

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

December, 1911.

The Month.

The General Unrest. As the year 1911 draws onward to an end its sun seems to be setting in waves of angry and far-reaching unrest. We can only trust and pray that, under God's guiding hand, order may be brought out of the chaos, and that 1912 may witness the dawn of brighter days. The Report of the Railway Commission has been received by the various railway unions in a spirit of fierce hostility. A large number of the country's workers are in a state of seething discontent. The turbulence at home finds its counterpart in the warfare on the northern shores of Africa. The contest around Tripoli is to be no bloodless and lightly won campaign. It has already been marked by fierce, ruthless, and sanguinary fighting. It is a war full of dreadful possibilities. Quite apart from any question of the general peace of Europe, there is the problem of its effect on the whole Mohammedan world. If a Holy War be proclaimed, to be waged by Arabs in the fastness of the desert, Italy may find herself involved in long and costly conflict. And, what is perhaps a matter of more serious import, the mission of Christianity to the world of Islam will be grievously hindered in this work. If Turkey would accept defeat in Africa and devote herself seriously to reform and reorganization at home, some of these ills might possibly be averted. As Christians we must hope for the fulfilment of the inspired word: "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee: the remainder of wrath shalt Thou restrain."

The Future of China. From the further East comes news of rapid and momentous change. The Manchu supremacy, in its old form, is at an end in China. The future government of that great Empire is, not improbably, to be a constitutional monarchy, resembling that of Great Britain, with the full equipment of Parliamentary Government, a responsible Cabinet, an appointed Prime Minister with Parliamentary control of the Imperial Budget. That the British Constitution should have been deliberately selected by Chinese reformers as the model to be imitated is at once a compliment to England and a lesson of responsibility. Will China accept our religion as well as our political system? Do our lives and our conduct present to her a pattern as attractive as that provided by our civic polity? Whatever we have done, or left undone, in the past, there is no doubt that the next few years will be times of critical importance for Christian Missions in China. Before the outbreak of the present revolution she had made considerable advance. She has swept away her old examination system; she has a reformed legal and judicial system; she has a German-drilled army with modern weapons; only last month a warship was launched for her on the Tyne. All this progress has been vastly accelerated by the recent *coup d'état*. The question for Christian England now is, What use she will make of the great opportunity presented to her?

The Chinese University. In this connection, the project of the new university for China is a matter of the greatest importance. From a merely mundane point of view the question is pressing enough. If the rising generation of China is to be trained on Western lines, it is well that England, as well as Germany and America, should share in the task of instruction. Our trade with China produces, at the present moment, no inconsiderable share of England's wealth, and it is to be hoped that with a reformed and revived China, the bonds will be drawn yet closer. But from the point of view of China's own highest welfare, the matter is far more pressing. At present,

the youth of China is going abroad for its University instruction, either to the Universities of the West or to those of Japan. So far as work is being done in China in the new schools and laboratories that have taken the place of the old Buddhist temples and examination cells, it is under the guidance of instructors imported from Japan. The sheer materialism of modern Japan is well known, and its influence can only be fraught with evil for modern China. It should be the aim of those who wish China to be not only prosperous, but truly Christian, to forward the cause of the new University to be established at Wuchang-Hankow, and further, to make provision for the erection and equipment of hostels, not merely as residences for Christian students, but also as centres of Christian life and influence.

We have spoken of the unrest and upheaval that seems to prevail both at home and abroad. It is a matter for thankfulness that the problems which underlie all this are being frankly faced by a considerable number of undergraduates to-day. The Student Volunteer Missionary Union is to hold its fifth quadrennial conference at Liverpool in the early days of January next. The Conference on this occasion is to have a somewhat wider scope than has been formerly the case. The cause of foreign missionary work will naturally occupy a foremost place. But the conviction has been gaining ground of late that the social problem at home is one that cannot be, and should not be, ignored; that, to concentrate attention on the claims of foreign work to the entire exclusion of the very un-Christian condition of things that prevails at home, is only to expose the Christian missionary to retorts and criticisms that cannot well be answered. There is also a more fundamental question. Have we rightly apprehended ourselves the fundamentals of the faith we profess? The Conference at Liverpool is to be occupied with this threefold topic: the work in the foreign field, the social problem at home, the real meaning of that faith which alone can inspire us to deal with both. The

The Liverpool
Conference.

prayer of all true-hearted Christian people will be that the deliberations may be so guided by the Divine Spirit, that they may bear rich fruit in future service.

A New Review. We wish to take the present opportunity of extending a hearty welcome to the new *International Review of Missions*, the first number of which will appear in January next. The review is issued by the continuation Committee of the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference. It should be clearly understood that this *International Review* is in no sense a rival to existing missionary magazines. To quote the words of its projectors: "It will occupy a distinct and separate field of its own in endeavouring to carry further, in a systematic way, the investigations of the Edinburgh Conference, and to serve as an organ for the discussion and study of missionary problems from an international standpoint." The Committee hope that such a review will be a powerful influence in the direction of Christian unity; that it will promote the systematic study of missionary problems; that it will provide a continuous bibliography of the best missionary literature, and that it will be of especial service to the Missionary in the field by keeping him in living touch with work in other regions of the world than that in which he ministers. We greet most heartily the advent of a magazine which has such aims before it, and we trust that it will be successful in realizing the high ideals of its founders.

Germany and Britain. The difficulty in Morocco is settled, and the relationship between the two countries, so far as high politics are concerned, seems to be entirely satisfactory. But, unfortunately, amidst all the general unrest there seems to be danger of mutual suspicion and mutual dislike. In both countries the Press has been much to blame. The editor, who for purposes of sensation permits inflammatory articles to appear, is committing a crime—the seriousness of which it is scarcely possible to exaggerate. England and Germany are bound together by ties of business, of blood, and of religion. On every

ground there should be good feeling between us. If we think of little else but business, war would mean a crippling of trade, and hard times for both. If a book recently published, "The Great Illusion," is right, things would be as bad, nay, even worse, for the winner than for the loser. On the ground of relationship, the ties are so many and so close that the war would be almost civil. But the plea of common faith is more potent still. The three great nations of the world which stand by the reformed faith are Britain, Germany, and the United States, and the power of that faith is sufficient to maintain amity between us. We refer to the matter here because an appeal for united prayer has been issued over an influential list of signatures, and that plea we heartily endorse. With our prayers there must go a real effort for a better understanding.

The *Guardian* for November 3rd contained a "Politics in the Pulpit," leading article which we desire to commend most earnestly to the consideration of our clerical readers. The subject of the article was "Politics in the Pulpit." The writer points out that many clergy, for the best of reasons, eschew the discussion, in the pulpit, of "party politics." With this attitude he has no quarrel, but he pleads that there is a real distinction between "party politics" and "politics." Many of the matters which form the subject of political debate to-day are matters in which the Christian minister cannot be silent. But the point of immediate interest suggested by the writer is this : It is an undeniable fact that the capitalists of England and her working classes are at present in a state of fierce antagonism. A breach exists which seems likely to grow larger in the future. Who can mediate and do something to reconcile the opposing forces? Have not the clergy here a great and fruitful opportunity? They are identified with neither party. Their calling is to minister to all, both rich and poor. If by sympathetic study of the points at issue, by a determined attempt to see the point of view of either side, by unremitting efforts to prevail on both parties to approach the matter as brothers and not as

natural enemies, the clergy can help in healing our present distress, they will have merited the Divine blessing on the peacemakers, and will indeed commend the love of Christ their Master to all their fellow-men.

Mrs. Humphry Ward has written a new novel. "Richard Meynell." It is marked, like so many of her books, by the unpleasant people who figure in it, and the unpleasant moral situations that it discloses. Quite apart from the religious position, the book, like "Robert Elsmere" and "David Grieve," leaves an unpleasant taste in the mouth. Her pictures and her people may be pictures and people of common life; but when there are so many pleasant people and pleasant pictures, the novelist has an opportunity of bringing sunshine into some of the darker places of our common life. This is an opportunity which Mrs. Ward seems deliberately desirous of missing. She has, or she thinks she has, a religious mission. Presumably she imagines that the proclamation of her message will do good. But when she has been given all the credit for the highest and best motives in this respect, it is difficult to understand how anyone can be really the better for the reading of such a book.

The book, however, has a special interest. Mrs. *Elsmere Redivivus*. Ward brings into her new book, after twenty-three years, the wife and daughter of Robert Elsmere. Evidently she does it to connect the teaching of that book with this, and to mark the progress of the movement which began in her earlier work. Catherine Elsmere is just what she was before—cold, dutiful, pious, perhaps a little less cold and a little more human. Mary Elsmere is the brightest part of the book, and the real love-story of the book is hers, she eventually marrying the hero, the Elsmesian clergyman, Richard Meynell. The book differs from "Robert Elsmere," in that the so-called liberal movement has made extensive progress, that at least one Bishop and many clergymen have been captured by it. Here the

Modernists remain in the Church as long as they can ; they conduct a rigorous revision of the Prayer Book without any semblance of authority ; they become the mouthpieces through which Mrs. Ward attempts to popularize some Modernist writings. Once again, however, in the long run, they are beaten, as we are convinced mere rationalism will be beaten, despite the brave show that it can sometimes make for itself. Perhaps the student of modern thought will read the book. We advise him to do it with discrimination, for the lady who speaks of a "Third Classic" at Oxford, may quite possibly not be the best interpreter of the intellectual movements of her time.

For our readers there is one page in the book of **Comprehensiveness.** particular interest. Meynell is having an interview with his Bishop, and at a tense moment the Bishop speaks to him : "Make one last appeal, Meynell, to your obedience." Here is the answer :

"I was a boy then," said Meynell slowly ; "I am a man now. I took those vows sincerely, in absolute good faith ; and all the changes in me have come about, as it seems to me, by the inbreathing of a spirit not my own—partly from new knowledge, partly in trying to help my people to live, or to die. They represent to me things lawfully, divinely, learnt, so that, in the change itself, I cannot acknowledge or feel wrong-doing. But you remind me—as you have every right to do—that I accepted certain rules and conditions. Now that I break them, must I not resign the position dependent on them? Clearly, if it were a question of any ordinary society. But the Christian Church is not an ordinary society! It is the sum of Christian life! And that life makes the Church—moulds it afresh from age to age. There are times, we hold, when the Church very nearly expresses the life ; there are others when there are great discordances between the life and its expression in the Church. We believe that there are such discordances now ; because—once more—of a New Learning. And we believe that to withdraw from the struggle to make the Church more fully represent the life, would be sheer disloyalty and cowardice. We must stay it out, and do our best. We are not dishonest, for, unlike many Liberals of the past and the present—we speak out! We are inconsistent, indeed, with a great pledge ; but are we any more inconsistent than the High Churchman who repudiates the 'blasphemous fables' of the Mass when he signs the Articles, and then encourages adoration of the Reserved Sacrament in his Church?"

We wonder whether this paragraph represents the minds of the very few within our Church concerning whose teaching in

the modernist direction we sometimes have reason to praise. We believe in reasonable comprehensiveness, but we do not believe that the faith can be held and undermined at the same time; nor do we believe that one who has lost his faith can lightly put aside a past pledge, unless he puts aside with it the position gained by the giving of that pledge. Surely avowed dishonesty is still dishonest, and equally surely it is not condoned by the dishonesty of others. There are tendencies, both in matters of faith and practice, existing amongst us at the present time which cause serious misgiving, but we believe Mrs. Humphry Ward is hopelessly wrong in imagining that, given the liberty to speak out, any large number of clergy would take their stand by Richard Meynell. We are sometimes staggered at the ease with which eccentricities of ritual and sacerdotal teaching are made to square with subscription to the Articles. But for all our difficulties and perplexities the Church of England does not want, and will not welcome, either rationalism or Romanism. "Robert Elsmere" was alleged to have won its converts. "Richard Meynell" comes twenty years after, and to a more discerning public. We do not fear it, nor the converts that it makes, if ever indeed it succeeds in making one.

The recently published book by Canon Denton Thompson on "Central Churchmanship" has aroused, as it could hardly fail to do, considerable interest in the Anglican world. The *Guardian* has welcomed it with the most cordial appreciation. The *English Churchman* treats it with suspicious hostility. The *Church Family Newspaper* greets it warmly, and has arranged for a series of letters on the topics with which it deals. For our own part, we think that the book has come at a most opportune time, and we are most grateful to Canon Denton Thompson for having written it. He has described, in terms both accurate and felicitous, the form which the Evangelical school of thought is taking in the face of present-day needs and present-day problems. Just because Evangelicalism is a living force it must grow and move

Central
Churchman-
ship.

with the times. It must preserve the fundamental points of its great traditions, its profound reverence for Scripture, its emphasis on the atoning work of Christ, its doctrine of the soul's direct access to God, its Scriptural view of the ministry and Sacraments. These great truths constitute the heritage which it is our mission and our privilege to interpret, and, if necessary, reinterpret, to the twentieth century. Canon Denton Thompson's able presentment of the case makes this abundantly clear, and removes misapprehensions which some may have entertained about a great historic school of thought within our Church.

We should like to tender our respectful con-
The Bishop gratulations to the new Bishop of Ripon, to the
of Ripon. diocese to which he goes, and to the Church at large on this most excellent appointment. Dr. Drury has contributed to these pages, and we hope he will again. He is one of the clearest, and one of the sanest, teachers of to-day—an ornament of the most useful kind to the diocese over which he will preside. He has just published a book on the "Ministry of Our Lord," which we hope to review in due course. It is simply full of good things, and, without disrespect to his other books, likely to be the most popular of all his writings.



The Continental Reformation.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

III.—THE RENAISSANCE: ERASMUS.

A SHALLOW philosophy has suggested the principle that "ridicule is the test of truth."¹ The suggestion is hardly worthy of discussion, and we have no time to discuss it here. But it is worth while to raise the question how far ridicule helped the work of the Reformation. It may be said, with confidence, that satire and banter did a good deal in preparing the way for the Reformation; whether it did not do as much harm as good, when the conflict had actually begun, is not so easy to decide. The work of the Humanists, and especially of those Humanists who largely employed satire in preparing for the Reformation, was in the main destructive: ridicule, as a reforming force, can hardly be anything else. They challenged the usurped and tyrannical power of the hierarchy; they mercilessly exposed the folly and stupidity of the greater part of the teaching given not only from the pulpit, but even from University chairs; and they taught people to see the debasing character of the numerous superstitions which monks and friars professed (either ignorantly or fraudulently) to regard as efficacious and edifying. Religion, as taught by those in authority, and as accepted by those who had any religion at all, had become mainly external, such as the performing of certain acts, being present at services, going on pilgrimages, performing of penances, veneration of relics, and the like; and every one of these, however helpful, or at least innocent, in their origin, had become in practice little better than paganism revived. Services appealed simply to eye and ear, even when they were decently performed; and they were often grossly irreverent. Pilgrimages were picnics, accompanied by drunkenness and lewdness. Penances were often senseless in character, and could be compounded

¹ The saying is attributed to Lord Shaftesbury, but it is not found in his writings. See Carlyle on Voltaire, in the *Foreign Review*, 1829.

for by payment. Relics were sometimes of the most ludicrous and impossible kind ; straw from the manger at Bethlehem, and feathers from Archangels' wings.¹ All this kind of superstition supplied boundless material for satire, and satire might be useful in putting a stop to it.

The ignorance of the clergy was another topic which gave many openings to the satirist ; and, as is commonly the case in corrupt times, it was those whose duty it was to put an end to such ignorance who were least aware of its existence. Bishops did not visit their clergy ; they did not know, and they did not care to know, what kind of priests were ministering to the people. Luther suspected that things were bad in Saxony, and at his suggestion a Visitation was held, and he was one of the visitors. He has left us a report, which shows us how well grounded his suspicions were. Some villagers did not know the Lord's Prayer ; they said that it was too long to learn by heart. In one village not a single peasant knew any prayer whatever. In another there was an old priest who could scarcely repeat either the Lord's Prayer or the Creed, but who made a good income by counteracting the spells of witches. And this view of the functions of a priest was common enough, especially in Italy. He might be utterly ignorant or grossly immoral ; but he had control of unseen powers. His blessings were worth having for oneself, and his curses for the confusion of one's enemies.

Is this ignorance of the clergy a point which might have been mentioned among the differences between the English and the Continental Reformations ? There is not much reason for thinking so. In 1551, Bishop Hooper held a Visitation of the diocese of Gloucester. He asked his clergy these questions : How many Commandments are there ? Where are they found ? Repeat them. What are the Articles of the Faith ? Repeat them. Prove them from Scripture. Repeat the Lord's Prayer.

