieval College - The story of the Vicars - Choral of York Minster".

It was only permissive and then only on the basis of the improper use of the endowments. (1) Moreover it is obvious that the King died before this section could be put into operation. The authority of this portion of the act did not extend to his successor.

The title of this act, 'Dissolution of Colleges', together with the wording of the marginal index, gives a false impression of what the text of the act actually says.

George Unwin, in his reference to this act, appreciates the true position. He says,

"The first act of Henry VIII in 1545 did not condemn masses for the dead in principle, but only the abuse in practice of endowments for this purpose. Commissioners were to take into the King's hands all revenues that had been thus misappropriated". (2)

The necessity for the act, however, does show that respect and veneration for masses for the dead was already dying out among the people. Far from gifts being given for this purpose, that which had been given was being taken away. It may be taken as reflecting the popular outlook just as much as imposing it.

The actual dissolution of the chantries, religious gilds etc. was not until the following reign, in 1547.

There is no doubt, of course, that in view of what had happened to the Monasteries, the suppression of these particular designated organisations was a distinct, possible contingency;

(1) Section 14 of the Act.

(2) George Unwin: "Gilds and Companies of London", p. 208.

in which case their properties would be taken by the crown. A suggestion to that effect was certainly made to King Henry VIII by his advisers, but the fact that the suggestion was not embodied in legislation indicates that the King was not yet prepared to go so far. The suggestion was made to the King for an act of Parliament in these terms:

"Memo: All lands tenements and other hereditaments which were given to the use of the finding of priests to sing for the souls of the dead . . . be given to the King . . . towards fortifying the coasts of England. . .

Provided that lands given . . . for the relief of the poor and impotent or for educating ministers of God's word, or of any liberal science or for amending highways maintaining bridges and passages, relief of taxation remain as the giver intended . . . Provided that priests . . . dependent on the same for their livings should have competent livings or augmentations of livings assigned to them". (1)

It should be carefully noted that the act of 1545 did not suppress the chantries, or deprive any chantry priest of his living, it merely placed in the King's hands the superiority of the endowments.

Baskerville in "The Suppression of the Monasteries" states:

"When the chantries perished ten years after the monasteries it was the conservative Bishop Gardiner who approved of their suppression. 'I understand', he wrote in 1546, 'it hath pleased the Court of Parliament to give in to the King's Majesty's hands the disposition of all hospitals, chantries and other houses, whereof I am very glad'". (2)

The above statement by G. Baskerville is not strictly correct,

- (1) State Papers: Henry VIII, Vol. XX Pt. 2 No. 852, pp. 415 - 1545.
- (2) Geoffrey Baskerville: "Suppression of the Monasteries", p. 276.



for Bishop Gardiner was approving of the act of 1545 which did not suppress the chantries, as has been indicated above. The mistake has been made by Mr. G. Baskerville through following the common misunderstanding of what the act of 1545 really said and did.

It was only in the reign of Edward VI that the suppression of chantries and the whole system that supported them took place. Only then was the Reformation thoroughly established in England.

Before considering the legislation of 1547, however, it may be permitted to give some consideration to the much maligned character of Henry VIII. A careful study of the legislation of his reign, for which the King was predominantly responsible, fills one, in the first place, with a very deep sympathy for this unhappy monarch and, in the second place, with unbounded admiration for his statesmanship and ability. His legislation is full of concern and sympathy for the poor. (1) The whole tone and outlook in relation to the poor and working people is in marked contrast to the spirit and outlook of the legislation of Edward III. Henry VIII had overthrown one powerful family after another, until it could be said even by H.A.L. Fisher, who is antagonistic to Henry,

"The heir to the throne (1547) a boy of 9, had been educated by men of the new school . . . The star of the old nobility had paled; the men who sat at the council board or thronged the

(1) H.A.L. Fisher: "Political History of England", p. 393.

diplomatic service were with few exceptions laymen of humble origin, active talents, and reforming tendencies. Splendid abilities had been enlisted in the public service; devotion to the crown was boundless; the policy of the state was largely conceived and resolutely carried out". (1)

Henry VIII was a religious man; he understood theology; but did not go so far as to accept Reformed Doctrine in any thoroughgoing fashion. "The King's Book" 1543 'set forth a true and perfect doctrine to all his people'. (2) It repudiated the Pope and the doctrine of indulgences but was equivalent to traditional Catholic orthodoxy. The Six Articles (1539) were essentially conservative (3) and did not meet the views of the great reformers. 'Parliament in 1543 restricted the reading of the Bible to noblemen, gentlemen and merchants'.

Nevertheless 'adherents of the old learning were confronted with the established facts that the pope had been repudiated, that the monasteries had been overthrown, and the Bible was sanctioned in the English language. So long as Henry lived complete reaction was as impossible to conceive as a frank advance along the pathway of doctrinal change'. (4)

Had Henry some glimmerings of the significance of Christian

ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ ? In December 1545 he made a speech to Parliament in which he said:

"I hear the special foundation of our religion being charity between man and man, it is refrigerate as there was never more dissension and lack of love between man and man, the occasions whereof are opinions only and names devised for the continuance of the same. Some

- |     |                |                                 |           |
|-----|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| (1) | H.A.L. Fisher: | "Political History of England", | p. 481.   |
| (2) | " " "          | " " " " "                       | , p. 474. |
| (3) | " " "          | " " " " "                       | , p. 436. |
| (4) | " " "          | " " " " "                       | , p. 443. |

are called Papists, some Lutherans, and some Anabaptists . . . Of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you, and God Himself among Christians was never less revered, honoured and served". (1)

Regarding the country at this period, H.A.D. Fisher says:

"The England of Henry VIII was not a religious country, nor was the age of the reformation a religious age; but the English Bible sank into the general consciousness and gave to a movement which owed much of its original momentum to the material greed of the King and the aristocracy, a power of permanent appeal to the whole population. The Bible made the Reformation popular and secure, and this not only because it put within the reach of the humblest member of the country a sacred literature of great beauty and richness, but also because it brought into startling light the obscured features of primitive Christianity, the simple structure of the early church and the rudimentary precepts which lay at the base of the sacramental system. In the version of Wm. Tyndale the word *πρεσβυτερος* is translated 'elder' instead of 'priest', *ἐκκλησία* 'congregation' instead of 'church', *μετάνοια* 'repent' instead of 'do penance', and these and other renderings, though far more exact than the authorised latin of the Vulgate were revolutionary just because they were divested of associations with which the Latin terms had been clothed by the subsequent accretions of catholic tradition. . . .

In 1538 this, Wm. Tyndale's version was ordered to be supplied to the churches". (2)

Until the death of Henry VIII the practice of masses for the dead in the Chantries continued on the lines on which we have interpreted the 1546 act. This is brought out in a "Survey of St. Mary's College", Leicester in 1546 which shows it to be a chantry college employing seven chaplains and enjoying receipts from considerable rents.

[illegible]

(2) p. 418.

"Seven priests now resident, one room void. The College is within the parish church of our Lady where there is a vicar endowed and he has a pension of the King's Majesty of 88 a year by reason of the dissolution of the late monastery of Leicester". (1)

The Parliament of 1547 (Edward VI ~ Minority) consolidated the Reformation in England. It passed two acts, one giving communion in both elements and the other removing laws against the marriage of the clergy, in response to petitions from the lower house of convocation of the clergy. (2) Then it passed a very lengthy act dealing with Chantries and Gilds, etc.. The preamble of the act is an eloquent and valuable contemporary document revealing the outlook of Reformed England at the time. It reads,

"The King's most loving subjects, the Lords spiritual and temporal and the Commons in this present parliament assembled considering that a great part of Superstition and Error in Christian Religion hath been brought into the minds and estimation of men by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ and by devising and 'phantasinge' vain opinions of Purgatory and Masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed, the which doctrine and vain opinion by nothing more is maintained and upholden than by the abuse of Trentalls Chantries and other provisions made for the continuance of the said blindness and ignorance; And further considering and understanding that the alteration, change and amendment of the same, and converting to good and godly uses, as in erecting of Grammar Schools to the education of Youth in virtue and godliness, the further augmenting of the Universities and better provision for the poor and needy can not in this present Parliament be provided and conveniently done, . . . commit them to the King . . . who can with . . .

- (1) Mary Bateson: "Records of the Borough of Leicester", Vol.III p. 51 - Copy of the certificate of the Commissioners on the Survey of Chantries etc. following the Act of 1545.  
(2) A.F. Pollard: "Political History of England 1547-1603", p.16.

most prudent counsel . . . most wisely and beneficially both for the honour of God and weal of this . . . realm order alter convert and dispose the same". (1)

Thereafter Act 37 Henry VIII C 4 is recited. It appears that this act, dealt with above, was being evaded and that heritable properties of Chantries, Gilds etc. were being sold, appropriated and conveyed contrary to the act of the late King. All such of recent date were declared void and all were vested in the King through commissioners. Any 'heredytament' - heritable property - of chantries, gilds etc., any 'given assigned limited and appointed to the finding of any priest to have continuance for ever and wherewith or whereby any priest was sustained, maintained or founded . . . , should be deemed to be in the actual and real possession of the King'. (2)

'Lands etc. given to the priests for years shall be vested in the King for the remainder of such term of years'. (3)

'Lands given for maintenance of perpetual obits vested in the King'. (4)

In section VII it is enacted that all manors, lands, tenements etc. belonging to

"all fraternities, brotherhoods and gilds . . . other than such corporations gilds fraternities companies and fellowships of mysteries or crafts . . . shall be judged and deemed in actual and real possession of the King . . . without any inquisition or office thereof to be had or found". (5)

So far as our interest and investigation in the gilds is concerned Section VIII is the most important and far-reaching section of this Act.

- |     |               |   |                        |
|-----|---------------|---|------------------------|
| (1) | 1 Ed. VI C 14 | - | 1547 - Preamble.       |
| (2) | 1 Ed. VI C 14 | - | Section I, 1547.       |
| (3) | " " " " "     | - | " II (Margin Summary). |
| (4) | " " " " "     | - | " IV " "               |
| (5) | " " " " "     | - | " VII.                 |

The section reads:

"Also be it ordained and enacted that . . . the King . . . may direct . . . his commission . . . to such persons as it shall please him and the same commissioners or two of them at the least shall have full power . . . to survey all and singular lay corporations gilds fraternities companies and fellowships of mysteries or crafts incorporate . . . and all the evidences compositions books of accounts and other writings of every one of them to the Intent thereby to know what money or other thing was paid or bestowed to the finding or maintenance of any Priest or Priests Anniversary or Obit or other like thing, Light or Lamp, by them or any of them, . . . and also that the same commissioners . . . shall have full power and authority to assign and shall appoint, in every such place where gild fraternity the Priest or Incumbent of any Chantry be . . . Lands Tenement and other hereditament of every such Chantry . . . to remain and continue in succession to a Schoolmaster or preacher for ever, for and towards the keeping of a Grammar School or preaching, and for such godly intents and purposes and in such manner and form as the same Commissioners or two of them at the least shall assign or appoint: and also to make and order a vicar to have perpetuity for ever in every parish Church . . . and to endow every such Vicar sufficiently having respect to his cure and charge . . . and also the said commissioners . . . shall assign to every town or parish where they should think necessary to have more priests than one for the ministering of the Sacrament within the same town or parish lands etc. belonging to any Chantry Chapel or Stipendiary priest . . . as well to make ordinances and rules concerning the service use and demeanour of every such priest and schoolmaster . . . by what name or names he and they shall from henceforth be named and called: And also the said commissioners shall have full power . . . to assign as well to every Dean Master Warden Provost and other Incumbent and Minister of any of the said Colleges etc. . . . as to every fellow and poor person having yearly relief out of any . . . such several yearly annuities pensions or other recompenses during their several lives . . . as shall be thought meet and convenient. And over that the commissioners shall . . . enquire and try by such ways and means as they shall think meet and expedient what money profit and

and benefit any poor person . . . heretofore had . . . within 5 years next before the beginning of this present parliament out of any College etc. . . . and to make . . . orders . . . that said money . . . be paid to poor people for ever and to assign lands etc. . . . for the maintenance . . . of the same for ever; and also . . . towards the maintenance of Piers Jetties Walls and banks . . . and also all annuities pensions . . . shall be paid half-yearly to persons to whom the same ought to be paid . . .". (1)

"And it is ordained and enacted that . . . the said commissioners . . . shall be bound, as he will answer before God, to execute the commission beneficially towards the deans masters wardens provosts and other incumbents and ministers aforesaid and towards the poor people concerning the said assignments and also towards the maintenance of piers etc. . . . (as above)" (2)

"Pensions etc. shall not exceed the annual amount of former advantages". (3)

"Pensions shall cease on promotion of the parties". (4)

". . . all goods cattle jewels plate ornaments and other moveables as were or be the common goods of every such College Chantry etc. belonging to the service or . . . abuses aforesaid" shall be given to the King. (5)

"This Act . . . shall not in any wise extend to any College Hostel or Hall being within either of the Universities of Cambridge or Oxford; nor to chantry founded in any of the Colleges Hostels or Halls being in the same Universities; nor to the Free chapel of St. George the Martyr situate in the Castle of Windsor; nor to the college of St. Mary's College of Winchester . . . nor to the College of Eton; . . . nor to any Cathedral Church or College where a bishop's see is". (6)

Then follows the curious and apparently contradictory sentence:— ". . . other than to such Chantries obits lights and lamps . . . as at any time within five years . . . have been used or maintained . . . to which chantries etc. . . this act shall extend". (6)

(1)	I Ed. VI C 14 Section 8.	(4)	I Ed. VI C 14 Section 11.
(2)	" " " " " 9.	(5)	" " " " " 13.
(3)	" " " " " 10.	(6)	" " " " " 15.
(Margin summary).			

