

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
C H U R C H M A N

A Monthly Magazine and Review

VOL. XXXIV.

*NEW SERIES, VOL. XV.*

CHURCH BOOK ROOM  
6 GROSVENOR MANSIONS, 82 VICTORIA STREET,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

1920

The Church Book Room, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1.

# INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIV

## SUBJECTS

	PAGE		PAGE
Authority, by the Rev. Harold P. Smith, D.D. . . . .	478	English Character of the Church of England, The, by the Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D. . . . .	217
Burney's, Dr., "Israel's Settlement in Canaan," by the Rev. J. S. Griffiths . . . . .	43	Episcopacy, by the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D. . . . .	23
Call of the New Age to the Preacher, The, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D. . . . .	643	Fixed Dates and Prophecy, by the Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.D. . . . .	247
Changes in the Communion Service, by the Bishop of Manchester . . . . .	181	Hall, Bishop, by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A. . . . .	205
Chapels Royal of Britain, by J. Cresswell Roscamp, M.E. . . . .	679	Henry, Matthew: A Prince of Commentators, by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A. . . . .	490
Cheltenham Conference Papers:—		Holy Angels, The: Their Appearances and Ministrations, by the Rev. John R. Palmer, Litt.D. . . . .	92
Position of the Anglican Communion in the Christian World:		Hythe Church, by M. Adeline Boulter-Cooke . . . . .	550
(I) by the Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley, M.A., 353; (II) by the Rev. Stuart H. Clark, M.A. . . . .	357	Inspiration, by the Rev. G. Estwick Ford, B.A. . . . .	75
Fellowship of the Churches:		Kelly, Thomas: Evangelist and Hymn Writer, by the Rev. S. R. Cambie, B.D., Litt.D. . . . .	613
(a) Problems of the Home Church: (I) by the Rev. J. S. Flynn, B.D., 362; (II) by the Rev. Canon Baines, M.A., 367; (III) by the Rev. H. Foster Pegg, M.A. . . . .	370	Lambeth and Unity, by the Rev. A. W. Greenup, D.D. . . . .	298
(b) In the Dominions: (I) by the Rev. J. D. Mullins, M.A., D.D., 374; (II) by the Rev. Canon Morrow, M.A., 381; (III) by the Rev. George F. Irwin, B.D. . . . .	385	Lambeth Conference, 1920, The, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A. . . . .	530, 587, 653
(c) In the Mission Field: (I) by the Rev. G. T. Manley, M.A., 387; (II) by the Rev. C. S. Wallis, M.A. . . . .	392	Law, William, on the Holy Spirit, by the Rev. S. Harvey Gem, M.A. . . . .	103
Evangelicals and the National Assembly: (I) by the Bishop of Barking, 447; (II) by Albert Mitchell, 450; (III) by the Rev. E. W. Mowll, M.A., 455; (IV) by the Rev. Canon Alfred Allen, M.A. . . . .	458	Life and Worship in the Reign of Queen Anne, by the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M.A. . . . .	539, 596
Christopher, Memories of Canon, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. 193, 254, 318, 420, 504, 561, 621, 666	666	Modern Development in the Study of the Greek New Testament, A, by the Rev. F. E. Wagner, M.A., D.D. . . . .	259, 324, 433
Church Book Room Notes 57, 115, 173, 231, 289, 347, 521, 579, 637, 691	691	Month, The 1, 59, 117, 175, 233, 291, 349, 407, 465, 523, 581, 639	639
Church of England, 1640-1662, The, by the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D. . . . .	14	Mosaic Tabernacle, The, by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D. . . . .	140, 198, 553, 603
Correspondence:—		Necessity of Dogma, The, by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, M.A. . . . .	427
Changes in the Communion Service . . . . .	341	Pelican and the Nest, The, by the Rev. Canon S. A. Johnston . . . . .	483
Poverty of the Clergy . . . . .	342	Perversion and its Lessons, A, by A Clergyman of the Church of England . . . . .	162
Dislocations in St. John's Gospel, by Chancellor P. V. Smith, LL.D. . . . .	132	Present Religious Conditions in Civic, Commercial and Industrial Life, by the Rev. A. A. Boxley . . . . .	156
		Quakerism: Its Affinities, Contrast and Secret, by the Rev. T. A. Gurney, M.A., LL.B. . . . .	237

	PAGE		PAGE
Reformation Settlement, Our Attitude to the, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D. . . . .	65	V. Millennial Dawnism or Russellism, by the Rev. E. L. Langston, M.A. . . . .	660
Reservation of the Sacrament: A Plea for Reconsideration, by W. Guy Johnson . . . . .	86	Statistical Position of the Anglican Communion, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A. . . . .	294
Reviews of Books 53, 111, 171, 224, 280, 343, 403, 461, 515, 571, 629, 687	687	Studies in Texts, by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A. 108, 167, 213, 276, 337, 398, 443, 499, 546, 617, 682	682
Sabbath and the Lord's Day, The, by the Rev. S. Harvey Gem, M.A.	472	Verse: Epicureans and Stoics, by William Olney . . . . .	270
Some Latter-Day Heresies:—		Witness of History to the Inspiration of the Word, The, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. . . . .	149
I. Spiritualism, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A. . . . .	7	Württemberg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles, The, by W. Prescott Upton . . . . .	33
II. Christian Science, by the Rev. F. Mellows, M.A. . . . .	122		
III. Christadelphianism, by the Rev. F. Mellows, M.A. . . . .	308		
IV. Modern Theosophy, by the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D. . . . .	411		

## AUTHORS

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Allen, Rev. Canon Alfred . . . . .	458	Gurney, Rev. T. A., LL.B. . . . .	237	Mowll, Rev. E. W. . . . .	455
Baines, Rev. Canon Bardsley, Rev. C. C. B. . . . .	367	Hitchcock, Rev. F. R. Montgomery, D.D. 140, 198, 553, 603	603	Mullins, Rev. J. D., D.D. . . . .	374
Barnes, Rev. W. E., D.D. . . . .	217	Hooton, Rev. W. S., B.D. . . . .	247	Olney, William . . . . .	270
Boughton, Rev. C. H. K., B.D. . . . .	65, 643	Inskip, Rt. Rev. J. T., D.D., Bishop of Barking . . . . .	447	Palmer, Rev. J. R., Litt.D. . . . .	92
Boxley, Rev. A. A. . . . .	156	Irwin, Rev. George F. . . . .	385	Pegg, Rev. H. Foster . . . . .	370
Carpenter, Rev. S. C. . . . .	427	Johnson, W. Guy . . . . .	86	Pulvertaft, Rev. T. J. 7, 294, 530, 587, 653	653
Carter, Rev. C. Sydney . . . . .	205, 490	Johnston, Rev. Canon, S. A. . . . .	483	Roscamp, J. Cresswell, M.E. . . . .	271, 679
Cambie, Rev. S. R., Litt.D. . . . .	613	Langston, Rev. E. L. . . . .	660	Smith, Rev. Harold, D.D. . . . .	14, 478
Clark, Rev. Stuart H. . . . .	357	Lees, Rev. Harrington C. 108, 167, 213, 276, 337, 398, 443, 499, 546, 617, 682	682	Smith, Chancellor P. V., LL.D. . . . .	132
Cooke, M. Adeline-Boulter . . . . .	550	Manchester, Bishop of . . . . .	181	Streatfeild, Rev. G. S. . . . .	539, 596
Flynn, Rev. J. S., B.D. . . . .	362	Manley, Rev. G. T. . . . .	387	Thomas, Rev. W. H. Griffith, D.D. 149, 193, 254, 318, 420, 504, 561, 621, 666	666
Ford, Rev. G. E., Gem, Rev. S. Harvey . . . . .	75, 103, 472	Mellows, Rev. F. . . . .	122, 308	Tisdall, Rev. W. St. Clair, D.D. . . . .	23, 411
Greenup, Rev. A. W., D.D. . . . .	298	Mitchell, Albert . . . . .	450	Upton, W. Prescott . . . . .	33
Griffith, Rev. J. S. . . . .	43	Morrow, Rev. Canon . . . . .	381	Wagner, Rev. F. E., D.D. . . . .	259, 324, 433
				Wallis, Rev. C. S. . . . .	392

# THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1920.

## THE MONTH.

**Changes in the Communion Service.** It is only necessary to set out in parallel columns the original proposals of the Convocation of Canterbury in regard to changes in the Order of Holy Communion and the conclusions arrived at by the Conference to which those proposals were referred by the Archbishops to see at once how great is the difference between the two:—

### CONVOCAION PROPOSALS.

The Prayer of Consecration shall be said immediately after the Sanctus, the Amen at the end being omitted.

The Prayer of Oblation shall follow at once in this form, the words in italics being new:—  
[“Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me], *Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy Holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion, mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty*

### CONFERENCE CONCLUSIONS.

That the Prayer of Humble Access be moved so as to follow immediately after the Comfortable Words.

That the Prayer of Oblation be not moved from its present position.

That the Words of Institution be followed by—(a) An Act of Remembrance; (b) An Act of Thanksgiving; (c) A Prayer for the Holy Spirit as follows:—

Wherefore, O Father, we Thy humble servants, having in remembrance before Thee the precious death of Thy dear Son, His mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, looking also for His coming again, do-render unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which He hath procured unto us.

*thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy Fatherly goodness,"* etc., to the end of the Prayer.

Then shall be said :—

The Lord's Prayer, and

The Prayer of Humble Access,  
followed by

The Communion of Priest and  
People.

After the Communion, shall follow the Thanksgiving, the Gloria and the Blessing.

And we pray Thee of Thine almighty goodness to send upon us and upon these Thy gifts Thy holy and blessed Spirit, Who is the Sanctifier and the Giver of life, to Whom with Thee and Thy Son Jesus Christ be ascribed by every creature in earth and Heaven all blessing, honour, glory, and power, now henceforth and for evermore. *Amen.*

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say, Our Father ["The Lord's Prayer"].

The Communion then follows.

It does not need to be a particularly learned person to see that the changes effected by the Conference are of a most important character, and of great significance, for whereas the proposals of Convocation, if they had been carried through, would have assimilated the Communion Service to the Roman Mass, the conclusions of the Conference leave the essentially Reformed character of the service unimpaired. We do not say that those conclusions are wholly free from objection; indeed we ourselves would infinitely have preferred that in the work of Prayer Book Revision the Office of Holy Communion had been left alone, but if changes there must be then we have every reason to be thankful that the result of the Conference has been such as to allay, to a very large extent, the anxieties which the original proposals called forth. Moreover it should be remembered that the use of the new Order, even if ultimately it should become authorized, will be permissive only and not compulsory.

What made the  
Difference? The difference between the original proposals and the conclusions of the Conference are so marked that it will be interesting to see if we can trace any of the influences at work which helped to bring it about. We desire to

avoid saying anything in a partisan spirit, but we may be permitted to recall certain facts which are common knowledge. It will be remembered that when first it was seen how dangerous were the tendencies of the proposals of Convocation the Bishop of Manchester and others called a Conference to consider the whole position. As a result of that Conference it was decided to present to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York a Memorial against the adoption of the changes proposed. That Memorial was duly circulated. In the meantime, however, a Joint Conference of the two Convocations had been held in private to co-ordinate the various changes which had been proposed in the course of the ten years' debates on Prayer Book Revision, and agreement was reached on every point except in regard to these changes in the Communion Office. The Memorial was presented to the Archbishops on Thursday, February 27, it having been signed by ten diocesan bishops, 3,128 clergy and 102,548 laymen. The Archbishop of Canterbury made a long reply, but the only passage in it material to our present purpose was the following :—

All that we have been doing is simply to bring proposals together towards something which has ultimately got to be faced in its entirety, and then we have to see what the desire of the Church is, as far as we can ascertain it, for adopting, or not adopting, the changes which are suggested. When we found how strong the feeling was to which you have given expression to-day, we at once stopped going forward with regard to it. The whole thing has been stopped ; we have said we must wait until we can confer face to face with those men of strong Evangelical opinions who can best help us, with devout spirit and with prayerful co-operation with ourselves, to try to reach a solution in this matter. No formulating of any proposal on this subject can be adopted by Convocation until a Conference, or conversation, of that kind, to endeavour to ascertain the position all round, has been deliberately, quietly, and prayerfully attempted. We have tried our level best to consider the Evangelical, as well as the High Church, feeling ; and at that stage it is no doubt useful to have such a Memorial as you have put into our hands provided we take care that we do not seem to regard the proposals which have been made as something which are in themselves obviously and indisputably wrong and bad, such as would dismay our brethren in America, not to say anything of our brethren in Scotland, and a great section of our own perfectly moderate and reasonable Churchmen in England.

We may be pardoned if we emphasize some of the words in this passage of the Archbishop's address : " When we found how strong the feeling was to which you have given expression to-day, we at once stopped going forward in regard to it " : " We must wait until we can confer face to face with those men of strong Evangelical convictions who can best help us " : " At that stage it is no doubt



useful to have such a Memorial as you have put into our hands." The result has shown that the Archbishop spoke as a true prophet. The Memorial did its work ; the changes against which, it protested have been laid aside in favour of changes which it is held by many Evangelical theologians—though not by all—can safely be accepted as not in any way upsetting that " careful balance of doctrine which is characteristic of our Communion Office." For that result we are profoundly thankful, and we feel that those who promoted the Memorial are to be congratulated upon the attainment of so large a measure of success.

The Conference. The Conference called by the Archbishops to consider the matter held two sittings, viz., on May 2 and on November 27. It is useful to put on record the names of those who attended. They were the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of Bristol, Chelmsford, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester, Manchester, Ripon, Truro and Warrington ; the Deans of Westminster and Christchurch ; Archdeacons Lisle Carr, A. G. Robinson and J. H. Srawley ; Canons E. R. Bernard, Brightman, Burroughs, Headlam, Grose, Hodge, Barnes-Lawrence, A. W. Robinson and Sparrow-Simpson, and the Revs. L. G. Buchanan, W. H. Draper, Dr. Frere, W. Lockton, J. G. McCormick, F. B. Macnutt, R. H. Malden, E. M. Milner-White, T. W. Pym, T. Guy Rogers, N. S. Talbot, F. Underhill, H. A. Wilson and E. S. Woods. The value of such a Conference is shown to be very great. It is true the decisions arrived at were not unanimous—the proposals being carried " by a large majority "—but the frank and free interchange of opinion has paved the way for what may be hoped will be a final settlement of a very difficult question. It must be remembered that the " conclusions " of the Conference are not themselves absolute ; they take the form of " recommendations " to Convocation, but we find it difficult to believe that any substantial alterations will be made in them by that body. It is impossible to resist the reflection that if there had been similar Conferences at different stages of the Prayer Book Revision discussions it might have been possible to find a way out of our difficulties and much of the bitterness of controversy would have been avoided.

Every one will be asking what view is taken of the results of the Conference by those Bishops who signed the Memorial. The *Record* has published letters from several of them and it is clear that they are by no means of one mind on the subject. The Bishop of Manchester is strongly and unalterably opposed to what has been done, and on every point he gives his reasons for dissenting. In regard to the change proposed in the Prayer of Consecration he writes :—

The proposed addition, both by its form and by its place in the Prayer of Consecration, leans to the *sacrificial* sense. The words "having in remembrance *before Thee*" are to be specially noted. It is no answer to say that all our acts are *before God*. The statement is true, but we do not repeat the thought in every prayer. This is not the real reason why the words are inserted here. They are inserted here to please and conciliate those who build up an edifice of sacrificial doctrine on our Lord's simple command "This do in remembrance of Me." They suggest an interpretation of those words which is admitted by the best scholars to be a false interpretation. They will certainly be quoted as a sanction by our Church of this false interpretation. No one who knows the history of the controversy will treat them as non-controversial.