¹ In the collection at Wittenberg there were 5,005 relics ; among them pieces of the rods of Moses and Aaron, and ashes of the burning bush. At Halle there were 8,933 relics ; among them wine from the wedding-feast at Cana, and some of the earth out of which Adam was made.

Where is it found? Out of 311 clergy, only fifty answered all these simple questions, and of these fifty there were nineteen who answered only *mediocriter*. Eight could not answer a single question, and one knew that there were ten Commandments, but knew nothing else. There was plenty of material for gibes and jokes in such a condition of things as this, especially as the New Learning spread and knowledge was increased.

The Renaissance opened up a promising sphere of activity for the *condottieri* of literature. It has been pointed out that one tendency of the Renaissance was to exalt the dignity of the individual as distinct from the body to which he might belong, and to reveal the natural value of each single person. Everyone who had a gift, if it was only a fluent tongue, could attract attention by proposing startling innovations or attacking venerable institutions: and it might easily happen that the individual combatants were far more interesting than the subjects about which they disputed. Whether it was on the dispensing power of the Pope or the sacrifice of the Mass, the value of indulgences or the necessity of fasting, the realism of the new art or the worthlessness of the old philosophy, any man could get a hearing, if only he could put his points with some cleverness; and anybody could raise a laugh, if only he could make established things look ridiculous.

In Italy, the Renaissance was unproductive in the religious sphere. Excepting Laurentius Valla, hardly any of the Italian Humanists did anything for the recovery or illumination of religious truth. He showed that the Donation of Constantine was a fable, that there were faults in the Vulgate, and that the Apostles' Creed could hardly have been composed by the Apostles; and he wrote notes on the New Testament. But neither he nor any of the early Humanists used the New Learning either to defend or to attack the doctrines of the Church. Their attitude towards the Christian faith was one of well-bred reserve. It was gratuitous *gaucherie* to pose as an unbeliever, when no one supposed that you were serious in

professing to believe. Erudition and classical elegance were the things to be cultivated, and to study the Vulgate or the Latin Fathers was fatal to the acquisition of a Ciceronian style. How very little interest the Italian Humanists had in Christianity is shown by the fact that printing had been going on for sixty years, and some works (it is said) had been published eighty or a hundred times, before anyone thought of publishing a Greek Testament.

Beyond all question the best representative of the most fruitful elements in the Renaissance is Erasmus. He sums up in himself its love of the past, its devotion to literature, its enthusiasm for culture, its scorn of ignorance and superstition, its appreciation of ideas, and its indifference to niceties of doctrine. Wisdom and morality were to him of far more account than speculative dogmas or scholastic subtleties ; and this was the case with nearly all the best Humanists. He knew that doctrine was a powerful aid to living a godly life, and he saw no reason for preferring other doctrines to those which were taught by the Church ; but these must be freed from the contemptible excrescences with which the ignorance, avarice, and pride of priests and monks had overlaid them. It is here that Erasmus was such a puzzle, and seemed to be such a timid time-server, to the men of his own generation, and that he remains much the same to ourselves. Erasmus was resolved to remain a loyal Catholic ; yet he must denounce stupid and debasing superstitions. But how much of what the medieval Church taught was Catholic truth, and how much was superstitious perversion of it or pagan addition to it ? It was difficult to attack the latter without seeming to attack the former, and the critic might easily make mistakes in drawing the line between them. Few men, even among Protestants or sceptics, have assailed the vices and follies of monks and priests with more incisive ridicule than Erasmus, and to the ordinary reader he seemed to be assailing the whole ecclesiastical system. As regards effects, although not as regards intention, the ordinary reader was not far wrong. Erasmus was quite sincere in

declaring, more and more decidedly and loudly as time went on and as Luther's attitude became more pronounced, that he was not a Lutheran, and had no intention of becoming one. But his writings as a whole, and especially those which were most widely read, told far more against the Church of Rome than for it; and, according to the principles and policy of the time, Paul IV. was quite right in placing the writings on the Index.

In this matter Erasmus was not unlike the historian Guicciardini. Guicciardini was the younger contemporary of Erasmus, and, as the unscrupulous factotum of Leo X. and Clement VII., he knew the dark corners of ecclesiastical policy and practice far better. His father had not allowed him to gratify his insatiable ambition by becoming an ecclesiastic, because of the unutterable corruption of the Papacy and the Curia. So Guicciardini entered the Law, and became a diplomatist and statesman in the service of the Popes. In conviction and profession he remained an adherent of the Roman Church; but he loathed, even more intensely than Erasmus did, the clergy and the Papal Court, whose dirty work he cynically executed with consummate industry and skill. This is how he writes of his employers:

“It would be impossible to speak so ill of the Roman Court as it deserves, so that more abuse would not be merited, seeing that it is an infamy—an example of all the shames and scandals of the world. I do not know a man that is more disgusted than I am with the ambition, greed, and unmanliness of the priests.”

And this is his own shameless excuse for scheming and working in the interests of a government which he so justly despised and abhorred:

“My position under several Popes has compelled me to desire their aggrandizement *for the sake of my own profit*. Otherwise, I should have loved Martin Luther as myself—not that I might break loose from the laws which Christianity imposes on us, but that I might see that gang of scoundrels stripped either of their vices or of their power.”

Guicciardini was a little younger than Machiavelli, whom he criticized as an amiable enthusiast, because, although, like

himself, he regarded moral principles as having as little to do with the art of government as with the art of navigation, yet in Machiavelli there still survived some glow of patriotism. The "Principe" of Machiavelli has often been condemned in strong terms; but the "Ricordi Politici" of Guicciardini has been described as "Italian corruption reduced to a code and raised into a rule of life."

It is here that the parallel between Erasmus and Guicciardini ends and becomes a contrast. Both of them hated the wickedness and folly of priests and Papalists, and both of them resolved to remain in the Roman Church in spite of these things, which Erasmus believed to be curable, though Guicciardini, perhaps, did not. But what is certain is that Guicciardini was willing, for the sake of his own profit and power, to work hard in support of the system which he abhorred; while Erasmus, at the risk of liberty, and, perhaps, of life, continued to ridicule and condemn it. But we will not part from Guicciardini without two more quotations, one of which excites our pity, and the other our admiration :

"All states," he says, "are mortal; everything, either by nature or by accident, comes to a close. Hence, a citizen who finds himself witnessing the dissolution of his country need not so much groan over this misfortune as over his own lot, in having been born in a time when the hour of his country's doom has struck."

That is sad and selfish rather than heroic. Seneca, or Epictetus, or Marcus Aurelius would give us better counsel than that. But here is something which is worthy of the best Stoicism, and not unworthy of a Christian :

"Do not be afraid of benefiting man, simply because you see that ingratitude is so common; for, besides the fact that a temper of benevolence (in itself, and without any other object) is a generous quality, and in a way divine, you now and again find someone exhibiting such gratitude as richly to compensate for the ingratitude of all the rest."¹

Where Machiavelli and Guicciardini went wrong was in supposing that moral principles—that is, just those forces by means of which societies are held together and nations are

¹ See Morley's *Essays on Guicciardini and Machiavelli*.

exalted—can be set aside in politics. What is required for strong government, they said, is acute intelligence backed by remorseless vigour. The cunning to plan and the force to strike—these are essential ; perfidy and cruelty are admissible if required ; truth and equity are irrelevant. In statesmanship there are no crimes, only blunders. Let the ruler be loved if he can, but it is absolutely essential that he should be feared. “ Praised be those who love their country more than the safety of their souls !”¹

It is this ignoring of moral principles, to say nothing of Providence, which makes these two writers unsafe guides in estimating the forces which determined the course of the Reformation. We are in safer hands when we follow the guidance of Erasmus, although he requires some supplementing and correcting if we are to arrive at a fair judgment.

The words of Drummond respecting him will bear quoting once more :

“ Erasmus was, in his own age, the apostle of common sense and of rational religion. He did not care for dogma, and accordingly, the dogmas of Rome, which had the consent of the Christian world, were, in his eyes, preferable to the dogmas of Protestantism. . . . From the beginning to the end of his career he remained true to the purpose of his life, which was to fight the battle of sound learning and plain common sense against the powers of ignorance and superstition ; and amid all the convulsions of that period he never once lost his mental balance.”²

There were other good qualities which he did not lose, and some which he acquired or improved. But there were also some which he did not possess, and which he never acquired. He himself confessed that he lacked the spirit of a martyr ; and we may say that he lacked the strength of mind which is required for the work of a reformer at a crisis in which reforms, on a large scale and without much delay, were righteously and clamorously demanded. There was hardly a practice or a

¹ In his essay on Ranke's “ Popes,” Macaulay says : “ Neither the spirit of Savonarola, nor the spirit of Machiavelli, had anything in common with the spirit of the religious or political Protestants of the North.” That is true of Machiavelli ; but in 1523 Luther republished Savonarola's “ Commentary on the Psalms.”

² “ Life of Erasmus,” ii., pp. 355 *et seq.*

doctrine of the Roman clergy that Luther endeavoured to reform which had not previously been criticized or ridiculed by Erasmus. Erasmus, like Luther, contends for the individual responsibility of man to God without intermediate agency, and he denies the mediatorial function of a sacerdotal order. He declares that much of the religion which priests and monks teach the people is mere paganism, with the names of saints and angels substituted for those of gods and goddesses. And although the "Praise of Folly" is on the surface (what the "Ship of Fools" is in reality) a skit on human follies in general, yet it is in fact a satirical exposure of the follies and frauds of those who professed to represent the Catholic Church.¹ In the sphere of religion the whole hierarchy of Rome, from the Pope downwards, together with the majority of the laity, are shown to be egregious fools.

The Spaniard Stunica sent to Leo X. a list of thousands of heretical expressions collected out of the writings of Erasmus. To such as Stunica it was no doubt shocking to read exposures of the ridiculous and irreverent problems which theologians sometimes discussed; such as, whether any time was required for the Divine Generation; whether God could have taken the form of a woman, or an ass, or a pumpkin; whether a pumpkin could have preached and worked miracles. And it was unpleasant to be told that theologians were rather dangerous persons to deal with in dispute, because they come down on their opponents with hundreds of proved conclusions, and call on them to recant; and then, if one refuses to recant, one is denounced as a heretic. This was exactly what Stunica did. But Leo X. was not a rigorous champion of orthodoxy, and perhaps Stunica's private denunciation of Erasmus did not do the latter much harm. There was a little more peril when the University of Paris publicly condemned the "Colloquies." Yet, in spite of his audacious utterances, Erasmus was never molested by either inquisitor or prince, and the University's condemnation was really a magnificent advertisement.

¹ Pennington, "Life and Character of Erasmus," pp. 77-102.

But, in spite of this large amount of agreement with Luther, Erasmus was quite unable to take the same line as Luther. Luther felt that they were not in harmony, yet he tried to make himself the humble ally of a scholar, whose reputation already stood so high in Europe. As early as March 1, 1517, Luther had written to John Lange: "I am at present reading our Erasmus, *but my heart recoils from him more and more.*"¹ In 1518, he wrote to John Reuchlin, another great light of the Renaissance, saying that he did not possess Reuchlin's learning or ability, but they were fighting for the same cause. Luther no doubt believed this, but it was only partly true, for Luther was not a Humanist, and Reuchlin was not a Reformer. The next year, 1519, Luther wrote a similar letter to Erasmus, who from the first was not much more than stiffly neutral, and ended in being bitterly hostile. Erasmus took time to answer him. At last came a frigid letter, in which he gently declined to take sides. He had read Luther's "Notes on the Psalms" and had liked them, but he had not read any of his other writings, and therefore could express no opinion about them, but they seemed to be causing a great deal of excitement. His own view was that these discussions should be confined to the learned, who would be able to debate such matters without heat. Erasmus frequently excused himself from giving any judgment respecting Luther, by saying that he had read so few of his writings. Luther made no reply, but he did read the writings of Erasmus, and as late as April, 1524, he could still write affectionately to him, while lamenting his timidity: "We have borne your weakness patiently and highly appreciate your gifts." Five years later, however, he writes very bitterly about him, as raging against the Lutherans: "He is a thoughtless Indifferentist, who ridicules all religion in his Lucian fashion."²

Their estrangement was not very wonderful. They agreed

¹ M. A. Currie, "Letters of Martin Luther," pp. 13, 38 *et seq.* The words in italics are too strong for *et indies decrescit mihi animus erga eum.* See B. J. Kidd, "Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation," p. 54.

² Currie, pp. 123, 191.

chiefly in what they condemned and wished to destroy—immorality, greed, fraud, ignorance, and superstition, especially in the lives of monks and clergy. What Erasmus ridiculed, Luther denounced. With regard to reconstruction they had not much in common; nor could they have, for Erasmus did not want to reconstruct anything. He wished to retain the existing edifice and to free it from overgrowths and filth. Moreover, he was content to work slowly, and to trust a great deal to the gradual spread of knowledge. He had nothing of the burning zeal which made Luther so vehement and so courageous. He was naturally, if not exactly timid, yet very much averse to violent language and violent measures, indeed to everything which might provoke what he called a *tumultus*, and which we may perhaps translate “a beastly row.” He was a lover of peace and of gentle methods, and he declared that he so abhorred all sorts of quarrels, that, if he had a large estate to defend at law, he would sooner lose it than litigate it. Luther said of him, “Erasmus knows very well how to expose error, but he does not know how to teach the truth.” In 1536, when he had quite broken with Erasmus, Luther thus compared him with himself, Melanchthon, and Carlstadt; “Erasmus has good words to no purpose; Luther has good purpose, but good words won’t come; Melanchthon has both, and Carlstadt neither.”¹

But Erasmus deserves a better estimate than that. He was the greatest figure of the Renaissance, the best representative of the New Learning that any country produced. And he was the most cosmopolitan. Born, educated, and ordained in Holland, he had lived in France, Belgium, England, Italy, Switzerland, and Germany; and, although he derived something from every one of these nationalities, yet he did not belong to any one of them more than to the rest, and (what is rather remarkable in such a scholar) he seems to have mastered the language of none of them. The language which Erasmus wrote and spoke was Latin; not the Latin of the classics or of the

¹ “Res et verba Philippus; verba sine re Erasmus; res sine verbis Lutherus; nec res nec verba Carlostadius.”

Fathers, but a Latin of his own ; neither Ciceronian nor elegant, but conversational, pointed, and vigorous, and intelligible to everyone who knew Latin of any kind. Mark Pattison says that the Latin style of Erasmus is "the most delightful which the Renaissance has left us." And Erasmus talked with so many influential persons in Europe that he would have been an international force, if he had written only a quarter of his actual works.

In the early days of his brilliant career, he was much more of a scholar than a theologian, and even in his later years he cared much more for religion than for theology. This was one of the things which checked sympathy between him and Luther. Luther cared little for literary culture, and Erasmus cared still less for Lutheran theology. If one must have theology in addition to the simple teaching of the Bible, he preferred that which had the sanction of time and of the Church. The essence of Christianity, according to him, is the love of God and the love of one's neighbour manifesting itself in sympathy and forbearance. Love was the motive power in the life of Christ, and it ought to be the motive power in the life of every Christian. In an excellent letter to the Bohemian, John Schlechta, he says : "Many might be reconciled to the Church of Rome, if we did not define everything exactly, and were contented with those doctrines which are laid down in the Holy Scriptures and are necessary to salvation. These are few in number."¹ His "Dagger of the Christian Soldier"—*Enchiridion Militis Christiani*²—written in 1501, and republished in 1518 with a letter defending its contents, shows us both his earlier and his riper thoughts on Christianity, which is held to consist, not so much in the belief of certain doctrines, as in the practice of patience, purity, and love. He says that he wrote the *Enchiridion* to correct those who make religion consist in external observances, while they neglect inward piety.

¹ Pennington, p. 202.

² "Dagger," not "handbook," is right; Erasmus himself calls it *pugniunculus*.