"The King may alter chantries in the Universities". (1)

The King may alter obits and apply the income "to a better use, as to the relief of some poor men being Students or otherwise". (2)

The Act is much less clearly and concisely drafted than the acts of King Henry VIII. The meaning and purpose of the statute, however, is clear. Purgatory was declared non-existent and masses for the dead were declared useless and superstitious. The appropriating of their endowments for other purposes was therefore logical and proper. We notice that the money was devoted to the creation of schools, to the securing the better service of the ordinances of religion in the parishes, to maintaining bridges, piers and other public works, and to the relief of the poor. It is important to notice how carefully life interests were concerned. All persons having an income from these funds were to continue to enjoy the same for life, even though the duties for which they were paid had no longer to be performed. And even though they were not originally life appointments, they became so, with the added security of being state pensioners. The only restrictions were that the income was not to be increased, and if ecclesiastical preferment, yielding a larger sum, were obtained, the pension naturally ceased.

It was a wise and statesmanlike act. It was thoroughly in line with the proper establishment of the Reformation. It was exceedingly kind, and indeed generous, to personal

(1) I Ed. VI C 14 Section 16 (Margin summary).  
(2) " " " " " " 33.



vested interests. Its passing would have a cleansing and liberating effect upon the social life of the community. It is interesting to notice that the grievance of the suppression of the gilds does not figure prominently in the complaints of the Roman Catholic insurgents of the Pilgrimage of Greece in 1549 (1). We must also remember that at this period of

history,

"the belief that the truth is one and absolute, that it receives clear definition through the Church, and that, so defined, it deserves to be protected by the whole power of the state, was part of the intellectual climate of Europe". (2)

A.F. Pollard sums it up in these words:

"The purpose of the chantries Act was to differentiate between their secular and religious objects, to confiscate the revenues devoted to the latter and to abolish altogether the "colleges" of singing men and chantries. There may have been a further motive. "There is no one thing", wrote Sir John Moore, "that more continueth a daily hurt to the realm than corporations"; and the civilians of the sixteenth century bred up on Roman Law had a rooted objection . . . to all associations which might impair the sovereignty of the state" . . .

"The doctrine of purgatory on which chantries depended lost its legal protection with the repeal of the Six Articles; even those who believed in the efficacy of prayers for the dead doubted the value of hired prayers, and Gardiner expressed his concurrence in the abolition of chantries". (3)

As has already been pointed out Gardiner's expression cannot be thus interpreted; . . . Otherwise Pollard's summary of the situation is correct.

"The act has been described", he continues, "as a 'far more statesmanlike act than that of Henry' but its execution did not come up to its

(1) A.F. Pollard: "Political History of England 1547-1603", p.19  
(2) H.A.L. Fisher: " " " " , Vol.III, p.474.  
(3) A.F. Pollard: " " " " , 1547-1603",  
p. 18, ff.

intentions, and its definitions were at fault. All religious associations with the specific exceptions were dissolved; the popular religion - or superstition - suffered a heavy blow". (1)

In spite of this and previous acts, however, many of these endowments, some of which served useful secular purposes, were not properly handed over but found their way into private hands. That this happened on a wide scale was notorious (2). For example: In the Records of the Borough of Leicester, the accounts of the rentals of the Corpus Christi Gild appear at intervals, - 1541/2 being the last. Thereafter they cease. There is no document relative to the Act of 1547. But in February 1586, under the heading, "Royal lease of Leicester and Chantry Lands", there appears a Latin indenture between Queen Elizabeth and James Tenton, gentleman. In consideration of his service in finding out her possessions of the Duchy, largely hitherto concealed, she has let to him to farm certain of her lands in Leicester (specified) . . . for a rent of £13 5 11d. (3)

It is a little window which reveals to us what happened before and after the 1547 act.

Moreover, as we shall see when we come to study the Trade Gilds, where these gilds were conducted separately from the religious fraternity, they were entirely unaffected by the passing of the 1547 act. (4)

The legislation quoted above shows that over a considerable

(1) A.F. Pollard: "Political History of England 1547-1603", p.11

(2) George Unwin: "Gilds & Companies of London", p. 212.

(3) Mary Bateson: "Records of the Borough of Leicester", Vol. III, p. 222.

(4) George Unwin: "Gilds & Companies of London", p. 201.

period there was on the part of the Religious Gilds a certain lack of respect for the law and frequent attempts to evade it. If the analogy of the monasteries <sup>(1)</sup> is any guide they would probably have an equal lack of respect for the objects for which many of their endowments were originally given and this is alleged in Act 37 Henry VIII C 4 Section 6.

One is therefore amazed to find the following extravagant statement in the otherwise scholarly work of Toulmin Smith. In a footnote his daughter states:

"My father's indignation was aroused by his researches into the story of the fate of the Gilds. In a manuscript note he remarks that for the abolition of Monasteries there was some colour, and after professed enquiries as to manners: moreover allowances were made to all ranks. But in the case of Gilds (much wider) no pretence of enquiry or of mischief. And no allowance whatever. A case of pure, wholesale robbery and plunder, done by an unscrupulous faction to satisfy their personal greed, under cover of law. No more gross case of wanton plunder to be found in History of all Europe. No page so black in English History". <sup>(2)</sup>

Again it was described as

"this wanton and wicked pillage of public property. . . . The Act of 1 Ed. VI C 14 was still more ingenious; for it held up the dogma of purgatory to abhorrence, and began to hint at Grammar Schools. . . . All the possessions of all Gilds, except what could creep out as being trading Gilds (which saved the London Gilds), became vested, by these two Acts, in the Crown; and the unprincipled courtiers who had devised and helped the scheme, gorged themselves out of this wholesale plunder of what was, in every sense, public property". <sup>(3)</sup>

The above hysterical outburst is partisanship and not historical criticism. The final sentences of the footnote

(1) Geoffrey Baskerville: "The Suppression of the Monasteries" (neglect of Masses).

(2) Toulmin Smith: "English Gilds", Intro. 42 (footnote).

(first quoted) are nonsense. The essential substance of the above is also untrue. Instead of "no allowance whatever", which Toulmin Smith alleges, it has already been shown that most generous allowance was made to all life interests involved, and to all persons having receipts of income that were not life interests.

The interest of the Reforming party in education was real and the foundation or re-endowment of Grammar Schools genuine.

"It is to the Reformation that Europe owes the education of the people in the fullest acceptation of the word". (1)

We have already shown that the real plundering of the Gild funds was done by private individuals, probably from within the gilds, with the connivance of the Gilds themselves. The experience of the London Gilds shows that the genuine craft gild had no difficulty under the Act and no need to 'creep out'. T. Smith's paragraph, however, implies the admission that genuine craft gilds were practically non-existent in England, apart from London. This is the submission of the present writer.

Were the endowments confiscated under the Chantries Act devoted in any substantial degree to education and the provision of Grammar Schools? It must be remembered that the free income, after pensions were paid, had to be devoted to the provision for parochial clergy, the upkeep of bridges etc. as well as education. The total funds available would also be much less than what resulted from the dissolution of the monasteries. So far as the gilds were concerned the returns show

(1) Howard Staunton: "The Great Schools of England", Intro.XVII

that masses were largely provided from current contributions rather than endowed funds.

G.M. Trevelyan says (1) that Edward VI got an undeserved reputation as a founder of schools; that what happened was simply that his ministers refrained from abolishing certain schools and by way of flattery attached the King's name to them; that most of the chantry and gild schools of this period suffered, some more, some less. In this outlook Trevelyan is, with A.F. Pollard, following the lead of A.R. Leach, who is described as the

'leading investigator of his generation into . . . the earlier history of English Schools. He was very quick in forming his opinions. The result is that sometimes he has been regarded as too hasty'. (2)

"Mr. Leach estimates the number of chantry schools dissolved by the Chantries Act of 1547 at about one hundred of which fourteen were refounded by Edward VI . . . Altogether he estimated that there were three hundred grammar schools in England before the Chantry Act". (3)

Along with this we may notice that

"sometimes the gild priest was to provide schooling for the sons of the members of the gild". (4)

"In most cases, probably, it was one of the duties of the Chantry Priest to keep a school . . . In 1525 Sedbergh school was endowed along with a Chantry . . . In 1548 it was re-endowed with £20 13 10d. and the schoolmaster with his yearly stipend of £10 17/-". (5)

On the other hand we must notice evidence of a different kind. J.H. Lupton, an authority on educational matters in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, (6) writes,

- (1) G.M. Trevelyan: "English Social History", p. 113 f.
- (2) Encycl. and Dict. of Education: Article "A.R. Leach".
- (3) As above - "Early English Grammar Schools".
- (4) As above - Article: "Gilds".
- (5) Sedbergh School Register pp. 2-3. (6) J.C.C. Minchin, "Our Public Schools", p. 237.



pay the Master out of the Crown Revenue . . .  
A Table extracted from several Warrants all  
dated July 20, 1548 and in Parliament engrossed,  
might be here inserted for 25 counties".  
(Actually only Herefordshire is given in detail,  
showing ten Grammar Schools, the Town, the former  
title, the incumbent and Revenue continued.)  
Besides these and divers others - the same most  
religious Prince, (Edward VI), in lieu of many  
country schools formerly suppressed, erected  
anew several others in many towns . . (many names  
follow.) (1)

Of the type of education provided in the Pre-Reformation schools  
we have little knowledge. (2) Many may have been merely school  
of singing for the mass. Many were very small, six to twelve  
pupils. (3)

"The entire subject of secular schools previous  
to the Reformation is a question of controversy  
concerning the interpretation of historical  
material." (4)

We may sum up our comment in the following quotations.

"The Protestant Reformation introduced a new  
basis for elementary vernacular education,  
namely the necessity of personal study of the  
scriptures in order to secure salvation".

"The history of elementary schools in England in  
this period has not been studied sufficiently to  
provide a reliable account of it". (5)

Regarding the further history of these endowments, two points  
may be noticed. The reason why educational and public funds  
did not benefit to the extent that they ought to have done  
from the suppressions was that

"the chantry lands which parliament had granted  
to the crown for the endowment of education and

- (1) Christopher Vase: "Considerations Concerning Free Schools  
as settled in England" (1678 A.D.) p. 38 f.
- (2) Encycl and Dict. of Education: Article "Guilds".
- (3) G.G. Coulton: "Medieval Panorama", pp. 388, 390.
- (4) Munroe: "History of Education", p. 339.
- (5) Parker: "The History of Modern Elementary Education",  
pp. 53, 55.

other respectable objects, were now (in 1552) re-granted or sold wholesale to private persons for inadequate sums in cash; for ready money was the greatest need of Northumberland's Government". (1)

The Monasteries and the Religious Gilds, had on account of their wealth, been great strongholds of Roman Catholicism. Not only the success but the very survival, of the Reformation required their suppression. It was because of this that Mary was unable, even by force, to really re-establish the old religion. Dealing with the year 1555, A.F. Pollard writes:

"There had been no real re-conversion to Rome, and the reconciliation was merely a marriage of convenience. 'If the Church', wrote Cecil in 1559 in advice to the Scottish Reformers, 'had not been shorn of her wealth by Henry VIII she would have triumphed in the struggle; and her failure to recover that wealth in 1554 betrays the hollowness of her victory'". (2)

Unlike Toulmin Smith, we may, in sincerity and very truth, thank God for the suppression of the gilds!

