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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1899.

ART. I.—SPURIOUS DOCUMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

I PROPOSE to show that the forgeries of the Church of Rome were a great means employed by her for the consolidation of her spiritual and temporal dominion. The wonder is that she should have had the hardihood to persevere in this work through successive generations. But she knew, from the ignorance which universally prevailed, that she might safely practise on the credulity of her spiritual subjects. Roman Catholics have now for some time admitted that their forefathers have been the victims of imposture. Even leading members of the Vatican Council in 1870 had the courage to denounce the usurpations of the Church of Rome, and to describe them as founded on frauds and forgeries. Students of ecclesiastical history will at once remember that I am here referring particularly to the Donation of Constantine and to the Decretal Epistles. I fear, however, that many are altogether ignorant of these remarkable documents. I propose, therefore, now to give an account of them.

I shall begin with the Donation of Constantine.[1]

This document contained an alleged grant of the city of Rome and of the exarchate of Ravenna by the Emperor Constantine to the Pope. It was produced by the Pope Stephen to King Pepin when he had compelled the Lombards to evacuate the contested territories, for the purpose of inducing him to cede them to the See of Rome. Some people, however, imagine that Stephen only stated to Pepin that the grant had been made, and that the document was afterwards forged to confirm the truth of that assertion. The tradition

[1] This document may be seen in Migne's "Patrologia," vol. lxx.

had for some time prevailed that Constantine, on his departure from Rome for Constantinople, had invested the Pope with some authority over the city. The idea is that some designing person, near the end of the eighth century, anxious for the advancement of the Papacy, had dexterously laid hold of the tradition for his own purpose, and had embodied it as a fact in the instrument called the Donation. It seems to have been found among the Decretal Epistles, of which I shall speak presently; but whether it was composed by the Pope, or by some other ecclesiastical person, it is now admitted to have been a gross and impious forgery. And yet upon this basis the Popes have rested their claim to sovereignty over the monarchs of the earth, and to supreme sway over the Churches of Christendom.

The Donation of Constantine begins in the following manner:

"In the name of the holy and undivided Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Flavius Constantine, Cæsar, and Emperor in Jesus Christ," etc.

"To the most holy and blessed Father of fathers, Sylvester, Bishop and Pope of the city of Rome, and to all his successors who shall hereafter sit in the chair of the blessed Peter, to the end of the world; and to all our most reverend and catholic Bishops, loved of God, and subject throughout the world to the holy Church of Rome by this our imperial constitution," etc.

Then follows an account of his conversion, which differs altogether from that given by Eusebius. He informs us that Constantine embraced Christianity in consequence of a miraculous cross which he saw in the heavens as he was advancing to attack Maxentius, having this inscription upon it: "*Hac vince*"—"In this conquer." We are informed, however, in the document that Constantine was afflicted with the leprosy on account of his sins; that, after having exhausted to no purpose the resources of medical science, he had consulted the heathen oracles as to an effectual remedy; that he had been informed that if he plunged into a bath of the blood of infants, he should be immediately cured of the disorder; that a number had been collected for the purpose of being killed; and that Constantine, touched by the sight of the infants, who were unconscious of the terrible doom which awaited them, as well as of the mothers who stood dissolved in an agony of grief around him, had forbidden the slaughter of the innocents. Then he was recommended to apply to a holy man, Pope Sylvester, who was at that time living in a cave in the mountains, and that he had miraculously cured him of his leprosy. In gratitude for this cure, he

had become a convert to Christianity, had asked to be baptized, and had issued this document, in which he had made over certain territories to the holy See at Rome. The deed then proceeds:

"While I learned these things from the teaching of the blessed Sylvester, and by the grace of the blessed Peter, I found myself perfectly restored to health. We, with all our nobles, and the whole Senate, with my chiefs also, and all the people subject to the glorious empire of Rome, judged it right that, as St. Peter, when on earth, appears to have been made the Vicar of the Son of God, so the bishops who are the successors of St. Peter ought to obtain from us and our empire the power of supremacy, more than that which has pertained to our imperial majesty, thus choosing for ourselves the prince of the Apostles and his successors as our steadfast patrons with God. And we decree that the holy Church of Rome shall be honoured with the same reverence as our imperial authority on earth; and that the most holy chair of St. Peter be more gloriously exalted than our own earthly throne, conferring on it power and dignity, and authority and imperial honour. And we decree and ordain that the Bishop of Rome shall hold supremacy over the four sees of Antioch, of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, and of Constantinople, as also over all the churches in the whole world; and we decree that the Pontiff who for the time being is over the holy Roman Church shall be higher than, and chief over, all the priests of the whole world; and that all things whatsoever relating to the worship of God and the establishment of the Christian faith be determined in accordance with his judgments.