Like his younger contemporary, Zwingli, who was another enthusiastic Humanist, Erasmus had no such contempt for the human reason as Luther had. Natural religion, though inferior to the Gospel, is acceptable with the Father of all; and Cicero and Socrates may win salvation as well as St. Paul. Erasmus was convinced that such moral teachers as these had the true spirit of Christianity and might be called Christians before Christ. Cicero had as much right to a high place in heaven as many a canonized saint, and when one thought of the Athenian martyr, one felt inclined to pray, *Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis.*

That Erasmus should select just these two heathen teachers is of interest, for both of them have points of contact with himself—Cicero with regard to his subsequent fame, and Socrates with regard to a leading feature in his teaching. The reputation of both Cicero and Erasmus would probably be less disputed and more generally accepted as excellent, if not quite such a large number of their letters had survived. Men, who might otherwise have seemed to be almost heroic, have written themselves down as very human indeed. Again, the moral teaching of Socrates is built upon the principle that "virtue is knowledge." If a man knows what is really good for him, he is sure to seek it. Men go wrong through ignorance; they think that vice is good for them. Prove to them that this is an error, and they will cease to follow vice. Erasmus was just as firmly persuaded that the remedy for the frightful evils, which disgraced the Church and dismayed all serious persons, was to be found in increase of knowledge. He believed that these evils could be gradually driven out under the influence of ridicule and common sense. "Give light," he said, "and the darkness will disperse of itself." That is a comfortable metaphor; but to suppose that mankind will always seek what is good for them when they know it, and that to expose abuses and make them look ridiculous will suffice to effect their reform, is to leave out of the account the unruly wills and affections of sinful men. And Erasmus seems to have been not alone in this

opinion. There were other Humanists who were disposed to think that sarcasm, elegantly expressed and accompanied by culture and good taste, would heal the running sores of society and bring back the beauties of a Christian life. It is true that some of these Humanists had somewhat defective conceptions of what a Christian life meant ; they thought of it as refinement freed from superstition. But Erasmus knew better than this ; and, although he had not had Luther's terrible experiences, he must have been aware that something more than banter and culture was needed to give relief to the stricken conscience and strength to the enfeebled will.



The Scriptural Argument for the Time of Communion.

BY THE REV. CANON PAIGE COX, M.A.,

Vicar of Alderley Edge.

IN the CHURCHMAN for June there is an article by the Rev. W. S. Hooton on "The time of Communion at Troas." In this article Mr. Hooton comments on a passage in the Bishop of Salisbury's "Ministry of Grace," referred to by me in my little book, "The Church of England as Catholic and Reformed." Mr. Hooton contends, in opposition to the Bishop, that the Communion at Troas took place on what we should call Monday morning.

It would be interesting to know how the Bishop would defend his opinion¹ that the service was in the early hours of the Lord's Day—a view which Mr. Hooton himself admits to be "reasonable," and to have "great authority behind it." Anyhow, the fact stands out, as the Bishop has remarked, that "the only account we have of the hour of a Eucharistic service in the Acts puts it after midnight."

"All other indications in Scripture," so Mr. Hooton says, "point to the evening hour." What are these indications? None, save the fact that the Sacrament was instituted in the evening. The Scriptural argument as to the time most appropriate to Communion hinges entirely on the reason for that. The time of day chosen was when the Passover was eaten, and that, we know, was at the beginning of the Day of the Passover, reckoning from sunset according to the Jewish method. It may be inferred from this, with the greatest confidence, that when the Lord's Day came to be observed as the day peculiarly appropriate to Christ's memorial, the Holy Communion would be celebrated at the beginning of the day, as in the case of the Passover. In due course, when the Roman day took the place

¹ It is needless to say that this article was in print before the lamented death of Bishop Wordsworth.

of the Jewish, the hour of Communion would be pushed forward from the evening to the morning, so that the usage might be kept up of consecrating the day from the beginning, and Bishop Wordsworth sees "the first indication of the new arrangement" at the Communion at Troas.

As regards the Christians of Palestine, we know full well that they made no violent break with the past. Not only do we find the Apostles at the outset observing the accustomed Jewish hours of prayer, but towards the end of the narrative of the Acts we read (Acts xxi. 20) how James and the elders assured Paul that the thousands of Jews at Jerusalem which believed "were all zealous for the law." It is practically certain, therefore, that, with their strong conservative instincts, they would observe their special Paschal feast in commemoration of Christ's sacrifice at the same time of the day as that on which the Paschal lamb was eaten. It seems most unlikely that they would go counter to immemorial usage and reserve the celebration of the Eucharist for the latter part of the Lord's Day, which no Jew would have dreamt of doing in the case of the Passover. It is to be remembered, too, that the Sabbath was still observed by Christians on the seventh day of the week separately from the Lord's Day, which practice, indeed, was kept up for the first three centuries.¹ The Sabbath would thus be the day of preparation for the Lord's Day. What more probable, then, that, as the Sabbath drew to an end at the sunset hour, the Christians would assemble in readiness to take part in the Holy Communion when the Lord's Day began? Is it imaginable that they would let the evening pass, and all the long day following, and reserve their gathering together for Eucharistic worship for the close of the Lord's Day?

Mr. Hooton is of opinion, indeed, that, as the appearances of the Risen Lord to the assembled Church occurred on the Sunday evening, there is a "distinct presumption" that the gatherings of early Christians for Holy Communion would have taken place after sunset on Sunday, which, by the way, would have

¹ See the article on "The Sabbath" in Hastings' "Bible Dictionary."

been really in the early hours of Monday, not on the Lord's Day at all, according to the Jewish computation. But surely there were obvious reasons why the Lord should not have showed Himself to the disciples on the day of the Resurrection till the quiet and leisure of the evening had come, when they could conveniently meet together, and no inference can be drawn from this as to the superior suitability of the evening of the Lord's Day, or rather of the first hours of Monday, for Holy Communion over the equally quiet hours of the previous evening at the beginning of the day. After all, was it not the actual Resurrection in the early dawn that made the day so sacred? And surely it must have seemed to the disciples much more appropriate to celebrate the Lord's memorial at the beginning than at the close of the day. We may well believe that this was one of the governing reasons, coupled with the change from the Jewish to the Roman day, which caused the substitution of an early-morning Communion for one at the hour consecrated by the Passover usage ; and it is a much more likely supposition that when the change came the time was pushed forward by a few hours from the Passover time than backward from Monday.

There is another yet more important deduction to be drawn from the institution of the Holy Communion at the time corresponding to the beginning of the Jewish Passover. The Passover was not only a memorial, but a sacred meal, partaken of, on the first occasion, preparatory to the Exodus. The Israelites were bidden to eat it, with special reference to the journey on which they were about to start, and the recollection of that journey and of its peculiar circumstances was always associated with subsequent celebrations of the feast. It is to be inferred from this that the first Christians learned to partake of the Holy Communion as a preparation for the due observance of the day which was to commemorate their deliverance from their bondage to sin and death.

On this point the Christian Church from the beginning has given no uncertain witness. It derived from the Jewish Church, we may say, the suggestion of the consecration of the weekly

festival of the Resurrection by Holy Communion in the earlier hours of the day, and the practice has been kept up in the greater part of the Church till quite recent times. Even at the Reformation the idea of celebrating the Holy Communion on Sunday evening does not appear to have been mooted in England at any rate, and it is only within the last sixty years or so that there has been any departure within the Church of England from this Catholic rule, as we may well call it.

We may not forget in this connection what great store St. Paul set on adhesion to time-honoured and general practice among Christians, on grounds of edification as well as of order, and how decisively, if not curtly, he pronounced against a certain innovation among the Corinthians by saying: "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." There is a strong presumption that customs having wide and long acceptance, that are traceable up to the very first days of the Church, do testify to the "mind of the Spirit" in such matters.

We are fain, all of us who hold the Catholic faith, to lay stress on the significance attaching to the consensus of the Church on that subject. We believe that it was under the guidance of the Holy Spirit that the faith was defined in the first five centuries, and that it has been under the same guidance that the faith has been assented to by the majority of Christians from century to century. Dr. Sanday, in his "Christologies Ancient and Modern," has declared his own convictions in this matter in a singularly impressive passage, where he says: "In the last resort the key to the position is that there is a God in heaven who really shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will. I believe that in His hand is the whole course of human history, and especially the history of those who deliberately seek His guidance. I therefore trace His influence in the ultimate decisions, the fundamental decisions, of the Church of the Fathers; and it is to me incredible that He should intend the course of modern development to issue in direct opposition to them."

It so happens that the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, in his article

on "Orders and Reunion" in the *CHURCHMAN* for June, employs what is in effect the same argument with reference to episcopacy. Speaking of the "continuous guidance of God's Holy Spirit in the Church," he says: "We must recognize that antiquity has a claim to our respect, that continuous tradition has a moral authority over us. . . . If we wish to link ourselves on to the past ages of the Christian Church, we must desire to carry on, through whatever developments and alterations, the fundamental principles of the Church's historical existence—those principles which were the sources of its vitality and the basis of its system from the beginning."

In a precisely similar way it may be contended that the greatest consideration should be given to the continuous use of the Church in celebrating the Holy Communion at the beginning of the Lord's Day, as a sacred meal to fortify Christian people for the due observance of the day throughout.

It is to be remarked here that this witness of the Church is not to be confused with the tradition in favour of fasting Communion. That tradition has its own significance, but it does not accord with Apostolic usage, and has not been so continuous and widespread as the tradition in favour of Communion in the early hours of the Lord's Day. The fasting tradition demands respect in so far as it shows what has been for a long period the mind of the Church in regard to the self-discipline and self-denial which are indispensable to worthy Communion, though the practice may have commended itself to some for superstitious reasons, and been pressed beyond the dictates of common sense. There will be a good many who, while claiming and exercising a rightful liberty on the question as to whether it is best for them to abstain or not to abstain altogether from food before communicating, will feel morally bound to pay the utmost deference to the much more authoritative usage of the Church as to the time of Communion.

This antecedent judgment, on grounds of what may be called, in the proper sense of the phrase, Catholic loyalty, will in many cases have received confirmation from personal experience.

When once the habit is formed of receiving the Holy Communion in the earlier hours of the Lord's Day, the loss will be felt when the privilege is not available. Over and over again will the devout communicant have been conscious of unspeakable comfort and support as the direct consequence of partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, and for this reason he would deprecate, for the sake of others, the practice of encouraging Christian people to defer the great refreshment till the sacred day is well-nigh over. Surely, in the interest of the due observance of the Lord's Day, it would be well if the Church were, in conformity with Scriptural usage, to advocate the reception of the Holy Communion as a means of giving its proper consecration to the whole of the Lord's Day. If the circumstances of some in modern life make it difficult for them to sanctify the early part of the day by public worship, our wisdom and our duty is surely to endeavour to produce a revision of popular custom and habit in this regard—not to yield to popular custom, but to make such custom give way to the ancient rule of the Church; and especially is it advisable that everything that can be done, whether by legislative enactments or otherwise, should be done to restore the good old usage of spending the last hours of Saturday quietly and thoughtfully, in preparation for the Lord's Day.

The time of Communion may seem, after all, a slight matter, on which Christians may be well content to agree to differ; but in these comparatively slight matters there may be important issues involved, such as that of the unity and good order of the Church. Individual action on the part of one section of men in the Church often provokes individual action on the part of others by way of protest and opposition. It is thus that the Church is kept at variance when God is calling us to knit up our forces, so that we may present a strong and united front to those spiritual foes that are sapping the very foundations of national religion and morality. We shall never come to a good understanding with one another unless we resolve to regulate our private judgment by a proper deference to the authority of

Scripture first of all, and then to the collective and continuous voice of the Church, so far as it can be ascertained.

It is on these grounds that, finding myself, as I do, in such full sympathy on many points with those who favour Sunday evening Communion, I would venture to plead with them that they should reconsider this point, and "try it anew," to quote Hooker's famous sentence, "argument by argument, with all the diligent exactness they can." They may discover flaws in my reasoning on the subject; if so, I trust I shall prove open to correction. At any rate, I would assure them that I have put forward my view of the matter with the utmost goodwill towards them, and from a simple and earnest desire for the peace and unity of the Church, and the consequent strengthening of its influence.



Reordination and Reunion.

BY THE REV. H. T. MALAHER, B.A.

THE desire for Christian Reunion is growing stronger and stronger, but how are we to set about its attainment? on what principles is it to rest?

In this paper an attempt will be made to suggest the lines along which an answer to this question may be sought, with special reference to the subject of Reordination—a concrete and practical side of the question. Now Reunion is a question that must be dealt with as a whole, and on intelligent principles, otherwise the very success that may attend its earlier stages will become a hindrance to those that come later. For instance, should Home Reunion be achieved in a manner that is unwise, it will prove an almost insuperable barrier to the ultimate Reunion of Christendom as a whole. It is in this connection that the question of Reordination is seen to become of vital importance. Our aim, then, should be to conduct each separate stage with reference to the problem as a whole. What, therefore, shall be our method?—it must be one that proceeds by a recognition of the *facts* involved, and of *all* the facts.

This will immediately suggest to us that a party solution will never achieve success, because it would necessarily be one-sided. In practical politics it is, of course, impossible wholly to eliminate the party point of view; in fact, party has its legitimate place, since without its influence certain aspects of truth might fail to receive due recognition. But while we may find it necessary to work *as* a party, we should not work *for* a party. Only the non-party spirit is able to look in the face the whole of the facts involved.

Now the facts that dominate this problem are two. The first of these is the Fact that there exists a Catholic Church. By this is meant that amid all the divisions of Christendom a certain group of churches claim to be the legitimate local or sectional representatives of an historic or universal Society founded by

Christ Himself, and to be connected with that original Society and with one another by virtue of Apostolical succession—that is, the corporate preservation of historic and organic continuity with that original Society. But there is a Second Fact, equally certain, though sometimes but grudgingly allowed. It consists in the manifest working of the Holy Spirit in those branches of Christendom that lie beyond and outside this Historic or Catholic Church.

Any scheme for Reunion that is to ensure success must be one that takes account of *both* these great facts, allowing to each its due place. The practical difficulties attending any such attempt, however, are evident from the common experience that a strong sense of the importance of either of these facts is usually felt virtually to involve a denial of the importance of the other one. The strong believer in the Catholic Church demands as an essential preliminary the unconditional surrender by the non-Catholic of his whole claim to Christian Churchmanship; while the strong believer in the universal working of the Holy Spirit derides Apostolical succession and the importance ascribed to it as a figment of the sacerdotal imagination.

Even supposing such to be so, the existence of belief in the value of each of these facts would remain facts true for the psychological sphere in which Reunion is to operate—firm beliefs which are too widely held and deeply-rooted ever to be entirely overcome, and which any scheme of Reunion must consequently face and take into account. But since in that case these facts could not be faced and dealt with in the same spirit of intelligence and conviction as if they were true, not merely psychologically, but also theologically, it may be well to digress for a while and see if it is not possible to adopt some practical working theory of the Church which will enable these two beliefs to be harmonized both with Scripture and with one another.

These two facts are really but the expression of the twofold aspect and nature of the Church as represented in the New Testament. There may be found both an individualistic

aspect and a corporate, both a basic principle and a corporate expression thereof. The principle referred to is the entrance by baptism, upon profession of repentance, into a covenant relationship with God, bringing with it the inspiration and aid of the Holy Spirit. The whole company of people thus in covenant relationship with God, and members of Christ, is referred to as the Church of God, and, in its future ideal state, as the Body of Christ. But the Body of Christ was not intended even in its unpurified state (likened by our Lord to a field of wheat mixed with tares) to remain united by no bond other than a common baptism and a common profession of faith. It was plainly intended that the Church should be organized as a whole, and not remain a congeries of isolated individuals or small and independent groups. A definite Society, the historic or Catholic Church, was founded and provided with the beginnings of a regular ministry. Thus, in the New Testament, the two aspects of the One Church are seen to be complementary ; we may say that its aspect as the Church Catholic coincided with its aspect as the Church of God—that is to say, the Church of God consisted of Catholic Churchmen only, there were no Dissenters—non-conforming to the unity of the Church.

Apply this working theory to the situation as it is in the present day, and we see that these two aspects of the One Church no longer coincide, and the Church of God now contains a Non-Catholic element as well as a Catholic. Though this Non-Catholic element, by reason of its Nonconformity, is self-deprived of the fulness of the covenant blessing, yet we dare not unchurch them, as do some. Those whom God has acknowledged we dare not disavow.