A Roman Catholic writer after idealising and idolising the gilds says, "If the gilds were so excellent as is maintained, the obvious question arises, why, then, did they fail and almost entirely disappear? The central answer . . . is . . . the gilds grew out of the living Faith and when the Faith grew cold the gilds began to wither and die". (3)

In one sense this statement is true. The real reason for the decline and suppression of the gilds was not legislative but spiritual. The gilds grew out of the belief in purgatory and the efficacy of masses for the dead. What the aristocracy

(1) A.F. Pollard: "Political History of England", 1547-1603, III, p. 74.

(2) As above, p. 131.

(3) J. Clune: "Medieval Gild System" - Foreword.



could buy individually for themselves, the gilds made available to the middle classes. With the decline of belief in Purgatory and the loss of belief in the efficacy of masses and lights for the dead, the dissolution of the gilds was only a matter of time and a question of method. Along side of this we may put G.G. Coulton's comment on the suppression of the Monasteries.

"Monachism of 1500 was condemned not so much for its actual sins of omission and commission, as for its gradual loss of faith in its own professed ideal, a faithlessness bred of centuries of failure". (1)

And also Voltaire's comment:

"Voltaire in his 'Lettres sur les Anglais', urged that the prosperity of England dated from the destruction of the religious houses". (2)

The logical sequel to the suppression of the monasteries was the suppression of the Gilds.

---

### The Craft Gilds.

The subject of the Craft Gilds is one to which much fertile imagination has been devoted, coupled with an unusual amount of wishful thinking. To this must be added the practice of reading back into the Middle Ages the practices and functioning of Craft Gilds in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, without the necessary manuscript authority, or evidence, to support such ahistorical transposition or anachronism. We shall endeavour to trace the functioning and nature of the Craft Gilds of the Middle Ages as far as actual medieval evidences allow us. This whole problem is touched on by Wm. Cunningham

- (1) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", II, p. 229.  
(2) G. Baskerville: "English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries", p. 274.

when he wrote:

"Gross . . . proved that Dr. Brentano's conclusions on the conflict of the Merchant and Craft Gilds had been too hastily formed, and that English history could not be safely reconstructed from continental analogies. Mr. and Mrs. Webb showed good reason to distrust the pedigree which had been provided for Trade Unions, and raised the question whether they were of ancient lineage at all. Still further Professor Ashley re-examined the evidence as to the confiscation of Gild property and showed that the sweeping charge which had been brought against Henry VIII and Edward VI were at all events imperfectly proved . . .

We cannot classify gilds satisfactorily, until we know how far the same gild preserved the same character throughout its whole history, or whether it took on new functions to meet the requirements of a new era . . . .". (1)

On the other hand we have the statement of G. Clune, typical of the attitude already referred to:

"The Craft Gild guaranteed the consumer that its goods were of sound quality and that the workmanship was excellent of its class". (2)

That this is a true description of the Medieval scene is not borne out by contemporary documents, and for reasons indicated later cannot be accepted.

In dealing with medieval craft or trade gilds an exception must often be made of the City of London, which in respect of these organisations was often quite unique from the rest of England. Craft gilds in London survived from the Middle Ages through the Reformation in a way that is seldom traceable anywhere else in England. The inferences to be drawn from this, and some of the London Gilds themselves, will be considered

(1) Wm. Cunningham - Preface to Mary Bateson: "Cambridge Gild Records".

(2) G. Clune: "Medieval Gild System", p. 51.

later. Meantime we may notice that:

"... the greater part of such of the trading and craft guilds as survived the drastic axe of the Reformation are now the Livery Companies of the City of London. It has been well said, 'The Livery Companies with their political and municipal power are peculiar to London. No other city has permitted such a development of its mysteries and trades, nowhere else in England have chartered associations of the kind attained such wealth and power'. (1)

Evidence of Craft Guilds, even of the existence of craft guilds, before the census of 1388/9 is scanty.

There is repeated legislation before that date which makes considerable reference to matters over which the craft guilds are supposed to have exercised supervision and authority, but which legislation makes no reference whatever to craft guilds, or even to their existence. The distinction between crafts, or mysteries, and labouring was clearly affirmed. That admission to the craft is controlled, and is through an indentured apprenticeship, is clearly implied, but that the craft membership, thus controlled, exercised a further or social jurisdiction is definitely not implied. Functions or rules which <sup>we</sup> would regard as pertaining to a craft guild were dealt with repeatedly by legislation. For example in 1350/1 it is enacted

"that Carpenters, Masons and Tilers, and other workmen of houses shall not take by the day for their work, but in manner as they were wont, that is to say: a Master Carpenter 3d. and another 2d.. A master (Free-Mason) (2) 4d. and other masons 3d. and their servants 1d., of Tylers 3d. and their Knaves 1d. ob. and other coverers of Fern and Straw 3d. and their knaves 1d. ob. ...

(1) George Elkington: "The Coopers - Company and Craft - London" p. 6.

(2) Free-Mason = Free-stone mason.

Plasterers and other workers of midwalls and their knaves by the same manner without meat or drink 1/- from Easter to St. Michael; and from that time less, according to the rate and discretion of the Justices which should be assigned thereto. . . " (1)

That Cordwainers and shoemakers shall not sell boots and shoes nor none other thing touching their mystery, in any other manner than they were wont the said XX year: item that Goldsmiths, Saddlers, Horseshmiths, Sporriers, Tanners, Corriers, Tawers of Leather, Taylors and other workmen, artificers and labourers and all other servants here not specified shall be sworn . . . to do and use their crafts and offices in the manner as they were wont to do the said XX year". (2)

As has already been pointed out, Brentano's Essay (3) is in many respects inaccurate and cannot be relied upon. It is based far too much on Continental references and analogies, which are 'simpliciter' applied to England. Brentano also, as a Roman Catholic, had the tendency to idealise the Middle Ages and particularly the Gilds. In the above connection Brentano says,

"To the complete independence of the Craft-gilds . . . they should have the right of freely electing a warden for the regulating of their trade and for managing the Gild. In England this freedom was never restricted": (4)

This is not correct. Not only was the regulating of trade carried out by legislation over the heads of the Craft-gilds, but there is also considerable evidence that such craft-gilds just did not exist in England in many places and at such periods as they were supposed to flourish. For example there

(1) 25 Ed. III Stat. 2 C 3 - 1350-1.

(2) " " " " " C 4 - " .

(3) "History and Development of Gilds" in Toulmin Smith's "English Gilds".

(4) Brentano: "History and Development of Gilds", CXXI.

is evidence to suggest that no craft-gilds existed in the Borough of Leicester in 1343 and whether they did or not the appointment of their wardens was in the hands of the "Mayor and community" and not in the hands of the craft or craft-gild.

"The Mayor and community in 1343 renewed the old rules for fullers and appointed wardens to inspect their work . . . As there was general complaint of weaving the whole town elected two weavers as wardens to examine the weaver's work.  
. . .

About the same date the watermen, probably water-carriers, were forbidden to form a society and enjoined to serve the community faithfully. They had probably attempted to regulate their trade by uniting as a gild". (1)

This example may explain why there were so few returns of Craft Gilds in the census of 1388 - they just did not exist. (2)

A statute of Edward III in 1360/1, after the Black Death, would clearly imply that craft gilds were not general throughout the country and that the attitude of authority was definitely unfriendly to the formation of such gilds. It reads, inter alia,

"That that Statute of Labourers of old time made shall stand in all points, except the pecuniary pain, which from henceforth is accorded, that the labourers shall not be punished by fine or ransom . . . ". (but shall be put in prison for fifteen days.) . . .

And that as well Carpenters and Masons be comprised in this ordinance, as all other labourers servants and artificers; and that the Carpenters and Masons take from henceforth wages by the Day and not by the week nor in other manners; and that the Chief Masters of Carpenters and Masons take 4d. by the day, and the other 3d. or 2d. according as they be worth; and that all Alliances and Covines of Masons and Carpenters and Congregations, Chapters, Ordinances and Oaths betwixt them made or to be made,

(1) Mary Bateson: Records of the Borough of Leicester. Vol. 3, Intro. p. 65.

(2) Toulmin Smith: "English Gilds" - See also above analysis.

shall be from henceforth void and wholly annulled so that every Mason and Carpenter of what condition that he be, shall be compelled by his Master to whom he serveth, to do every work that to him pertaineth to do, or of free-stone, or of rough stone; and also every carpenter in his degree: but it shall be lawful to every Lord or other to make bargain or covenant of their work in gross, with such labourers and artificers when please them, so that they perform such works well and lawfully according to the Bargain or Covenant with them heretofore made". (1)

The above could be interpreted as a prohibition against the formation of Trade Gilds.

From the point of view of the social life of the people the following legislation is of interest in 1405/6.

"The Statute of Labourers is recited and re-enacted. Then "No one shall put his child apprentice unless he have 20/- per annum in Land or Rent. No one who has served as a labourer on land to twelve years of age shall be put to any other occupation. So many are put to serve apprentices in divers crafts . . . that there is so great scarcity of labourers and other servants of husbandry that the gentlemen and other people of the realm be greatly impoverished . . .

Every man or woman shall be free to set their son or daughter to take learning in any manner of school that pleaseth them within the realm". (2)

The only convincing contemporary evidence (apart from London) of the effective functioning of Trade Gilds is in respect to their social exclusiveness, their monopolising or controlling the right to practice their mystery. It was not concern for good workmanship or fair dealing, but for the preservation of privileged position as masters or tradesmen. Their evident unpopularity can be easily understood. With the advent of Henry VIII an entirely new outlook makes its appearance in

(1) 34 Edward III C 9 - 1360/1.

(2) 7 Henry IV C 17 - 1405/6.

legislation, namely a new interest in the common people, and a new sympathy for the poor. In support of the above statements the following legislation may be quoted:

Preamble: "Complaineth . . . your poor subjects of this realm . . . that . . . victuals . . . have been sold at prices not convenient, so that . . . poor persons might with their craft or bodily labour buy sufficient for the necessity and sustenance of them, their wives and children: - now - all victual . . . but in especial beef, mutton, pork and veal which is the common feeding of the mean or poor persons are . . . sold at so excessive a price that your subjects . . . cannot gain with their labour sufficient to pay for their victual and sustenance". (1)

Then follow regulations as to the price of meat and how it was to be sold. There is no reference to any trade gild or Gild Merchant. The duty of enforcing the act is laid upon Sheriffs, Justices of the Peace, and officials.

Act anent true dying of Woollen Cloth.  
"Be it enacted that it shall be lawful to the Wardens of the mystery or Craft of Dyers of every City, borough and Town Corporate within this realm where such wardens be . . . and where no such warden be to the Mayors, Sheriffs, Bailiffs, Constables etc. to enter into all places privileged where dying is used . . . for the better reformation of the said untrue dyeing of clothes, hats and caps". (Act includes detailed regulation of the Dyeing industry.) (2)

The reference to wardens may imply that they were wardens of guilds, but it also implies that adequate supervision of the craft of dyers was not exercised and that the authority to exercise it was not possessed.

There is also the act against the Craft-gilds already quoted. (3) This act reveals on the part of the Gilds an

(1) 24 Henry VIII C 3 1532/3.  
(2) 24 Henry VIII C 2 1532/3.  
(3) 22 Henry VIII C 4 1530/1 } - Quoted on pages 244 of this thesis.  
28 Henry VIII C 5 1536 }

exclusiveness of an anti-social nature, and the exploitation of a privileged position. As the act was passed at Westminster one may ask if it was the conduct of the London gilds that was most prominently before the minds of the legislators?

The Weavers would be one of the earliest and one of the most ubiquitous of the Gilds. (1) Yet we find that

"the traces of craft gilds at Cambridge are scanty: this was not due to the absence of artisans: the shearmen and the wool-combers . . . have left their traces, but there does not appear to have been any gild or company in connection with the clothing trade. Some skimmers had indeed formed a gild of their own in honour of St. Katherine but they made no effort to keep the membership or management of the gild entirely in the hands of men of their own craft, and they do not seem to have contemplated any trade objects in founding their society . . ." (2)

We note also that

"opposition to the weavers was general in whatever towns their gilds occurred". (3)

And also that "nearly all craft gilds of which we have record in England before the thirteenth century were weavers' gilds". (4)

In the City of London certain records of the Weaver's Gild and others are worthy of notice. There was about 1300 A.D. certain limitation of numbers -

"Thirty years ago in the City there were about two hundred and eighty looms, now there are but eighty . . . The diminution of numbers of the London gild may not have been entirely due to artificial manipulation. . . This may be accounted for by the migration of weavers to country districts to escape gild restrictions". (5)

(1) Brentano: "History of Gilds", CXIX and CXX.