"We grant to the same holy Apostles, my lords the most beloved Peter and Paul, and through them also to the blessed Sylvester, our father and supreme Pontiff, and to all his Pontifical successors who to the end of the world shall sit in the chair of the blessed Peter, and by this Act give the Lateran palace of our empire—the palace which is far superior to all the palaces in the whole orb of the earth; also our diadem—that is, the crown of our head—together with our mitre, and also the mantle that usually surrounds our imperial neck, and with these also our robe of purple and our cloak of scarlet, and all our imperial robes, and the rank of our imperial and presiding knights, conferring upon him at the same time the imperial sceptres, with all the imperial insignia, badges, and decorations, and all that belongs to the imperial dignity."

The decree, after having declared that the clergy are to be made patricians and consuls, that they were to have the same caparisons for their horses as those which were used by

the Roman senators, and that the Pope may admit whom he will to the clerical office, thus proceeds:

"We have decreed that the said venerable Sylvester, our father and supreme Pontiff, and all his successors the Pontiffs, ought to use the diadem—that is, the crown—which we transfer from our own head to him, made of the purest gold, with precious stones, and that he ought to wear it on his head to the praise of God and to the honour of the blessed Peter. But inasmuch as this most blessed Pope himself will not suffer the crown of gold to be upon the crown of the priesthood, which he wears to the glory of the blessed Peter, we have with our hands placed on his head the mitre of resplendent white, symbolizing the resurrection of our Lord. And in our reverence for the blessed Peter we ourselves hold the reins of his horse, as holding the office of his stirrup-holder; and we ordain that all his successors shall wear the same mitre in their processions, in imitation of the empire; and that the Papal crown may never be lowered, but may be exalted above the crown of the earthly empire, lo! we give and grant not only our palace as aforesaid, but also the city of Rome, and all the provinces and palaces of the city of Italy and of the western regions to our aforesaid most blessed Pontiff and universal Pope, our father Sylvester, and the Pontiffs his successors, and by this divine and pragmatic constitution command them to be ceded to and remain in the jurisdiction of the holy Roman Church.

"Wherefore we have thought it fitting to transfer our empire and the power of our kingdom to the regions of the East, and have commanded to be built a city to our name in the province of Byzantium, and an empire to be established there; because where the supreme head of the priesthood and of the Christian religion has been placed by the heavenly Emperor, it is not right that the earthly emperor should have authority. And all these things which by this imperial decree and by the other sacred edicts we have enacted we now decree shall continue unaltered to the end of the world."

This edict concludes with a clause condemning those who violate it "to be bound and snared in eternal damnation, having the saints of God, the princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, as their enemies, both in the life that now is and in that which is to come; and being burned in the lowest hell, to perish with the devil and the wicked."

This is the celebrated Donation of Constantine. We cannot fail to be amazed at the awful impiety of the language, for the forger begins the document with the name of the Holy Trinity, and concludes with imprecating the most direct curses on those who contravene its authority. A glance will serve to show the

imposture to all thinking men; for they will observe that Constantine is represented as having transferred the seat of empire to a city which had not been built, and as having given the Pope the supremacy over the See of Constantinople, which had not yet been founded. They will think it strange, too, that the miracle of Pope Sylvester should have been the cause of the conversion of the nobles and people as well as of the Emperor, so that they should all have been induced to agree with him in giving the Pope this supremacy over the churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, and this sovereignty over the sovereigns within the boundaries of the Western Empire. But, as Gibbon says in his "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," "So deep was the ignorance and credulity of the times, that this most absurd of fables was received with equal reverence in Greece and in France, and is still enrolled among the decrees of the Canon Law. The emperors and Romans were incapable of discerning a forgery that subverted their rights and their freedom" (chap. xlix.).

For many centuries the Church of Rome appealed to this document as the title-deed to the possession of a spiritual and temporal dominion. Thus Pope Leo IX., in the middle of the eleventh century, vindicated the claims of the Papacy by giving in an epistle almost in detail the different particulars mentioned in this document, and by asserting that Constantine confirmed the Donation with a golden cross, which he placed along with the document on the tomb of St. Peter. I shall give the reason for this constant appeal to the Donation in the words of Gibbon: "This fiction was productive of most beneficial effects; the Greek princes were convicted of the guilt of usurpation, and the revolt of Pope Gregory was the claim of his lawful inheritance. The Popes were delivered from the debt of gratitude, and the nominal gifts of the Carlovingians were no more than the just and irrevocable restitution of a scanty portion of the ecclesiastical state. The sovereignty of Rome no longer depended on the choice of a fickle people, and the successors of St. Peter and Constantine were invested with the purple and prerogatives of the Cæsars."