In face of their compliance with the Scriptural conditions of faith and baptism unto repentance, and in face of the manifestation in their lives (both individual and corporate) of the power of God unto salvation, it is worse than folly to speak as if Catholic Churchmen alone possessed a practical monopoly of grace. Moreover, in condemning, and justly condemning, the sin of schism, we must not forget that the spirit of schism is, in

the sight of God, not far removed from the act of schism. Those parts of the Church which preserved the principle of Catholic unity did so, in some instances, at a considerable sacrifice of other sides of Catholic truth, and were in some cases themselves largely responsible for the breach by reason of their resolute clinging to old abuses in preference to reform. We must remember, too, that those whom we stigmatize as schismatics are not themselves responsible for the error of their forefathers, and in many cases they have not the vaguest conception of the Catholic Church, or of their duty to seek after communion with it. This is a case where theories must bow to facts ; in certain Non-Catholic quarters the outward signs of the working of God's Spirit are far more visible than in certain Catholic quarters. Non-Catholics may not, therefore, be unchurched. They are Churchmen, though not Catholic Churchmen.

Such is our working theory of the Church—the Church of God may be shown both by Scripture and experience to have a double aspect, and at the present day these aspects no longer entirely coincide. But they were intended to, there is no really insuperable reason why they should not coincide again, and such is the end towards which we are working. That end will be attained only by giving both great Facts their due. The advantage of such a method, and of such a statement of the question as the above, is that it makes no attempt to convert everybody to one particular point of view. Such a task would be hopeless, and so no attempt need be made to persuade the High Churchman to abandon belief in Apostolical succession and the Catholic Church, but rather he is asked to refrain from asserting certain narrow and exclusive deductions from these beliefs : nor is the Nonconformist asked to give up the belief that the Holy Spirit is blessing his work, but rather to refrain from imposing certain limitations and restrictions upon that blessing.

We come, then, to the practical question as to how the two facts that dominate the problem of Reunion shall have equal

justice done to them in actual practice. It takes concrete form in the controversy as to Reordination. Two solutions of the present state of affairs are proposed. One is that Non-Catholic Orders shall become Catholic—that is, universally recognized, by means of a mere Declaration of *Recognition* of their validity. The other solution is that they be treated as totally invalid, and *Reordination* be insisted on. Thus an impasse is reached, because either solution does injustice to one or other of the Facts, and is totally unacceptable to the opposite party. But surely there is a third alternative, obtainable by modification of the second proposal. Is it not possible to insist upon Regular and Catholic Ordination (Reordination) while at the same time refusing to treat their former commission as necessarily invalid. This form of Reordination might be termed *Extended Ordination*, in view of the wider extent of the sphere (a Church now united) in which the Commission is to operate. For so long as the needs of the future are met there is no need to pass judgment on the past and to decide either one way or the other the question as to whether the former commission was valid for its own narrower sphere ; let it suffice that the new needs of a Church extended by Reunion with another body require a minister that has received Catholic Ordination.

To the present writer it seems clear that the claims of what we have called the Fact of the Catholic Church *do*, in any scheme of Reunion, inevitably and undoubtedly demand an insistence upon *some* kind of Regular and Catholic Ordination. Only thus can a Non-Catholic ministry become a Catholic—legitimately representative, to the present generation, of the original Historic Church ; only thus can Reunion be made acceptable to the larger section of Christendom. The heritage of the Church of England is twofold, having both a Catholic side and a Reformed. Apostolical succession is an essential part of the Catholic side of our heritage ; as loyal Churchmen we can never consent to betray it—and betrayed is what it would come to, unless Reunion is to mean nothing more than interchange of pulpits.

But, on the other hand, if we demand that the Nonconformist shall respect the Catholic side of our heritage, his heritage also must be respected in turn. We should press for Catholic Ordination, not on the ground of the supposed invalidity of his Orders, but on the grounds of Apostolic Order, of expediency, of the preservation of their Catholic heritage to the churches (in possession of the same) with which union is contemplated. Why need an insistence on Catholic Ordination be considered to involve a denial of the whole previous Churchmanship of Non-Catholics? Non-Catholic Churchmen broke their connection with the Catholic branch of the Church because (rightly or wrongly) they felt it was the only way of securing their Evangelical heritage; and now, having secured it, there is no reason why they should not be welcomed back again to take up the rest of their heritage—the Catholic part of it. Let us not theorize about the past, let us deal, practically, with the present. Non-Catholic Orders were certainly not valid for Catholics, but need we insist that they were not valid for Nonconformists themselves? Whatever theory of Orders we may prefer for ourselves, we can at least refrain from forcing it upon others. Let us face the fact that Non-Catholic Churchmen have been blessed by God, and refuse henceforth to treat them as outcasts. We can do so without losing our own Catholic Churchmanship; it is only certain rigid *theories* of Churchmanship that we need to disregard. Mere *Recognition* does injustice to the first of our two great facts; *Reordination*, on the ground of the total invalidity of the previous commission, does injustice to the second fact; *Extended Ordination* does injustice to neither, and justice to both.



Some Causes of Failure in the Christian Ministry.

BY THE VENERABLE T. J. MADDEN,

Archdeacon of Liverpool.

FAILURE! Causes of failure! Failure in the Christian ministry! What sad, depressing words are these! Failure, where failure means so much—more than in any other calling in the world. Failure, where the minister of Christ goes forth to his labours crowned with Divine promises of success. Has not the Everlasting God, the Author of eternal redemption, fixed His canon against failure? Can God fail of His purpose? And, if not, can we in any sense use the word “failure” in connection with the ministry of reconciliation? Just because we have this treasure in “earthen vessels,” just because of the frailties of our mortal nature, we have to acknowledge and confess that we have failed in our ministry as the stewards of the mysteries of God. And yet the temptation to many of us is to deny our *personal* responsibility for failure. We blame the parish and the people; we blame circumstances, when we ought to blame ourselves, for our unsuccessful ministry. We need to pray: “Search me, O God, and know my heart”; show me my true, real self; save me from *self-deception*. I know of no more subtle temptation than this—to turn our eyes away from ourselves and to fix them on persons and things without, and so persuade ourselves that if we were only placed in a different parish, with a different class of parishioners, and under less exacting conditions, success would be sure. This attitude of mind may be justified in a few cases; but, at any rate, do not persuade yourself that you are one of these unfortunate brethren—for the end of that way is spiritual despair. That the people we minister to are seldom the cause of our failure is clear from a study of the ministry in the Apostolic Church. There has been no more bitter opponent of the Gospel than the Jew—no more difficult man to convince and convert. The Lord described the religious Jews of His day as “serpents” and “vipers.” Out of this unpromising material the first Christian converts were made.

Study the history once again, and recognize that the victory was with St. Peter, St. Stephen and St. Philip—men of like passions with ourselves—because they were “full of faith and the Holy Ghost.” On the Day of Pentecost, and on the days that followed, there was only “a Man and a Message”; with this result—there were added to the Church *daily* thousands of converts. Look at St. Peter’s sermon, look at any of the sermons recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. They are simple narratives of historical events, leading up to brief summaries of the life of our Lord. You could not describe them as “eloquent,” or “polished,” or even “persuasive” sermons. They were the simple, unaffected utterances of men with a limited vocabulary, and of plain, homely speech. But behind the message was a MAN—baptized with the Holy Ghost. They were powerful sermons, because the messenger was endued with power from on high. Turn to the history of our own times, and what do we see? *Here* is a clergyman placed in a most difficult parish. The church is empty, the parishioners indifferent. He is a man of no special ability, with no great gifts of speech or originality of mind, and yet in a few years that parish becomes a centre of a vast and increasing work for God. The church is crowded, hundreds are converted, and the communicants’ roll is close upon one thousand. *There*, close to him, with almost the same conditions as regards the parish, we find a man, eloquent, able, scholarly, and yet, judging his work (as we can only judge it) by visible results, his ministry has failed. His church is almost empty, the communicants are few, and the parishioners are seemingly uninfluenced by the ministry of their parish church.

What is the explanation? It cannot be in the *circumstances* of the parishes. They are almost similar as regards population and people. We are therefore driven to this solution: that somehow the failure is connected with the ministry of the individual clergyman. Let us face the humiliating fact—the causes of failure lie chiefly in ourselves, and not in the parish or people.

If, then, we are driven to the conclusion that the causes of

failure are chiefly *personal*, let us honestly search them out ; for it is particularly baffling to fail without knowing why we fail.

Amongst the causes of failure in ourselves none is more obvious to others, and more disastrous to our spiritual influence, than *Vanity*. It is a vice to which we are, as clergymen, peculiarly exposed. At an early age we are placed in a prominent position ; our sacred calling makes us respected and welcomed in the homes of all classes ; kind and flattering things are said to us, and we grow vain and conceited. But while vanity may be, primarily, a vice of callow youth, it is not unknown amongst elderly ecclesiastics. It is the most subtle of sins, and assumes different forms in different individuals—self-love, self-conceit, self-assertion, self-glorification, a love of display, a spirit of boasting, arrogance, and, especially, intellectual arrogance. The vain man loves the praise of men, and to them he magnifies his work and his personality.

Another fruitful cause of failure is our *Inconsistencies*. The godless and the indifferent are ever on the watch for inconsistency in Christians. They find a grim satisfaction in pointing out to their fellows the inconsistencies of the clergy, and we all know how often a good man's ministry has suffered because he has not been scrupulously exact in his language, or paid his debts punctually, or ruled his own household in righteousness. How often has a hasty temper, a biting word, an ambitious spirit, a grasping love of money, a proud and haughty manner, caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme ! These things are noted and talked of at many a fireside, to the detriment of our influence and usefulness. It is more than sad when men give the lie by their lives to the solemn utterances of the pulpit.

There is need, then, that we should examine ourselves for faults of temper, faults of tongue, and faults of manner, lest we do despite to the Spirit of truth and holiness, the gift of God to us at our Ordination. It is the holy, consistent life of the clergyman that bears testimony to the power of the Gospel, and thereby wins others to accept that same saving evangel.

And a third cause of failure is our *Conformity to the World*, and the use of worldly methods to further the work of the Church

in our parishes. That is *the* temptation of our day. We have bazaars, whist-drives, parish dances, and private theatricals, in order to raise money for spiritual purposes. Can we think for one moment that, if we are doing God's work in God's way, He will leave us without the means to it? And have we ever raised money for God's work by questionable methods without our conscience condemning us? We have need again and again to admonish ourselves and to warn our people not to be conformed to this world. If the Spirit of Christ dwell in us, if we have in deed and truth renounced the world, we may be sure of this—God will use us for His glory. But if we truckle to the world ourselves, or drag the world and the things of the world into the work of God in the parish, there will undoubtedly be failure, and continued failure. What we all want to realize is this—that we did verily and in truth receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of the ministry, and that spiritual work can best be done by spiritual men, through spiritual means.

If the sin of worldliness attacks the city parson to the undermining of his spirituality and the degradation of his sacred ministry, the country clergyman suffers from the creeping paralysis of *Sloth*.

Indolence of body and mind and spirit lie at the bottom of the failure of many a country ministry. The people are few and oftentimes uninteresting. We can get round the parish comfortably once a month. After a very few years the monotony of it all crushes the spirit, and the work grows stale and dull, and enthusiasm dies. Then we become that contemptible creature, "a lazy minister." But is this the sin only of the country rector? Do we not know something of this disease—this paralyzing curse—even in our city ministry? The regular visiting of parishioners and of the parish schools, the morning in the study, the daily hour with God and His Word, are things of the past with not a few of us.

"God harden me against myself,
This coward with pathetic voice;
That craves for ease and rest and joy—
My hollowest friend, my deadliest foe,
My clog whatever road I go."

A further reason why we fail is our *Lack of Faith*—faith in God to use us for His own ends and purposes. The Church is His Church, the work His work. “All souls are Mine, saith the Lord.” The Almighty has called us and sent us forth with this commission: “To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.”

Why, then, should it be accounted a strange thing with us to have conversions frequently, as the result of the delivery of His message of love and reconciliation? Do we believe in God the Father *Almighty*, Who is mighty to save? Do we go forth to the sick chamber, to the cottage meeting, to the House of God, in the expectation that we shall be used of God, and that God will speak through us? As we stand paralyzed before the world’s devilry, we hear the reproachful words of our glorified Lord: “O ye of little faith, bring him hither *to Me*.”

The Churches now seem to put their faith in choirs, and clubs, and guilds; in armies, and societies, and services—all useful and necessary in their way. We hear so much of man and his machinery for saving souls, of *my* parish, and *my* organizations, and *my* schemes, and *my* plans, of “this great Babylon which I have built,” that it is little wonder God sometimes drives us forth with the dread sentence: “The kingdom has departed from thee”; because we give not the glory to God, because we have not faith in God our Saviour. Here I would stop to add a word of warning; not only must we have faith in God, but there must be strict and instantaneous obedience to the directing voice of God. When we hear the command, “Go near, and join thyself to this chariot,” there must be no arguing, no excuses, no quibbling with God the Holy Ghost. Here lies the path of success. Obey at once, and thus show your implicit faith and confidence, and many a sinner will go on his way rejoicing when you have preached unto him Jesus. The man who wishes not to fail must not only be *called* of God, but he must be both God-possessed and God-directed.

But amongst the personal causes of failure I know of none more fatal to a true spiritual ministry than *Professionalism*.

Professionalism is but the outward and visible sign of the

decay of the inward and spiritual life of the man. Whence this decay, deadness and formality, where all was once life and light in the Lord? It is often through neglected private and personal communion with the Source of all our spirituality. Probably there is nothing which so humbles us to the very dust as the thought of our private devotions. The best of us stand condemned when we think of our hurried, formal, faithless prayers. And formal private prayers react upon the services of the Sanctuary. The public prayers are read perfunctorily—without what our fathers called “unction.” We fail to lift the hearts of our people into the presence of God, because our own hearts are not there.

I have been reading during the last month the memoirs of Bishop Wilkinson and also a volume of his sermons, “The Invisible Glory.” The sermons, as you read them in cold type, are most disappointing. You wonder wherein lay their power, for these same sermons lifted many worshippers in St. Peter’s, Eaton Square, to a higher and holier plane of spiritual experience. The secret is revealed in the story of his life. The sermons were saturated with the prayers of the good Bishop. He lived, he thought, he preached, in an atmosphere of prayer. I do not think there is a new idea in the whole volume of sermons (that is a comfort for some of us); but those who heard them preached experienced a Divine power in each message, unto the salvation and edification of their souls. It is a secret we can all learn—that the one irresistible power in our ministry, in our preaching, is the power of prayer—prayer in the Holy Ghost.

“Why, therefore, should we do ourselves this wrong,
 Or others, that we are not always strong,
 That we are ever overborne with care,
 That we should ever weak or heartless be,
 Anxious or troubled, when with *us* is *prayer*,
 And joy and strength and courage are with *Thee*?”

But all real prayer carries with it *meditation*; the quiet waiting upon God, sitting still in His presence, until our soul, our whole inner being, is bathed in the Sublime—until we become partakers of the Divine nature. Meditation is the soul getting in tune

with the Infinite. In all personal religion there is the element of mysticism—of the true mysticism—of the soul silent and still before God. In this age of hurry and noise, of many meetings and engagements, we are losing this edifying gift. Our meditations ought to be orderly, ought to be connected with the great facts and the great truths of the sacred Scriptures. We must meditate kneeling upon our knees ; meditate, too, with the Holy Book in our hands ; meditate, as Phillips Brooks meditated, with pen and paper ready to record the whisperings of God to his inmost spirit. “For spirit with spirit can meet,” and God reveals His secrets to those that love and fear Him. And it is by this “sitting at His feet” we become like Him in character. Do we want to be holy men of God? Then let us meditate upon God’s holiness, and never forget, “We are as holy as we truly *will* to be holy,” and our hearty desire to be holy will keep us ever learning of Him who is the Holy One of God. Professionalism will wither and perish when the soul is filled with all the fulness of God, and that fulness is ours through prayer and meditation. These will cost time, will mean the ordering of our day into hours set apart for prayer, and work, and sermon preparation. We must steadfastly remember that our engagements with God are more important than those with men ; and we must keep them faithfully, or fail in our ministry.

What we want in these busy days is courage to say “no,” when to grow in grace, to become conformed to His image, is more important than to address meetings of all sorts and descriptions, and to undertake all kinds and varieties of work. Remember this : our people, as a whole, will only rise as high in their spiritual life, and no higher, than we ourselves. Not only for our own sakes, but for the sake of those over whom we are placed by God, we should be much in the presence of God. Even the *servicing of tables*, which one hears so much of, and which is too frequently a parrot cry, need not hinder us—any more than it hindered Stephen—from being full of faith and power. And all saw his face “as it had been the face of an angel.” Truly he must have turned that face more frequently to God than to men.