(2) Mary Bateson: Cambridge Gild Records - Preface by Wm. Cunningham, IX.

(3) F. Consitt: London Weavers' Company (1932), p. 3.

(4) George Unwin: "Gilds and Companies of London", p. 94.

(5) F. Consitt: London Weavers' Company, pp. 23 - 24.



This implies that Gild authority outside London was much less effective than within it. We must also notice that anent the Weaver's Gild, "In July 1335 an . . . action was brought against the Burellers, who were accused of weaving without being members of the Weaver's Gild . . . The Burellers say that they are not weavers, but freemen of the city, and as such are entitled to carry on any trade or mystery . . . The Weavers argued that the Burellers were violating the gild's charter, in allowing their servants to weave . . . It was decided by the Mayor, Sheriffs, Aldermen and other of the more discreet men of the city, after grave consideration, that it should be lawful for all and singular freemen of the city . . . to weave cloth and sell the same at their will, saving to the King his yearly ferm . . . " "The London custom of permitting the exercise of any art to a freeman was wise".

(1)

This example from London, the stronghold of medieval trade-gilds, completely demolishes the traditional picture of the Gild monopoly and authority over craft and trading in the Middle Ages.

Another interesting circumstance emerges from the study of the London Weaver's Gild, namely the discovery that the craft and fraternity were distinct, though to both the title Gild might be applied.

The ordinances of the Weaver's Fraternity were given in 1378/9. (2)

There were no craft gild returns in 1388.

The ordinances of the Weaver's Craft were drawn up and submitted to the magistrates of London in 1407. These were the real foundation of (3) the Craft Gild. They regulated (1) Against working by candlelight, (2) Wages - (5d. but not food or drink), (3) Quality of work, (4) Against receiving workmen from others unlawfully, (5) None shall make a conventicle, congregation, or a free fellowship in any way whatever, (6) discipline sections.

- |     |             |                            |           |
|-----|-------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| (1) | F. Consitt: | "London Weavers' Company", | p. 27.    |
| (2) | "           | "                          | , p. 191. |
| (3) | "           | "                          | , p. 196. |

In 1456 the prices of cloth were fixed in detail, as were also wages. (1)

The oaths of journeymen prescribe a quarterly payment of 6d. (2) in the Fraternity the quarterly payment is 3d. (2) The Craft is men only; the Fraternity is "brothers and sisters". (3)

There was a grant of Arms and Crest to the Weavers' Company in 1490.

The complete ordinances of the Weavers' Gild were first set out, in fifty-three sections, (4) and ratified on 25th June, 1577 - which is post-reformation. (5)

The story of the London Weavers has been summed up in these terms

"Craft and Fraternity were distinct. Towards the close of the fourteenth century the Weavers felt the need of a closer bond than their craft association gave. Hence (1378/9) they formed a fraternity. . . One of the outstanding advantages of working through a fraternity was the secrecy of its proceedings, e.g. no single mention of the Weavers' craft is made in the ordinances of the fraternity. The only evidence that its members were weavers lies in the entry of the rules in the Weavers' Minute Book. For some time the Weavers kept the Craft and Fraternity aspects of their gild sharply distinguished . . . The convention changed before the close of the fifteenth century . . . and by 1492 the Fraternity of the Weavers had become completely identified with the Craft". (6)

Out of the successful gilds of London the great Livery companies were formed. These are mentioned in the Prologue of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales - his only reference to gilds.

"The disintegration of the gild system was due to new industrial conditions" (after 1497) . . . now the successful masters forming the Livery were differentiated from the poor householders and journeymen etc.". (7)

(1)	F. Consitt:	"London Weavers' Company",	p. 213.
(2)	" "	" "	" p. 203.
(3)	" "	" "	" p. 196.
(4)	" "	" "	" p. 216.
(5)	" "	" "	" p. 261.
(6)	" "	" "	" p. 106 ff.
(7)	" "	" "	" p. 114.



chantries and of obits the religious observances of the companies remained after the Reformation very much what they were before". (1)

In fact the Craft gilds developed with new zest and impetus in the freer atmosphere of Reformation (i.e. Elizabethan) England.

For example, "The Basket-makers' Company was established (incorporated) by an order of the Court of Mayor and Aldermen of London on 22nd September, 1559". (2)

"During the reign of Elizabeth there was scarcely one of the London Companies that was not affected by the grant of letters patent". (3)

The Coopers-Company and Craft of London show no evident break at the Reformation. (4)

The essential accuracy of the position here indicated is admitted even by the Roman Catholic historian.

"The craft gilds as such were not destroyed by the acts of 1545, 1547 . . . All their powers of industrial control remained unaffected, and they lost only such of their property as was devoted to religious purposes. But that was a great deal. Almost every gild promoted some spiritual purpose or other. . .

The great London companies, on the plea that they were purely trading companies, escaped the general confiscation". (5)

Another factor contributing to the ineffectiveness of the Craft gilds in the provinces and their tendency to be more and more absorbed by the Church and to become religious gilds, is indicated by George Unwin.

"The set of articles for the regulation of their calling which the men of a mystery presented to the civic authority in the earliest period were almost entirely silent as to the social machinery by means of which the regulations were to be enforced. The rules about the length

(1) George Unwin: "Gilds & Companies of London", p. 212.

(2) H.H. Bobart: "Records of the Basketmakers' Company", p. 1.

(3) George Unwin: "Gilds & Companies of London", p. 256.

(4) G. Clune: "Medieval Gild System", p. 191.

(5) George Elkington: "The Coopers-Company & Craft of London",

of apprenticeship; entrance to a trade, the search of workshops, the seizure of defective wares or materials, were sufficient to give the craftsmen a fairly complete control of their trade if they were well enough organised to take advantage of them. But no such organisation was directly authorised by the city. From the strictly constitutional point of view the wardens or overseers of a trade, though elected by the craftsmen, were the sworn officers of the municipality, and could only enforce their authority by a direct appeal to the Mayor and Aldermen. They were not authorised to hold courts of the craft or to levy quarterage upon its members. The whole social machinery by which the craft secured an effective control of trade - the annual and quarterly meetings, the common dress, the entrance fees, quarterly subscriptions and fines, the authority to settle disputes between members, the religious and charitable functions which gave the association its binding force - belonged not to the craft as such but to the fraternity, and the fraternity, whilst it might need the toleration of the civic authorities, derived its sanction from the Church". (1)

From this it seems to have followed that the supervision of the honesty of trading was in fact exercised by the civil authority, national or local, and not by the guilds as is so generally supposed. This is borne out by the study of legislation.

This question of authority and sanction appears to have been a factor towards all or most guilds becoming in the end Religious Guilds, in fact if not in name. Even regarding London, George Unwin writes:

"The Janus-like appearance of the Gild, as a craft on one side and as a fraternity on the other, and the difficulty we find in clearly separating these aspects, were not the result of a mere confusion in the medieval mind. It was a more or less conscious device for securing liberty of action". (2)

Distinctions arose within the Craft-guilds between those who were "of the Livery" and those who were not. That excluded the poorer brethren; the guilds were split in two. It (1) George Unwin: "Guilds & Companies of London", p. 169: p. 108.

was a division of rich and poor. Similarly, the difficulty of becoming masters caused the formation of Journeymen's Gilds.<sup>(1)</sup> Yet with most of these it might still with a basis of truth be said,

"The gilds were based on religion; religion was to them the breath of life. . . The result was inevitable. The body might maintain for a time a semblance of life, but the soul had departed.

On the continent wherever the Reformation got a foothold, religious gilds were judged to be founded on superstition and they were accordingly suppressed."<sup>(2)</sup>

### Scotland

What has been said above applies to England. What was the situation in Scotland? As usual, evidences are much fewer and less satisfactory.

In comparison with England, gilds in Scotland developed later. All gilds, irrespective of their title, which were really functioning as such before the Reformation were in fact Religious Gilds. Where Gild Merchant or Craft gilds existed and functioned, it is found on examination that their real nature and purpose were religious. In any other sense the growth of Gild Merchant and Craft-gilds proper was a development of post-Reformation social life. Dumbarton, for example, may be taken as typical. Made a Royal Burgh in 1222, a trading burgh, it had no Gild Merchant until after the charter of 1609 which, inter alia, granted it. The affairs of the Merchant Guildry are only traceable 1686-1865.<sup>(3)</sup> Trade Corporations are shown to be all of post-Reformation origin and development. <sup>(4)</sup>

(1) G. Clune: "Medieval Gild System", p. 169.

(2) " " : " " " " , p. 193.

(3) R.D. Thomson: "Affairs of Dumbarton Merchant Guildry".

(4) " " : "Transactions of Trade Corporations of Dumbarton"  
"Dumbarton Coopers' Corporation", 1636-1846.

"In Glasgow there was no Merchant Gild". (1) And no craft gilds evidently existed.

"Whether there was a Merchant Gild or not, it was considered the prerogative of the magistrates, as representing the community of the Burgh, to regulate wages, hours of labour and quality of work, just as they controlled markets and fairs and fixed the prices of merchandise and the conditions of its sale. Tailors and weavers, skimmers, shoemakers and saddlers, bakers, fleshers and maltmen in Royal Burghs were all placed under the supervision of the chamberlain, and it was his duty to see that they carried on their trades fairly and in the interests of the burgesses as a body. It was not, however, until the fifteenth century that the craftsmen came to occupy a prominent position in the Burghs. In 1424 the Parliament of James I held at Perth, enacted that in every town of the realm each craft, with the counsel of the officers of the town, i.e. the magistrates, should choose a deacon or maisterman to assay and govern the work of that craft. This statute was amended in 1426, but repealed in 1427, when it was made illegal to elect deacons or for deacons to act or to hold meetings, which, it was explained, were often conspiracies". (2)

This points to the general absence of craft gilds in Scotland in the fifteenth century. Religious gilds formed among men of the same craft and carrying the craft name were in a different position. The craftsmen and the merchants also were distinct.

"In 1466, it was enacted that no craftsman should be a merchant unless he truly renounced his craft . . . And a merchant must not act as merchant for a craftsman". (3)

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, at the dawn of the Reformation, craft gilds, as such began to arise. They may more truly be regarded as pertaining to the new age and outlook

- (1) David Murray: "Early Burgh Organisation of Scotland", I, p. 343.  
(2) " " : " " " " " " , I, p. 343.  
(3) " " : " " " " " " , " , p. 346.



that was coming than to the old one that was passing.

"By the beginning of the sixteenth century their numbers were such as to induce various crafts to apply for corporate recognition". (1)

"In 1528 the Webster craft had the rules of their craft confirmed and approved with consent of the archbishop. . . . Hammermen in 1536 . . . Tailors in 1546; Masons in 1551; cordiners and Baskers in 1558, Bakers, Maltmen and Fleishers claim that they were likewise incorporated some time prior to the Reformation". (2)

"After the Reformation, the Coopers, Wrights, Surgeons and Barbers, Gardeners and Dyers and Bonnetmakers, respectively received Seals of Cause from the Magistrates (of Glasgow) at various times". (3)

The following two extracts from Glasgow regulations in the <sup>15</sup>thteenth century may be noticed:-

"Item - if rotten pork or salmon be brocht to the meycat for sale be ony, thei sal be seisit be the balyies, and sent incontinent to the lipperfolk without ony manere of question". (4)

"If a brewster wife made evil ale and acted contrary to the custom of the town, she was liable to a penalty of eight shillings - . . . and the ale sall be geyffin to the pure folk the twa part and the thyrd part send to the brethyr of the hospital". (5)

That apparent Craft Gilds were in reality Religious Gilds is shown by the following quotations. Under the heading of "Craft Gilds", David Murray writes,

"The Hammermen (of Perth) maintained the altar of St. Elvy, paid the salary of the chaplain and supplied him with vestments, and their records are full of entries showing that the altar was their constant care". (6)

(1) David Murray: "Early Burgh Organisation in Scotland", I, p. 360.

(2)	"	"	::	As above,	p. 362.
(3)	"	"	:	"	" , p. 364.
(4)	"	"	:	"	" , p. 263.
(5)	"	"	:	"	" , p. 265.
(6)	"	"	:	"	" , p. 374.