The Bishop of Durham does not "decline general concurrence," but he expresses his "deep regret that these changes should, by a representative body, be deemed pressingly desirable," and he affirms that it will be "a very grave difficulty" in his own case whether he can ever personally use the proposed new order. Nor is the Bishop of Llandaff quite happy about the proposals. He does not see any really urgent need for them, and he would be very sorry to see the additions to the Prayer of Consecration adopted. On the other hand the Bishop of Liverpool is ready to accept the conclusions of the Conference. So also is the Bishop of Chelmsford. He agrees that there may be phrases in the compromise which may be capable of a double interpretation, but this, he says, is not uncommon in our Prayer Book. He adds : "The proposals as they stand are free from the grave objections which the former proposals contained, and they do not in themselves contain any doctrine contrary to, or inconsistent with, that held by the Primitive Church or by the Reformers generally." The Bishop of Truro holds that the new proposals do not in any way alter the doctrinal balance of the service. He is thankful that they proved acceptable to the Conference and he trusts that they will be accepted by all sober sons and daughters of the Church of England. The Bishop of Sodor and Man has no doubt that the changes now proposed are liturgically correct.

He adds, "One, all must agree, is intentionally ambiguous. Two are to me practically needless. Others, I think, devotionally helpful, while none, in my opinion, is doctrinally unsound." The proposals will continue to be discussed for some time to come, and the letters of the Bishops should prove helpful in guidance.

The letter written by Sir W. Joynson-Hicks, **The National Church League.** Bart, M.P., on behalf of the National Church League, will, we hope, receive widespread attention. He makes a point which is apt to be overlooked, yet it is of supreme importance. It is hardly realized that the Church of England is on the eve of a momentous change in its administration. Before these lines appear, the Enabling Bill will in all probability have received the Royal Assent, and then, as Sir William Joynson-Hicks points out, the National Church Assembly will have real powers, and the elections to this body will be as important for the Church as elections to Parliament are for the nation. What then is our duty? He states the position quite clearly. "The ritualist Societies," he says, "are keenly organizing in order to secure control of this great assembly, and I know no other body which can so well put before moderate Churchpeople the desires which we have, and our endeavour to keep the Church pure from ritualist and Romish propaganda, as our National Church League." It is obvious, therefore, if the League is to do its work efficiently, it must receive adequate support. We trust that there will be a considerable response to the present appeal and that when Sir W. Joynson-Hicks returns from India in, as we sincerely hope, greatly improved health, he will find the welcome news awaiting him that the whole of the sum needed has been supplied.



## SOME LATTER-DAY HERESIES.

## I. SPIRITUALISM.

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.

VERY few ideas that have hold on a large number of minds are without some foundation. Facts that cannot be classified under known laws are very easily correlated by the assumption of an unknown something that appears to satisfy the intellect. We are all aware of the definition of the unknown through the more unknown, and the word "Spiritualism" covers so many different meanings that to assert Spiritualism explains what we cannot understand—that is, classify, correlate to what we already know—is really to state we do not know and use a number of letters to explain our ignorance. The world is full of things undreamt of in our philosophy, but that does not mean that all our dreams are true. Psychical life contains a great number of experiences that elude our present psychological analysis. Human love is the strongest and most abiding of all emotions, and when centred in one beloved who has passed from us, it seeks to renew the past and live over again the soul communion that was the salt of life.

The hypothesis that we can consciously or through a medium communicate with the dead is a very natural one that demands sympathetic treatment. If we believe that man survives death and preserves his personality we cannot rule out the possibility of getting into touch with the dead who live. Believing as we do that mind persists and that thought in the world beyond is similar to thought here, there is no *prima facie* objection to "oneing" with the living dead. The whole of Christianity is centred in this "oneing" of the individual soul with Christ, and all our most precious experiences come from communion with Him Who died and rose again. As Christians we are assured we can communicate with the One Who died and rose, and this at once makes it possible for us to consider whether the dead we knew in the flesh can get into union with us. The whole subject must, therefore, be discussed on the basis of evidence as distinct from that of authority if we are to secure an answer that will satisfy the queries that are put to us.

To-day "Spiritualism" is propagated as a fact by honest men. No one who has read the works of Sir William F. Barrett, Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle can deny this. The historian of the movement, Mr. J. Arthur Hill, has given us the story of its growth from the standpoint of a firm believer in the manifestation of the spirits of the departed on the earthly plane. Respectable names can be cited in support of many of the phases of thought that are now forgotten, and it is remarkable that those who propagate Spiritualism to-day have made reputations in domains of thought that are physical rather than psychological. No recognized psychological authority has thrown in his lot with the "Spiritualists." Our life-long investigators of mental states and psychological experiences have stood apart from the movement. They are just as human as the rest of us, and are as anxious to get into touch with their beloved dead as any who have lost children in the war. They are as greatly daring as other men, and have shown they are not deterred from investigation and belief by "authority."

Then the whole history of Spiritualism is vitiated by fraud. The temptation to deceive for the purpose of comfort and to self-hypnotize the moral sense has been so strong that few mediums have resisted falling into temptation that ends in deliberate deceit. Never was any cult marked by so many lapses from straight dealing, and that it has survived the exposure of the mediums of the past and present is a proof of the vitality of the "instinct" that if the dead live we must get into touch with them. Besides, there is no doubt that to dabble in Spiritualism means for many mental and moral wreckage. Very few of us are all round balanced, and the practice of occultism means very often the occlusion of reason. Canon Barnes, an eminent scientist and clear thinker, writes: "I hold that all the well attested evidence, on which the theory of spirit communication is based, will ultimately be explained by a fuller knowledge of the interchange of consciousness between living persons." In other words, he maintains that we can explain the unknown by the known and not by the still more unknown.

Spiritualism claims to be a religion. Mr. J. Arthur Hill, its most trusted historical writer and expositor, says:

It is a religion to those who sincerely say it is, and there are many. Moreover, if Myers' pithy remark is true, that "the two elements most necessary for a widely received religion are a lofty moral code and the attestation of

some actual intercourse between the visible and the invisible world," Spiritualism is quite specially equipped, for it has the second qualification in a degree unique among the churches. But it has other things also. It is not only a religion; it is a form of Christianity, though some of its adherents prefer not to say this, because by Christianity they mean an ecclesiastical and creedal system, which not without reason, they regard as not necessarily good or representative of the mind of Christ." In another part of the volume *Spiritualism, Its History, Phenomena and Doctrine* (pp. 258-9), "I have no objection to any one regarding Jesus as a superhuman being, far above our level. In an infinite universe there are probably infinite grades of spiritual existence, and Jesus may have belonged to some higher order than ours. I admit that I have felt this about Emerson. Not only his writings, but the records of his life with the comments of those who knew him well, make me feel that he was so much greater and better than I, that it is with a certain surprise and hesitancy that I think of him as of my own genus 'only a man.' Consequently I sympathize with those who, being rightly humble about their own persons, but perhaps rating others and human possibilities in general too low, feel the necessity of regarding Jesus as more than man. They have a right to their opinion. Humility is a great virtue. All men, and indeed all created intelligences, are sons of the great Father, and many of our Elder Brothers will pass the 'mystic line' at the upper limit of humanity, becoming 'divine' but not necessarily God Himself. Of these great spirits we know little. We may regard them as the Hindoos do, as incarnating on our own plane from time to time, as Krishna, as Jesus voluntarily did for the salvation of men. It is right in a sense to worship them even, for their worthship, their value to the world, is incalculable. Some think the time is now ripe for another such Avatar. Who knows? It may be so."

We have quoted this long passage as the most illuminating in recent Spiritualistic writings of the position assigned to our Lord by one who desires to see Him honoured. The gulf between the place given Him and that He occupies in the New Testament is incalculable. Spiritualism may claim to be a religious cult; we do not quarrel about words, but we cannot admit its right to be acknowledged a form of Christianity in any sense worthy of the word as interpreted intellectually or historically.

What is the Revelation of Spiritualism? It professes to bring human beings on earth into contact with human beings who have died. We are told they leave this earth as they were, and in the other world begin the round of development where they left off here. "In the higher state of being which we enter at the dissolution of the physical frame we shall retain, to a great extent, recollections of our past life, and shall find that there is an intimate relation between the past, the present and the future."

It is alleged we enter upon a "higher state of being." If that be so, then we should expect to receive from the departed through the medium's knowledge of a higher type than we possess here.

Revelation should be made not only confirmatory of the persistence of identity, but of knowledge hid from us here on earth that will advance the well-being of those left behind. It is admitted that the messages presumed to come from the dead are almost if not entirely trivial. It is only necessary to read "Raymond" to find proof of this. Sir Oliver Lodge is as honest as daylight, and he feels the force of the criticism. He does not, however, permit it to weigh with him, and quotes the first message sent by the late Lord Kelvin over the telephone as a vindication of the character of the communications from the other world. Lord Kelvin repeated the first lines of the nursery lines, "Hey, diddle-diddle," etc., as the first thing that came into his head, and he was confirmed in the efficiency of the instrument by hearing the words "The cow jumped over the moon." The argument that if a man of his eminence used this proof, why should not the spirits act in line with him, falls to the ground, when we ask, Were all Lord Kelvin's thoughts given over the telephone on the same plane? Did not those who spoke to him receive communications indicative of his higher intelligence, and were not a very large number of his telephonic communications proof that he possessed a mind much superior to that of ordinary men? Where in the whole of the records of spiritualistic séances do we find any coherent conversation that is equal to the talk between Lord Kelvin and a first-class scientist on the questions of mutual interest to them in the domain of science? It is not to be found. Spiritualism as far as the advance of human knowledge is concerned or the revelation of new facts, is the most barren of all revelations that claim the right to be regarded "as being a fresh departure in religious thought and experience such as we have not had for two thousand years" (Sir Arthur Conan Doyle).

There is real danger to the moral and physical health of a considerable number of men and women from dabbling in spiritual séances. It is not good to surrender the will to the control of others. It has been always recognized by psychologists and physicians that hypnotism has its grave disadvantages as well as its advantages. In all borderland studies in which the personality runs the risk of losing self-control we cannot avoid danger. The dividing line between sanity and insanity is hard to draw. Comparatively few men and women have perfect balance of intellect

that can withstand all shocks, and there are a great number who require just a little pressure on one side or the other to press them over the border. There is evil in us all, and there is evil outside ready to make use of our weaknesses for our destruction. We deliberately lead ourselves into temptation if we indulge in practices that make a strong appeal to the suppression of the personality in the effort to catch something that may come to us from the occult. Medieval thought was full of the presence of demons ready to make illicit use of individuals to their own destruction. This belief made the lives of thousands a burden to them, and we have no knowledge whatever to lead us to dogmatize that the alleged messages sent by the "spirits" have their origin in external evil spirits who seize the souls of men and women dabbling in a forbidden thing. We need no such explanation of facts that are known. Some of the writer's friends after applying themselves to spiritualistic practices dropped them because they had an injurious effect on their character, and the history of mysticism is full of stories of moral downfall of those who had resort to any form of mysticism that opened the soul of man to any other than God Himself. Whatever value the "spirit" messages may have for the comfort of those who believe in them, there is no doubt that the recourse to mediums has had a deleterious effect on a number of men and women. Balancing the good and the evil on a merely utilitarian basis it is not too much to say that the evil exceeds the good.

What should be the attitude of the Christian Church towards Spiritualism? The Archbishop of Canterbury has announced that a Committee of Enquiry is now engaged on the subject and its Report will be considered by the forthcoming Lambeth Conference. The present writer deprecates anything like a dogmatic fulmination against Spiritualism. The age of proscriptions by authority has passed. Something more is required than the condemnation of men who call themselves experts by a body of men who have given little or no attention to the subject. The phenomena of Spiritualism require explanation, classification and scientific examination. The use of the X-rays by the unskilful leads to fatal illness. The man of science knows how to employ them and to guard against their evil effects. So it should be with Spiritualism. Men whose training fits them to investigate should be asked to apply themselves to its



study. That has been done in the past, and as a whole the verdict has been against the objective reality of communications from a spirit world. Certain supposed messages and facts are unexplained, but that is the case in every department of human knowledge, except in these studies, where arbitrary postulates and definitions and axioms lead to definite conclusions. We need something more now, when Spiritualism finds a seed plot in so many sorrowing hearts. Knowledge can alone kill the cult where it is pernicious. Neither ridicule nor denunciation on *a priori* grounds can bring conviction to the minds of the devotees of Spiritualism. The cult will not die as long as a strong human interest leads men and women to place value in mascots and in superstitious practices of all kinds. We must face the fact that the mind of man is not always logical, and where strong emotion leads, strange practices will follow. On the other hand, clear authoritative expositions by those who have no axe to grind but depend for their conclusions on the dry light of reason applied to occurrences that can be contemporaneously tested, will do much to confine the danger to a very small circle. The supposed facts are ready for investigation. We can no more prove a negative by strong assertion of impossibility without evidence, than establish communication with the dead by evidence that has not been subjected to the most thorough-going scrutiny.

Christianity satisfies the cravings of the heart of man by its doctrine of life in Christ and the Communion of Saints. We believe that the blessed dead live in Him. We know Him in our experience and through Him we are one with them in Him. The Church is one, triumphant with Christ in the heavenly places—if we must use spatial terms—militant here on earth. Those who love their Saviour and have found Him precious know that those who died in Him are safe in His keeping. More has not been revealed to us. It is not unnatural to ask for personal touch—for communion with the dead. We have as yet been vouchsafed no sure evidence of this fact. What passes for evidence seldom stands even superficial examination, and it may well be that part of the Divine discipline is to test our faith by relying on the promises of the Gospel and by avoiding the dubious methods that profess to add to our knowledge by the dark séances and the narratives of mediums who in the majority of cases have proved moral failures—unable to withstand the temptation of saying more than they know and

professing more than they can perform in order to retain their reputation as men and women with special gifts.

In his chapter, "Private Sittings at Mariemont," Sir Oliver Lodge concludes with the following "warning": "It may be well to give a word of warning to those who find that they possess any unusual power in the psychic direction, and to counsel regulated moderation in its use. Every power can be abused, and even the simple faculty of automatic writing can with the best intentions be misapplied. Self-control is more important than any other form of control, and whoever possesses the power of receiving communications in any form should see to it that he remains master of the situation. To give up your own judgment and depend solely on adventitious aid is a grave blunder, and may in the long run have disastrous consequences. Moderation and common sense are required of those who try to utilize powers which neither they nor any fully understand, and a dominating occupation in mundane affairs is a wholesome safeguard." These are wise words, but is it too much to say that the "psychics" are not always remarkable for their self-control and their moderation and common sense? Some may be, but the so-called psychic temperament is not seldom united with a lack of mental balance and is incapable of a dominating occupation in mundane affairs.

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.



## THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 1640-1662.

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D.

ABOUT 1655 Thomas Fuller, then Perpetual Curate of Waltham Abbey, thus introduced his *Church History of Britain*: "An ingenious gentleman, some months since, in jest-earnest, advised me to make haste with my History of the Church of England; for fear, said he, lest the Church of England be ended before the History thereof. This History is now, though late (all Church-work is slow) brought with much difficulty to an end. And, blessed be God, the Church of England is still (and long may it be) in being, though disturbed, distempered, distracted. God help and heal her most sad condition."

There is much misapprehension about the condition of the Church during this period. There is a widespread view that all the episcopal clergy were ejected, and Presbyterians and Independents, often of no education, put in their place. Also the extent of the spoliation of church property is often exaggerated. Again, the distinction of the ground of ejection of the ministers deprived in 1660 from that of those deprived in 1662 is commonly ignored, both by Churchmen and Nonconformists, the former regarding both sets as alike intruders, while the latter often consider both to have lost their livings for conscience' sake. Actually, those ejected in 1660 were all in some degree intruders and ejected simply as such; those ejected in 1662 were not intruders, but as legally appointed to their livings as those who conformed.

The standard book on the subject is Shaw, *The English Church under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth*. The present article deals simply with the personnel and the finance of the Church—passing over e.g. the Westminster Assembly, the supersession of the Prayer Book by the Directory and the establishment of the Presbyterian system. Also lack of space necessitates passing over the work of the Triers.