We have dealt with the causes of failure in the messenger, let us now consider the cause of failure in the MESSAGE. Of course if the messenger is in full fellowship and communion with the Holy Ghost, his message will be in the power and demonstration of the Spirit. We have need to take heed both to ourselves and to the doctrine—*‘κηρυξον του λογον*, should be the preacher’s motto.

What about *our own* preaching? Is it the faithful setting forth of the whole counsel of God, on sin, and on sin’s eternal penalty, on the Atonement, the vicarious sufferings of Christ, the love of God and the sanctification of believers? Have our sermons strong vitality? Do they hold? Or are they powerless to grip a single soul? Do we apply the Gospel of God to the hearts and consciences of our congregation, rich and poor alike, with all the earnestness of men who believe that their hearers are in danger of the wrath to come? Or have we become hucksters of the Word of the living God? Wherein lay the success of St. Peter and St. Paul as preachers? Not, surely, in any tricks of eloquence or flowers of rhetoric. Think of that insignificant Jew, with some obvious bodily defect, described by himself as “*contemptible* in speech,” as well as weak in body. What was the secret of his successful preaching? He himself tells us: “My preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power.” This is the secret of the preaching that tells—not physical force nor psychic force, but *spiritual* force.

We want, however, in our preaching, and in all our work, a little more *sympathy* with our people—that Jesus-like feeling of compassion for the multitude. Unless our hearts are touched, even to weeping, when we behold the people, unless our hearts go forth to them in our sermon, their hearts will not respond to the heavenly message.

There is only one way in which we can gain true sympathy with our people. We must be much *amongst* them, in touch with them, rejoicing with those that do rejoice, and weeping with those that weep. What reality there will be then in every sentence we utter from the pulpit! What point will be given to

many a sermon, because we have come not only from the study to the pulpit, but from the *parish* to the pulpit!

When I had completed my paper thus far, I was led to consult six of our Bishops as to what they considered the causes of failure in the Christian ministry. Their own outstanding spirituality (which they would be the last to acknowledge), and their position in the Church of God, give special value to their words. It will suffice if I give the replies of two of them in full—that of my own Bishop and that of the Bishop of Durham. These two cover the replies of the other Bishops.

The Bishop of Liverpool says :

“ I should be inclined to group the causes of failure into three classes—those in ourselves, our methods, and our people :

“ 1. IN OURSELVES.—Neglect of communion with God, professionalism, loss of high ideals, the imperceptible growth of slackness, through familiarity with our work, parish, and people.

“ 2. IN OUR METHODS.—Conservatism, which prevents us from keeping an open mind and adapting ourselves to changing circumstances, habits of thought, and fresh accessions of knowledge.

“ 3. IN OUR PEOPLE.—The growing love of novelty and change, impatience of discipline, dislike of definite doctrine and teaching (especially on such points as the righteousness of God, the obligation of law, the sinfulness of sin, the certainty of judgment on sin), the growing power of worldliness, and love of pleasure.”

The Bishop of Durham writes :

“ 1. I am afraid ‘ failure in the Christian ministry ’ is sadly common, if success is to be at all tested by evident spiritual results—conversions to God, and holy, consistent, unworldly lives, ready to serve others and sacrifice self.

“ 2. In pastoral life generally the chief reasons for failure (let me speak, not as a judge, but as one who knows something of his own failure) seem to me to be—

“(a) The lack of a close, personal ‘ walk with God ’; so that secret communion with Him is either crowded out by hurry or stifled by indolence.

“(b) Forgetfulness of elementary consistencies—in temper, talk, and (to use a vague but convenient word) tone.

“(c) Slackness or self-indulgence in common habits.

“(d) Forgetfulness of the fact that we are to be ‘ examples to the flock.’

“(e) Omission of sympathy with, and respect for, other people. (‘ Honour all men.’)

- “(f) Low ideals as to what we want with men—contentedness with mere ‘good Churchmanship,’ at the best; and, only too often,
 “(g) The use of worldly methods to help what should be spiritual work.

“3. With regard to failure in the pulpit, the main causes seem to me to be—

- “(a) A much too common undervaluing of the holy ordinance of preaching (an undervaluing alike unscriptural and ‘unchurchly’—see the Ordinal).
 “(b) Far too little prayer and pains over preparation (as a result of the undervaluing noticed above).
 “(c) A low state of faith in the power of the Word brought home by the Spirit.
 “(d) ‘Essay’ sermons, ‘clever’ sermons, and suchlike evils.
 “(e) Preaching ‘it’ instead of ‘Him.’ (This is a great cause of failure.)
 “(f) A lack of the indefinable tone of ‘witness’ to truth known by the preacher for himself.
 “(g) The absence of sympathy and respect for hearers; and last, but not least,
 “(h) A markedly frequent reticence about the fulness of the Atoning Sacrifice for present peace, and about the power of the Spirit for ‘victory to-day.’ (These last are the two Divine foci of the Gospel, wonderfully embodied and sealed to faith in the Holy Communion.)”

What is the *conclusion* of the whole matter?

To know the causes of our failures ought to be the first step to remedy them. We need not lie down under the weight of the disabling burden of our failings and our infirmities; yea, of our sins—for they are sins. He who forgave the cowardice of St. Peter, the doubts of St. Thomas, is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever. He walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks. He holds the stars in His right hand, He remembereth that we are but dust, that we have this treasure in earthen vessels. Let us go to Him in penitence, in faith. He is able to do abundantly above all that we can ask or think. If we give ourselves over to Him—“bind the sacrifice with cords even unto the horns of the altar”—He will receive us to empower us afresh with the “anointing” of the Holy Ghost; and failure will be turned into glorious success. “The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”

Chaucer's Churchfolk.

BY THE REV. HENRY ELLERSHAW, M.A.,

Professor of English Literature in the University of Durham.

EACH age has its own problems to settle, and each age is inclined to think that never before were the times so unruly and so far out of joint. Nowadays, for instance, the lawlessness and disregard for authority which are so characteristic seem far in excess of what has occurred before, and far more serious. The Church life, too, of our days is not without cause for anxiety. The faith once for all delivered to the saints seems not to satisfy those who profess to believe in it, and so one tries to whittle a bit off here, and another a bit off there, until the greatest difficulty exists in knowing what the connotation of the word "Christian" is in the mind of any of the individuals who use the term.

Still, though there are many things to disquiet us, we must not think that we have any monopoly of either social or Church problems. Our fathers had many to face, and, looking back, we shall see that they were neither simple nor trivial. If we consider the Churchfolk of Chaucer's time—that is, roughly, the second half of the fourteenth century—we shall find that, in spite of the picturesqueness of the age, we are not without much to be thankful for when we contrast our own period with his. History gives us plenty of information as to the character of those far-off days, and, without diving deep into diocesan and other records, anyone who cares for the older literature of his country may easily find material for forming an opinion. And it is unlikely that the opinion thus formed will be altered by subsequent study, for the more one goes into the history of the past, the more it seems that writers such as Chaucer have not misrepresented the state of society and the Church.

Among the personages assembled at the Tabard on that famous April day which marks the commencement of the

“Canterbury Tales” there are seven who are definitely connected with Church life, and, from what we read of them, some idea of the Church of the fourteenth century may be gained; and they may be taken as a fair sample. Chaucer is not the Juvenal of his age—Langland takes that part; he is rather the Horace, and the words of Persius applied to Horace we may well apply to Chaucer:

“Omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
Tangit et admissus circum præcordia ludit.”

Chaucer is a man of the world; he knows its vices, its weaknesses, its foibles. There is, moreover, in his composition a spice of charity. He does not condemn—that he leaves to others—yet he is too clear-eyed not to see how far his time had gone astray. We must not suppose that he approved what he saw merely because he does not abuse society in good round terms; *that* we are not justified in asserting. There is no doubt that he held up the mirror to his age, and in it we see that he noted many of the faults which another sterner man with a less delicate perception would have passed over unnoticed, as well as the more flagrant offences which all could see. And it is because of this—because Chaucer had this penetrating glance for little things—that we may well believe him when he brands the grosser faults; and, recognizing his mild temper, may well believe the more highly coloured accounts which we get from contemporary sources.

We must not think that Chaucer is unfair because a quarter of his characters are connected closely with Church life. We must remember that, if it were the duty of Churchfolk “to goon on pilgrimages,” *a fortiori* it would be the duty of those who were in some definite capacity the *alumni* of the Church; and, further, compared to the population, the number of religious was much greater than it is now. It is pretty certain that Chaucer gives a not overdrawn account of a pilgrimage of his day, and the picture which he presents to us is such that we must feel the time for pilgrimages was almost over—if not

quite. There was a time, of course, when a pilgrimage was a solemn religious duty, but by Chaucer's day there was a change. For most people it consisted of a merry journey, with a visit to the shrine of some saint as its excuse, and an equally merry return. What should we think nowadays of a religious procession being headed by a bagpipe? Yet that was the instrument upon which the Millere was an accomplished performer :

“A baggepipe wel koude he blowe and sowne,
And therwithal he broghte us out of towne.”

And in a short time—by the end of the Knight's Tale—this noble leader of the rout acknowledges that the ale of Southwark has been too potent for him, and insists on telling a story which, to say the least, is indecorous. Indeed, the only pilgrim throughout the “Tales” whose behaviour is in accord with his office is the Poor Parson, and he, when he rebukes the host for swearing by “Goddes bones,” earns the retort :

“‘O, Jankyn, be ye there ?
I smelle a Loller in the wind,’ quod he.
‘Nowe good men,’ quod our hoste, ‘herkneth me ;
Abydith, for Goddes digne passioun,
For we shall han a predicacioun ;
This Loller here will prechen us somewhat.’”

Twenty-nine pilgrims were assembled at the Tabard, drawn from all grades of society—knighthood, the Church, medicine, law, trade, and agriculture, besides other callings which were represented, but with which we are not concerned. The first of Chaucer's characters which properly engages our attention is the Prioress. Her portrait is a dainty one. Named Madame Eglentyne, she was demure in her smiling, sang the office through her nose “ful semely,” as Chaucer humorously puts it, and took pains to appear well-bred and of courtly manner. But though in many traits the account is delightful, can we believe in her sincerity to the ideal of her calling? There is much to show that the lady was more delicately worldly than deeply religious, and there is hardly a doubt that she thought more of

her manners than her beads. I wonder what interpretation she put on "Amor vincit omnia"!

As for the Monk, there is no disguising the fact that Chaucer saw that his demeanour was in utter opposition to his calling; and how slyly he expresses this opinion!

"This ilke Monk leet olde thynges pace,
 And heeld after the newe world the space.
 He yaf nat of that text a pulled hen
 That seith that hunters beth nat hooly men,
 Ne that a Monk whan he is recchelees
 Is likned til a fissh that is waterlees.

* * * *

But thilke text heeld he nat worth an oystre;
 And I seyde his opinioun was good
 What sholde he studie and make hymselfen wood,
 Upon a book in cloystre alwey to poure,
 Or swynken with his handes and labour
 As Austyn bit? how shall the world be served?"

That this case was no isolated one we learn from the Visitation which William of Wykeham held of the monastery at Selborne in 1387. In the Bishop's directions for a reformation we find, under Articles 9, 11, and 29, the very offences reprov'd which Chaucer notes.¹

But, however much the Monk may have transgressed the rules of his order, he seems to have been free from the gross offences of which there is little doubt the Frere was guilty; for the latter, using the influence due to his position, appears to have taken advantage of many of the young women with whom he made acquaintance. He was a licensed beggar, merry and unprincipled, hail-fellow-well-met with all the countrymen of his district, and, moreover, on friendly terms in the town with women of position. The secret of his influence probably lay in this, that he asserted he had power of confession in excess of that possessed by the parish priest.² Further, his penance

¹ This document may be easily consulted, as it forms Appendix iii. to White's "Selborne."

² We know that such powers were given in special cases to the friars; see, e.g., Surtees, vol. cix., p. 304, where we read that Urban IV. had given power to the Carmelites to hear confessions and impose penance—"nisi forte talia com[m]iserint propter quae sedes Apostolica sit merito consulenda."

was easy where he had plenty of good food. Well known at the tavern, he cared little for the poor, and would even take a farthing from a widow without a shoe to her foot, such a shameless beggar was he! He was worldly wise, and as for being a *poor* Frere—no one less :

“ He was not lyk a cloysterer
With a thredbare cope, as is a poure scoler,
But he was lyk a maister, or a pope ;
Of double worstede was his semy cope,
That rounded as a belle out of the presse.”

What Chaucer has to say is emphasized by Gower in the “*Vox Clamantis*,” Books iii. and iv. ; and what we learn from the Prologue is amplified in the mouth of the Summoner when that worthy comes before us.

A much pleasanter character is that of the Clerk of Oxenford. He had studied long, was lean, and “looked holwe.” His garments showed his poverty, “for he hadde geten hym yet no benefice.” Yet, apparently, he preferred poverty to the sacrifice of principle, for the poet goes on to tell us that “ne was so worldly for to have office”—that is, some unclerical employment. A wise man, he preferred twenty books to rich robes or a musical instrument. With grateful mind he used to pray for the souls of such as aided him in his search after knowledge. Money, thought, and time were all lavished on learning, and Chaucer surely depicts the true scholar in the words with which he concludes his sketch :

“ And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.”

In passing, however, it may be noticed that, although it seems a common idea that in pre-Reformation days the Bible was but little known, this was hardly the fact. In Middle English literature there are plenty of references to it, and Chaucer himself was not ignorant of it. Indeed, from the description of the Doctour of Phisik, we should be led to the inference that to be ignorant of the Bible denoted a careless or ungodly liver. We are told of the Doctour that—

“ His studie was but litel on the Bible.”

This would be a thing hardly worth noticing unless it were contrary to popular usage and expectation.

The best-known personage among the Canterbury Pilgrims is certainly the parish priest—the “Poure Persoun” of a town. Nor can any praise be too high for the delicacy of the portrait or the worthiness of the subject. The Parson was poor, holy in thought and work, and a learned man moreover: and of these qualifications none is more needed in our own days than the last, though there are folk who prefer a football-player as a parson. In every aspect of the priestly life the Parson was Christ's true servant—“he was a shepherd, and nought a mercenarie”:

“This noble ensample to his sheepe he yaf,
That firste he wroghte and afterward he taughte.
Out of the gospel he tho wordes caughte,
And this figure he added eek therto,
That if gold ruste what shal iren do.”

It was not his wont to leave his flock and run

“To Londoun unto Seint Paules
To seken hym a chaunterie for soules.”

But it is impossible to render the portrait in other than Chaucer's colours, so let those who list turn to the Prologue:

“A bettre preest I trowe that nowher noon ys;
He waited after no pompe and reverence,
Ne maked him a spiced conscience,
But Cristes loore and his Apostles twelve,
He taughte, and first he folwed it hym selve.”¹

In the few lines which follow we have sketched the Christian labourer. He was a Plowman, and the brother of the Parson. We learn:

“A trewe swynkere and a good was he,
Lyvyng in pees and parfit charitee.
God loved he best, with al his hoole herte,

¹ The line “ne maked him a spiced conscience” is generally misinterpreted. The mistake arises from giving conscience a different meaning here from that which is given to the word when used (twice) of the Prioress. We are told by some that the Parson had not a scrupulous conscience. *That is just what he had.* If not, the lines which follow are nonsense. If conscience be taken in the sense of *feelings*, then *spiced conscience* means touchy feelings, and that gives the true sense and makes the passage consistent.

At alle tymes, thogh him gamed or smerte,
And thanne his neighebore right as hymselfe."

From the heights of holy living the poet takes us to the depths in the picture which he gives us of the Somonour and the Pardoner. The Summoner was a drunkard and a debauchee, with a fiery-red face covered with knobs and pimples, which terrified children. His ignorance was colossal; when drunk, Latin was his only talk :

" A fewe termes hadde he, two or thre
That he had lerned out of som decree
* * * * *
But whoso koude in oother thing hym grope,
Thanne hadde he spent al his philosophie."

Further, he would teach the sinner to be in no awe of the curse of the Archdeacon, unless his soul was in his purse; in that case, the Archdeacon was someone to be afraid of, for he had the power of inflicting fines on the misdoers. Thus, truly "Pers is the Ercedekenes helle"—that is, his place of punishment. This reprobate Summoner has under his jurisdiction the young folk of the diocese, and what could be expected to eventuate from the influence of such a guide, with his parrot-cry of "Questio quid juris"?