"In 1492 the deacon and brethern of the Craft of Barbiners or Weavers of Dundee "declared that they had an intention, in respect of the growth of grace and for the honour of St. Severus, the bishop, their patron saint, to found a chaplaincy beside the altar of the blessed Magnus the Martyr and to arrange for certain consents that were necessary .

These having been obtained the Weavers made statutes for supplying and upholding of divine service etc. . . . The Town Council in 1512 . . confirmed them". (1)

"In 1515 the Merchants of Dundee, with consent and authorisation of the Town Council, agree to erect an altar in the south aisle of the Parish Kirk . . . and to appoint a chaplain. . .

In order to provide for the reparation of the altar and uphold the service, the merchants were empowered by the council to choose a dean having authority to exact certain duties on all goods exported beyond the sea, to tax all merchants setting up booths or beginning business and to exact fines (2) . . all this for the service of the altar". (2)

(1) David Murray: "Early Burgh Organisation of Scotland", I,

p. 376.

(2) " " : As above, p. 387.

## Conclusion

We are now in a position to return to the issues raised in the Introduction.

We found that *κοινωνία* as it appears in the New Testament was an essential part of the gospel. It was closely related to the doctrine of the Kingdom of God and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We also found evidence to indicate that an element of *κοινωνία* is part of the essence of Ultimate Truth. Not only is Ultimate Truth 'personal', but it also involves *κοινωνία*. The *κοινωνία* of the Trinity is an essential aspect of the Godhead. Therefore, no matter how *κοινωνία* may be ignored, if we approach Ultimate Truth by any other road, the nearer we approximate to our goal, the more persistently will *κοινωνία* tend to reappear. When any avenue of approach leads men really near to God, we will find the re-emergence of *κοινωνία*, even though it may not have been directly transmitted thereto from its New Testament source. If, however, *κοινωνία* is not recognised as a necessary element of Truth, it will again be ignored and laid aside, and the quest towards Ultimate Truth will for some unaccountable reason be frustrated. We must, therefore, be prepared for the transitory and even mysterious re-appearance of *κοινωνία*, even although it may never have been 'built-in' as an established doctrine in the Systematic Theology of Western Europe.

It must be remembered, also, that the term *κοινωνία* as used above, and elsewhere, means 'Christian *κοινωνία*' in its full and deep connotation. This is to be clearly

distinguished from secular *κοινωνία*, which can be used to describe any external human partnership. In the LXX and in the papyri, as has been shown, *κοινωνία* has been used in this purely human and secular sense of 'partnership'. In the New Testament, however, the term, like *βαπτισμός*, became 'baptised' into the Christian vocabulary, and took on a new and deeper meaning. It came to designate the conditions under which the Holy Spirit was 'shared' by believers, as well as the 'sharing' itself. The *κοινωνία* became 'the common life in the Body of Christ'. This Christian *κοινωνία* is what we seek to designate by our ordinary use of the term.

We have seen that in the theology of Cassian and also in the theology and practice of Benedict, it had no place. The standpoint was essentially individualistic; the other factor was not recognised as an essential element of the true Christian life.

"In the early ages the concept of utility or purpose, other than the perfecting of the individual soul, does not appear to have entered into the ideal of the regular life. It was regarded merely as a systematised form of life on the lines of the Gospel counsels of perfection, to be lived for its own sake and as the full expression of the Church's true and perfect life". (1)

In consequence of this "

"as Bishop Ullathorne points out, the early Benedictine missionaries established monasteries not parishes". (2)

The essential individualism and patriarchal administration of the monasteries is further borne out by Cardinal Gasquet, who

(1) Gasquet: "Rule of St. Benedict", Intro. XIV.  
(2) Butler: "Benedictine Monachism", p. 127.

is quoted as saying,

"The monastic system established by St. Benedict was based entirely upon the supremacy of the abbot . . . Upon this principle of obedience to authority depended the power and success of the monastic system". (1)

From Benedictine Monachism the Western Church derived in this respect its interpretation of Christianity.

"The term 'Benedictine Centuries' applies to the six centuries between the middle of the sixth and the middle of the twelfth centuries . . . These centuries were called 'Benedictine' because during them the Benedictines were the chief religious, civilising, and educative influence in the Western Church". (2)

Consequently, a fundamental individualism was behind the concepts of both church and state which we find in the Middle Ages.

"The social system (of the Middle Ages) was intelligently organised on an individualistic basis in direct dependence on Nature, in associations which were based partly on brute force, quite rationally conceived, and also upon the

- (1) Butler: "Benedictine Monachism", p. 199.  
(2) " : " " " p. 77 (footnote).  
(3) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Church"  
(4) D'Entreves: "Aquinas. Selected Political Writings",

The structure

The structure of both church and state was patriarchal and architectonic. A certain unity, or even balanced harmony was the result of a superimposed order. The philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, which expounded the character of Church and State, showed itself to be architectonic in spirit, outlook and essence. Each person has his place, including the serf and the slave. Absolute monarchy is the best form of government. (4)

"The greatness of kingly virtue becomes further apparent from another fact; that is from a king's singular likeness to God; since a king

- (1) Butler: "Benedictine Monachism", p. 199.  
(2) " : " " " p. 77 (footnote).  
(3) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", I, 2d  
(4) D'Entreves: "Aquinas. Selected Political Writings", Ch. p.

does in his kingdom what God does in the universe". (1)

As something imposed from without, the political structure of the Middle Ages cannot be regarded as embodying the principle of Christian κοινωμία.

Superficially regarded, the resultant unities from these different approaches may not always be immediately distinguishable. The unity of a family, for example, may result from patriarchial authority where the father is lord and master. He rules his household; his wife and family are under him and obey him. The conception still survives in the Prayer Book marriage service. On the other hand, there is the conception of the home as a partnership in which the husband and wife together, build up their home life and share it with their children. In appearance the two homes may not radically differ, and yet at heart there is a real difference between them. This similarity in appearance, of what is at heart different, occurs in many spheres.

The life of society in the Middle Ages, as has been said, was patriarchial and architectonic. This was shown in Monastic life, - the abbot was supreme. It was shown in Church life, - the Pope was supreme. It was shown in civil life - the King was supreme. Under them those who received a delegated authority shared in the element of supremacy or administrative power. Thus the Prior, the Bishop and the Baron exercised in more limited spheres the same kind of authority.

(1) D'Entreves: "Aquinas. Selected Political Writings", p. 51.

To superficial observation it might seem at first sight as if the Christian *κοινωνία* of the early days reappeared in the Middle Ages in the restricted sphere of the monasteries, and, also, in the sphere, in civil life, of the medieval guilds. It was, therefore, in the expectation of finding at least some realisation of the early ideal in these spheres of medieval life that we concentrated our attention upon them. To our surprise the evidence has led us to very different conclusions. This particular doctrine was carefully eliminated from monasticism in its foundation. Up to the beginning of the thirteenth century, while monasticism still had the power of reformation from within, every movement of reform was inspired by a desire to return to a stricter observance of the spirit and outlook, if not the letter, of the Rule of St. Benedict. Thereafter monasticism shared in the spirit and outlook of the patriarchial and architectonic system of feudalism. Spiritually the outlook of monasticism is essentially individualistic; and this coloured the spiritual outlook of the entire medieval civilisation. The individualism of the modern age has its roots in the Middle Ages.

The medieval guilds have been shown to be predominantly religious. The religious purposes, however, were individualistic in their ethos and object. They were associations together, on the basis of secular *κοινωνία*, for the purpose of achieving thereby individualistic ends, which the members would have been unable to achieve by their own isolated efforts.

They were in fact 'co-operative chantries'. But the whole conception of the medieval guilds came far short of the New Testament conception of spiritual *κοινωνία*. As the Eucharist had become individualistic in the Mass, so the funeral benefits of the guilds (which was their chief "raison d'être") were distributed individually to their members. In fact the medieval religious guilds might be compared to a modern Mutual Insurance Company, where the contributions are paid mutually for the benefit of each at death; in the latter case the benefit is given in money, in the former in masses. It is still individualistic though the method of achieving its end is corporate. Care must be taken in all considerations of medieval guilds to derive our conclusions from medieval evidence only, and not from the practices, outlook, or life of the guilds of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Of the working of these later guilds we have abundant evidence, but it is neither applicable nor transferable to the earlier period. The earlier guilds were dominated by the Roman Catholic Church; the later guilds flourished in the spiritual freedom of the reformed lands and the difference which this made to the life and practice of the guilds was profound. Every guild history must be carefully scrutinised for this anachronism. Whether the post-reformation guilds at any time achieved the vision and practice of Christian *κοινωνία* is outwith the scope and enquiry of this thesis.

If evidence of this doctrine of Christian *κοινωνία* is not discovered in the life of monasteries or of the guilds, it is

unlikely it will be found in the social life of the people. The age was dominated by the Church and by religion. The Church claimed supremacy even over the State. The right of investiture was won by the Church. The social life of the period, therefore, could not reflect an outlook differing radically from that of the Church itself. Nevertheless, among rebels and heretics we do get from time to time evidence that there did arise periodically, in the minds of some, a vision of this doctrine as an essential element of the faith. For example, we have the record in 1281 A.D. of a protest, against the burden of entertaining visitations, from the clergy of the Deanery of Holderness. The preamble begins,

"If the beginnings of the early Church were called to mind it will be remembered that its members were one in faith, one in spirit, one in baptism and that having pooled their resources they all promised to supply the wants of the poor and to regard the needs of all as their own . . . And although there are many churches, yet they are compactly joined together in one body so that if one member suffers all the members suffer with it, or if one church should be desolate or oppressed all the others must needs share her grief. . . But to-day the Church is not only without nourishment but is even abandoned and rejected, weighed down with new burdens and unwanted oppression and there is scarcely anyone to bring her solace in all her troubles . . ."  
(Then follows a plea for a reduction in the number of officials and retainers requiring hospitality on a visitation!) (1)

Here we have a momentary vision on the part of the petitioners without their realising how far-reaching that vision could be relative to themselves.

(1) Moorman: "Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century", p. 121.



Our knowledge of the Peasants' Revolt comes almost entirely from their opponents. Direct evidence from the side of the peasants is slight. Froissart describes the preaching of John Ball in the following terms.

"Ah, ye good people, the matters goeth not well to pass in England, nor shall not till every-thing be common and that there be no villians nor gentlemen, but that we all be united together, and that the lords be no greater masters than we be. What have we deserved, or why should we be kept thus in servage? We be all come from one father and one mother, Adam and Eve; whereby can they say or show that they be greater lords than we be, saving that they cause us to win and labour for that they dispend?"

"Froissart had no sympathy for what he was reporting, but its tremendous import comes through him, in spite of himself". (1)

There seems no doubt that behind the preaching, which inspired the Peasants' Revolt in 1381, there lay some realisation, perhaps incompletely formulated, of the New Testament teaching on *κοινωνία*. There was also the realisation that it was in no way embodied in the social structure of the age. In fact the manner in which the Peasants' Revolt was crushed, and the attitude of both Church and State towards the peasants, once the tide had turned, emphasise the opposite. The attitude of the feudal lords is clearly expressed by King Richard himself in his reply to a deputation of the rebels after their defeat.

"Oh, miserable men, hateful both to land and sea unworthy even to live, you ask to be put on equality with your Lords. . . Serfs you have been and are; you shall remain in bondage, not such as you have hitherto been subjected to, but incomparably viler. For so long as we live and

(1) Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. VII, p. 739.

rule by God's grace over this kingdom we shall use our sense, our strength and our property to treat you that your slavery may be an example to posterity, and that those who live now and hereafter, who may be like you, may always have before their eyes, your misery and reasons for cursing you . . . " (1)

The sense of a national life that was 'shared' is far removed from this outlook.

We have also to consider the Statute of Labourers, 23 E III St. 1 and others following, the Acts of Parliament restricting the wearing of clothing according to the different classes of the nation, e.g. 3 Edward IV C 5 (1463 A.D.)

There were the acts preventing the indulgence in certain sports by those in the lower grades of society, e.g. 12 Richard II C 6 (1388 A.D.)

If the doctrine we are considering was not realised in the life of the monasteries nor in the life of the guilds, it was certainly not embodied in the social life of the people.

Even the building of the great Cathedrals did not embody that corporate spirit of unselfish service and devotion that is often credited to their construction.