The Long Parliament soon began to deal with clergy who had given offence by supporting Archbishop Laud's innovations, or by defending arbitrary government. Later on, the "Committee

for Plundered Ministers" was set up, to provide for Puritan ministers expelled from parishes under the control of the King's forces; this committee was given power to sequester the livings of 'scandalous and malignant priests' subject to the ratification of parliament. Thus it might as well have been termed "The Committee for *Plundering Ministers*." Later on (early in 1644) County Committees were in many cases set up to deal with these cases, consisting of some of the members of the Parliamentary Committee for the county. Any five of these might meet in any one place and hear charges against local clergy. The instructions given to these committees in the counties of the Eastern Association do not seem to have given fair play to the accused; but no doubt local knowledge on the part of the members of the committee went a long way. The sequestrations were much more numerous in the case of counties under the control of Parliament from the first—as all those in the south-east of the country—than in those where they only acquired full possession later on. In many of these latter it would seem that only pronounced royalists and Laudians were ejected; men who had given no special offence were likely to escape, especially if the living were a poor one.

Our great source of information is Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*. Like Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, it is confessedly a one-sided work, requiring to be used with discrimination; but like it, contains valuable information. Many original documents are still preserved, and have been used by Shaw and other writers, such as Davids, *Nonconformity in Essex*, and Kingston, *East Anglia and the Civil War*.

There are several marked classes among the sequestered clergy.

(1) Pluralists were deprived at least of their extra livings, being usually left with the poorest. The Presbyterian position was not very consistent; they did not hold two livings, but might hold a living with a preachingship, or mastership of a college, equally involving non-residence.

(2) A comparatively small proportion were ejected on clear grounds of immorality, drunkenness, or the like.

(3) Much the greater number were ejected on political or ecclesiastical grounds—for having read the Book of Sports, adopted Laudian innovations, spoken in favour of the divine right of bishops, or disrespectfully of the Parliament, or the like. Thus Mr. W. M.

Palmer says (Kingston, *East Anglia and the Civil War*, p. 392) that the greater part of the informations given before the Earl of Manchester's Committee sitting at Cambridge refer "to 'popish practices' which the unfortunate minister had been guilty of, and to his expressions of friendliness towards the King and unfriendliness to Parliament. In only a few cases is immorality alleged." Cases where the great bulk of the charges are of this character, but one of drunkenness is thrown in, really belong to this class.

(4) There are however cases where it is not easy to decide whether there was some ground for such charges as well as for the political. A typical case is that of Lawrence Washington of Purleigh near Maldon (his two sons emigrated to Virginia, and from one of these George Washington was descended). The ground for his sequestration was, "He is a common frequenter of alehouses, not only himself sitting daily tipping there, but also encouraging others in that beastly vice, and hath been often drunk, and hath said that the Parliament have more papists belonging to their armies than the King had about him or in his army, and that the Parliament army did more hurt than the Cavaliers, and that they did none at all; and hath published them to be traitors that lent to or assisted the Parliament." Here the moral and the political charges seem equal. But Walker quotes a Justice of the Peace in the county, who personally knew Washington, who took him to be a very worthy, pious man; as often as he was in his company, he always appeared a very modest sober person; and he was recommended as such by several gentlemen who were acquainted with him before he himself was; adding that "he was a loyal person, and had one of the best benefices in these parts."

(5) Later on, a number were sequestered for refusing to take the "Solemn League and Covenant." These form the only class who could have saved themselves by submission. It is not, however, clear how far all those who kept their livings, in the districts under the control of Parliament at the time the Covenant was imposed, actually took the Covenant; some certainly escaped it in various ways. In defence of those who took it without being convinced Presbyterians, it may be pointed out that at the present time people have different principles as regards signing petitions. Some will sign nearly anything they are asked to sign; others will only sign what they thoroughly and entirely agree with; others will sign a decla-

ration or petition with which they are in general sympathy, though they may disagree with some of its arguments or alleged facts. So men might have taken the Covenant simply as a statement that they were willing to accept Presbyterianism—they did not regard the method of Church government to be very essential.

The number of sequestrations was very variously estimated. Walker's estimate (7,000) is far too high; but on the other hand, wherever we have additional information, the actual number of cases is decidedly higher than those reported by him. Mr. G. B. Tatham thinks parochial sequestrations may amount to 3,500. As regard Cambridgeshire, Mr. Palmer says that we have direct evidence that, out of 155 livings, there were ejections in sixty-eight cases, sixty-five accepted the Solemn League and Covenant, or at least conformed to Puritan forms; of these more than one third lived to see and to participate in the restoration of monarchy and episcopacy. We have no knowledge of twenty-two livings, and in ten it is impossible to decide whether there was a sequestration or not. Thus, omitting unknown and doubtful cases, quite half the clergy in Cambridgeshire were ejected; in Hertfordshire the proportion was nearly as high. In Essex it was only about one third; but some districts were swept pretty clear; in that reaching from the Thames at Dagenham up to Ongar and Epping, only three or four clergy were left out of nearly twenty.

In a case of a sequestered clergyman having a wife and family, and no substantial private means, they were commonly allowed one fifth of the income; but according to Fuller, the parliamentary intruder frequently refused to pay, on some ground or other.

There is much misconception about the position and the character of these intruders. First, in regard to their legal position—they were not strictly incumbents—rather in the position of a *locum tenens*. If the sequestered incumbent died, the patron would formally fill up the vacancy; if, as was common, he appointed the minister already there, this minister would now acquire a permanent status which he had not had before. These ministers were at first supposed to be Puritan ministers driven out from parishes under the control of the King's army; but it must have been a good time for unbeneficed clergy generally, if sufficiently Puritan. But in the early years all of these would have been in episcopal orders, and they were commonly of as good education as those they replaced.

Let me take another illustration from Essex. The living of Stapleford Tawney was sequestrated from Richard Nicholson, on grounds, mainly at least, political: "For that he is a common drunkard and hath expressed great malignancy against the Parliament, saying they were a company of factious fellows, and that this Parliament is no Parliament; and that the main part of the Lords and Commons being with the King, they were the Parliament; and used divers other wicked speeches against the Parliament and against several Lords in the House of Peers, and had three wicked and scandalous libels against the Parliament found in his study, and did sing one of them in an alehouse." He was heard before the House of Lords, in April, 1643, his defence being that the evidence against him was false. Four witnesses appeared, one of them the rector of an adjacent parish. The House held the charges proved, and ordered the living to be sequestrated and himself committed to Newgate till the pleasure of the House be further known. In January, 1675, his wife petitioned for the fifts, which were granted. The living had been sequestered to Daniel Jennour or Joyner, M.A., apparently the Vicar of Chipping Ongar, a much poorer living. On his death, probably early in 1646, Thomas Horrocks, M.A., was appointed to succeed. He was of St. John's College, Cambridge, ordained by Bishop Morton of Durham; he had been a schoolmaster at Romford. Calamy has a strange story that he was presented to a considerable living in Norfolk, "but as he was travelling with letters of institution and induction, a false brother who was in his company robbed him of them and supplanted him in his parsonage, to which he submitted, without offering to recover his right by law."

In August, 1647, when the quarrel had arisen between the Army and the Parliament, there was a report that the Army would restore the sequestered clergy. Nicholson, who probably belonged to a local family, demanded from Horrocks the parsonage house and glebe, usurped his pulpit, and though shown Fairfax's declaration, contemptingly kept the key of the church door, and called the people to witness that Horrocks refused to give way to him to officiate in the afternoon. Horrocks complained to the Lords, who ordered Nicholson to keep quiet under heavy penalties.

In 1650 Horrocks was presented by the patron to the living of Maldon, where he did good work, his preaching being much valued by

some of the leading county gentry. He was ejected in 1662. I do not know who succeeded him at Tawney, where Nicholson was restored in 1660.

There were throughout the Commonwealth period many parochial clergy in episcopal orders, though the normal ordination was Presbyterian. On the one hand we find a large number who managed in some way to retain their livings, *e.g.*, Sanderson and Hacket; or to get appointed to new livings, like Fuller. To give two Essex examples: the vicar of Braintree from 1610 to 1657 was Samuel Collins, a man who had the respect alike of Archbishop Laud and of Matthew Newcomen. The adjoining parish of Bocking was held by John Gauden, appointed by Laud in 1642 under pressure from the Earl of Warwick; he held this till 1660 when he became bishop, first of Exeter and then of Worcester. He claimed the authorship of *Eikon Basilike*. He could preach a sermon with any Puritan, as far as length went; he once preached for three hours and then offered prayer for another hour.

Again there were younger men who had been privately ordained by some deprived bishop. We usually hear only of cases where those so ordained subsequently became bishops or the like—as Bull, Dolben, Lloyd, Patrick, Tenison; but by all analogy there must have been a larger number not attaining distinction.

There is often also misconception about the Church endowments.

The lands of Bishops and of Deans and Chapters were sold; but parochial endowments were not touched. In fact in a number of cases the parochial clergy were the gainers. Frequently a royalist had his fine reduced on undertaking to settle an annual sum on some church or churches, *e.g.*, Sir Richard Grosvenor of Eaton, Chester, had his fine of £2,590 reduced to £1,290 on undertaking to settle £130 per annum for ever upon the ministers for such places as the Committee for Compounding should appoint. Sir Richard Leveson of Trentham, Staffordshire, ancestor of the Duke of Sutherland, had his fine of £9,846 reduced to £6,000 on condition of settling £380 per annum on the ministers of certain specified parishes in Staffordshire and Shropshire.

Furthermore, when the Bishops' and Chapters' lands were sold, their impropriations and tithes were reserved for the better maintenance of preaching ministers and schoolmasters. A body of trustees



for the maintenance of ministers was appointed, to whom these tithes were paid, as well as the tenths. They seem to have handled an income of nearly £40,000 from tithes and over £10,000 from tenths—total, not quite £50,000; about four-fifths of this went in grants the rest in expenses. The augmentations naturally varied greatly; many were from £10 to £30, but there were not a few of £40 to £60, and some even higher. We must always remember that money was much more valuable then, perhaps more than four times its pre-war level. Near London, according to the report of November, 1655, the ministers of Uxbridge and of Bow received augmentations of £72 each; Kingsbury, Hornsey and Staines, £20 each; Hampton and Edgware, £10 each.

It was in connection with these augmentations that the well-known parochial surveys of 1650 were made; not unfrequently these reports recommend the union of small parishes or the division of large ones. A number of ordinances or acts were passed for this purpose from 1654 onwards, after fresh surveys in many cases (1655-8). But the Restoration practically everywhere brought these proposals to an end.

It will be seen that in many cases the parochial clergy, if of approved Puritanism, were better off than before; and that proposals for redistribution of endowments according to need, and of sacrificing cathedral interests to parochial, have precedent behind them.

To conclude with the ejections at the Restoration. In 1660 an Act was passed to restore the sequestrated clergy, so turning out all intruders. As has been said, these intruders were legally in the position not of an incumbent but of a *locum tenens* or curate-in-charge put into a parish where the incumbent is suspended; though as time went on this distinction had become ignored or obliterated. It made no difference whether the intruder was or was not prepared to conform. It was a question of intrusion—not of orders or of conformity.

The case of those ejected in 1662 differs greatly. None of these were intruders; they held their livings by as legal a title as any who conformed. Calamy gives the document whereby his father, the second Edmund Calamy, was presented to the living of Moreton near Ongar by the trustees of Robert Earl of Warwick, 1659. Nor was the question of orders the main one—those ejected might be in unquestioned episcopal orders. The main point was conformity—would they use the Book of Common Prayer and declare their unfeigned

assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by it? One would think that, both then and since, many who made this declaration must have interpreted it rather freely, just as many who took the "League and Covenant." In most promises common sense allows reservation. They were also called upon to declare that it was unlawful under any pretence whatever to take up arms against the King—a pronounced Church of England doctrine in the Restoration period, till the King began to oppress the Church; then, as I once heard Prof. Gwatkin put it, "Common sense gained the day, and the Church joined with her enemies—the Dissenters, to cast out the Lord's Anointed!"

Thus the Nonconformists ejected in 1662 suffered much more obviously for conscience' sake than the Anglicans ejected under the Long Parliament—except for the probably comparatively small number who refused to take the Covenant. In the case of the rest no promise or subscription was asked for or would avail. The same applies on the other side to the ejections of 1660. Yet a large proportion of Anglicans clearly suffered for their religious and political convictions as surely as the Nonconformists did.

To close with a narrative creditable to all parties, Francis Chandler was at the Restoration minister of Theydon Garnon, near Epping, where a sequestration had taken place long before he came. "He was very desirous of King Charles' restoration, and prayed for him as rightful king some time before. On May 29, 1660, he went to London with great joy to see his pompous entrance." But he was turned out under the Act of 1660. The old Rector not living to return, the living was given to John Meggs, Rector of St Margaret Pattens, who had during the Long Parliament lost this living and been imprisoned. He had such an esteem for Chandler that the next day after his induction he desired him to be his assistant, and allowed him twenty shillings per week for his services. In 1662 Dr. Meggs very much pressed him to conform; and though he could not be satisfied to comply with the terms that were fixed, he continued very kind to him after he was obliged to part with him as his assistant. He afterwards commonly attended the public service of the Church of England and preached between the morning and afternoon service, and in the evening, privately, in his own house or at other places as he had opportunity. On the other days of the week he also frequently preached, and was often called in to

for the maintenance of ministers was appointed, to whom these tithes were paid, as well as the tenths. They seem to have handled an income of nearly £40,000 from tithes and over £10,000 from tenths—total, not quite £50,000; about four-fifths of this went in grants the rest in expenses. The augmentations naturally varied greatly; many were from £10 to £30, but there were not a few of £40 to £60, and some even higher. We must always remember that money was much more valuable then, perhaps more than four times its pre-war level. Near London, according to the report of November, 1655, the ministers of Uxbridge and of Bow received augmentations of £72 each; Kingsbury, Hornsey and Staines, £20 each; Hampton and Edgware, £10 each.

It was in connection with these augmentations that the well-known parochial surveys of 1650 were made; not unfrequently these reports recommend the union of small parishes or the division of large ones. A number of ordinances or acts were passed for this purpose from 1654 onwards, after fresh surveys in many cases (1655-8). But the Restoration practically everywhere brought these proposals to an end.

It will be seen that in many cases the parochial clergy, if of approved Puritanism, were better off than before; and that proposals for redistribution of endowments according to need, and of sacrificing cathedral interests to parochial, have precedent behind them.

To conclude with the ejections at the Restoration. In 1660 an Act was passed to restore the sequestrated clergy, so turning out all intruders. As has been said, these intruders were legally in the position not of an incumbent but of a *locum tenens* or curate-in-charge put into a parish where the incumbent is suspended; though as time went on this distinction had become ignored or obliterated. It made no difference whether the intruder was or was not prepared to conform. It was a question of intrusion—not of orders or of conformity.

The case of those ejected in 1662 differs greatly. None of these were intruders; they held their livings by as legal a title as any who conformed. Calamy gives the document whereby his father, the second Edmund Calamy, was presented to the living of Moreton near Ongar by the trustees of Robert Earl of Warwick, 1659. Nor was the question of orders the main one—those ejected might be in unquestioned episcopal orders. The main point was conformity—would they use the Book of Common Prayer and declare their unfeigned

assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by it? One would think that, both then and since, many who made this declaration must have interpreted it rather freely, just as many who took the "League and Covenant." In most promises common sense allows reservation. They were also called upon to declare that it was unlawful under any pretence whatever to take up arms against the King—a pronounced Church of England doctrine in the Restoration period, till the King began to oppress the Church; then, as I once heard Prof. Gwatkin put it, "Common sense gained the day, and the Church joined with her enemies—the Dissenters, to cast out the Lord's Anointed!"