His Comrade, who was such another as himself, rode with head uncovered save for a cap, and with eyes glaring like a hare's. On his lap before him lay his wallet, brim full of pardons all hot from Rome. Among his baggage he had a pillow-slip, which he asserted was our Lady's veil; and, in addition to this precious treasure, he said he had a piece of the sail of the vessel in which St. Peter was when he attempted to leave it and meet our Lord as He walked on the sea. Moreover, he had a Cross of latten full of stones, and pigs' bones in a glass, which he told the country-folk were relics; and, with these beguiling the people, he got in a day more money than the Parson could collect in a couple of months. In church he seemed a noble ecclesiastic, who could read well a lesson or 'storie'—that is, the series of lessons at mattins which took its

name from the first respond. But what he did best of all was to sing the offertory—this, by the way, was not the same thing as the collection. His object here seems to have been, by singing lustily the *offertorium*, to get his voice into good order for the sermon, that with clear and well-modulated tones he might the better persuade his hearers to open their purses.

Such are Chaucer's Churchfolk, and it might be thought that his estimate of them was uncharitable if we had been obliged to take his word alone. But, as a matter of fact, we need do no such thing. What he says is re-echoed and amplified by Gower, Langland, and Wiclif, to mention only well-known names, and what they say is confirmed by plenty of good documentary authority. If we extend our view and pass beyond our own country, we find that what furnished grounds of complaint here furnished grounds of complaint also elsewhere. On all hands we are confronted by a mass of evidence which goes to show that at this time, brilliant and splendid as it was in many respects, there was a real declension in Church life, and that all countries were affected by the blight. It is true that there must have been, in all classes of the religious, figures as noble as that of the Poor Parson; but the point is that the complaints against the Church were world-wide, and it is not likely that this phenomenon could have made its appearance without cause. And we must remember, further, that these complaints were made in many cases by those who were by no means enemies of the Church—take Langland as an instance. We are often tempted to look back with regret upon the Middle Ages, but, when we inquire more nearly into things, we have reason to thank God that we live in the days we do, and not least that the English Church to-day, in spite of its dissensions, has advanced to a general level nearer to that ideal which the Poor Parson holds up to us across the centuries.



William King : a Great Archbishop.

By M. G. MEDCALF.

THE name of William King, though, perhaps, unfamiliar to English readers, has a just claim to our remembrance as a great church-builder, and a zealous champion of the material and spiritual interests of the Church. The greatest of the Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation, no other prelate has left his mark on the diocese to the same extent. Dean of St. Patrick's in the days of the Revolution, he took a prominent part in the stirring events of these times. A strong ruler, a good fighter, he made many enemies as he passed through life. But his enemies were those whose vices gave them good cause to fear him. His was no faultless character. He was stern and unyielding, at times even arrogant and overbearing, but in days when everything was bought and sold, William King stands out as an upright and conscientious pastor of souls, who devoted all his powers and all his substance to the service of the Church.

William King was born in 1650 in the town of Antrim, the son of a Scotch Presbyterian. As a small boy he had the greatest difficulty in learning how to read. As a schoolboy he showed a very independent spirit, refusing to learn anything until satisfied himself as to its practical utility. He often played truant from school in order to read biography and history. Of this part of his life he says in his Autobiography : " I obtained a book of arithmetic and learned the rules with the greatest pleasure as far as the extraction of square root, but I dared not tell this to anyone lest I should be flogged." He rebelled against what he considered the unprofitable labour of learning by heart a Latin grammar in Latin, while all the time he was reading diligently in spare hours the works of Ovid, Virgil, Persius, and Horace.

Practically self-taught so far, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, at the age of seventeen, where he was soon elected to

a scholarship. It was his good fortune to come under the influence of a pious and faithful tutor, one John Christian, a man worthy of his name. The latter found the young student ignorant of the very elements of Christianity. In his school-days, King tells us, he learnt "nothing about the public or private worship of God, nothing about Catechism or Sacrament, about the Creed or Ten Commandments or Lord's Prayer." He had never known anyone who practised private prayers until he entered college. "When all forms of prayer were done away with," he says, "it was scarcely possible that rude and ignorant lads should make prayers for themselves." These almost incredible facts reveal the depth of irreligion to which the nation had sunk at this time.

King, in after-life, expressed the deepest gratitude to his friend, John Christian, from whom he received his first lessons in the Christian faith. Yet his own action was characteristically independent. He set about a systematic inquiry into the whole subject, working his way through natural to revealed religion, and passing in review all the various forms which Christianity had assumed in his day, until finally he ended by becoming a convinced Christian and obedient Churchman. That such a vast amount of reading, which occupied two years of his undergraduate life, should have been attempted by a young student, is sufficient proof of his earnestness. Nor were Arts neglected, for shortly before taking Holy Orders William King competed for a Fellowship, and failed by no means discreditably.

William King now became private chaplain to Parker, Archbishop of Tuam, by whom he was appointed to the charge of seven parishes and the Provostship of Tuam Cathedral. This part of Ireland was then, as to-day, an admirable playground for the wealthy classes. In the gay society into which he was thrown the young priest must often have been told he was a fool to waste his time over musty volumes or parish duties, when the salmon and trout fishing and duck shooting and red-deer hunting were in full swing. Encouraged by his patron the Archbishop, King, nevertheless, made time, often in

the small hours, for study, and acquired specially a knowledge of Canon Law, which stood him in good stead in after-life.

After six years of this life, Parker having become Archbishop of Dublin, King found himself, at the age of twenty-nine, Chancellor of St. Patrick's and Incumbent of St. Werburgh's, then one of the most important parishes in Dublin. He welcomed the change from the "lazy and indolent state of life which he led in the country," to quote his own words, and threw himself with characteristic energy into city parochial work. At this time King, like other Churchmen of his day, was a Tory in politics, upholding the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and the duty of passive obedience.

In 1685, with the accession of James, came a time of sore trial for the loyal Church party. The charge of inconsistency has been brought against King. There is no doubt that he changed his opinions, as did many others, when the policy of James reduced the political doctrine of Churchmen to a practical absurdity. It is not true to say that he trimmed his sails and went with the tide.

He engaged in a controversy with Peter Manby, Dean of Derry, who, having turned Roman Catholic, and continuing to enjoy the emoluments of his Deanery, had the audacity to attack the doctrines of the communion which he had abandoned. The controversy, which turned on the essential matter and form of Holy Orders, caused much sensation at the time.

The appointment by James of a Jesuit priest, Dr. Stafford, to the Deanery of Christ Church, Dublin, was disputed by King in the ecclesiastical courts.

Panic prevailed among the Protestant population. There was a general exodus to England in the early part of 1689. Amongst those who fled were Dr. Francis Marsh, Archbishop of Dublin, and Dr. Huntingdon, Provost of Trinity College. The former appointed Chancellor King as his commissary, to rule the diocese in his absence. About this time also King was elected Dean of St. Patrick's by the Cathedral Chapter. The two appointments testify to the confidence and

respect with which King was regarded by his fellow-Churchmen. As Professor Stokes puts it, he was the only clergyman in Dublin that showed he had a head on his shoulders during those troubled times. When all his ecclesiastical superiors ran away, he alone stood his ground and faced the storm.

It soon arrived. King James entered Dublin on Palm Sunday, 1689. All Protestant citizens were disarmed. An armed force kept guard over Trinity College. Terror reigned in the city, and people went abroad at the risk of their lives. In May the Parliament was held, at which was passed the famous Act of Attainder, a comprehensive measure by which over 2,000 Irish Protestants found their property confiscated, and their persons liable to death or imprisonment.

These events removed the lingering scruples in the mind of Dean King as to the lawfulness of armed resistance. Henceforth he stood openly on the side of William of Orange. He continued to administer the affairs of the diocese, and, although many of the clergy had fled, he arranged so that "not one church was left without a curate during the whole time of the tyranny." His courage and abilities, however, marked him out as a dangerous person, and in July of that year he was imprisoned in Dublin Castle. When in prison he wrote a diary,¹ which has recently been published by Professor Lawlor (Dublin University), and which is valuable as throwing much light on events in Ireland during this period. Dean King was released before Christmas, but could not walk the streets of Dublin without risk to his life.

The Battle of the Boyne in the following June turned the tide decisively against the Stuarts. William entered Dublin in triumph after the battle. A thanksgiving service was held in St. Patrick's Cathedral, at which the Dean was the preacher. Inquiring afterwards his name, the Orangeman was pleased to make a jest thereon: "He is a namesake, since I am King William and he is William King!"

¹ The Latin autobiography quoted *passim* first appeared in the *English Historical Review*, 1898.

When all was safe and quiet, Archbishop Marsh returned to Dublin, and Dean King's services and sufferings were rewarded by promotion to the important See of Derry.

Consecrated Bishop in Christ Church Cathedral on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1691, William King tells us that he took that Apostle for his model. The circumstances of the time, however, compelled him to imitate St. Paul as the stern repressor of offences and abuses more than in the gentler graces.

On taking possession of the Diocese of Derry, Bishop King found it in a woeful condition. The three years' war, followed by the terrible siege, had left the land desolate. There was scarce a habitable house in the diocese, the churches were in ruins, and the clergy wellnigh destitute. The Bishop set to work with energy to restore the waste places. Seven churches were rebuilt at once; others were repaired. The Bishop himself contributed generously in each case, while calling on the parishioners to do their share. He also assisted the distressed clergy out of his own pocket. Schools were reopened, and the Bishop insisted on the restoration of a regular order of Divine Service, and the residence of the clergy in their parishes.

Bishop King found the greatest hindrance to the progress of the Church in these parts to lie in the power and influence of Dissent. To combat some of the false ideas that prevailed, he published a work called "The Inventions of Man in the Worship of God." In it he compares the rule of the Church with the practice of Nonconformists, showing the former to be in agreement with Holy Scripture, while the latter were merely human inventions. The fifth chapter deals with Holy Communion, and shows that the weekly celebration, which is the rule of the Church, is in accordance with Scripture and the usage of the Primitive Church. The book caused a great stir among those against whom it was aimed. Nonconformists were surprised to find their own favourite weapon turned against themselves. Two Presbyterian ministers attempted a reply. The Bishop retorted by addressing "An Admonition to

the Dissenters of the Diocese of Derry," which he followed up by a "Second Admonition." In the latter, illustrating the importance which the Church attaches to Holy Communion, he refers to the Rev. George Walker, who kept up constant celebrations of Holy Communion in Derry Cathedral all through the siege, and who, when wine became scarce, used to mix it with water in order to eke it out. With this he contrasts the practice of Dissenters who have put the sermon—the words of men—in the place of the Divinely appointed means of grace.

In a letter to a friend written about this time, the Bishop mentions returning from a visitation in which he carried the Consistorial Court with him and prescribed penance to near one hundred people, for one thing or another. He adds: "I had great crowds of dissenters everywhere, and entertained them with a discourse."

The famous trial of Bishop Hackett at this time affords a lamentable illustration of the neglect and corruption into which the Church had fallen. Bishops King of Derry, Dopping of Meath, and Wiseman of Dromore, were appointed a Royal Commission to examine into the state of the Diocese of Down and Connor and the charges against its Bishop and clergy. Bishop Hackett had neglected his diocese for nineteen years, residing in London, and selling the livings in his gift to the highest bidder. An Archdeacon named Matthews had made himself Rector of half the parishes in Down and many in Dromore, all of which he neglected equally. Bishop Hackett was found guilty of simony and neglect of duty, and was deposed. Matthews and other delinquents were also deprived. The case is interesting, because it afforded precedents and guidance to Sir Walter Phillimore and other great English lawyers and canonists in the famous ritual trial of the sainted Bishop King of Lincoln.

* * * * *

In 1703 Bishop King was translated to the Metropolitan See of Dublin. He had not been long installed in his new dignity before he became involved in a quarrel with the

authorities of Christ Church Cathedral. The point in dispute was the Archbishop's right of visitation and jurisdiction. Flagrant abuses and irregularities in connection with the Cathedral made the latter especially anxious to assert that right. The Dean and Chapter appropriated the revenues of no less than twenty-seven parishes, and in several of these made no provision for the spiritual charge. Nor was this all. The sacred edifice and its precincts were allowed to be desecrated in a shocking fashion. The crypt was let to tapsters and tobacco dealers; the chapter-house was turned into a toy-shop, the judges had their robing-rooms within the precincts, and the entire edifice was in a pitiful condition of neglect. The case dragged on for more than twenty years, and was brought before several courts in Ireland and England. A less tough antagonist than King would have wearied of the struggle. It finally terminated in the House of Lords with a victory for the Archbishop. Anyone going into the history of this case and reading both sides will be satisfied that the Archbishop's long conflict was a noble battle for the cause of righteousness and true religion.

But King's episcopate in Dublin is memorable for better things than lawsuits. He was a great church-builder. Dublin, which had been a small city clustered round the two cathedrals, now began to spread on all sides. By Archbishop King's efforts the growth of the Church kept pace with that of the city. Dublin is to-day, as regards division of parishes, very much what this great prelate made it. The city parishes and churches of St. Mary, St. Paul, St. James, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Ann, date from his episcopate. Also there is a list extant of some twenty suburban and country churches repaired and, in some cases, rebuilt under his rule. In nearly every case when a new church was built a residence for the incumbent was also provided. The Archbishop's efforts, seconded by Dean Swift, restored to the Church the first-fruits (known in England as Queen Anne's Bounty), and they were chiefly used for the purchase of glebes. It was his care also to make due provision

for the stipend, and by his efforts a quantity of tithes appropriated to the See were devoted to their original purpose—the support of the parochial clergy. The Archbishop's personal generosity and liberality were unbounded. He remained a bachelor to the end of his days, and, like his great model, St. Paul, all his care and provision for the future were concerned with the Church. And as he did not wish the parochial endowments¹ which he secured to be enjoyed by an ignorant or idle priesthood, the conditions were attached in each case that the incumbent must be a graduate and resident in the parish. His desire to insure a well-instructed ministry led him to found a Lectureship in Divinity in Trinity College, and none of his numerous benefactions have been more fruitful in promoting the welfare of the Church.

The Duke of Grafton, Viceroy of Ireland in King's advanced years, describes him as "very indiscreet in his actions and expressions, pretty ungovernable, to a ridiculous extent national, but, in justice to him, he is charitable, hospitable, a despiser of riches, and an excellent bishop, for which reasons he has generally the love of the country, and a great influence and sway over the clergy and bishops who are natives."

The last somewhat contemptuous expression reveals a policy to which both Archbishop King and Dean Swift offered vigorous opposition—that, namely, by which deserving Irish clergy were passed over for promotion and strangers from England put over them who cared naught about Ireland save as an easy means of wealth. But these were the days when, under Walpole's long régime of corruption, ecclesiastical promotion was bestowed entirely for political reasons.

The good Archbishop lived to the age of seventy-nine years, and died May 8, 1729. All his life a man of immense industry and energy, he was yet a constant sufferer from ill-health. The amount of literary matter he left behind is amazing,

¹ When the State robbed the Irish Church in 1869, some scruples were felt about taking Archbishop King's and other private benefactions, and a sum of £500,000 was handed over in their stead.

considering what a busy public life he lived. Besides works on theology and philosophy, he collected a large mass of material for an Irish Church history, and his letters fill seventeen large volumes. His "State of the Irish Protestants under James" is his best-known popular work.

The Divinity Professorship which he founded in Trinity College keeps alive among us the memory of the great Archbishop whose earnest desire was that the Irish clergy should be a learned and useful body. For the last twenty years that chair has been ably filled by the Very Rev. John H. Bernard, D.D., late Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, but whose recent appointment to the See of Ossory now causes his resignation of the Professorship.

To our shame, it must be recorded that the remains of our most illustrious Archbishop, to whom the Dublin Diocese owes so much, lie in a grave unmarked by the simplest tombstone in the churchyard of St. Mary's, Donnybrook.

The writer of the above sketch wishes to acknowledge indebtedness to the late Professor Stokes' "Irish Church Worthies," edited by H. J. Lawlor, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Dublin University; to the Autobiography and Diary of Archbishop King, edited by the same; and to "Peplographia Dublinensis."



Concerning Sacrilege and its Consequences.

By M. ADELIN COOKE.

WHEN "two priests of the Church of England," edited Sir Henry Spelman's "History and Fate of Sacrilege," it was, no doubt, with the feeling that the time had come when a warning for future generations should be uttered.