"Equally fallacious", says A.H. Gardner, "are many theories of craft work in the Middle Ages. It has frequently been suggested that the period was a golden age when men worked for love of their craft and without stint . . . There is no shred of evidence for this legend. When the poor were little more than serfs, it is not to be imagined that they were allowed much freedom in their work, nor that they had any extraordinary love of it. In actual fact craftsmen were admonished that they 'should all be true and trustworthy in their office, whether they work by the day or by the piece, as many carpenters

(1) Lindsay & Groves: "The Peasants' Revolt", p. 136.

and masons do. When they labour by the day they shall not stand all the more idle that they may multiply the days of their work. If thou labourest by the piece, then thou shouldst not hasten too soon therefrom that thou mayest be rid of the work as quickly as possible and that the house may fall down in a year or two. (Bert-hold of Ratisbon, 1250-72)". (1)

To this may be added a note that at the beginning of the fifteenth century even an orthodox friar complained:

"It is to be feared that the solemn making of churches and the good arranging of them . . . is more of pomp and pride than to the worship of God". (2)

When we come to the Reformation Period the special doctrines which we are contrasting were not dealt with specifically by the reformers. A great deal of the Medieval background was accepted by them even while they 're-formed' the manner in which the doctrine of the Faith was expressed. The modern world 'grew out' of the medieval world; its roots are in the period we have been considering. The essential outlook of the Reformation and the Renaissance was individualistic rather than otherwise. Regarding Individualism and the Renaissance, Troeltsch makes the following comment:

"The Individualism developed by the Church . . . seized on the aesthetic methods of differentiation and training of the personality alongside of methods which are purely religious, and thus bit by bit the inheritance of antiquity was again brought to light as the method of a supplementation and cultivation of individualism in other than merely religious directions. As this developed the control of the church declined. Literature, art and science passed out of the hands of the church into the hands of the laity". (3)

- (1) A.H. Gardner: "Outline of English Architecture", p. 22.
- (2) G.G. Coulton: "Five Centuries of Religion", IV, p. 546.
- (3) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", I, p. 378.



by the name of callings. Every man's mode of life, therefore, is a kind of station assigned him by the Lord. . . . Everyone in his particular mode of life will, without repining, suffer its inconveniences, cares, etc. . . . persuaded that the Lord has laid on the burden. . . . In following your proper calling, no work will be so mean and sordid as not to have a splendour and value in the eye of God". (1)

Is Calvin's treatment of the Apostle's Creed in Book 2, Chapter 16 of his Institutes significant? In that chapter he gives an exposition following the framework of the Apostles' Creed. He concludes his comment, however, after the phrase<sup>2</sup> "to judge the quick and the dead" has been dealt with, and leaves untouched the whole final section of the creed, which includes "the communion of saints". Nor does he return to it. The omission appears to have been deliberate.

"Hitherto I have followed", he said, "the order of the Apostles' Creed because it states the leading articles of redemption in a few words, and may thus serve as a Tablet in which the points of Christian doctrine, most deserving of attention, are brought separately and distinctly before us". (2)

When in Section 19 he summarises 'the whole sum of our salvation going over the steps of the Creed, he again omits reference to the last section. In dealing with the Church Calvin says:

"I will begin with the Church into whose bosom God is pleased to collect his children, not only that by her aid and ministry they may be nourished so long as they are babes and children, but may also be guided by her maternal care until they grow up to manhood, and finally attain to the perfection of faith". . . . (3)

"Regard must be had to the secret election

- (1) John Calvin: "Institutes of the Christian Religion", Book 3, Chapter X, Section 6.  
 Compare with Aquinas as quoted on p. 143 above  
 (2) " : As above, Book II, Chapter 16, Section 18.  
 (3) " : " " " VI, " 1, " 1.

and to the internal calling of God, because he alone "knoweth them that are his" . . . they are a small and despised number, concealed in an immense crowd like a few grains of wheat buried among a heap of chaff, to God alone must be left the knowledge of his Church, of which his secret election forms the foundation". (1)

The doctrine of election makes the Church a collection of individuals who have a common bond only because each is united to Christ. The conception is individualistic in its theological outlook. The great conflict of his age, however, was with the Roman Church, was the struggle for the 'freedom of the Christian man', and the obsession of his age was with soteriology and election. The aspect of doctrine that is before us was scarcely considered. Where the subject of the 'Church' was dealt with it was essentially the functioning of the *ἐκκλησία* that was discussed.

A study of Reformation theology is outwith the immediate scope of this thesis. Nevertheless the comment of Troeltsch on Calvinism should be noticed:

"The impression that Calvinism fosters on atomistic individualism in which the community merely consists of the sum of the individuals composing it, is only a superficial idea, which fastens on the external process through which this society is built up". (2)

In a sense, however, Calvinism almost developed a new type of individualism.

"All Calvinistic peoples are characterised by individualism and by democracy, combined with a strong bias towards authority and a sense of the unchangeable nature of law. It is this combination which makes a conservative democracy

(1) Calvin: "Institutes of the Christian Religion", Bk. VI, Ch. 1, Section 2.

(2) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", II, p. 598.

possible, whereas in Lutheran and Catholic countries, as a matter of course, democracy is forced into an aggressive and revolutionary attitude". (1) We recall the scriptures, "By their fruits ye shall know them".

We may come to the general conclusion, therefore, that, so far as the development of the Christian doctrine of *κοινωνία* was concerned, the Reformation theology effected no radical change on the religious outlook of St. Benedict.

If this is true of the officially formulated doctrine, a wider vision appears from time to time elsewhere, and also in the practice and experience of the Reformed Church. It appears in Sir David Lindsay's 'Satire of the Three Estates' where towards the end 'Correction' pronounces judgment, and addressing the Merchants and the Lords Temporal says

"The Common-Weal tak by the hand,  
And mak with him perpetual band!"  
("Here call the Temporal Staitis, to wit, the  
Lords and Merchants, embrace John the  
Common-Weal".)

\* \* \* \* \*

Later - Gude Counsel: (to Correction)

"Give John the Common-Weal ane gay garboun;  
Because the Common-Weal has been ewrelockit,  
That is the cause that Common-Weal is cruikit.  
With singular profit he has been sae suppressit,  
That he is baith cauld, nakit and diagysit".

Correction:

"As ye have said, Father, I am content,  
Sergeants, give John ane new aboulyement!  
Of satin, damask or of the velvet fine  
And give him place into our Paximent synoi"

(Music. They clothe John 'gorgeously' and set  
him down among them in the Parliament.)

It was a real vision of what Christian *κοινωνία* in action could mean, - even though it was not so named.

(1) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", II, p. 619.

In the movement of the Reformation itself much of its power originated from the fellowship of groups on a deep spiritual level into the midst of which the Holy Spirit came with power. This element in the source of much of its power was unrecognised and, as such, was not embodied in the formal theology of the Reformed Church. Without considering the question further in the Reformation Period itself, we may now look for certain examples of its emergence in the intervening centuries until to-day, under the general religious ethos of the Reformed Faith. Neither the enquiry, nor the examples, are intended to be exhaustive. Representative instances alone are cited as part of the general argument.

The movement of Quakerism is illuminating in this respect. It began in the initial experience and preaching of George Fox with a strong element of individualistic mysticism, (1) but developed and gained its power through the incorporation of an intense Christian *κοινωνία* into its life and teaching.

"Mysticism is frequently self-centred and absorbed with the inward gaze . . . 'And leaving human wrongs to right themselves, Cares but to pass into the silent life'.

There was, however, in the Quaker movement a moral earnestness and a social intensity which saved it from the easy pitfalls of mystical quests. . . . They never lost their hold upon the central purpose of their lives - to transform this present world and these actual human fellows about them to the end that the will of God might become the will of men, and that society here on earth might take on a likeness to the Kingdom of Heaven. Fox had his first awakening, not over his own sins, but over the moral conditions and social customs about him".

(1) Wm. C. Braithwaite: "Beginnings of Quakerism", Intro.  
p. 42.



"Like the divine peoples at Pentecost, they (the followers of George Fox), found themselves swept by a common Spirit, and baptized into an integral, organic life. . . . They rose together to a new level, underwent common experiences, and formed a single family group". (1)

To begin with George Fox's preaching was mystical and individualistic, but the accession of a vigorous community of Westmorland Seekers greatly enriched the intellectual and spiritual forces of the movement, and made possible its further extension on a large scale. (2)

"It provided the new movement with a type of meeting out of which the Friends' meeting could naturally develop, and with an existing organisation, immature no doubt, but sufficiently established to provide, corporate fellowship to a number of groups of persons who met in their own meetings, but also kept in touch with one another". (3)

The description of their experience, quoted from early records, is illuminating.

". . . Their hearts were knit to one another and to the Lord in fervent love, not by any external covenant or form, but in the covenant of life with God, and they met together in the unity of the Spirit, treading down all contentions about religion or its practices. The more they found opportunity for waiting together, the more were they strengthened in their hope and faith . . . The new experience brought with it a fresh glow of spiritual life and a fresh fervour of fellowship, which filled men with wonder and joy. The fellowship of Pentecost . . . was reproduced . . . ". (4)

Speaking of 1654 Braithwaite writes,

"Group life of the simplest kind began inevitably and naturally from the first; indeed it was

- |     |                     |                            |                |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| (1) | Wm. C. Braithwaite: | "Beginnings of Quakerism", | Intro. p.33.   |
| (2) | " "                 | " "                        | " " " " p. 94. |
| (3) | " "                 | " "                        | " " " " p. 95. |
| (4) | " "                 | " "                        | " " " " p. 96. |

characteristic of Fox that he won men to an acceptance of his message not merely as individuals but most often in groups. . . . The experience of the indwelling light of Christ gave them a new ground of fellowship . . . As sharers together in this great experience, they were closely knit to one another in a unity of spirit of which those around them knew nothing". (1)

". . . By the year 1660 the Quaker groups were already vividly conscious of their spiritual fellowship with one another . . . ". (2)

"The Quaker manner of life tended from the first . . . to give to the members of these groups a special kind of corporate life." (3)

"In the early ages Christianity the sense of brotherhood among the disciples of Christ had been so strong as to dissolve all social distinctions, and there was something of the same experience among the early Friends . . . the Quaker groups took the burden of relieving their own poor . . . ". (4)

The Quakers in their experience found again the power and secret of *κοινωνία* but it was never a central factor in their 'creed' and so was not sufficiently recognised or built in to their way of life to be adequately preserved: this, together with other weaknesses in their position, has led gradually to their reducing influence and lack of growth. When, however, their spiritual life was most vital the sense of 'fellowship' as belonging to the spiritual life emerged.

The part played by "fellowships" in the Evangelical Revival and spiritual awakening of the eighteenth century was very considerable. The deadness and formality of the established religion is a by-word with historians of the period.

- |     |                     |                            |              |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| (1) | Wm. C. Braithwaite: | "Beginnings of Quakerism", | pp. 130-131. |
| (2) | " " " :             | " " " "                    | , p. 508.    |
| (3) | " " " :             | " " " "                    | , p. 499.    |
| (4) | " " " :             | " " " "                    | , p. 495.    |

Enthusiasm was at a discount. The reaction against Puritanism continued. The spiritual life of the common people was largely being neglected. But the Spirit of God is not thwarted.

"After the Puritans were overwhelmed and the days of the Merry Monarch came . . . religious fellowships were not likely to be popular. Yet it was in the reign of Charles II and within the borders of the Established Church that they sprang up again. About the year 1678 through the influence of Dr. Anthony Horneck and Mr. Smithies, a number of young men in London, who were seeking to lead a holy life, began to meet together . . . the societies consisted of baptised and confirmed members of the Church of England only. They were led by clergy . . . Practical divinity was their theme. The Christian life of love, almsgiving and service was their aim". (1)

The development of these societies at the time throughout the Church of England was spontaneous and widespread, and showed how ready the soil was for the seed that Wesley was to sow. There was, however, little recognition of the essential place of 'fellowship' in the Christian gospel.

"Dean Hook, in his Church Dictionary, defined Fellowship as 'an establishment in one of the colleges of a university . . . with a share in its revenue'. This definition has been used to prove that, in the Dean's day, the very idea of Christian fellowship had died out in the Church of England. This may not be quite fair . . . There is, however, enough truth in the criticism to make it worth repeating. Fellowship, which was one of the four elements of the Pentecostal Church, was but little in evidence in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (2)

- (1) Archibald W. Harrison: "The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion", p. 27.  
 (2) " " " : As above, p. 26.



formed his disciples into small groups called Societies and gave them regulations which required the exercise of the social virtues. In all cases the Societies were divided into smaller groups, described as bands and classes. The weekly meetings of the bands and classes were expressions of social, as well as religious duties and fellowship". (1)

Yet while all this is true, it must not be forgotten that Methodism was essentially individualistic, and all these groups and classes existed for individualistic purposes. Great internal controversy raged around the particular individualistic doctrine the different sections favoured. And the movement soon came to display that dissipated tendency which this type of doctrine so easily creates.