Thus the Nonconformists ejected in 1662 suffered much more obviously for conscience' sake than the Anglicans ejected under the Long Parliament—except for the probably comparatively small number who refused to take the Covenant. In the case of the rest no promise or subscription was asked for or would avail. The same applies on the other side to the ejections of 1660. Yet a large proportion of Anglicans clearly suffered for their religious and political convictions as surely as the Nonconformists did.

To close with a narrative creditable to all parties, Francis Chandler was at the Restoration minister of Theydon Garnon, near Epping, where a sequestration had taken place long before he came. "He was very desirous of King Charles' restoration, and prayed for him as rightful king some time before. On May 29, 1660, he went to London with great joy to see his pompous entrance." But he was turned out under the Act of 1660. The old Rector not living to return, the living was given to John Meggs, Rector of St Margaret Pattens, who had during the Long Parliament lost this living and been imprisoned. He had such an esteem for Chandler that the next day after his induction he desired him to be his assistant, and allowed him twenty shillings per week for his services. In 1662 Dr. Meggs very much pressed him to conform; and though he could not be satisfied to comply with the terms that were fixed, he continued very kind to him after he was obliged to part with him as his assistant. He afterwards commonly attended the public service of the Church of England and preached between the morning and afternoon service, and in the evening, privately, in his own house or at other places as he had opportunity. On the other days of the week he also frequently preached, and was often called in to

assist on private days of fasting and prayer; and yet it does not appear he ever met with any disturbance. Once, after being silenced by the Uniformity Act, he preached at Theydon Church with Dr. Meggs' leave; and he kept a good correspondence with the neighbouring clergy so long as he lived there.

He used to set God always before him, and took care to keep up constant intercourse with Him. He would often say *Incipienti, progredienti, et proficenti, Deus mihi sit propitius.*

HAROLD SMITH.

---

### A TIME OF GRAVE AND INSISTENT APPEAL

"The time is indeed a time of grave and insistent appeal to the Christian, calling him to the secret place of thought and prayer. There first he will set himself to grasp afresh for his own soul the eternal certainties. He will take pains there to feel again beneath his own feet the everlasting rock of revealed salvation in Christ, the immovable facts of the holy history, glorified all over by the Shechinah cloud of the heavenly mystery, the open 'mystery of godliness,' the wonder-truth of God incarnate and sacrificed for the believer's pardon, and holiness, and heaven. There he will set himself to ponder afresh the sure words of promise for Church and world, given us to shine only the brighter amidst the shadows of time. Perhaps he will especially, there and then, read again, and yet again, as I for one have come to do more than ever, those articulate predictions of the written Word which may well make us deem it at least possible, in view of the vast motions of recent history, that the æon is hastening to its consummation, that the Times of the Gentiles are running out apace over Jerusalem, that the glorious personal Return of the Lord our Hope is to be looked for with an ever-kindling expectation. Even so, come, Lord Jesus!

"But if these meditations take their just line and keep their true proportion, they will only make the man who goes apart with God in his chamber more alert, more prompt, as with the vigour of a radiant anticipation, to ask what he can do, what he can pray for, in order to the reviving of the Church for her commissioned work of bringing the world to know that the Father sent the Son. The only hope, 'that blissful hope,' ἡ μαχαρια ελπις, is never for a moment meant to leave the man who hails and holds it indifferent to duty and opportunity around him. The more assured he is that his Lord may not much longer now delay His Coming, the more will he desire to help to the uttermost to prepare His way. That transcendent expectation, while it lifts him, in a wonderful manner of its own, out of entanglement in the world's worldliness, will only deepen his sympathies and animate his ambitions to work in the world for the world's revival Godward. He will address himself to the humblest personal duty, and devote himself, if the call comes, to large and far-reaching enterprise for God and for good, with as much entirety of purpose as if he knew that the present order was to last for ever; only he will do it also with an elevation of spirit born of the assurance that he is building, in his little measure, a high road over which ere long shall pass not only the tired procession of mortal life but the returning footsteps of the King in His beauty, and of all His saints with him."—THE BISHOP OF DURHAM at the Church Congress.



## EPISCOPACY.

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D., Vicar of St. George's, Deal.

I PROPOSE to deal with the subject of Episcopacy very briefly under four heads: (1) Origin of Episcopacy, and its nature in the Early Church; (2) Is Episcopacy legitimate? (3) Is it necessary according to (a) the New Testament; (b) the Early Fathers; (c) the Prayer Book? (4) Bearing of all this on the question of Reunion.

### I. ORIGIN OF EPISCOPACY

Although not approving of the spirit of Jerome's remark (in commenting on Titus i. 5, 7, "Idem est ergo presbyter quam episcopus, et, ante quam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fuerunt, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur," we must yet admit that not only do the words *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος* in the N.T. always and everywhere denote the holder of one and the same office, but also that the differentiation between the two terms was of very gradual growth. As it is an accepted fact of history that the worship of the early church was modelled on that of the Synagogue, not on that of the Temple, and as the ministers of the Synagogue were styled "Presbyters" (עֲלֵמֵי: *πρεσβύτεροι*), it was quite natural that the same title should be given to the corresponding officers of the Christian congregation, just as the congregation itself was called both *συναγωγή*<sup>1</sup> and *ἐκκλησία* (עֲבֵדָה: *ἐκκλησία*), as was that of the unconverted Jews. Each Christian as well as each Jewish assembly was under the guidance not of a single presbyter but of a body or council of presbyters, collectively denominated "the Presbytery" (*πρεσβυτέριον*).

These men were in each case called presbyters (Elders) from the fact that they were selected from among the senior members of the community. Each Jewish Synagogue of any importance recognized one among its presbyters as the chief of that little community, and styled him the "Chief of the Synagogue" (רֹאשׁ הַבְּנַיִת: *ἀρχισυναγωγος*). It is noteworthy, however, that, just as this

<sup>1</sup> Jas. ii. 2.

word (Mark v. 22, etc.) was sometimes used in the plural and then (apparently) denoted all the presbyters of that particular synagogue, so in the Christian congregation, when the secular Greek official title *ἐπίσκοπος* came into use as equivalent to presbyter; all the presbyters alike were so spoken of. It is easy to understand, however, that the fact that in the synagogue one presbyter was generally regarded as "primus inter pares," and on special occasions acted as representative and president of the community, rendered it natural for the same thing to come about in each Christian community. When the term "synagogue" ceased to be used in Greek in reference to the Christian congregation, and consequently its President could not be styled *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*, the presiding elder (whom Justin Martyr and others call *προεστώς*) would naturally be distinguished by the title "Superintendent," in Greek *ἐπίσκοπος*, and the word gradually assumed this meaning and referred no longer to each of the Elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*), but was confined to one among them.

The origin of the Episcopate is therefore easily understood. In any society certain men necessarily come to the front through their personal character and abilities. Hence, even had there been no precedent tending in that direction, there must necessarily have appeared some Presiding Elder in each Christian community soon after its incorporation. When, however, we remember that the existence of a similar leader in each Jewish synagogue set the example, we perceive that the Christian congregations would almost unavoidably be led in the same direction. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that in nearly every city in which Christians were found, a body of Presbyters was early formed (1 Tim. iv. 14; Acts xiv. 23), and that it was presided over by a Superintendent by the end of the first century—in most cases much before that time. The residence of Paul himself for considerable periods in Corinth and Rome accounts for the fact that such a president, or (as he afterwards came to be distinctively styled) *Episcopos*, is not mentioned as existing in those two Churches when Clement wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians. He does not himself claim the title at Rome, though writing in the name of the Roman Church, nor is the letter addressed to any such official at Corinth. In Jerusalem, however, where no Apostle seems to have long resided, and where several of them might occasionally be found sojourning for a short

time, James, "the Lord's brother," early became the Presiding Elder, and hence, by an anachronism readily understood, is later spoken of by the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians and others as the first "Bishop" of Jerusalem. Paul sent Timothy and Titus as his commissaries to Ephesus and Crete respectively, not as Bishops but to represent himself in his Apostolic character, and hence with authority over the local Presbyters for a time. This was, however, another step in the development of Episcopacy, if we may now use the word. The convenience of having a chief Pastor was all the more readily felt when the Apostles passed away one by one. It is not surprising therefore to find Ignatius writing of each city having not only a "presbyterion" or Council of Elders, with deacons to help them, but also a President or Superintendent, to whom the term Episcopos had then come to be applied exclusively. His language about the authority of these Bishops has been misunderstood and has caused doubt as to the genuineness of his Epistles, while the same mistake has led others to found high hierarchical claims for the Episcopate on his words. When, however, we remember that there was an Episcopos in every city, and often in villages, at that time, we perceive that the Episcopos was then practically merely the Rector or Vicar of what was then, as now, called "a Parish" (*παροικία*),<sup>1</sup> the other presbyters being his "Assistant Curates" as we should now express it. There is nothing at all strange, then, in Ignatius' urgent warnings to "do nothing without the Bishop"; "As the Lord . . . did nothing without the Father, so do ye nothing without the Bishop and Presbyters." Accordingly he speaks of the Presbyterion at Ephesus as "fitted to the Bishop as strings to a harp." To the Church at Smyrna he says: "Deem that a valid Eucharist which is under the Bishop or him to whom he has delegated it"; "It is not permitted, apart from the Bishop, either to baptize or to hold an Agape." A modern Rector might use the very same language in giving advice to a brother Incumbent's curates. The principle was that of St. Paul; "Let all things be done decently and in order." To found upon such expressions of Ignatius the theory that the Early Church held Episcopacy absolutely essential to the existence of the Church is therefore to show that one has failed to understand the state of affairs in Ignatius' time. The mistake arises from reading modern

<sup>1</sup> Vide Circular Letter of Church of Smyrna, *initio*.



conditions into ancient documents. To think that the *Episcopos* in Ignatius' letters connotes the modern head of a Diocese among ourselves is equivalent to that of the man who would blame Paul and his fellow-travellers for luxury in travelling, because Luke says, " We took up our *carriages* " (Acts xxi. 15, A.V.). The word *Bishop* doubtless comes from *Episcopos*, yet to found an argument for Episcopacy on Ignatius' words is really to confound St. Luke's company of Missionaries tramping along each with his pack upon his back with a modern party of tourists in a motor-car !

It is worth noticing that in the *Didaché* the term *Episcopos* includes the *Presbyteros*, for presbyters are not mentioned separately, only " bishops " and deacons (*Did.* xv. sqq.). When a Rector (or *Episcopos*) came to the fore, he was long only the chief Presbyter of the Parish, elected (and ordained, if there was anything equivalent to an Ordination to the office) by the other Presbyters in early times, in some places at least. Timothy was ordained " by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery " (1 Tim. iv. 14) ; and the practice seems to have remained in force in Alexandria until the third century (*Duchesne, Early History of Christian Church*<sup>1</sup>). Whether the Order of Bishops is even now distinct from that of Presbyters is still a moot question.

## II. IS EPISCOPACY A LEGITIMATE MODE OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT ?

" This question need not detain us long. Our own study has proved to us all the general correctness of the statement made in the Prayer Book (Preface to Ord. Services) that " It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church ; Bishops, Priests and Deacons."

But such a fact as this does not by any means do away with the necessity for considering the question whether Episcopacy is so essential to the Universal Church that no Christian community which does not possess Episcopacy can justly claim to be part of the Church of Christ, or, in other words, that Ordination is not

<sup>1</sup> Vol. I., p. 69, and Vol. II, p. 99, Eng. Trans. Hase, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 68. De Pressensé, *Histoire des Trois Premiers Siècles*, vol. II. pp. 466, 467. He quotes Jerome as saying : " Alexandrini usque ad Heraclium Dionysium presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciant " (*Hieronom. Opera*, ii. 220).

valid unless conferred by a Bishop. Hence we now proceed to enquire: Is Episcopacy necessary?

### III. IS EPISCOPACY NECESSARY? IF SO, IN WHAT SENSE AND FOR WHAT REASON?

We have seen that Episcopacy was found very useful in the Early Church and that it arose almost of necessity and was gradually adopted everywhere. The same may be said of Royalty in most parts of the world. But it has been found by experience that the existence of a king is not necessary to constitute a State, that a Republic is quite as legitimate as a form of government as is a Monarchy. Can it then be affirmed that a Presbyterian form of government is legitimate in any part of the Christian Church as an alternative to the Episcopal? Or are we obliged to hold that a Christian Community is no part of the Church Universal unless it is governed by Bishops? In answer we address ourselves (*a*) to the New Testament; (*b*) to the Early Fathers; and (*c*) to the authoritative formularies of the Church of England. Of course these three authorities are of very different value: yet they all seem to me to disprove the assertion that Episcopacy is necessary for the existence of the Church, meaning by the latter word the Church Universal, defined in our Communion Service as "The blessed company of all faithful (*i.e.* believing) people" (τῶν πιστῶν).

(*a*) In the N.T. it cannot be said that Episcopacy is once mentioned. In fact it had not been evolved then. The process which ultimately produced Episcopacy was already in operation, as we have seen above. But that is not quite the same thing. In Moses' time causes were already working which finally led to the establishment of the Israelite monarchy, yet it would hardly be correct to say that the kingship existed then. As the Apostolic Office did exist in the New Testament Church, and was established by our Lord Himself, it is somewhat strange that its continuance was not insisted on as necessary for the very existence of the Church. But the early Christians understood the essentially spiritual nature of the Church's life too well to fancy that it *depended* upon names or even the regular transmission of the ministerial functions, though they did not overlook the value of such things. St. Paul secured the appointment of Presbyters (a body of them, a *Presbyterion*) in each Christian community; but the strict letter of Holy Writ

leads us to perceive that Ordination was not performed by a Bishop but "by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14).

(b) As the Episcopal Order arose from the Presbyterial, and as the latter was the older of the two, it is illogical to affirm that, though Presbyterial Ordination was sufficient to "transmit the grace of Orders" in Apostolic times, Orders now conferred by the Presbyterial Church of Scotland are not valid. There was Presbyterial Ordination (even of Bishops) in the Church of Alexandria for some centuries, yet the rest of the Church of Christ did not even suggest that Alexandria was schismatic. As we have already seen, Rome and Corinth were at first without Bishops, and Clement of Rome recognizes only two Orders, Episkopoi and Diaconoi (Ep. to Cor. xlii.), since the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters had not arisen in Rome and Corinth when he wrote. He speaks of the Apostles as appointing Ministers, and of others afterwards being appointed by the latter to succeed them, with the approval of the Church, and declares that such Ministers should not rashly be deprived of their office. He never suggests the necessity of "Episcopal" ordination, though there were probably Bishops, as distinct from Presbyters, in some Asiatic Churches then. It is well known how much importance Hegesippus and Irenæus ascribe to the due succession of Bishops, but they do so, not from a belief in the need for the transmission of spiritual authority through Bishops, but because they were concerned to prove, in opposition to Gnostic claims to the possession of esoteric Christian doctrine, that though the Rule of Faith, the N.T. books, and an orderly succession of Ministers, had been handed down, generation after generation from the Apostles, yet these Gnostic heresies had never been recognized by the Church. Not till Augustine's time do we find that the Episcopate was valued especially as transmitting spiritual or ecclesiastical authority. In earlier times the historic importance of being able to trace a regular succession of men chosen by each Christian community, recognized as heads and representatives of such communities, and, lastly, appointed and consecrated by other similar heads of Christian communities, was what was held to constitute the special value of the Historic Episcopate.<sup>1</sup> If

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Robinson's Essay on Apostolic Succession in the *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, ed. by Dr. Swete.

the same end can be attained by Presbyterial instead of by Episcopal headship, why should Episcopacy be regarded as necessary? In fact Irenæus speaks of transmission from the App. through the succession of *Presbyters*.<sup>1</sup> A republic may be as legitimate a State as a Monarchy. At any rate, as the earlier Church did not regard Episcopacy as *necessary* for the transmission of Orders, why should we? It has never been an article of the Christian Faith embodied in the Creeds, as must have been the case had Episcopacy been deemed so essential as to render its absence a bar to the transmission of Orders and the due administration of the Sacraments. Even now, illogically enough, those who deny that the Lord's Supper when administered by a Minister who has not been Episcopally ordained is valid, yet recognize that such a Minister—nay, even a layman or a woman—may (and in cases of necessity should) administer the other Sacrament of the Christian Church, Baptism. Why this difference?