Abbeys and abbey lands are for the most part irrevocably lost, but there remain bishoprics, colleges and churches—which, had King Henry VIII. lived longer, would probably have shared the same fate as the monasteries—and English people are some sixty-four years or so nearer what seems likely to be the great act of spoliation of the twentieth century. What will be done with the confiscated revenues of our national Church, funds or lands given from time to time to the Church and for the Church's use by pious folk, who as little dreamed of the prospect of their being alienated from her, as did the hosts of persons who left money and endowed chantries so that Masses should be said for the repose of their souls, that a day would come when chapels and chantry priests should be swept away? Without embarking on the vexed question of disposing of the Church's property, we may very well remember what was accomplished in the sixteenth century—although King Henry solemnly affirmed in Parliament that he would "order the chantries, colleges, and hospitals, and other places"—given to him "to the glory of God and the profit of the commonwealth"—and strike at what is after all at the root of the matter, which is that any act which deprives the Church of what has been given for her use is sacrilege, and as such is bound to have its reward.

When, indeed, has sacrilege ever gone unpunished? Our author, the worthy knight who was possessed of the sites of two Norfolk abbeys which occasioned the expenditure of much money in law-suits, and who found himself to be far happier and more fortunate when eventually quit of them, traces back sacrilege to our common parents, Adam and Eve, and cites

instance after instance from the Old Testament to support his theory. Such examples—it is unnecessary to quote what will be immediately remembered—occur frequently throughout the Bible, always with retribution following upon them, most often in death, such as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, Achan, who was stoned for taking what was consecrated to God, or Uzza, who stretched forth his hand to stay the ark; frequently in sudden disease, or in childlessness—an awful judgment for a Jew—or the final extinction of the entire family, as in the case of Jeroboam, who sacrilegiously made the golden calves for the Israelites to worship. Instances of sacrilege offered to the Temple at Jerusalem by invading armies are recited in the Books of Maccabees, and the punishment thereof, as for example the scourging of Heliodorus.

Sacrilege, however, was held by the Pagans to be quite as dreadful a sin, and quite as awfully rewarded; and often and often we read of the fate which befell heathen generals and commanders who fired or sacked temples and destroyed images. Never are they left unpunished; they fall into fearful straits; they are seized with madness or loathsome diseases, or are murdered by their sons; their children are killed, or suffer shipwreck, or destroy themselves. History, both ancient and modern, furnishes innumerable examples of sacrilege and its consequences—violent deaths, extraordinary accidents, insanity, absence of male heirs, poverty, and inability for estates to remain long in the same hands.

Naturally, that which has to do with our own country most concerns us, though there are striking examples in French history, and the misfortunes and ultimate fate of our royal race of Stuart are traced by Sir Henry Spelman in the most interesting manner from that hasty action of Robert the Bruce when he slew the Red Comyn in the very church. I suppose, too, that William the Conqueror is a fairly notable instance—he is at all events a popular one—and the belief that all his troubles were due to the destruction of churches in the New Forest is widely spread.

Most of all, however, do the annals of English history point to the spoliation of the Church when King Henry VIII. ordered the monasteries to be suppressed, and the consequences of such a wide-reaching act of sacrilege, to the Crown, the actual agents and benefactors, and to the nation. There are some people who assert that the monasteries had failed to fulfil their purpose, and so rightly received an end. There were notorious cases undoubtedly, but for the most part ecclesiastical establishments were centres of devotion, light, and learning—centres, too, where the poor were diligently relieved—the poor who by the Dissolution were spread broadcast over England without means of subsistence. The point, however, is not what the monasteries were in the sixteenth century, or whether they had served their office, but that they had been founded and endowed for the glory of God, and that what they contained had been given to Him and for His honour and worship, and that to take away and appropriate to lay hands and lay uses what was consecrated for this purpose was sacrilege. Let us see how this great sin was punished, for punished it was, and that in a sufficiently awful and lasting manner which has not yet been expiated in the twentieth century. Of the nobles who were the first original grantees of Church lands, all are extinct in the male line save eight, and of the terrible dooms in which their families were involved, the misfortunes, ruin, poverty, sin, and failure of heirs, Spelman gives a long and direful description. Enriched as they were who either bought or were granted the abbeys of the Church, it is an extraordinary fact that it seemed impossible for them to be kept in those families; instead of passing from father to son, they went from one person to another, bringing tribulation on all who possessed them. The absolute failure of male heirs is very marked in the numerous instances which Spelman recounts for our instruction; it appears, indeed, to be the common curse on those who own Church property, so that family after family is blotted out, even when five or six times over the same name has been taken by distant relatives or by the successors of female heiresses so as to preserve it.

We suppose that it is generally conceded that the possessor of Church land falls under the Church curse of fire and water, and many are the instances adduced in local histories or guide-books, the annals of noble families, and accounts of genealogies, in which these elements have played a prominent part. There are also, however, certain abbey lands which lie under a special curse, that of the abbot who was being ejected from his monastery and who solemnly cursed the invader and his successors ; or a curse attached to lands, as is the case with the manor of Sherborne, given by William I. to Osmund, Earl of Dorset and Bishop of Sarum, and by him returned to the See, and protected by grievous penalties upon all who should alienate it from the bishopric. "That whosoever should take those lands from the bishopric, or diminish them in great or in small, should be accursed, not only in this world, but also in the world to come, unless in his lifetime he made restitution thereof."

The history of Sherborne Castle from the time when King Stephen reft it from Bishop Roger of Sarum is one long account of strife between the Bishops and such parties, and the misfortunes which befell those who attained it unlawfully.

The history of such curses is interesting and extraordinary, none perhaps more so than the story of that thirteenth-century Earl of Pembroke, who took two manors belonging to the Bishop of Fernes in Ireland. The Bishop, failing to receive them back, excommunicated the Earl and his son (who also refused restitution) after him in the words of the Psalm, "In a generation his name shall be put out," which accordingly happened, for within fifteen years all five brothers died childless.

All the mitred abbeys are instanced in this curious and awe-inspiring book which was "Published for the Terror of Evil Doers," and to which the two priests—the Rev. Dr. Neale and Rev. Joseph Haskoll—contributed much extra matter. We learn the fate of the grantees of Rievaulx, Bath, Fountains, Canterbury, Coventry, Tewkesbury, Shrewsbury, Evesham, Glastonbury, St. Albans and many more, both of well-known names of famous abbeys or of lesser foundations which now,

perhaps, are remembered only by the name of a street. With each and all the fate of the first owner is given, with much concerning their succeeding possessors, and it forms so awful a list of dire retribution that, were the book (the last edition was published about 1888) more widely known, we cannot help thinking that the subject might receive serious consideration, and some restitution, at least, be made to the Church. There are estates which everybody knows belonged to some once-celebrated monastery, but the partition and distribution of Church lands has been so great that it is almost impossible to say who, innocently enough, may not have them amongst his possessions. Certain it is that prosperity cannot attend those who, if not concerned with actual sacrilege, are yet parties to the sin in retaining what they know to have been originally consecrated for the service of God. It is difficult to urge a policy of absolute restitution, yet much might be done, especially to prevent the ruins of sacred abbey churches being given over to feasting and merriment on the part of thoughtless tourists.

A bright memory among such establishments is the use to which the Benedictine Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul and St. Augustine at Canterbury has been put. When the great monastery was suppressed it was first used by the Crown, came into the possession of Lord Cobham, whose family became extinct in the male line, and changed hands with the customary frequency of Church property. After being desecrated for years it was bought by Mr. A. Beresford-Hope (to whom by a strange coincidence the editors of 1846 dedicated the "History and Fate of Sacrilege"), and was finally rebuilt and restored as the training quarters of men who should go out as missionaries to all the world.

Let us hope that such an example may lead others to the serious consideration of Church estates, and how they may still be consecrated to God's glory, and to understand that all which has once been devoted to Him can never pass into lay hands, or be put to lay uses, without being guilty of the sin of sacrilege and as surely reaping a just retribution.

Discussions.

[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 15th of the month.]

"A PRAGMATIST VIEW OF PRAYER-BOOK REVISION."

(*"The Churchman,"* November, p. 838.)

MR. EMMET'S axiom that "the best (Prayer-Book) is simply that which works best" is one to which most will agree. It affords a most useful basis for discussion, and some chance of arriving at agreement.

He proposes of vestments that they should be optional, "care being taken to secure that the congregation in which they are used is one which is actually helped by them." Surely this proposition carries the corollary that the congregation must at least be able to formulate its opinion, and make it known?

Having been brought up in England, and now for five years quartered in Scotland, I wish I could impress upon the Church of England what a great strength democratic control is to its sister Churches of Scotland. The people here in Scotland seem to feel that the Church is their own. The plan of electing ministers to vacant charges has many drawbacks, but it makes the people feel bound to support the man chosen. A man may not have voted for the minister himself, but probably his father did, and he feels bound to support his father's choice.

It is to this I attribute the crowds hurrying to the churches on Sunday morning in the Scotch towns.

In Presbyterian churches the minister chooses the Lessons, and he generally chooses those which will illustrate or help his sermon. The congregation then, on hearing the Lesson, naturally wonder what the minister is going to say about it, and this quickens their interest. The whole plan greatly assists the minister in teaching his people from the Word of God.

In the Church of England, on the other hand, the First Lesson is generally one the hearers already know almost by heart; it is the merest coincidence if the two Lessons bear on the same subject, and many clergymen apparently regard the matter as so hopeless that they will take a text from the Epistle or Gospel when these are not going to be read at the service.

In the Church of England many chapters of the Old Testament are never read, though almost as beautiful as those read every year.

One minister told me that he had drawn out a three-year scheme. This would probably be very useful, especially if it were only regarded

as obligatory to read one Lesson from it, the other being chosen by the preacher to suit his subject.

No one who has attended Presbyterian churches can fail to be struck by the appeal which prayers appropriate to the season and the affairs of the day make to the reverent attention of the people, and also to the extra burden of preparation which they lay upon the minister.

But is it not recognized in the Church of England that the clergyman may pray as he pleases in the pulpit after the sermon? If so, this seems to meet the need of an opportunity to offer prayers suitable to the time. And if no special event has to be prayed about, surely the preacher should gather up the thoughts of his sermon in a short prayer. For, if he succeeds in making the people join with him in such petitions, his sermon has certainly not been in vain. And if his sermon has been an effective appeal, the people will certainly join in such a prayer.

The Anglican and Presbyterian Churches have very much to learn from each other; and the Presbyterian ministers are aiming at that which works best, and have no prejudice against Episcopacy. Anglicans would do well to study Scotch methods in many matters; and this may bring reunion, for the Scotch are not only studying, but adopting such Anglican methods as they find helpful.

F. A. MOLONY (*Major, R.E.*).



Notices of Books.

The Reader's Commentary: ROMANS. By Principal Grey. London: Robert Scott. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH. By A. T. Chapman. Price 3s. 6d. net. EXODUS. By S. R. Driver, D.D. Price 3s. 6d. net. NUMBERS. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. Price 2s. 6d. net. Cambridge: *University Press*.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By Rev. Charles Brown, D.D. Price 2s. EXODUS. By Rev. F. B. Meyer. Price 2s. London: *R.T.S.*

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA. Edited by Rev. P. J. Boyer. Price 1s. 6d. net. JAMES AND HEBREWS. By Arthur Carr. Price 1s. 6d. net. Cambridge: *University Press*.

It is not an unhopeful sign of the times that scarcely a month goes by without our receiving one or more Commentaries on various books of the Bible, intended, and in most cases excellently adapted, for various classes of readers. We have a batch of them before us now.

First, comes Mr. Grey's Commentary on the Romans, the initial volume of a new series for which the editors and publisher of this magazine are responsible. We may venture to describe it, though in the main we must leave it to others to review. It is intended for English readers, and it is based upon the revised version. The English text is printed at the top of

the page, and the Commentary beneath in two columns. Many Commentaries have been written upon the Romans, and many more will be written ; for its treasures are inexhaustible. But we believe there is plenty of room for Mr. Grey's. His deep spirituality, his convincing clearness, and his practical common sense will help the reader of this Commentary to a better understanding of this important Epistle. The Commentary is intended for Sunday-School teachers, for thinking Churchpeople, and for students generally, and we believe that Mr. Grey's Commentary will take a high place amongst literature of its kind, and we shall be glad to feel that it will bring light and clearness to many an earnest worker for God.

The Cambridge Press have issued "An Introduction to the Pentateuch." It is intended to give a general account of the critical problems which concern the Hexateuch (the title of the book says Pentateuch, the preface Hexateuch, quite why, we do not know), so that the treatment may be moderately complete, and repetition may be avoided in the introductions to the several books. The work is well done, it runs on the lines of somewhat advanced criticism, but Mr. Chapman generally gives the reasons for his conclusions, and we can accept them or reject them as we please. We do not think that he always treats with the consideration they deserve, the views of those from whom he differs, especially if they happen to be conservative critics. For instance, in Appendix VIII. he argues the question of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and he either does not appreciate, or else he a little despises the arguments which conservative critics have drawn from that book. The introduction as a whole is a most useful one ; but we have yet to meet the school-boy for whom it is written. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges will have to change its title, if more volumes of this kind are to be issued in its name.

We have two other volumes in the same series, "Exodus" by Dr. Driver, and "Numbers" by Dr. McNeile. As might be expected from the editors, they are full, thoughtful, and scholarly.

Two volumes of the much more elementary series for schools are also issued—the Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Hebrews by Mr. A. Carr, and "The Book of Joshua" by Mr. Boyer : these are both excellent little Commentaries, and will make quite useful class-books. Mr. Carr has got a great deal of information into his little book, and we like it much the better of the two. Mr. Boyer's notes are much more restricted, and he does not always deal with the difficulties that the boy at school would feel.

Lastly, we have two volumes of the Devotional Commentary. Their purpose is, of course, entirely different from that of the Cambridge Bible. They are intended to help devotion, to find the spiritual messages of the books with which they deal. The volumes that have preceded these have largely succeeded in the effort ; certainly these do. Mr. Meyer's is perhaps the more devotional ; Mr. Brown's the more scholarly. The books are divided into chapters, and each chapter is given a title. Thus we get the general teaching of Scripture rather than a detailed exposition. The Christian student must study the Bible critically, and he must study it devotionally. In the batch of Commentaries now lying before us, he has ample material for both kinds of study.

THE INEVITABLE CHRIST. By F. B. Macnutt, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

This is the latest volume of the "Preachers of To-day Series," which the Rev. J. Stuart Holden is editing, and it well maintains the high standard of the Series. Canon Macnutt is a strong and vigorous preacher, who can interest and help large and cultured congregations. His book lets us into the secret of his success. He preaches the old Gospel in its simplicity; he does not lose sight of modern needs, and he does not fail to give himself to reading. The volumes of sermons are difficult books to read, but Mr. Macnutt has been able to impress his personality upon his book, and we are glad to read his sermons as many have been to listen to them. However small and select our shelf of sermon literature be, this book deserves to be added to it.

STUDIES IN THE EVANGELIZATION OF SOUTH AFRICA. By G. B. A. Gerdener. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

GOOD MEASURE. By Nellie Fincher. Maritzburg: *Times Office*. Price 4s.

The problem of black and white in South Africa is a dangerous and difficult one. It will have to be solved on the spot by those who really understand it. But the sympathy of the home land counts for much, and it must be wisely shown. These two books will help us. The first is an examination of the problem from the missionary point of view. Mr. Gerdener writes wisely and kindly, and we can warmly commend his book to all who would have an intelligent grasp of the subject.

Miss Fincher's book is a novel, and not the first from her pen. She is gaining some reputation in South Africa and deserves it. She writes fluently and brightly. She knows how to tell a story, and is a keen observer of the customs and problems of the country in which she lives. But her book is more than a novel, it deals in story form with the same subject as Mr. Gerdener's book and in a way that will help. We shall be glad to learn that Miss Fincher's works are being read in England. Simpkin, Marshall are the English agents.

CONCERNING THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE. By the Rev. Nathaniel Dimock. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Two vols. Price 5s. net.