"Like the original (Methodist) group at Oxford, the first and foremost purpose of these societies was personal, individualistic, spiritual. They harboured no ulterior motive. They were brought into being for religious purposes, to enable every member in company and fellowship with others to work out his own individual salvation". (2)

This reminds one very strongly of the monks for whom St. Benedict wrote his Rule that in the 'coenobium' they might work out their individual salvation. Nevertheless it is apparent that the conception and experience of fellowship had a very strong place in the Methodist movement. It was the source of much of their strength and spiritual power. It was often their means and weapon of evangelism. But its central place and doctrinal significance were not appreciated nor self-consciously realised. Where fellowship with man and with God

(1) Robert F. Wearmouth: "Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century", p. 229.

(2) " " " : As above, p. 115.

is not acknowledged, or regarded as the true end of life, then differences come to be magnified and divisions widen. How much of the growing weakness of Methodism and its multiple divisions are due to this doctrinal weakness it is difficult to say, for Methodism "stressed the conversion of the individual as the very soul of Christianity". (1)

In Cambuslang the tradition still persists that before the revival under Whitefield occurred, numerous small groups of praying people had sprung up within the community. (2) The spiritual awakening of the eighteenth Century was definitely associated with a re-discovery of *κοινωνία* in its power, in its effectiveness and in its demands. But as this was not clearly realised, much of the secret of the Revival was lost to subsequent generations and even, to some extent, at the time to

The whole movement demonstrates anew that the Spirit of God is not stopped nor thwarted by the blindness, ignorance nor selfishness of men. In a completely individualistic age the Spirit of God burst through to bring, even by individualistic methods, the gospel of the grace of God to the souls of men. Men may come to God by many paths; but if they come in solitary or individual ways they find a strange hunger for this missing fellowship when they get there.

The element of fellowship which appeared in the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century, may be taken as the beginning of a modern movement towards this forgotten aspect of

(1) Archibald W. Harrison: "The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion", p. 179.

(2) I was assistant in Cambuslang Old Church - the information was gathered personally.

the Faith. In many different departments of life we find a growing consciousness of what is missing. They do not all, of course, express it in religious terms, or even, perhaps, realise that fundamentally it is a spiritual issue. But certain factors are common to each of these divergent streams of thought viz. a sense of dis-satisfaction with individualistic conceptions which apparently satisfied past generations; a yearning after some new integration or unity; a growing realisation that, in whatever sphere we are dealing with, corporateness is an aspect of reality that must be reckoned with. We find, therefore, in modern life different streams of thought, which seem to be flowing towards a common centre. In that centre we believe that there will be found the Christian revelation of  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\alpha$ , with its distinctive application to every department of human life and human thought, and to every aspect of reality. Beyond that  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\nu\iota\alpha$ , in its earth-bound aspect, there is living fellowship with Christ and with the atoning significance of His incarnation and of the Cross, which leads to the very presence of God Himself. In the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit, God the Father and the resurrected Christ return to earth and to all the departments of human life and thought.

Human fellowship on a sufficiently intense spiritual level is so powerful in leading people into fellowship with God that it does so almost in spite of what particular theological doctrines are held.

The spiritual revivals of the nineteenth century owed much

of their power to an intense experience of spiritual fellowship. Critics called it "mass hysteria". People would be willing to accept any doctrine provided that at such a price they could achieve this spiritual fellowship, of which life itself offered them so little, but for which their souls so desperately craved. Take the one example of the Oxford Group Movement. Theologically the movement is weak. "Holy Spirit unitarians", someone rather unkindly called them. Philosophically, four absolutes are a self-contradiction. Psychologically their practice of 'guidance' will often interpret the voice of the Freudian unconscious as the voice of God. But - they achieved, for a time at least, a Christian *Koinonía*. One had only to attend one of their house parties to be impressed and infected by it. For the sake of this exhilarating and transforming fellowship men and women were willing to make considerable and sometimes painful adjustments in their lives.

At the present time it would seem as if the human mind was reaching after a new synthesis, a new integration, a new wholeness, a new togetherness. Not only in religion but in every sphere of human life is this becoming manifest. Just as the movement of tidal waters can never be explained by considering terrestrial circumstances alone, so to account for these movements of the human spirit in these days we may also have to look beyond the earth. Let us therefore briefly indicate movements of human thought in different departments of life which seem to be pointing in this general direction, where something akin to this neglected doctrine might be found.



It is interesting to observe something analogous in the sphere of science.

"Physics, by its own results, has been brought to a critical juncture. Either it must rest content with an insoluble riddle, or it must venture out of its own territory and undertake to dismantle the foundations upon which the whole of our Western thinking has hitherto been built. By doing so, it trespasses upon the field of philosophy. With very few exceptions our younger physicists are of the opinion that the dualism of corpuscle and wave, particle and field, presents us not merely with a problem in physics . . . but rather with an ultimate philosophical problem. It seems as if our thinking had gone astray inside a labyrinth, and we can see no way out." (1)

The old classical atomic theory has broken down, where the atom was the ultimate irreducible constituent of matter. Between the theory of relativity, with its recognition of the finiteness of the speed of light on the one hand, and the quantum theory on the other, there is the recognition that no atom, or even 'object-system', can be truly studied or understood apart from its environment. In other words, in the language of this thesis, you cannot separate the unit from its physical *κοινωνία*. This leads to the philosophical conclusion that is reached by an advanced scientist, that 'the whole universe . . . is a partner in every problem'. (2)

Correspondingly also, the difficulties we have in considering together individualism and *κοινωνία* in the social and spiritual life of humanity have their analogy in the problems of modern science. The corpuscular theory of light, which might be compared to 'individualism', studied alone,

(1) Karl Heim: "The Transformation of the Scientific World View", p. 50.

(2) Eddington: "Fundamental Theory", p. 13.

gives satisfactory results up to a certain point; the wave, or 'corporate', theory likewise studied alone gives satisfactory results up to a certain point. But they seem from their very nature alternatives. The scientific solution of the dilemma is the theory of complementarity, (1) namely, that both are simultaneously true, but only one or the other can be studied by finite human minds at any given time. To omit either is to give ultimately an unbalanced and incomplete view of scientific truth.

The analogy to the difficulty of the simultaneous consideration of individualism and *κοινωνία* is very striking. So also is the fact that the scientific world view, which corresponded to the theological individualistic view of the nineteenth century and earlier, is undergoing a profound and fundamental change, and this change might be described as in the direction of the recognition of the partnership of all phenomena.

The development of modern psychological thought is also not without its significance in this connection. Jung in his study of the collective unconscious and the significance of archetypes has moved far from the idea of the atomic isolation of the individual. In fact the conception of 'individuality' through the 'individuation process' is regarded more as something to be attained rather than as the elementary starting point. (2) While from another angle, W. Trotter in "Instincts

(1) For an excellent account of this principle, first proposed by Bohr, in connection with the dual nature of light and matter see *Dialectica*, Vol 2, No. 3/4.

(2) Frieda Fromm-Reichmann: *An Introduction to Jung's Psychology*, Ch.3 & 4. Jung: "Modern Man, in Search of a Soul".

of the Herd in Peace and War", has indicated the tremendous psychological influence of human association on personal conduct and also the fundamental need for such association, in some form, for the true satisfaction and inward peace of the human psyche. He has indicated the importance of the herd instinct. It is a factor in nearly every mental conflict. Until it is reckoned with and given its true place in life the fully harmonised and integrated personality will not be achieved. This also is in harmony with the basic trend and direction of modern thought.

In Lewis Mumford we have an American thinker who, in his outlook, is far ahead of most of his contemporaries. In four volumes of comprehensive and penetrating thought, he has dealt largely with the fundamental issues we have raised in the Introduction. Mumford finds a major evidence of the spiritual collapse of the last century in the gogue of what he calls "pragmatic liberalism", based on a false conception of liberty and of the individual as an isolate. (1)

He recognises the need for the development of the whole personality of man.

"The ideal personality for the opening age is a balanced personality: not the specialist but the whole man. . . . God must work within us . . . Unless we now rebuild ourselves all our external triumphs will crumble . . . Do our individual life-plans make for a universal society? . . . Do our public life-plans make for the fulfilment and renewal of the human person, so that they will bear fruit in a life abundant . . . ever more deeply experienced and more widely shared? . . ."

(2)

In "The Culture of Cities", he expounds the necessity of

(1) Lewis Mumford: "The Story of Utopias", p. 95.  
(2) " " : "The Condition of Man", pp. 419-423.

an organic community within which the human personality may develop. In the development of 'The Insensate Industrial May Town' (1) he traced how the human personality was disintegrated between work and leisure and the social community was disintegrated between employer and employed. In the rise and size of Metropolis he showed how organic community was finally destroyed in bigness. In the 'Rise and Fall of Megalopolis' he traced the development of conditions in which for multitudes the living of human life in its wholeness became impossible. He headed his description thereof "A Brief Outline of Hell". (2) He pled for a social basis of the new urban order, and the creation of an organic community within which an integrated and developing human life in its wholeness might at least have the possibility of being realised.

In his analysis from this angle of the economic and sociological conditions of the present era, he has rendered yeoman service. For example, in 'The Story of Utopias' he says,

"To Plato a good community was like a healthy body, a harmonious exercise of every function as the condition of its strength and vitality. Therefore a good community could not be simply a collection of individuals each of whom insists on some private and particular happiness without respect to the welfare and interest of his fellows. The secret of the good community is the principle of function. A place for every man, and every man in his place. e.g. a modern symphony orchestra". (3)

"Nineteenth Century utopias are all machinery; the means has become the end, and the genuine problem of ends has been forgotten". (4)

(1) Lewis Mumford: "The Culture of Cities", p. 143 f.  
(2) " " : " " " " " , p. 272.

(3) " " : "The Story of Utopias", p. 40.  
(4) " " : " " " " " , p. 147.

"Instead of a whole man interacting in a whole community, we consider only a partial man in a partial community, and by a mental sleight of hand, before we know it, we have let the part stand for the whole. - The error of the Economic Man". (1)

Lewis Mumford has given considerable study to the historical sociological outlook of Christianity and has traced it in "The Condition of Man". One feels, however, that while most of his comment on Christianity is externally correct, he misses much because he has not seen it, or has not studied it, with the vision of faith. There is more in the Christian norm than he has appreciated. Nevertheless his thought represents a tremendous advance on American outlook and indeed on that of Western civilisation. He appreciates the need of community, the function of community for personality, and that the emergence of the 'hollow' community and the 'hollow' man are at ~~least~~ <sup>heart</sup> the emergence of one problem. He expounds clearly also that the survival of our civilisation depends on our solving this problem and creating the social conditions permitting the wholeness of life and perhaps even the attaining of that wholeness of life. (2)

He has travelled far; he is looking in the right direction; a little further and a full vision of Christian κοινωνία may reveal much that is presently hidden in the mists of obscurity.

Martin Buber, in his "Paths in Utopia", has in some respect

- (1) Lewis Mumford: "The Story of Utopias", p. 239.  
(2) " " : "The Condition of Man", Ch. XI.

gone further, or deeper, than Mumford. In his outlook he also exemplifies this trend of modern thought.

"Most Experimental Settlements", he says, "came to grief or petered out - not as some think the communist ones alone. Those founded on religion survived. It is precisely where a Settlement comes into being as an expression of real religious exaltation, and not merely as a precarious substitute for religion, and where it views its existence as the beginning of God's Kingdom, that it usually proves its powers of endurance". (1)

"Owen's experiment, 'New Harmony in Indiana', failed. Owen's confession was that the attempt to unite a number of strangers not previously educated for the purpose, who should live together as a common family, was premature, and that the habits of the individual system die hard". (2)

The fact is, however, that ordinary *κοινωνία* is insufficient. And Owen had no use for religion.

"The more a man, or humanity, is mastered by individuality, the deeper he sinks into unreality". (3)

"Christianity stands for a spiritual revolution, for the creation of a new type of community and of a new future from the lower ranks of society". (4)

This developing outlook has deeply affected religious thought.

L.S. Thornton in "The Common Life in the Body of Christ" has undertaken a detailed and exegetical consideration of Christian *κοινωνία* as it appears in the New Testament. He has not merely traced the incidence of the term but also the emergence of the idea or the conception so indicated.

(1) Martin Buber: "Paths in Utopia", p. 73.