(c) The Teaching of the Church of England on this point. The principle upon which our Church acts and judges in such matters is clearly expressed in Art. XX. "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written . . . it ought not . . . beside the same . . . to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." Hence, were our Church to insist on Episcopacy as necessary for the Universal Church, and for the transmission of Orders and the administration of the Sacraments, she would be acting *ultra vires* and stultifying herself. On the other hand, in accordance with the first part of this Article: "The Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies," the Church of England has the right of deciding *for herself*, as she has decided, to retain Episcopacy and insist on Episcopal Ordination. But nowhere has she insisted that every other Church must adopt the same system, and otherwise cannot be recognized as a true branch of Christ's Church Universal. On the contrary, when we consider the circumstances under which the Articles of 1562 were drawn up and the friendly relations which then existed between our own Church and the Reformed Churches on the Continent, and then read Art. XIX and Art. XXIII, it becomes clear that care is taken to avoid insisting on the necessity of Episcopacy in the constitution of other branches of the Universal Church. Art. XIX says: "The

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, *Haer.* iii. 2.

visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." And Art. XXIII runs thus: "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard." As Archbishop Whately says of our Reformers: "Though themselves deliberately adhering to Episcopal Ordination, they refrain, both in the Article on 'the Church' and in that on 'Ministering in the Church,' from specifying Episcopacy, and Episcopal Ordination, as among the essentials" (*Apostolical Succession Considered*, Longmans, 1912, pp. 72, 73).

#### IV. BEARING OF ALL THIS UPON THE POSSIBILITY OF REUNION

The result of our inquiries seems to me to be twofold. In the first place we see that Episcopacy is of great antiquity in the Universal Church, and that in the first few centuries it was very useful. The fact that it was afterwards abused is no reason why it should not be still capable of being of great service to the Church in modern times. In this respect it may be compared with Royalty. But as the latter institution is no longer suited to every nationality without distinction, so certain branches of the Christian Church have been justified in preferring to return to the older Presbyterian form of government, just as some nations have rightly abolished royalty and become republics. As, however, the late War has proved, there is no reason why Empires and Republics should not form alliances with one another. It is no longer possible for men to hold that Monarchy is the only form of political rule of which God approves, for He has blessed republican states too, both in war and in peace. So too in ecclesiastical matters it cannot be denied that God's Holy Spirit has abundantly blessed many Churches which have adopted other than Episcopal direction. Hence, recognizing that where the Holy Spirit is, there is the Church (cf. Acts x. 47), we dare not "unchurch" those parts of the One Univer-

sal Church which God has accepted. The Church belongs to Christ and not to us. If the Commander-in-Chief has seen fit to acknowledge other regiments as well as our own to be integral parts of His Army, the one "Army of the Living God," who are we that we should venture to oppose His supreme decree? We must beware of imposing unlawful terms of agreement. If we follow no higher example in this matter, let us at least learn even from Balaam to say: "He hath blessed, and I cannot reverse it" (Num. xxiii. 20).

Secondly, we have seen that our own Church recognizes in her Articles certain principles, in accordance with which we must admit the validity of the Orders and Sacraments of at least certain Churches which are not Episcopal. Therefore, remembering the urgency of our Divine Lord's prayer for Unity in His Church, and recognizing what a scandal to the world and source of weakness to the cause of Christianity our disunion is and long has been, and that Episcopacy was not established to rend the Church asunder but rather to preserve its unity, we conclude that we are justified in endeavouring to devise some means whereby, while retaining Episcopacy for ourselves, we may yet form a living union between our own and those other Churches which, holding the "Faith once for all delivered unto the Saints," prefer a system of ecclesiastical polity different from our own. It may be questioned whether the System of the Church of Scotland, for instance, with its presbyter and council of Elders in every parish does not approach nearer to that of the sub-Apostolic Church than our own, since the functions of the modern Bishop differ so immensely from what they were in Ignatius' day. That, however, is a matter of no practical importance. What is of importance is to refuse to degrade Episcopacy into a shibboleth, or, still worse, to use it as a Nehushtan, a hindrance to the unity of the Church of Christ, a curse rather than a blessing.

NOTE.—The foregoing Paper was read recently before a small gathering of Church of England Clergy, and discussion was invited. Among the weightiest arguments brought forward against the writer's conclusions were the following: (1) According to one opponent's view, the writer was wrong in his exegesis of the New Testament, in his history, and in his statement of the doctrine of the Church of England. The opponent said he had almost fancied himself, in listening to the Paper, to be hearing a "Little Bethel" preacher. The New Testament recognized three Orders of the Ministry, and these still existed and must exist. (2) Another approved of the sketch given of the Origin of the Episcopate, but could not imagine any reader of Ignatius' Letters accepting the explanation given by the writer of this Paper.

[Yet, if we take a modern example—for instance Deal—the matter seems fairly obvious. In Deal there are about 11,000 people and three parishes. The old Parish Church is St. Leonard's, and its Rector still bears the title "Rector of Deal." If we imagine ourselves back in the second century, in Ignatius' time, Deal would have had an "Episcopus" and a number of Presbyters associated with him, and would have constituted one Parish. What would the "Episcopus" then have been but the modern "Rector" ?] The Church of England in Ordination conferred on her Clergy, through the imposition of the Bishop's hands, certain authority and powers which the "Non-Episcopal bodies" did not claim to bestow. To the writer these arguments did not seem to affect his contention at all seriously. But he lays them and his paper before the readers of this Magazine, hoping that the important subject dealt with so briefly and inadequately in this Article may receive the attentive consideration which is so very especially needed at the present time.

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

### A REMARKABLE BOYHOOD.

HERBERT TINGLE, AND ESPECIALLY HIS BOYHOOD. By John R. Clark Hall, with an introduction by H. M. Burge, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. London: S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This somewhat slight sketch of the playtime amusements of a very remarkable boy and his companions, with some references to his maturer life, is of quite unusual interest. We echo the hope expressed by Dr. Burge, now Bishop of Oxford, that it will be widely read. It is a capital book to give to a boy and the parents and friends of children will find in it much to reflect upon. Herbert Tingle at an early age showed signs of possessing a mind of much originality and power, coupled with a very remarkable memory and no little practical ability. How out of very scanty materials he and his boy friends, one of whom is now the writer of this book, evolved a state system with railways, armies, political parties, elections, newspapers, universities and national institutions, Mr. Clark Hall tells us so interestingly that we could wish the book had been a good deal longer. The newspapers and books of this imaginary state were at first produced by hand with a fine pen to resemble print. Afterwards they were produced on a toy printing press. Some of them must have been uncommonly well done, for Mr. Clarke Hall found one at the British Museum, with the imprint of "Tingle and Hall" and wondered much how it reached there. A reproduction of a map drawn by Herbert Tingle at the age of 13 which is given as a frontispiece to this memoir, gives proof of his skill as a draughtsman. Some passages from a stage-play "Harfequin and Bluebeard," one of many ventures of the same kind, shows a good deal of latent talent which went undeveloped in later life. The book gives us a picture of happy intelligent boyhood, full of fun and high spirits, growing into serious and thoughtful manhood with noble ideal and purpose, not desirous of shining widely, only ambitious to do the work of life well in every detail and so to leave the world a little better than he found it.

W. G. J.



## THE WURTEMBERG CONFESSION AND THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

BY W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

THE correct title of the Thirty-nine Articles is: "Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God, 1562, according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding of the diversities of opinion, and for the establishment of consent touching true religion." This title is generally misprinted in our present Prayer-books, especially by suppressing the clause "according to the computation of the Church of England," which is of real importance. For, by the "computation of the Church of England" the years of grace began on Lady Day not on January 1, seeing that the Incarnation dates from the Annunciation and not from the Nativity. Consequently, on the "Old Style" reckoning, the days from January 1 to March 24, both inclusive, were dated as a year earlier than they appear in the "New Style" or civil calendar.

The Convocation which authorized the revised Articles met in January, "1562," *Old Style*, which is 1563 in our modern computation. This is of importance, for it shows that the revision of the Articles was decided on by Archbishop Parker *after* the revival of the Council of Trent in 1562, and most probably because of it. It renders us certain that many of the alterations then made were aimed at precisely contradicting the Council's *official* definitions of Romish doctrine, as is the case in Articles XXII., XXIV., XXX. and XXXI.

The method of the revision of 1563 (as it is best to call it) was not to discuss and revise the "Forty-two Articles" of 1552-3 in Convocation. Archbishop Parker revised those Articles himself, and submitted his draft revision to Convocation. Convocation then ordered one or two slight changes, the excision of four Articles and the change of the third paragraph "Of the Lord's Supper." Consequently, the main changes in the Articles were effected by Parker's revision beforehand. A comparison shows that he preserved twenty-one of the original Articles substantially unchanged, materially



altered the expression of seventeen, amalgamated four Articles into two, struck out two whole Articles, and inserted four new Articles (now nos. 5, 12, 29 and 30). In his amendments of the expressions of the Articles, and in framing the new ones, Parker followed principally the guidance of the "Wurtemberg Confession," *except*—as will appear later—on the one point of the "eucharistic presence." It is therefore of great interest to know something of this Confession.

On June 26, 1534, Wurtemberg became Protestant under the restored Duke Ulrich (d. 1550). Its conversion was of importance, not only because it drove a Protestant wedge into Upper Germany; but because theologically as well as geographically. Wurtemberg became a link between the Lutherans of Central and Northern Germany, who held a theory of a "real presence" in the elements, and the "Reformed" of the Rhineland and Switzerland who rejected any such notion. For the two first Reformers of Wurtemberg were Ambrose Blaurer, who held the "Reformed" view of the Lord's Supper, and Erhard Schenpf, a decided Lutheran. Blaurer was more of the school of Bucer, who disbelieved the "real presence," but wished all Protestants to agree to leave it an open question, and to use only such language as—while excluding any presence effected by priestly consecration—would leave men free to believe or not as they wished that there was a "real presence" in the elements at their reception. Blaurer the Oberländer took the district above the Staig, and Schenpf that below it, and the latter "instituted a form of the Lord's Supper with which the Oberländers were satisfied" (Ranke, *Hist. of Ref. in Germany*, iii. 536: London, 1847).

On August 2, 1534, Blaurer and Schenpf signed a "Concord," which, as Blaurer took care to insist before signing, could be agreed to by a Zwinglian. It was to the effect that "The body and blood of Christ are truly—that is *substantially* and essentially, but not quantitatively or qualitatively *or locally*—present and proffered (*exhiberi*) in the Supper." The scholastic terms which shocked some Protestants appear to contradict each other. If "substantially" be interpreted naturally it involves the "real presence"; if "locally" be interpreted naturally it excludes any such idea; the most satisfactory point was that the "true presence" was asserted to be in the "Supper" and not in the *elements*. Hence

when Schenpf tried to claim that Blaurer had become a convert to the Lutheran view, his colleague replied by reminding him of his protest before signing the Concord, and said that he had not in any way changed his opinion. The Wurtembergers therefore—while mainly inclined to Lutheranism—chose to use language which mediated on the “real presence” and afforded a common shelter for both Lutheran and Reformed.

On the death of Ulrich in 1550 he was succeeded by his son Christopher, who by means of his ambassadors presented to the Council of Trent on January 24, 1552, the “Wurtemberg Confession” that had been drawn up by Brentius, who became noted some ten years later as the advocate of “Ubiquitarianism,” or the curious theory that the Lord’s body is present everywhere, and so may well be said to be present in the elements at the Lord’s Table! The Confession preserves just the same cautious ambiguity as characterised the Concord. “Of the substance of the eucharist we hold and teach that the true body of Christ and His true blood are distributed in the eucharist, and we refute those who say that the bread and wine are only signs of the absent body and blood of Christ.” It goes on to say that though God *might* choose to change the substance of the elements, yet “we have no certain Word of God for it,” and urges (by a confusion of the figures in Ezekiel iv. and v.) that where it is said of a tile “*This is Jerusalem*, it was not necessary that the substance of the tile should be changed into the substance of the city of Jerusalem.” Of course the Reformed could agree to such a representation, as they do not believe the elements “only” signs of the absent body and blood, but to be also means and pledges to us that spiritually faith is by them put in beneficial possession of the broken body and shed blood of Christ, which are absent from us not only in *space* as far as the throne of God is from earth, but are absent from us also in *time* as far as the Crucifixion is from the present day.

Accordingly when Peter de Soto published his *Assertio* against the Confession in 1555, he challenges the Wurtembergers to say in plain language what they do mean about the “real presence.” Thus to the first of the above extracts he says:—

“Add, friends (after the word ‘eucharist’), and really contains them after consecration even when it is not distributed.”

And he deals with the “tile” argument as follows:

“ Here, friends, we again expostulate with you, that ye do not openly explain your faith. Certainly, when it is said in Ezekiel, *This is Jerusalem*, it is plain that it is said not of the true city but only of a *figure* of it, which, if it is so understood in the present instance, *This is my body*, it will speak not of the true body of Christ, but of a *certain figure* of it which your words would seem rather obscurely to imply. . . . And when ye say that ‘ the body of Christ is truly present with the bread ’ we should desire that word *truly* to be explained more fully, that is to say, that *substantially* and *really* the body of Christ is *there*. But because it is a ‘ truly ’ only, and ye adduce the example from Ezekiel, we fear lest ye say that the body of Christ is *in such wise* ‘ truly ’ (*ita vere*) there, as Jerusalem was in the tile. . . . If ye hold the true faith that the body and blood of Christ are there really and substantially, why do ye adduce so *alien an illustration* (*tam alienum exemplum*).” (De Soto’s book is without pagination.)

All this is very fair argument and there is only one satisfactory reply to it, a frank acknowledgment that the Wurtemberg Confession was a mediating document which designedly left the doctrine of the “ real presence ” in the elements suspended in the air, neither affirmed nor denied.

How our English Reformers came to use this Confession in 1563 has never yet been determined, so that the following facts may be of interest as indicating the probable channel of communication to have been Grindal, Bishop of London, Parker’s zealous assistant, and eventual successor.

Strype tells us that Christopher of Wurtemberg was a kind friend to the Marian exiles, giving them “ at Strasburg four or five hundred dollars, besides more given to them at Frankfort ”; so that probably at least some of them were interested to read their benefactor’s “ Confession ” which de Soto tells us was even in 1555 “ carried about in the hand of almost everybody.” In 1561 it was falsely quoted by the Cardinal de Lorraine at the Colloquy of Poissy, and the next year Nicholas des Gallars, a leading disputant there, published the *Acts of the Synod of Poissy in London*. Des Gallars was a favourite pupil of Calvin’s, and he was warmly welcomed by Grindal when he came over in 1560 to take charge of the French Church in London; so that Grindal would have learned from him about this misuse of the Confession.

In 1562 the Duke of Wurtemberg co-operated with Elizabeth in assisting the persecuted Huguenots, and sent a messenger to offer her his services if she was contemplating marriage with any foreign prince. (This was not an indirect proposal, for the Duchess was still alive!) The Queen sent back the messenger with a civil

letter dated January 27, 1563; but before he departed he was invited by Grindal to stay with him, which he did, and the two even "talked of Brentius's Ubiquity" with friendly difference of opinion (Strype, *Grindal*, p. 132; *Annals*, I. ii. 99). All this connects Grindal very closely with the Wurtembergers at the very time when the Wurtemberg Confession was being employed on the Articles. But another consideration appears to put it beyond reasonable doubt that Grindal was the link with Wurtemberg. From 1559 to 1563 he had as his private secretary, to whom he lovingly refers as "my Dithelm," a son of Thomas Blaurer, and nephew of Ambrose Blaurer, the "Reformed Reformer" of Wurtemberg (*Zurich Letters*, i. 130; ii. 28, 74, 107). Grindal was thus in the closest touch with the very heart of the "Reformed" section of Wurtemberg Protestantism. It would therefore appear that the revision of 1563 was mainly effected by Parker and Grindal correcting the Articles of 1552-3 with the aid of the Wurtemberg Confession.