These are the latest two volumes of the Memorial Edition of the late Mr. Dimock's works. The whole edition is most valuable, and no volumes more than these. They are marked by the wide reading, the sound scholarship, the shrewd common sense, and critical judgment which always characterize Mr. Dimock's work. Mr. Dimock sets out to prove that the doctrine of the real Objective Presence was not the teaching of our Reformers, and is not the doctrine of our Church. With vigorous clearness and ample learning he proves both points. For some folk the former fact does not mean much, but no loyal Churchman can afford to ignore the arguments which he uses to prove the latter. We get much positive statement from those who take the other view, and we have often tried to consider the grounds alleged for it; we venture to reiterate the kindly expressed wish of the preface, that those whose views may have been tending in an opposite direction may pause and reconsider this subject in the light of these volumes. Mr. Dimock is no mere controversialist, and we are led to most warmly commend his book, not only to those who call themselves Evangelical, but also to all thoughtful Churchmen.

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD AND SACRAMENTS. By the Bishop of Carlisle.
London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. 6d.

Readers of THE CHURCHMAN have already been able to see in our columns the major portion of this book, but they will be none the less glad to have in collected form the Bishop's trenchant Essays. Dr. Diggle clearly understands the needs of the Church to-day. He sees that if England is to be won for God, it must be by a religion that is Divine and not merely human, spiritual and not merely mechanical. He writes to help. He criticizes severely much of the current teaching and practice of to-day, but he does it with a view to better things. It may seem daring to entitle an essay "The Spiritual Reformation of the Clergy," but no one can read the Bishop's words without feeling the truth of his last sentence: "It is this spiritual development, spiritual training, spiritual power, which is the deepest of all the needs of the Church of Christ at the present day." This book is worthy of perusal and of careful thought, and we trust that it will receive it at the hands of a large number of readers.

ASPECTS OF THE HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. J. T. Levens, M.A.,
Vicar of Alverthorpe. *Macmillan and Co.* Price 5s. net.

We have read much of this book with profit as well as pleasure. It is a product of great learning and spiritual power, and if read with discrimination, may be cordially recommended as a book of devotion. Although the author hankers after much that was left behind by the Reformers when they compiled the second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., no warmer tribute than we here find could be paid to the English Liturgy; and in a note we read: "It seems time to make a protest against a kind of religious 'little Englandism' which shows itself in depreciation of our Liturgy, and in adding interpolations from other rites." In note L in the Appendix we have some salutary words distinguishing the crucifix from the cross as a symbol of worship. We are glad also to find a strenuous protest against the invocation of saints. The chapter on the federal aspect of the Holy Communion is instructive, but much compression might have been used with advantage. Chapter xi. on Holy Communion as a *test of doctrine* is for the most part admirable, and much of the closing chapter on the *prophetical aspect* of the ordinance is of great value.

Throughout the book, however, we are in contact with patristic rather than Scriptural thought: Very early in the treatise we read: "Jesus initiated the ceremony and the rite, but He left the development of them to His disciples. In this development His disciples and their successors were as surely guided by their Lord as during His life on earth." This is a large and dangerous assumption, as we realize when we find the author's ideal of teaching and practice represented by SS. Cyprian, Cyril, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom. Whilst opposed to anything approaching a carnal or corporeal presence in the elements, the objective presence is strongly insisted upon. Those, however, who maintain that our Lord's language was figurative when He said, "This is My Body," could hardly wish for better arguments in support of their view than they will find in the pages in which Mr. Levens deals with *what* body it is that Christ feeds us in this Sacrament. Truly, it is possible to darken counsel with words! Similarly, the chapter on the

mystical aspect of the Holy Communion shows how by slow, but apparently inevitable, steps the objective, localized Presence led to the gross materialism of the Middle Ages.

Against the all but unanimous voice of antiquity the author inclines to give a sacrificial sense to the word *ποιεῖτε*. And is it honest, in a long discussion on the *anamnesis*, to suppress the fact that the primitive and patristic Church interpreted the word in a purely subjective sense? The following words from Bishop Gore's "Body of Christ" are quoted with approval: "The Eucharist in which, according to the ordinance of Christ, bread and wine are presented to the Father, in the name of the Son and in memorial of His Passion." What Scriptural ground is there for such a statement? Indeed, the way in which the idea of "putting God in remembrance" is here worked up savours of an anthropomorphism suggestive of Old rather than New Testament theology. There is something almost grotesque as well as singularly inapt in the illustration taken from Joseph's coat: "As Joseph's brethren held up the coat stained with blood before their father, and asked him to recognize it as the garment of his son, so do we, but in sincerity and truth, plead before our Father in heaven the dying of His Son our Brother."

In discussing Heb. xiii. 10, not only is Bishop Westcott's interpretation ruled out, but, what is far more inexcusable, no mention or use is made of the same writer's elaborate note on the history of the word *θυσιαστήριον*, connected with that very passage. That note might well have modified, if it did not alter, the author's language in note S of the Appendix on the sacrificial language of the primitive Church. We should like to examine and criticize the following passage: "We must further conclude that the Primitive Church was divinely guided when it gave to the Holy Communion that central place which, in the religion of the Jew and Gentile, was occupied by sacrifice. This was done so early, so universally, and so completely, without protest or objection, that we are warranted in believing that it was due to Apostolic practice. Almost the same may be said of the transference of sacrificial terms to the Holy Communion." For lack of space we must be content to express dissent, and to point out that the Apostolic literature is a conclusive refutation of such a position. On a par with this is the assertion that the Holy Communion gives validity to all other services. We are far from denying that the Holy Communion occupies a central place in Christian worship; at the same time, nothing in the New Testament is more remarkable than the little that is said about it in the Apostolic writings.

Our author insists very strongly, and in a sacerdotal sense, on the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion, and, although he deprecates the use of the term, upholds in a secondary sense the *propitiatory* virtue of the Sacrament. This part, however, of his argument he stultifies by the use of an unfortunate illustration when he says that the Sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is to the Holy Communion as the sun to the moon. In that case the Holy Communion is not a sacrifice, but, as Evangelicals hold and teach, a witness to *the Sacrifice*.

We can go a long way with the writer in what he says about the sacramental nature of the ordinance. And it is just because our sacramental

convictions are strong that we can find no room in our minds for an objective Presence, and that we are so radically opposed to the omission of the act of Communion, which takes place in the practice of non-communicating attendance.

The writer, very likely without knowing it, is often unfair in speaking of Evangelicals—as, *e.g.*, when he says: “It does not seem to occur to those who exalt the Word above the Sacraments that the Holy Communion is in itself a word of God and a proclamation of the Gospel.” One can only say that such a statement betrays an unaccountable ignorance of the evangelical position.

It is only a trifle, but on p. 325 (footnote) Strauss is wrongly included amongst those who *followed* Baur; and we hope that in another edition the word “resiled” (p. 253) may have disappeared. G. S. STREATFEILD.

HELPS FOR INQUIRERS AND YOUNG CONVERTS. By Rev. J. Mitchell. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s.

The way of salvation and sanctification are clearly shown, and explanations of certain Bible difficulties are also added.

IN KHAKI CLAD. By Rev. W. E. Bristow. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d.

Lord Kitchener writes a commendatory preface, and the author gives the best of advice to soldiers, drawn from wide experience he has had of their life and temptations.

AN OPEN LETTER TO ENGLISH GENTLEMEN. London: *Williams and Norgate.* Price 2s. 6d.

A letter to be *read*, written by an anonymous author who gives a loud trumpet-call to service. He appeals to the best men in the best way, and should secure a ready response. Here is a great sentence: “Not what to get, or what to escape, but what to give—that is the spirit that shall recreate England.” The “Agenda Club” is the child of this letter, and has set itself to translate suggestion into action.

SONGS OF FAITH AND FREEDOM. Compiled by L. H. Dalton. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net

D. Alcock writes an illuminating preface. The songs are arranged in three parts, and are essentially associated with the freedom that comes from the Truth of God. Part I. deals with the Piedmontese Church, with Hus and Savonarola. Part II. leads to Reformation times on the Continent. Part III. the British Isles have to themselves. They are a splendid collection to set before old and young.

A MONTH WITH THE APOSTLE JOHN. By A. P. Ferguson, M.A. London: *Simpkin, Marshall.* Price 1s. 3d.

Studies on the First Epistle of St. John for every day in the month. They are full of fervour, evangelical teaching, and warm allegiance to Christ.

THE ART OF LIVING. By Dr. F. W. Foerster. London: *J. M. Dent and Co.* Price 3s. 6d.

These essays are described as sources and illustrations for moral lessons. They are excellent in every way, and pastors and teachers as well as parents would find them very valuable.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION. By C. G. Finney. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 2s. 6d.

A cheap and needed reprint of this “classic” on the subject of religious revivals.

FAMILY PRAYERS. By Rev. W. E. Roome, M.A. London: *Hunter and Longhurst.* Price 1s. 6d.

Thoughtfully arranged with selected passages of Scripture.

THE DAWN OF CHRISTIANITY. By S. F. A. Caulfield. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

Brief accounts of the inception of Christianity in Continental Europe, sometimes rather too sketchy, but useful. Apostolic succession is a very strong point with the writer.

REVELATION. By H. Iliowizi. London: *G. Routledge and Son.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

The poet lives in the Old Testament, and has produced majestic poems on Old Testament themes. His themes are high, but he has vision and considerable power of expression.

DANTE. By Dean Church. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s.

An exact reprint from the "Christian Remembrancer" of the Dean's beautiful appreciation of the great poet. A valuable addition to the little "Books of Religion" series.

THE DISCOVERY OF THE BOOK OF THE LAW. By E. Naville. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s.

A book to be read because of the source of it, and the suggestion it puts forth regarding the "finding of the Law" in Josiah's reign. The eminent professor thinks that spadework, rather than ingenious guesswork, will foster the best kind of criticism.

ST. THOMAS À BECKET. By Monsignor Demimuid. London: *Duckworth and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

This account of Thomas à Becket, well translated by C. W. W., needs to be read in conjunction with a writer of sober English history. Papal exaltation runs all through the book.

THE MESSENGER OF GOD. By D. Macfadyen, M.A. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s.

This is a brief study of the prophet Malachi. They are lectures rather than sermons, though they were delivered on Sunday mornings at Highgate Congregational Church. They link the prophetic literature with the twentieth century, are strongly ethical, and full of suggestion and thought on subjects that are at once ancient and modern.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By John Bunyan. London: *F. Sherlock*. Price 1s.

We are very pleased with this edition of Mr. Sherlock's in the Church Monthly Library. He writes a brief and illuminating life of Bunyan, prints the first illustration ever published in connection with the famous allegory, and has secured Mr. J. Hassall, R.I., F. Barnard, and others, to illustrate one of "the noblest of English poems."

THE LAST THINGS. By Archbishop Lowther Clarke. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

A series of Lenten addresses on death and the hereafter, full of wise spiritual counsel and appeal. The want of reference to our Lord's second coming, and its main features, makes us puzzled to understand some of the views expressed about the last Judgment.

OUT OF DARKNESS. By A. D. Stewart. London: *R.T.S.* Price 3s. 6d.

True stories, taken from missionary fields such as the South Seas, India, Arabia, Burmah, etc. They illustrate the adventurous side of missions, and at the same time that of suffering. The progress and blessing that has attended the proclamation and acceptance of God's Word in various parts of the world are sketched here with a force, sympathy, and discrimination that are hard to match. Indirectly the book is a wonderful piece of Christian evidence, and a striking witness to the vitality of the Word of God.

THE MORALITY OF SOCIAL PLEASURES. By Rev. M. Fowler. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d.

The writer discusses interestingly the theatre, racing, betting, gambling, week-end entertaining, Sunday work and amusements, politics, gossip, and slander, friendship and love, and the influence of thought. He says many good things, and much that needs to be said. He works from the highest ground. Those who object to theatre-going for very definite reasons will not quite be convinced by his first chapter on that subject. At the same time, they will realize the purity of his motive and the desire for fair-play.

TELL JESUS. By Anna Shipton. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 1s.

The writer gives recollections of the beautiful life of Emily Gosse. To read them is to be inspired with love to Christ. The poems are very musical and full of deep teaching.

A CHRONOLOGICAL CHART OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH. By Rev. S. S. Still. Cambridge: *J. Hallett*. Price 1s.

Arranged from the Bible narrative, and useful to the student.

THE STORY OF TOBIT. By E. M. M'Dougall and J. Shimwell. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

Luther described the book of Tobit as a "truly beautiful, wholesome, and profitable fiction."

FAITHFUL SOLDIERS AND SERVANTS. By Mrs. C. E. Pratt. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

A series of talks to young school-girls, simple and useful.

A STRANGE PORTRAIT GALLERY. By F. Rutherford Rawle. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

These addresses to young people are full of force and freshness. We like and commend them.

ME AND MINE. By Mrs. Challacombe. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d.

These short papers for women, and especially married women, are excellent, full of sound sense, and giving the secret of a happy home life.

THE HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY. By Rev. H. F. Wilson, D.C.L. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d.

A useful book, based on careful study, and specially valuable for to-day.

REASON TO REVELATION. By Philip Mauro. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Paper covers.

"Detached fragments from the records of a soul's experience." How a man of culture and of the world became a man of God will be read here with interest and profit.

EARLY IDEALS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. By Professor N. H. Kennett, B.D., Mrs. Adam, M.A., and Professor H. M. Gwatkin, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 3s.

Professor Kennett writes on Hebrew conceptions of righteousness and sin. Mrs. Adam deals with Greek ideals of righteousness, and Professor Gwatkin with Roman. We expect food for thought, and we get it. The comparison of the three cannot fail to attract the student.

CEREMONIAL OF THE ALTAR. By a Committee of Priests. London: *George Allen and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

This book states that it is intended for members of the Church of England, and it also professes to be compiled by a committee of priests. If the last statement is a fact, and the priests are priests of the Church of England, we do not wonder that they desire to remain anonymous. But we prefer to be charitable, and will try hard to believe that this book is written by Rome for Rome, and the use of the phrase, "Church of England," is simply a fresh piece of Roman aggression.

Received: **THE MOSLEM WORLD.** Edited by Rev. S. M. Zwemer, D.D. London: *The Nile Mission Press*. Price 1s. net. **THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX.** By the Right Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. net. **MEMOIRS OF RICHARD LEA ALLNUTT.** By Rev. M. R. Alnutt. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. The life-story of a faithful clergyman, with a preface by the late Bishop of Oxford. **DAILY READINGS AND PRAYERS.** Composed by a Layman, R.W. London: *T. Nisbet and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net. A series of passages from Scripture arranged for daily reading, together with appropriate prayers in a monthly cycle. **GOD'S STEWARDS.** By A. F. Marr. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. An interesting little book on proportionate giving. **THE HISTORIC PERSONALITY OF CHRIST.** By C. F. Nolloth. London: S.P.C.K. Price 3d. A useful little pamphlet from the author of "The Person of our Lord in Recent Thought." **SPEAKING IN PUBLIC.** By Charles Seymour. London: *The Speaker's Library*. Price 3s. The subtitle of this book is "How to Produce Ideas and How to Acquire Fluency." We dare not say that it answers the question, but even if it only helps a little, and it does that, many should be ready to read it. **THE PHILOLOGIA OF ORIGEN.** By Rev. George Lewis. London: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 7s. 6d. net. We have here an English translation of the famous selection of passages from the works of Origen made by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Cæsarea. It is another of the many volumes which helped to make the Fathers familiar to the modern Church. Origen is difficult to translate, but Mr. Lewis has done his work well, and the book should prove useful. **THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.** By G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 3s. 6d. This is another volume of Dr. Morgan's great work, and it maintains the high standard of those which have preceded it. It is certainly an interesting way of studying the Bible, and Dr. Morgan's capacity for dividing and subdividing seems boundless. The book is easily written, and will be easily and usefully read. **IN THE DAYS OF QUEEN MARY.** By Edward E. Crake. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. A story somewhat sympathetic to the Queen of the sixteenth century, and rather difficult reading for any but adults. **CARRIE LAISON'S RING.** By E. M. Blunt. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. A book for elder girls and young women. **IN THE ROYAL NURSERY.** By Gertrude Hollis-Price. Price 2s. 6d. A story of the seventeenth century, ending with the Restoration. **HUGH CARRINGTON'S ORDEAL.** By Charles W. Haskins. Price 2s. 6d. A novel with the right ring about it. **QUEEN MAB.** By G. K. Woodgate. Price 1s. 6d. A book for children brightly written in words of one or two syllables. **ANOTHER PAIR OF SHOES.** By Austin Clare. Price 1s. 6d. A pleasantly written love-story. **AT ALL COSTS.** By Gladys H. Ward. Price 1s. A romance of the days of James II. **A CHILD OF SURPRISES.** By Mabel Escombe. Price 1s. London: S.P.C.K. Another brightly written story-book for children.