(2) " " : " " " , p. 75.

(3) " " : " " " , p. 74.

(4) Troeltsch: "Social Teaching of the Christian Churches", I, p. 68.



vertical relations. The fellowship of the members with one another in the peace of Christ depends upon the control of Christ's love over all, upon the communion of all with Christ as co-partners in a common life. That common life is the life which Christ lives in all the members as He dwells in each of them". (1)

"The life common <sup>to</sup> Christ and His Church does not exist for its own sake. It has a mediatorial character. The Messiah and his people are sent from God to the world. The nature of the mission and the burden of its message are for ever embodied in the life of the divine-human organism. This embodied revelation is the sole ultimate channel of God's appeal to the world which He loves". (2)

"The divine-human *κοινωνία* between Christ and the Church issues from and reproduces the divine *κοινωνία* between the Father and the Son. By communion with her Lord the Church shares His thoughts and partakes of His sacrifice". (3)

In these quotations we have sought to indicate the fundamental thought of this very detailed work. Some of the statements may seem unduly sweeping. No attempt seems to have been made to study or trace the implications of this outlook for modern industrial society. Nevertheless the book shows an outlook and line of development in the religious sphere such as we have tried to indicate is already happening in other spheres of modern thought. As might have been expected from the nature of the theme, the religious development is deeper; it goes further or is more advanced than the others.

- (1) L.S. Thornton: "The Common Life in the Body of Christ", p. 154.  
 (2) " " " : As above, p. 444.  
 (3) " " " : " " " p. 313.



We have chosen these distinctive movements because they seem to point to or gravitate towards a common centre. (There are, of course, other movements of a disintegrating nature pointing in the opposite direction.) We believe that ultimately in that common centre there will be found, if not actually some form or concept of Christian *KOINONIA*, then something in some way approximating to it. We also feel that it is in this direction that the solution, or healing, of the disintegrating forces that are undermining our modern civilisation are to be found.

To this movement or development of modern thought this thesis is respectfully submitted as a humble contribution.

List of Books Consulted.

(Books consulted generally are given under one chapter only.)

Introduction

Emil Brunner	: Communism, Capitalism and Christianity
John Baillie	: The Belief in Progress.
" "	: What is Christian Civilisation?
" "	: Invitation to Pilgrimage.
Barbara Ward	: The West at Bay.
Arthur Bryant	: English Saga.
R.H. Tawney	: Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.
Martin Buber	: Paths in Utopia.
" "	: I and Thou.
Berdyaev	: Freedom and the Spirit.
James Jeans	: Physics and Philosophy.
Lincoln Bennett	: The Universe and Dr. Einstein.
Alexis Carrel	: Man, the Unknown.
A.J. Toynbee	: Study of History.
" " "	: Civilisation on Trial.
J.B. Coates	: The Crisis of the Human Person.
Lionel Curtis	: The Atomic Age.
Bertrand Russell	: History of Western Civilisation.
Hans Reichenbach	: Atom and Cosmos.
Pearce and Crocker	: The Peckham Experiment.
Peter Green	: The Christian Man.
George S. Hendry	: God the Creator.

MacNeille Dickson	: Apology for the Arts.
" "	: The Human Situation.
Selected essayists	: The Predicament of the Church.
Albert Schweitzer	: On the Edge of the Primeval Forest.
George Seaver	: Albert Schweitzer.
Magnus Ratter	: " " "
Valentine	: The Treatment of Moral and Emotional Difficulties.
Elton Trueblood	: Signs of Hope in a Century of Despair.
Ian Henderson	: Can Two Walk Together?
Aldous Huxley	: The Perennial Philosophy.
G.G. Finney	: Revivals of Religion.
C.S. Lewis	: Beyond Personality.
G.M. Trevelyan	: History of England.
" " "	: English Social History.
Lewis Mumford	: The Story of Utopias.
" "	: The Culture of Cities.
" "	: The Condition of Man.
" "	: The Conduct of Life.
H.A.L. Fisher	: History of Europe.
Sir Paul Dukes	: Come Hammer, Come Sickle.
Edward Crankshaw	: Russia and the Russians.
Arthur Koestler	: The Yogi and the Commissar.
S. Mikolajizyk	: The Pattern of Soviet Domination.
Mazz and Engels	: The Communist Manifesto.

Chapter 1

- Karl Barth : Chapter 1 the Romans.
- Falconer : Pastoral Epistles: I Timothy.
- Westcott : Commentary on Hebrews.
- International Critical  
Commentary : - Selected volumes.
- A.S. Peake : One Volume Commentary.
- Menzies : History of Religion.
- Edwin Smith : The Golden Stool.
- Sveto : History of the Doctrine of the  
Procession of the Holy Spirit.
- Wheeler Robinson : Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit
- Evelyn Underhill : Worship.
- A. Dupont-Sommer : Dead Sea Scrolls.
- George Milligan : New Testament Documents.
- Moulton & Milligan : Vocabulary of New Testament Greek.
- A. Deissmann : Light from the Ancient East.
- Moulton : From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps.
- Trench : New Testament Synonyms.
- Hastings : Dictionary of the Bible - Selected  
articles.
- Expositors Greek Testament.
- Cambridge Greek Testament.
- A. Souter : Novum Testamentum Graece.
- The Septuagint.
- Dictionaries and Concordances.

Chapter 2.

Owen Chadwick	: John Cassian.
A. Harnack	: Monasticism: Its Idols and History.
F.A. Gasquet	: The Rule of St. Benedict.
" " "	: English Monastic Life.
C. Butler	: Benedictine Monachism.
Dawson	: Religion and the Rise of Western Culture.
E. Troeltsch	: The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches ( 2 vols.)
D.D. Knowles	: The Monastic Order in England.
G.G. Coulton	: Five Centuries of Religion (4 vols.).
" " "	: The Medieval Village.
" " "	: Social Life in Medieval England.
" " "	: Medieval Panorama.
" " "	: Scottish Abbeys and Social Life.
Mitchell & Lye	: History of the English People.
Rule of St. Columbanus:	Praenaticorum Veterum (1604).
Life of St. Columbanus:	
H.B. Workman	: Evolution of the Monastic Ideal.
Hettensen	: Documents of the Christian Church.
H.E. Butler	: Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond.
James Morton	: Translation of "The Ancren Riwle". A treatise on the rules and duties of Monastic life.
E. Cutts	: Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages.
Dean Church	: St. Anselm.
Moorman	: Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century.

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Salzman   | : | English Life in the Middle Ages.                         |
| A.H. Gardiner   | : | Outline of English Architecture.                         |
| Boissonnade   | : | Life and Work in Medieval Europe.                        |
| Thorndike   | : | Medieval Europe.   |
| Frederick Harrison  | : | Medieval Man and his Notions.                            |
| Denholm-Young   | : | Collected Papers on Medieval Subjects.                   |
| Régine Pernoud  | : | The Glory of the Medieval World.                         |
| Sir Walter Besant   | : | Medieval London.   |
| G.T. Salusbury  | : | Street Life in Medieval England.                         |
| G.K. Chesterton   | : | St. Thomas Aquinas.                                      |
| A. Fortescue  | : | The Mass.  |
| James Norman  | : | Handbook to the Christian Liturgy.                       |
| A.R. Myers  | : | England in the late Middle Ages.                         |
| D'Entreves  | : | Aquinas, Selected Political Writings.                    |
| Thomas Carlyle  | : | Past and Present.  |
| " "   | : | Sartor Resartus.   |
| Barnard   | : | Companion to English History (Middle Ages).              |
| Wisconsin Academy Transactions, Vol XL, Part 2, "Medieval Housing". |   |  |
| R. Trevor Davies  | : | Medieval England 1066-1500.                              |
| Eileen Power  | : | Medieval People.   |
| Cambridge Medieval History (Selected chapters).                     |   |  |
| James Benthall  | : | History of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely.   |
| G.H. Pugh   | : | Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages (2 vols.). |
| G. Baskerville  | : | English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries.    |

Chapters 3 & 4.

- |                                 |   |   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Toulmin Smith                   | : | English Gilds.  |
| Charles Gross                   | : | The Gild Merchant (2 vols.).                            |
| H.F. Westlake                   | : | Parish Gilds of Medieval England.                       |
| A.D. Trail                      | : | Social England ( 2 vds.).                               |
| Encyclopedia Brittanica:        | : | 11th Edition; Articles on "Gilds"<br>by Charles Gross.  |
| Catholic Encyclopedia :         | : | Article on "Gilds".                                     |
| Wm James Ashley                 | : | The Economic Organisation of England.                   |
| George Clune                    | : | The Medieval Gild System.                               |
| P. Lindsay & R. Groves:         | : | The Peasants' Revolt (1381).                            |
| T. Johnston                     | : | History of the Working Classes in<br>Scotland.          |
| Chalmers                        | : | Caledonia.  |
| D.S. Rutherford                 | : | Biggar - St. Mary's.                                    |
| H.P. Stokes                     | : | 'Corpus Christi' - Cambridge College<br>Histories.      |
| John Lamb                       | : | History of Corpus Christi College.                      |
| Mary Bateson                    | : | Cambridge Gild Records.                                 |
| " "                             | : | Minute Book of Gild of St. Mary at<br>Cambridge (1298). |
| T.W. Maitland and<br>M. Bateson | : | Cambridge Borough Charters.                             |
| W.M. Palmer                     | : | Cambridge Borough Documents.                            |
| Cooper                          | : | Annals of Cambridge.                                    |
| Mary Bateson                    | : | Records of the Borough of Leicester.                    |
| " "                             | : | Borough Customs.  |
| Barnard                         | : | Companion to English History in the<br>Middle Ages.     |
| George Unwin                    | : | Gilds and Companies of London.                          |

- H.H. Bobart : Records of the Basket-makers' Company.
- F. Consitt : The London Weavers' Company.
- G. Elkington : The Coopers: Company and Craft.
- Sylvia L. Thrupp : The Merchant Class of Medieval London.
- David Murray : Early Burgh Organisation in Scotland.
- John Irvine : History of Dumbartonshire.
- R.D. Thomson : Affairs of Dumbarton Merchant Guildry.
- " " : Transactions of Trade Corporations of Dumbarton.
- J.D. Mackie : The Earlier Tudors 1485-1558.
- H.A.L. Fisher : Political History of England 1485-1547
- A.F. Pollard : Political History of England 1547-1603
- G.R. Owst : Preaching in Medieval England.
- Statutes of the Realm : Volumes 1 - 4.
- State Papers : Selected Volumes.
- Extracts from Edinburgh Records to 1560.
- Charters and Documents relating to the City of Edinburgh (1113A - 1540A.D.)
- English Historical Review: Selected Volumes.
- Sedburgh School Register.
- Dictionary and Encyclopedia of Education: Selected articles.
- Foster Watson : The English Grammar Schools to 1660.
- " " : The Old Grammar Schools.
- Rotha Mary Clay : The Medieval Hospitals of England.
- Howard Staunton : The Great Schools of England.
- A.M. Stowe : English Grammar Schools.
- J.H. Lupton : Life of Dean Colet.
- J.G.C. Minchin : Our Public Schools.
- Christopher Vase : Considerations Concerning Free Schools as settled in England (1678 A.D.)



- Munroe : History of Education.
- Parker : The History of Modern Elementary Education.
- Documents: Gild of St. Mary - Cambridge - Chancery Certificate
- Dumbarton Burgh Charters - 1222 (copy), 1609 (original).

---

Conclusion

- L.S. Thornton : The Common Life in the Body of Christ.
- John Calvin : Institutes of the Christian Religion, (2Vols.)
- T.M. Lindsay : History of the Reformation (2 vols.).
- S. Freud : The Interpretation of Dreams.
- " " : Psychopathology in Everyday Life.
- Pfister : Love in Children.
- Baudouin : Suggestion and Autosuggestion.
- Tansley : The New Psychology.
- McKenzie : Psychology, Psychotherapy and Evangelicalism.
- W. Trotter : Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War.
- Karl Heim : The Transformation of the Scientific World View.
- E. Whittaker : From Euclid to Eddington.
- Dialectica : Vol 2, Nos. 3/4.
- Frieda Nordham : An Introduction to Jung's Psychology.
- C.G. Jung : Modern Man in Search of a Soul.
- E.B. Emmott : The Story of Quakerism.
- Wm. C. Braithwaite: The Beginnings of Quakerism.
- S. Baring-Gould : The Evangelical Revival.
- Robt. F. Wearmouth: Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century.
- A.W. Harrison : The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion.
-