Archbishop Laurence in his Bampton Lectures for 1804, first noticed that the Articles received their "principal additions and elucidations upon doctrinal points (that of the *Eucharist alone excepted*)" at the revision of 1562-3, from the Wurtemberg Confession (*Attempt to Illustrate*, p. 234; Oxford, 1838). He shows how this Confession furnished the materials to complete the statements of the Articles on the cardinal doctrines of the Trinity, the Rule of Faith, and Justification, by supplying (1) in Article II. the clause "begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father"; and the whole of Article V., "Of the Holy Ghost." (2) The Canon of Scripture and rejection of the Apocrypha in Article VI., and the first clause in Article XX. (if its authenticity be allowed). (3) The first clause in both Article X. and Article XI., and the whole of Article XII.

There was, however, another point on which our Articles were "made fully perfect" in 1563, namely, the doctrine of the Sacraments, and though Archbishop Laurence does not claim this to have been affected by the Wurtemberg Confession, it is hardly possible to doubt that its influence extended also to some of these amendments, which were (1) the fixing of the number of Gospel Sacraments at two, and the denial of this title to "those five" which complete the Roman "Seven Sacraments." (2) Defence of Infant Baptism as "most agreeable with the institution of Christ." (3) The

introduction of the charge that Transubstantiation "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament." (4) The third paragraph in Article XXVIII. (5) The introduction of a new Article (XXIX.) against "reception by the wicked." (6) The introduction of a new Article (XXX.) against the Half-Communion.

The Wurtemberg Confession certainly inspired the attack on the "Seven Sacraments," which it deals with at length. On Baptism it says:—"Baptism is to be ministered, as well to infants as to those that are grown to full age . . . *according to Christ's Institution.*" Of the Lord's Supper it says: "If the substance of the bread were changed, we should have no proof of the truth of the Sacrament." Against the Half-Communion it urges that "the use of either *part* ought to be common to the whole Church," and that the "ancient Church did use both *parts*," and harps upon the idea that the elements are the two Divinely-united "parts" of "one and the self-same mystery." A careful comparison of the Wurtemberg Confession with the decrees of the Council of Trent, and of these decrees again with our Article XXX. of seven months later, will show how the Council sought to evade the argument of the Confession, and how the English Article pounced upon the Council's disingenuous decrees, and pressed the Wurtemberg argument home in a way that could not be evaded; but we have only space for one illustration of this interesting controversy.

The Articles when they refer to the elements call them "sacramenta," and with this we may compare the Communion Service of 1552-9, where the exhortation speaks of "the holy Sacraments of His body and blood," and the final rubric has the phrase "receive the Sacraments." In Article XXX. alone is there a departure from this language. In the Latin title the Roman word "species" is used to show that it was aimed against the Trent decree on Communion "*sub utraque specie.*" In the body of the Article neither the English term "sacramenta" nor yet the Roman "species" is employed, but the Wurtemberg name "part." The Wurtembergers had urged that those who "receive bread alone do not receive the whole Sacrament *sacramentally*"; Rome endeavoured gracefully to elude that blow by saying that the laity are not "*obliged . . . to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under each kind,*" and that "under each *kind* whole and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament is received"; the Church of England promptly countered

this by the statement that “ both the *parts* of the Lord’s Sacrament ought to be ministered.” This placed the matter on the right basis. The question is not whether the lay people are bound to *receive* both kinds (when they may not be allowed by the clergy to do so); but whether the clergy are bound to *administer* in both kinds, according to Christ’s ordinance and commandment. And the use of the word “ part ” insisted once again that the two elements together form one Sacrament, and that neither kind alone is therefore “ a true Sacrament ” in the strict sense of the word.

We see, then, that the Articles in 1563 were indebted to the Wurtemberg Confession for more than the points noted by Archbishop Laurence. They took from it valuable portions of sacramental doctrine, viz., the rejection of the Seven Sacraments, the defence of Infant Baptism by Christ’s institution of that Sacrament for “ nations ” (not exclusively for adults), the anti-sacramental character of transubstantiation, and the insistence upon both “ parts ” of the other Sacrament (also in virtue of Christ’s institution). So that even on the Eucharist itself our revisers of 1563 did not *entirely* refuse the help of the Wurtemberg Confession. As far as it was *anti-Romish* they used it. But in two places, and in two places only, did they depart wholly from the Wurtemberg Confession when amending the Articles. These two places are the third paragraph of Article XXVIII. and the whole of Article XXIX. ; the subject of both is the same—first considered *positively*, and then *negatively*, *the manner of eating the body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper*. On that question alone do our Articles refuse to be “ elucidated ” from Wurtemberg. And the divergence is too striking to be accidental.

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION,      ENGLISH ARTICLE, 1563.  
1552.

De substantia eucharistiae  
sentimus et docemus quod  
*verum corpus Christi*  
*et verus sanguis ejus*  
*in eucharistia*  
*distribuitur . . .*  
Quod Corpus Christi vere sit  
*cum pane praesens.*

Corpus Christi

[*in coena*]  
*datur, accipitur, et manducatur,*  
*in coena TANTUM*  
*coelesti et spirituali ratione.*

Even the apologetic Wurtemberg use of the term “ eucharist, for so it pleased our fathers to call the Supper of the Lord,” makes way for the use of the term which it pleased the Holy Ghost to employ. The name “ eucharistia ” does indeed occur twice in the Latin

of the Article, first in connection with Transubstantiation and next with Reservation; but in both cases it is translated in the English version by "Supper of the Lord," not *transliterated* "eucharist." The reason for this was because the Romanists based on the name a false argument for the "real presence," which the Catechism of the Council of Trent had the hardihood to set forth thus: "The Eucharist, a word which *we may render either 'the good grace,' or 'the thanksgiving'* . . . because it contains *in itself* Christ the Lord Who is true grace" (Pt. ii., ch. iv., qu. 3; Donovan's trs.). On the other hand, the word "Supper" suggests not what the viands may "contain," but the idea of *reception*.

So too the harmless word "distributed" is rejected as likely to be referred to the act of the minister. The cautious Wurttemberg ambiguity "present *with* the bread," which does not quite amount to "present *in* the bread" (Philpot, *Examination & Writings*, pp. 99, 100), was met with a declaration, not of a "presence," but of *actions* (giving, taking, eating), and all "only after a *heavenly and spiritual manner*."

That the revision of the Articles in 1563 thus shunned the language of the Wurttemberg Confession on the "real presence" *alone* out of all the important doctrinal corrections then made is a fact that must be faced by those who would persuade us that the Articles intend at least to mediate on this doctrine; to tolerate it, if not positively to affirm it. If that was the purpose, what possible reason can there have been for abstaining from adopting the language of the Wurttemberg formula?

In Wurttemberg for nearly thirty years Lutheran and Reformed had dwelt in *harmony*, first under the *Concord* and for the last dozen years under this very Confession. To Christopher of Wurttemberg the Reformed looked with merited affection and esteem. He alone of the Lutheran princes of Germany was striking a blow on behalf of the persecuted "Reformed" of France, and was boldly rejecting Catherine de Medici's overtures for peace, refusing to "mix himself up with anything that would prejudice those who were of the *same faith as himself*, even though there *might* be some *little difference*" (reply to the envoy Rascallon, March 17, 1563). He—while other Lutherans, like Joachim Westphal, were rejoicing at Mary's atrocities against the English "Sacramentaries"—had generously relieved the distress of our exiled Reformers, and Grindal's conduct

is proof that Englishmen were not unmindful of his past kindness.

If, then, in 1563, the revision of the Article on the Lord's Supper was effected in order to *withdraw* *censure* from the doctrine of the "real presence," and so to leave it at least possible for a believer in that doctrine to sign the Articles with a good conscience, why did our Reformers diverge from the Wurtemberg Confession on this point, and on this point alone, out of all the important re-modellings that they then made? In the Wurtemberg Confession they had a document of proved worth as an "eirenicon" on the "real presence," and the formulary which, above all other (semi-) Lutheran declarations, would most conciliate and disarm criticism from the Reformed Churches. Yet it is just on this question of the "real presence" that the English Articles turn away from the Wurtemberg Confession; they adopt none of its ambiguities, they use, on the contrary, the characteristic language of the "Reformed."

As to who actually compiled the third paragraph of Article XXVIII. we have no information, though Geste claims (in what the Judicial Committee has rightly described as "the questionable comments of a doubtful letter written for personal motives") that the first sentence of it "was of mine own penning"; but this does not amount to claiming to have been its "compiler," as the Supreme Court pointed out in correcting Sir Robert Phillimore's unwarrantable employment of that word for partisan reasons. Sancroft, as secretary, "penned" a large amount of the changes made in the Prayer-book at the last revision in 1661, yet we may not therefore call him the "compiler" of those amended passages, and the Sacerdotalists would be the last people in the world to concede that Sancroft should be regarded as irrefragable authority for the interpretation of those amended rubrics and prayers which are certainly "of his own penning."

Whether Geste did, even in a restricted sense, "pen" the sentence in question, is open to grave doubt. From the Parker MS. it is certain (1) that the full third paragraph of Article XXVIII. was in the draft *before* it was presented by the Primate to Convocation, so that Geste's "penning" can only have been in some draft submitted privately to the Archbishop, if it ever occurred; (2) that in the Parker MS. these words form part of an *explicit denial* of the "real and bodily presence," and therefore must have been understood in that sense from the beginning.



Here it is that we are so strongly tempted to doubt the good faith of Geste. For the sake of a Lutheran friend he alleged that the words were "penned" by himself, and that "*only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner" does not exclude a belief that Christ's body is received "corporally, naturally and carnally." The value of that special pleading may safely be appraised by any one who knows English; but when we know for certain that these words came before the Synod as originally forming part of a denial in so many words of "the real and bodily presence," we cannot fail to feel that Geste is hardly a trustworthy witness.

The writer hopes to show in a following paper that the paragraph introduced into Article XXVIII. (and its correlative, Article XXIX.) in reality have a source which places their "Reformed" character beyond question.

W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

---

#### A BOOK ON CONFIRMATION.

TALKS ON CONFIRMATION. By the Rev. F. Arthur Roughton. London: S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

No part of a Clergyman's life is more important than the preparation of Confirmation Candidates. Then he comes face to face with the young life of his congregation when conscience is tender and the boys and girls can be moulded by sympathy and led to personal knowledge of their Saviour. Most candidates wish to be "good" and are ready to receive teaching of a practical and doctrinal character. To seize and make the best use of the opportunity is an imperative duty. Mr. F. Arthur Roughton enables earnest men to do this. He has definite ideals and he is not afraid to express his own convictions which are definitely Evangelical. What is more, he has read widely and brings into his pages illustrations from the best modern theological and devotional books. The whole ground is admirably covered by a man who recognizes the sacredness of the task and the duty of fulfilling it to the best of his ability. A re-reading of the book deepens our view that it will prove invaluable to all who seek to give freshness and point to the classes they are privileged to hold. We recommend "Talks on Confirmation" to the senior as well as to the junior Clergy.



## DR. BURNEY'S "ISRAEL'S SETTLEMENT IN CANAAN."<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. J. S. GRIFFITHS, Rector of Lothersdale,  
Keighley.

THE nineteenth century will always be remarkable for the recovery of the knowledge of ancient civilizations through the labours of excavators, the discovery of monuments and the deciphering of old inscriptions. Bible students in particular are deeply indebted to the great explorers who have in many ways and at many points illuminated the pages of Holy Writ. It is true that archaeology is not yet an exact science, and the temptation is strong to go beyond the limits of what is actually proved, to exaggerate, to mix up theory and conjecture, and to make large and premature deductions from insufficient evidence; yet the area of positive knowledge is ever widening, and to-day there is a mass of archaeological material available for the illustration and elucidation of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Dr. Burney's book is an attempt, by the use of a portion of this material, to shed new light upon an admittedly difficult period of sacred history. It represents "an endeavour to reach historical results through the evidence of literary and historical criticism of Old Testament documents combined with the evidence of archaeology." That such an attempt should be made by an avowed disciple of Wellhausen is highly significant. It seems to indicate a changed attitude towards archaeology on the part of the Evolutionary critics. Formerly, as Dr. Cheyne frankly admits (*Bible Problems*, p. 142), they were disposed to ignore the claims of archaeology to influence criticism. This may have been due partly to the undeveloped state of the science, partly also to the way in which it was pressed, not always wisely or even fairly, into the service of conservative writers; but chiefly, we imagine, to the facts that it has completely disproved some of the propositions maintained by early critical writers (including Wellhausen himself), and that so many of the leading archaeologists have felt constrained to abandon

<sup>1</sup> *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, by Dr. C. F. Burney (Schweich Lectures, 1917).

and oppose the evolutionary hypothesis. More recently however, the leaders of the Wellhausen school have begun to realize that archaeology is a factor that must be reckoned with, and that their theories must harmonize with its testimony if they are to prevail. Dr. Burney is quite clear "that these two departments of Biblical research (archaeology and criticism) cannot rightly be kept apart" (p. 1). Proceeding along these two lines, he arrives at certain historical conclusions which may be summarized as follows:

The early ancestors of Israel migrated into Canaan about 2100 B.C. The traditional stories of the patriarchs "deal in the main with the movements of *tribes* under the guise of individuals" (p. 84); and some of these were possibly in Egypt under the Hyksos in the sixteenth century B.C. In the following century came further immigrations into Syria and Canaan from the E. and N.E. These immigrants were of the SA-GAZ, the bandit folk mentioned in the Tell-el-Amarna letters, and included "Habiru" presumably Hebrews and Aramaeans. The Israelites oppressed in Egypt by Raameses II in the thirteenth century B.C. were mainly those of the Joseph-tribes (containing possibly some other elements, *e.g.* Simeon and Levi). There were other tribes in Canaan all along. And it was an army of Joseph-tribesmen that invaded Canaan under Joshua. The Biblical conception of an early organized unity of Israel is "the reading of later conditions back into a period when they were non-existent."

There are, however, several weak links in this chain.

(1) The evidence is not convincing for the date 2100 B.C. given for the migration from Mesopotamia into Canaan. Genesis xiv. mentions a Babylonian king Amraphel as being contemporary with Abraham. Dr. Burney, in common with many other scholars, identifies him with Hammurabi. But the final "l" in Amraphel is an insuperable difficulty. Even if the final "l" could be accounted for, the remaining Hebrew consonants give us one of *eight* possible transliterations of the consonants of Hammurabi's name. That is the utmost that can be urged in favour of the dating. Formerly it was thought that the Arioch, king of Ellasar, mentioned in Genesis xiv. was identical with Warad-Sin, of Larsa, (*not* Ellasar), whose name could be read in Sumerian as Eriaku; but it is now known that Warad-Sin (2143-2123 B.C.) was not contemporaneous with Hammurabi (2123-2081 B.C.). There is no recorded episode

in the career of Hammurabi that corresponds with the notice of Amraphel who falls, according to any reasonable view of the Biblical chronology, in the gap between the end of the reign of Samsu-ditana, of Babylon (1926 B.C.—for dates see King, *Hist. Bab.*) and the accession of Gandash (1760 B.C.), a period concerning which archaeology furnishes no information.

(2) The identification of the Habiru with the Hebrews or Aramaeans is also open to question. Dr. Burney says (p. 68), "the philological equivalence of *Ha-bi-ru* with 'Hebrew'—or, rather, since the form is not gentile, with 'Ebher is perfect." But if we *assume* that the word Habiru is a transliteration from the Hebrew—of which there is no positive evidence—then one of *eight* sets of Hebrew consonants which it may represent is found in the consonants of 'Ebher. In other words, on a purely consonantal basis, there are seven other equivalents just as perfect as 'Ebher! No proof is given that the Habiru were Semites at all. On the other hand, as Dr. Burney admits (p. 77), the term *Ha-bir-a-a* (=Habiraeen) is applied in two Babylonian documents to men who bear Kassite names—Harbisihu and Kurdurra. But the Kassites were not Semites. If the Habiru were Hebrews, it is singular, to say the least, that the only two names of Habiru-people known to us should be non-Semitic.<sup>1</sup>

(3) The theory that only the Joseph-tribes were oppressed in Egypt while the other tribes were still in Canaan is, of course, contradictory to the Biblical account. The author supports it, however, by reference to two place-names, Jacob-el and Asher, and to the Israel stele of Menepthah.

*Jacob-el* is found in a list of places in Palestine conquered by the Pharaoh Thutmose III c. 1479 B.C. Dr. Burney seems to infer from this that a Jacob-tribe existed in Southern or Central Canaan at that time. But *Jacob-el* is the name of a *place*, not a tribe, and is not an adequate foundation for the argumentative edifice which the author seeks to erect upon it.

Of *Asher* Dr. Burney says (p. 54), "there exists external evidence which seems to prove that the Zilpah-tribe Asher was already settled in its final position in North-Western Galilee at a period prior to the Exodus (cp. pp. 82, 83)." Turning obediently to pp.

<sup>1</sup> For other arguments against the identification, see an article by Prof. Luckenbill in the *American Journal of Theology*, Jan., 1918.

82, 83 in search of this evidence, we find, "It is interesting to note that Sety I (like his successor Ra'messe II) mentions among his conquests a district called 'Asaru, corresponding to the hinterland of Southern Phoenicia, precisely the position assigned in the Old Testament to the Israelite tribe of Asher." The identification of 'Asaru with Asher though strongly supported by many scholars is, however, far from certain. Eerdmans (*Vorgeschichte*, 1908, p. 66 f.) contends that the Egyptian transliteration does not correspond to the name Asher, and that the name of the only known inhabitant of the district is not even Semitic. In other words it is a transliteration from some non-Semitic language, not from Hebrew at all. He also disputes the geographical location. On this latter point W. M. Müller argues that the position of 'Asaru was that of the tribal district of Asher because it is found in a list which is clearly working from N. to S. (beginning with the N. Syrian Hittites), and occurs between Kadesh and Megiddo. But Eerdmans in reply points out that the places which follow Megiddo on the list are North and not South of that town. If so the list is not in geographical order, and the location of 'Asaru cannot be certainly determined.

The author's third proof of a divided Israel is based on the "Israel stele" discovered by Prof. Flinders Petrie in 1896. This inscription mentions "Israel" among a number of Palestinian localities subdued and plundered by Meneptah (1214-1234 B.C.). "Israel is desolated, his seed is not." From this Dr. Burney infers that Meneptah had defeated in Canaan a tribal element called Israel at a date nearly coincident with that which is commonly assigned to the Exodus.

The following is Breasted's translation of the material portion of the inscription (*Ancient Records*, Vol. III, pp. 263 f.):

"The kings are overthrown, saying: 'Salâm!'  
 Not one holds up his head among the Nine Bows.  
 Wasted is Tehenu,  
 Kheta is pacified,  
 Plundered is Pekanan with every evil,  
 Carried off is Askalon,  
 Seized upon is Gezer,  
 Yenoam is made as a thing not existing.  
 Israel is desolated, his seed is not;  
 Palestine has become a widow for Egypt.  
 All lands are united, they are pacified;  
 Every one that is turbulent is bound by King Meneptah."

Of the places named, Tehenu is Libya, Kheta is Hittite-land, Askalon and Gezer are in S. Palestine, and Pекanan is *Kanan*, two miles S. W. of Hebron (Petrie, *Hist. Eg.* III, 12). Yenoam has been identified by Petrie and others with Yanuh near Tyre. Maspero suggests the *Yanim* of Joshua xv. 53, and locates the defeated Israel in that neighbourhood.

Now the determinative sign for "land" which is used of Tehenu, Kheta, Askalon, Gezer and Yenoam is lacking in the case of Israel. The name Israel, as Dr. Burney himself points out is marked by the determinative meaning "men," showing that it denotes a people, not a country. It is in fact an expression that fits a *non-territorial* Israel. The inscription, then, records a defeat of a non-territorial Israel, in or near Palestine, so complete ("his seed is not"—a conventional phrase used in some other inscriptions and meaning "crushingly defeated") that as a result Canaan was for a time at least saved for the king. That is to say there was a *pax Aegyptia* in Palestine, and the attempts of Israel and others to disturb it had signally failed. ¶The date of the Stele is given as Epiphi 3 = April 15 in the fifth year of Menepthah (1229 B.C.).

The inscription does not state that all the events mentioned occurred in the course of a single campaign, or that the king himself was present in every or any case. On this point Prof. E. Naville says, "Thus the last lines of the stele show that the safety of the king is complete. There is no indication whatever that this state of things is due to the victories of the king. He is not mentioned as conqueror. It is not said that he, personally did anything in the destruction of Askalon or Innuamma. It would be quite contrary to Egyptian inscriptions such as we know them to forget in that way the great deeds of their king. No more than the day-book of the official does this record a conquest by Menepthah in Palestine. The successful campaign attributed to him is a mere hypothesis resting on two texts neither of which gives any indication whatever of this war, still less a positive proof" (*Journ. Eg. Arch.*, 1915, p. 201). Israel's defeat, then, may have been inflicted by Egyptian troops—with or without Menepthah, or by allies or vassals of the king. The essential point is that by whomsoever inflicted it helped to save Canaan for a time for the king of Egypt.

The interpretation of the stele does *not* necessitate the assumption of a divided Israel, for in Numbers xiv. 40-45 and Deuteronomy i.

41-46 an event is recorded which seems to correspond in all essentials with the Egyptian inscription. In those passages it is related that the Israelites on attempting an invasion of Canaan from the south were so decisively defeated by the Amorite tribes that they made no further attempt for thirty-eight years. That notice may safely be accepted as historical for no nation ever *invented* a story that on trying to invade a country it was so crushingly routed as to be compelled to wander in a wilderness for thirty-eight years! This defeat was inflicted upon a non-territorial Israel, in or near Palestine, by tribes who were under the suzerainty of the Egyptian king, and it sufficed to protect Canaan from further attack by Israel until some thirty-eight years later; thus fulfilling the conditions of the Israel stele. Incidentally it indicates the second year of Menephtah as the date of the Exodus (see H. M. Wiener's interesting discussion in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1916).

(4) On behalf of his contention that only the Joseph-tribes entered Canaan under the leadership of Joshua, Dr. Burney points to the conquest of Arad in the Negeb by Judah and Simeon as a clear instance of a tribal settlement effected independently. In this case he relies exclusively upon Biblical evidence, *viz.*, Judges i. 16, 17, and Numbers xxi. 1-3 (J.), which passages he believes to be "obviously parallel." Both narrate a victory won by Israel in the Negeb, therefore they must be duplicate accounts of the same event! But according to Numbers this victory was gained *before* the general invasion under Joshua, the attack was made from the south, and no tribes are specially mentioned; while in Judges the conquest is attributed to Judah and Simeon moving southwards from Jericho after the passage of the Jordan. Besides, Numbers represents the Canaanite king as the aggressor, while in Judges the contrary is the case. It is not astonishing therefore that one who regards these passages as "obviously parallel," should find it "impossible to reconcile them as they stand." But Dr. Burney is in nowise discouraged. He judiciously selects from each passage just those elements which appear to countenance his theory. The *place* of conflict is of course common to both sections. On the questions of *date* and *direction* he "adopts the view that the position of the narrative as it stands in Numbers is more correct." Yet he follows Judges in representing the campaign as having been waged by Judah and Simeon, not (as in Numbers) by all Israel.

We give the result in his own words, "adopting the view that the position of the narrative as it stands in Numbers is more correct, and that the conquest of Arad in the Negeb took place through a tribal movement northward from the neighbourhood of Kadesh, the inference becomes plausible that the movement was effected by the tribes of Judah and Simeon" (pp. 29, 30). Plausible, perhaps, but far from sound! For Numbers xxi. 1-3 does not describe a *tribal* movement. It gives no hint or suggestion of such a thing. It was "Israel" that fought and won. It is not Numbers but the "less correct" account in Judges that mentions the tribes by name. If these passages are parallel it is, as Dr. Burney says, impossible to reconcile them.

Does not this impossibility warrant the suggestion that they may not be doublets at all, but relate to two distinct events? But, it may be asked, if Israel conquered Arad and occupied the Negeb under Moses, why should they need to re-conquer that region after crossing the Jordan? Why should they have turned and wandered for many years in the wilderness and finally invaded Canaan from another quarter? A clue to the solution of this difficulty is given in Numbers xiv. 40-45. There we read of a severe defeat sustained by the Israelites as a result of which they were driven back "even unto Hormah (Heb. *the* Hormah)." The fact that Numbers xxi. 3 explains why the city was called Hormah, while xiv. 45 assumes that it already has this name seems to show that the passage xxi. 1-3 has been misplaced. In fact, "it has long been recognized that the section is, in part at least, out of place" (Gray, *Numbers*, p. 271). The most reasonable view is that put forward by Wiener (*Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*), viz., that the text of Numbers has been disarranged, that the victory at Hormah preceded the defeat, and that both took place *before* the thirty-eight years' wandering. In that case Judges i. 16, 17, refers to a re-conquest of the Negeb and the re-naming of the city. It is true that this explanation vindicates the Biblical history at the expense of Dr. Burney's "plausible inference," but surely it ought not to be rejected merely on that account!

(5) Dr. Burney's adoption of the view expressed by Kuenen, Stade and others that the patriarchal narratives deal with the movements of tribes under the guise of individuals enables him to present a very fascinating version of the history. Abraham's journey was a



clan-movement from Ur to Harrañ, and thence to southern Canaan. The marriage of his son represents the arrival from the East of the Aramaean tribe of Rebekah which by union with Isaac produces the two tribal groups Esau-Edom and Jacob. These after a while disagree and the Jacob-tribe crosses the Jordan in the direction of the ancestral home, but having been reinforced by "marrying" the Leah, Rachel, Bilhah and Zilpah tribes returns to Canaan under pressure by the Laban-tribe. This return [Dr. Burney identifies with the] incursions of the Habiru in the fifteenth century B.C. The story of Joseph describes the separation of the Joseph-tribes from their brethren and their migration into Egypt. Dr. Burney claims that this interpretation of the traditions solves all the extra-Biblical allusions save one. The exception is the alleged occurrence of Joseph-el as a place-name in Canaan in 1479 B.C., a date at which, according to the theory, the Joseph-tribes were hardly in existence and were certainly not in Palestine.

On this highly ingenious re-construction of Hebrew history we may observe

(a) The view that the Old Testament represents the patriarchs as *tribes* under the guise of individuals has been ably discussed and refuted by many scholars of repute. Genesis knows nothing of an Abraham-clan, or an Isaac-tribe, or a Rebekah-tribe, or a Laban-tribe. Even Jacob whose names became quite naturally those of the nation is regarded, not as the founder of a special tribe, but as the progenitor of the individual tribes from whose union the nation was formed.

(b) It rests mainly (according to Kuenen, Stade, Guthe, and others) upon an alleged law of the growth of societies. "New nations never originate through rapid increase of a tribe; new tribes never through derivation from a family propagating itself abundantly through several generations" (Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I. p. 28). To which König aptly replies: "Often as I have read these sweeping statements, I have always missed one trifle: I never found a proof of this thesis" (*Neueste Prinzipien*, p. 36). Such a proof cannot be found. On the other hand many who are better entitled to be heard on this point than even Stade and Kuenen maintain the opposite thesis. Thus, according to H. S. Maine, the "patriarchal theory" is the one which best accords with all the facts (*Ancient Law*, pp. 126, 128).

(c) The interval between Abraham (2100 B.C.) and the return of Jacob (Habiru-invasion, 1411 B.C.) seems disproportionate when compared with that between the return of Jacob and the descent of the Joseph-tribes into Egypt (c. 1360 B.C.). But the exigencies of the theory compel the author to date the migration of Joseph *after* the coming of the Habiru for until then the Joseph-tribes were not in Canaan at all. This further obliges him to reject the commonly accepted view that the entry into Egypt took place under the Hyksos kings. Here again he comes into conflict with the Biblical account, for the Joseph-scenes presuppose a capital near the frontier. This was the case in the Hyksos period, but not afterwards until the reign of Raamses II. Also, the Israelites were settled in the land of Rameses. While the name itself is not as early as the days of the Hyksos, there is archæological evidence of the importance of this district in that period. It then sank into obscurity until the days of Raamses II.

On the whole we feel bound to confess that this book is not convincing. Of the author's wide reading, patient industry and literary skill there is evidence on every page. But the presuppositions with which he approached his task, and in particular his attitude towards the Biblical documents have militated against his success. He has developed a highly ingenious theory of early Hebrew history, but, as we have already shown, it receives but scant support from archæology and practically none from the Old Testament Scriptures.

J. S. GRIFFITHS.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

"THE RESPONSIVE PSALTER."

*(To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.)*

SIR,—I have read, with considerable interest, the article by Mr. Albert Mitchell on "The Music of the Church" which appears in the November number of THE CHURCHMAN. I was particularly interested in the portion of the article which deals with the chanting of the Psalms. Mr. Mitchell states that the Archbishop's Committee regard this question as "a problem." "Chiefly because it is hard to sing them well whether to Anglican or Gregorian Chants."

I have to confess that I have not read the Chapter devoted to "Church Music" contained in the report of the Archbishop's Second Commission of Enquiry, but I gather from Mr. Mitchell's Article, that neither the Commissioners or Mr. Mitchell have heard of "The Responsive Psalter" by the late Rev. James Eckersley. I think a study of this work would convince any impartial person that the problems referred to have been solved by the Author. The work has been before the Public for some years and I am surprised that in any enquiry as to Church Music it should have been lost, sight of or ignored. The late Mr. Eckersley during his life gave lectures in various towns throughout the country upon the Psalter, at which his chants were sung by Choirs, at Eltham (where he resided), at Southport, at Birmingham, at Exeter, at St. Johns College Cambridge and other places.

The work itself and Mr. Eckersley's lectures and demonstrations have been reviewed from time to time in various papers such as *The Guardian*, *The Church Times*, *Musical Opinion* and others. I venture to enclose a few extracts from these which I think should serve to show that the work is one at any rate deserving the serious attention of the authorities in the Church, and all who are interested in Church Music. It is the outcome of the lifelong thought of a scholar and musician. Amongst many musicians of note in the country it has been received with unqualified approval. Its fame has reached as far as India and the Author in his lifetime received several letters from Priests in India asking leave to make use of it for translations of the Psalms into native language. Only the other day I read a letter from an Indian Bishop speaking in the highest terms of the work and of the success with which he was adapting it to Hindustani. Strange that our own Ecclesiastical Authorities, while aware of the defects of the systems most in vogue, should never have come across it in their "enquiry" on Church Music!

The Author, I regret to say, died in November last year. By his will he left a legacy to Trustees, whose names I enclose, for the purpose of propagating the "Responsive Psalter." The Trustees held their first meeting on the 7th inst. They propose to issue as soon as possible a new and revised Edition of the work, fortunately the Author left ample notes for this purpose. Dr. Eaglefield Hull and Mr. John Brook have undertaken the Editorship. I may say the Trustees have absolute confidence that the Psalter has only to become known to be recognized as by far the finest system of chanting we have, and a most valuable addition to Church Music.

Yours faithfully,

W. B. THURSFIELD.

OCEAN CHAMBERS,  
WATERLOO STREET,  
BIRMINGHAM.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

## STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WOMEN IN THE ANGLO-SAXON TIMES. By the Right Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 7s. 6d. net.

THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND. By Henry Holloway, B.D. *S.P.C.K.* 7s. 6d. net.

The Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge is to be congratulated on its enterprise, for during recent years it has added wisely and considerably to our theological and ecclesiastical literature. Bishop Browne has done well to rescue from their comparatively inaccessible reports the Addresses that constitute this book, which deals with many other subjects than that of the place women occupied in Anglo-Saxon times. On every page we find matter for thought and facts that are interesting. Dry humour appears from time to time and many a shrewd reflection is made that stirs the conscience. Here is a comment. "And so Redwald had, in one and the same temple, an altar for the Christian sacrifice and a little altar for sacrificing to demons." A good many of us in these days keep a little private altar for that purpose. The two altars were due to the influence of his wife, who was opposed to Christianity. The accounts of double monasteries is instructive for at one time monasteries for both sexes were ruled by Abbesses of whom the most famous was Hilda at Whitby. To her was due the "foundation of that gift of sacred song which culminated in direct descent in John Milton." In concluding his study of the women of old England the Bishop gallantly remarks, "eleven and a half centuries and a Norman invasion have not spoiled the pleasantness and the ability of their representatives to-day."

In "The Cultus of St. Peter and St. Paul," the Bishop discusses and dissects the once notorious pastoral issued in 1893 by Cardinal Vaughan and fourteen Roman Bishops. Pursuing with an historian's insight the statements made he proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Roman Hierarchy was then guilty of gross perversions of fact. On one point he shows that the evidence of Bede is exactly against the contention of the cardinal as to the recourse of England to St. Peter. The whole Essay is a careful study that deserves the close attention of all those who are interested in the early position of St. Peter in the Church. Dr. Browne has studied the relations from the beginning between the Churches of England and Ireland and his historical summary will appeal to many Irishmen. He says, "if anyone asks where and what is the old Irish Church now, the curt and true answer is that there is no such thing, so far as Roman Catholicism is concerned." He proves his contention to the hilt. We should like to linger over this and the papers on Crediton and Erasmus, but our limits will not permit us. We commend the book to those who delight in historical byways under the guidance of one who can lead to what is attractive and give a true perspective to his companions. We regret that a work of this importance should have been published without index and a bibliography, which would have added to its usefulness.

Mr. Holloway is not guilty of these omissions, for his study of "The Reformation in Ireland" has a good index and a well-selected list of books that have helped him. He aims at giving the grounds for the failure of the Reformation to possess the minds of the Irish people and does so in a full study of the ecclesiastical legislation during the reigns of Henry, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth. He lays claim to impartiality and as far as we have

observed he has done his best to lay bare the forces that worked in Church and Nation with such disastrous consequences to our sister Island. In a rapid sketch he describes the conditions that led up to the situation in the time of the Tudors. He finds only two mediæval ecclesiastical Reformers who however failed to gather bands of followers. "It should be noticed that both these instances come from the Anglo-Norman section of the Church, which was in close touch with England, where there was controversy about the same subjects." Even in these days English movements were looked at askance by the great body of Irish Churchmen.

We recommend readers to follow Mr. Holloway in his story step by step until he reaches the reign of Elizabeth whose evident desire to have the truth preached in Ireland was foiled by her ministers. She wished the Bible and Prayer Book to be translated into Irish and used at the public services. The Irish people did not understand English and attendance at English services would not be instructive or helpful. To solve the problem of enabling ministers who did not know Irish to teach people who did not know any other language, it probably struck the statesmen that it would be the best course to place priest and people on the same level. Accordingly the extraordinary provision was made that the service should be in Latin! This was probably part of a scheme for the anglicizing of Ireland and we are now reaping the fruit of the policy of having Common Prayer in a tongue not understood of the people, a thing "repugnant to the Word of God." The story as told by Mr. Holloway cannot fail to prove that we are suffering from mistaken and political strategy as short-sighted as it was wicked. Those who wish to understand Irish religious life are recommended to study this useful volume.

### THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN. London: S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d. net.

Recent discussion has resulted in the publication of several treatises on this subject but this volume is by far the most important of them all. It embodies the report of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the question of women's ministry in the Church in all its bearings and there is no doubt that it traces "with a thoroughness never before attempted," the whole history of women's ministrations. In point of fact the report itself is contained in 28 pages while the rest of the book is given up to Appendices—sixteen in number—each contributed by a specialist, and in many respects these constitute the most important part of the work. The contributors to this section include Canon A. J. Mason, Dean Armitage Robinson, Dr. H. U. Weitbrecht Stanton, Miss Alice Gardner and others, while some whose names have been very prominent in connexion with the demand for a fuller ministry for women, are conspicuous by their absence, and it is interesting to note that only one woman—Miss Gardner—served on the Committee.

The first part of the report is simply an outline of the New Testament facts regarding the status of woman, a subject with which Canon Mason, in Appendix I, deals more fully. At the outset the point is emphasized that at that time the position of women was inferior to that of men in respect of their social position, education and influence and that therefore the frequent and prominent mention of them in the Gospel narratives is all the more remarkable. But we are reminded here (and again, later on, by Canon Mason) that our Lord called no woman to the Apostolate. The report says, "The seventy . . . were men." Canon Mason is more cautious and says, "There was no woman, as far as we know, among the seventy." After reviewing

the facts, this part of the report concludes by recording "the fact that the restriction of the Ministry of the Priesthood to men originated in a generation that was guided by the special gifts of the Holy Spirit." The inference is obvious.

The second part of the Report is devoted to a history, and again in outline, of the order of Deaconesses from Apostolic times to our own day, but the survey is complete even if necessarily compact.

When we turn to the Appendices we find ourselves confronted by a mass of evidence, gathered together, as we have said, by experts. Canon Mason's paper takes the premier place, not only on account of the primary importance of the subject—(The ministries of women in the New Testament)—but because of its lucidity and force. In commenting on the oft-quoted statement in Psalm lxxviii., "Great was the company of the preachers," he recognizes the fact that the word preachers is feminine but observes that it was customary for women to celebrate great events with song and dance and that if these female preachers proclaimed glad tidings it was probably in lyric utterances. He reminds us that there was in Israel no official preaching of religion and that when the Synagogue came into existence and addresses on religious subjects became customary, women do not seem to have been called upon to give them. He arranges the ministries of women in the New Testament Church under five heads—1. Special Gifts, 2. Duties of Government, 3. Ministries of Service, 4. Widows, 5. Virgins. The late Bishop of Gibraltar gives an account of the history and modern revival of Deaconesses and we have a full collation of the Ordination Services as used in ancient times in East and West, together with a modern form and suggestions for a new "use."

It is very probable that some of the contributors had no opportunity of reading each other's writings, which will account for a certain amount of overlapping. This was perhaps inevitable and different view-points will occasionally appear. Those who would see the Priesthood thrown open to women will find little encouragement in these pages. But the book proves beyond all question that the diaconate of women has had a very real existence and that women in religious orders have said and sung the Choir Offices even when Clergymen who could have acted as substitutes, were present; they have baptized children and buried the dead and they have been permitted to take the Reserved Sacrament to the sick. There are 15 collotype illustrations and in some of these women are shown wearing the surplice or rochet, and in some cases the fur almuce, and even the Eucharist maniple and stole. There are several sympathetic references to the Mildmay Deaconess Home and to the work of the Rev. Wm. and Mrs. Pennefather. The book will long remain a valuable compendium of information and reference since no aspect of the subject has been overlooked and the S.P.C.K. is to be congratulated on having produced a volume which is worthy of the traditions of the society.

S. R. CAMBIE.

### THE ARMY AND RELIGION.

THE ARMY AND RELIGION. An Inquiry and its Bearing upon the Religious Life of the Nation. With a preface by the Bishop of Winchester. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 6s. net.

This also is the product of a Committee which owed its existence to the desire of one of the members, who had been working in France for the Y.M.C.A., to "consider and interpret what was being revealed by war conditions as to the religious life of the nation, and to bring the result before the Churches." The Bishop of Winchester tells us in his preface that the

Y.M.C.A. generously bore the expense of carrying out the inquiry, though the Association had nothing to do with the drawing up of the report. There is no denying that the Committee was thoroughly representative—Dr. Talbot and Professor D. S. Cairns, of Aberdeen, were the joint conveners and it included members of practically every branch of the Christian Church, though we miss the Chaplain-General and we might have expected to find Prebendary Carlile, of the Church Army, included. Through the kindness of the Marquis of Salisbury they were able, Dr. Talbot tells us, to spend four days in conference at Hatfield, twice after that they met at Oxford and Farnham, besides several meetings in London, and subsequently they were in correspondence with a large number of persons qualified to give such evidence as they required—all this shows how very thoroughly the work was done. Each chapter is prefaced by an excellent analysis. The result of the inquiry is much what we should have expected. The majority of men believe in God, though their notions are crude, they believe, too, in a future life, even though their opinions are somewhat vague. Of Jesus Christ they know but little and they do not connect the Cross with Atonement or think of it as revealing the nature of God. They, as a rule, take a purely material view of life and so on. This is the general view of Chaplains and others who have worked among the troops, and it is all inexpressibly sad. The Churches are driven to confess their failure to touch the manhood of the nation and though of course here and there exceptions have been found, yet these only prove the rule and show that the Churches had better abandon their unfortunate internecine strife forthwith, and address themselves seriously to the task of trying to Christianize the nation. The evidence shows that the men are largely out of touch with the Churches, that they are mystified and scandalized by our unhappy divisions and indeed what is called “organized religion” has come in for a torrent of hostile criticism. It must not be thought, however, that the book is taken up entirely, or even mainly, with a re-statement of distressing facts that are widely known and amply vouched for. There is on every page food for reflection and evidence of a clear perception of the immensity of the task before us. We have read a great many pronouncements but we have not hitherto seen anything so eminently constructive in its policy as this readable volume and we believe that it will not serve as a discouragement but as a stimulus to those who now have the privilege of moulding the religious thought of a new age. The Churches have much to learn—they must learn to relate the Gospel message to the daily lives of ordinary men and women and to make their influence felt as live factors for social betterment.

We can only fervently hope that this inquiry will meet with the reception to which the urgency of the subject and the standing of the members of the Committee alike entitle it. We believe that, at the moment, this book is more important than any theological treatise could possibly be.

S. R. C.

---

#### THE “C.M.S. GLEANER.”

A new volume of the *C.M.S. Gleaner* begins with the January issue. As the official magazine of the C.M.S. it is fitting that it should contain full information as to the work of organization at home, as well as the latest news from all quarters of the mission field. An additional feature each month will be a leading article by a well-known missionary leader or worker. To the January issue the Bishop of Durham contributes a New Year's message.

## CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

A VERY useful sermon preached recently by Canon J. H. Thorpe, Vicar of St. George's, Stockport, on *Prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary* has just been published in pamphlet form (3d. net). Such a pamphlet

**Mariolatry.** is wanted just now that Mariolatry is being pressed with energy by a very considerable body of the sacerdotal clergy. The extracts from the Litany to the Blessed Virgin and the other references given by Mr. Guy Johnson in his Article on *Benediction* which appeared in the October number of this magazine proves this. Canon Thorpe in his sermon takes us through many phases of the cult of Mary worship, and points out clearly that Christ will be dishonoured and in practice deprived of His relationship to men as the One Mediator between God and men.

The article *The Church and Industrial Problems* by Sir George B. Hunter, K.B.E., D.Sc., which appeared in the October CHURCHMAN has been published in pamphlet form (3d. net) in response to many requests.

**Industrial Problems.** The article appeared so recently that it is unnecessary to comment upon it beyond stating that it evidently supplied a need, as several hundreds of the reprint have already been sold.

An "Oxford M.A." has given us a delightful little sketch of the life of Abraham Lincoln in a pamphlet published at 3d. net. We wish that it were possible for a series of such biographies to be printed in this readable handy form. As the author points out, as long as the

**Abraham Lincoln.** world lasts it will never be forgotten by mankind that Abraham Lincoln broke the fetters of slavery from off the coloured race; and has left us an example of a victorious life in the eternal struggle between the two principles of right and wrong. This sketch is of peculiar interest just now, and its production is welcome.

The name of Robert Holmes will not be unknown to readers of the CHURCHMAN. His excellent work as a Police Court Missionary and Probation Officer has not been of the character which leaves no mark. Lately

**Mr. Robert Holmes.** he has added to his labours by writing some interesting accounts of his experiences, first of all as articles in Blackwood's Magazine, and then in book form. *My Police Court Friends with the Colours*, *Walter Greenway—Spy and Hero*, *Sister Matty and Company*, are some of them, and they have been books which have not only been profoundly interesting and suggestive, but have been calculated to inspire Faith, Hope and Charity. Another book has just been published entitled *Chance Acquaintance* (6s. net), and we find it even more interesting, if that is possible, than the author's earlier productions. Containing as it does thrilling tales of real life which are told easily and well, it has a decided "pull" over the ordinary sensational tale of to-day. The various episodes which Mr. Holmes narrates take us, moreover, into a human side of the underworld which it is good for all of us to have some cognizance of.

Lecturers and students may find a difficulty in obtaining copies of several



of the very useful series of *Short Biographies of the Reformers*, which were published some little time ago by the R.T.S. The most valuable numbers of the series are stocked at the Church Book Room and are sold at 1d. each. They can be recommended with confidence. Each number is written with clearness and with a view to popular reading, and an interesting picture of the Reformer appears on the title page of his biography. The monographs are as follows:—*John Wycliffe, the First of the English Reformers*, by Dr. Samuel G. Green. *Hugh Latimer, the Apostle of the English Reformation*, written by the Rev. Charles Marson, who has been most successful in giving a plain, instructive and interesting summary of this eventful life. *Bishop Hooper, the Protestant Martyr of Gloucester*, is also written by the Rev. Charles Marson. *John Knox, the Reformer of Scotland*, by A. Taylor Innes. *Martin Luther, the Reformer of Germany*, by Professor John Gibb. *Philip Melancthon, the Preceptor of Germany*, by the Rev. G. Wilson. *John Calvin, the Reformer of Geneva*, by the Rev. J. Radford Thomson. *John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer*, by the Rev. H. Wratistlaw.

Canon R. B. Girdlestone's little book *The Churchman's Guide on Present Day Questions* (6d. net) is not as well known as it should be. It is a capital book to give to young Churchmen at their Confirmation and **The Churchman's to Church workers generally.** Its object is to give in compact **Guide.** form the answers to the three great questions: What is the Christian Faith? What does English Churchmanship involve? and What line should we take in reference to discussions on ritual and doctrine? The instruction given is clear and definite and the questions which are dealt with are important.

It will be remembered that some little time ago a volume of essays entitled *Church and Faith* was published, with an introduction by Dr. Percival, Bishop of Hereford, with the object of giving to Churchpeople a plain declaration of fundamental principles and facts, a full and frank exposition of what we hold to be the truth, and a dispassionate examination of points of difference. This volume contains articles by the Bishops of Durham and Ripon, Dr. Wace, Canon Meyrick, Chancellor Smith, Sir Montague Barlow, Mr. J. T. Tomlinson, and others. The book has long been out of print, but some second-hand copies are still obtainable and a few are on sale at the Book Room at 2s. 6d. net. Of the articles which appear two or three of the most important have been issued in pamphlet form, namely *The Lord's Supper*, by the Bishop of Ripon (2d. net); *The Confessional*, by Canon Meyrick (3d. net), which was recently issued for the second time with a preface by the Dean of Canterbury; and *The Reformation Settlement*, by Mr. J. T. Tomlinson (3d. net).

Evangelical Churchmen are frequently calling for manuals and hand-books which they can put into the hands of their young people which will give clearly and concisely the teaching of the Church of **Church Teaching.** England, and it is difficult to understand how it is that *English Church Teaching on Faith, Life and Order* by the Bishops of Durham and Ripon and Canon R. B. Girdlestone (1s. net) has not reached a very much larger circulation than 20,000. It should be pushed and circulated by tens and even hundreds of thousands. Its pages are well printed, its cover is neat and attractive, and the price of the present edition has not been increased in spite of extra war charges.