I should occupy too much space if I were to show that Popes, Cardinals, and historians have cited this document as a real instrument, and were to refute the arguments urged in support of its authority. Suffice it now to observe that the learned of the Church of Rome, after having for a long time exerted every effort to defend it, have been obliged to admit its want of authenticity. As Gibbon says, "In the revival of letters this fictitious deed was transpierced by the pen of Laurentius Valla, an eloquent critic and a Roman patriot.

His contemporaries of the fifteenth century were astonished at his boldness; yet such is the silent and irresistible progress of reason that before the end of the next age the fable was rejected by the contempt of historians, though by the same fortune which has attended the Decretals and the Sibylline oracles, the edifice has subsisted after its foundations have been undermined."

Whether Bishops and Cardinals, as well as monks, were engaged in framing this document we have no means of ascertaining; we find the same unanimity in the Roman Church as in the Greek and Reformed Church in proclaiming it to be a forgery. In all probability Romanists would still have endeavoured to maintain its authority, if they had not been reminded that they thus represented Constantine, instead of our Lord Jesus through St. Peter, as giving to the Pope supremacy over the churches. A mere man might invest him with power over certain cities and territories, but Jesus alone could decree that the patriarchates should be subject to his jurisdiction. For this, and for no other reason, Romanists, after having for seven centuries derived infinite advantage from a belief in the authenticity of this document, have now denounced it as an egregious imposture, and have declared that they do not wish to make use of it as one of the title-deeds of the Popes to their inheritance. But thus men often cast away the ladder by which they have ascended to greatness. The Church of Rome is now compelled to argue for her temporal power from its antiquity, as compared with that of the dynasties around her, and to affirm that it was by the special appointment of Providence that Pepin and Charlemagne put her in possession of it. But she seems to forget that, on this principle, she shows by her loud cries of indignation against those who have deprived her of it that she is rebelling against a Divine appointment; that she has incurred the woe denounced in Scripture on those who "build their house by unrighteousness and their chambers by wrong," and that it has been by an act of the same Providence that the territories over which the Popes have borne rule for ages have been taken away from them, and have become part of a united Italy under the dominion of the late Victor Emmanuel.

I must now give an account of the Decretal Epistles. No volume ever published has exercised a more injurious influence on vital Christianity or on the destinies of states and empires. Long before its appearance a rumour had been propagated that a book had been discovered containing the epistles of the Popes from the first to the seventh century. They were stated to be public documents, embodying the judgments of the Popes on various matters which had been submitted to them.

Those who were interested in its circulation attached to it the name of Isidore, Bishop of Seville, hoping that by imputing it to him it would obtain circulation, as he had published a collection of authentic pieces of history.[1] The rumour travelled from country to country, from city to city, from monastery to monastery, till at length it reached Rome. The Pope was most anxious to possess a copy of it, but was never able to see it; all the world had seen it before him. At length it came into his hands, and was received with rapturous applause. With a haste which seemed to show that he was not so great a stranger to it as he wished to be considered, he placed it on an equality with the Holy Scriptures, and declared that it was written by the "inspiration of the Holy Ghost."

The See of Rome was at this time occupied by Nicolas I. (858-867). He was a man of unbounded ambition, and surpassed all his predecessors in the boldness of his designs. His desire was to cause the supremacy to assume the form of an absolute monarchy. The circumstances of the times enabled him to veil his wish for self-exaltation upon the pretext of an honest desire to redress the wrongs of society. The kingdoms founded on the partition of the empire of Charlemagne had proved, like Jonah's gourd, which sprang up in a night and withered in a night. Civil war had laid waste the most fertile provinces of Europe. This was an age of oppression, disorder, and rebellion against constituted authority; the fountains of the great deep of society seemed to be broken up. The clergy suffered from the lawlessness of the times. The persecution of the Church had reached a height without precedent in the history of former ages. The sanctity which protected their persons and property no longer existed; the Metropolitans alone were safe from the violence of the oppression. They tyrannized over the Bishops and the inferior clergy, or, at any rate, they did not exert themselves to defend them from the royal tyranny which plundered them of their property and sent them forth needy dependents on the precarious charity of strangers.

Nicolas had often stood forth as the champion of the weak against the strong; thus he carried the opinion of mankind with him, while every step which he took tended to the exaltation of the Papacy. He had compelled Lothaire to respect the sanctity of the marriage-bond, and to take back the wife whom he had unjustly repudiated; he had fulminated

---

[1] The pseudo-Isidorian collection is printed in vol. cxxx. of Migne's "Patrologia." A new edition by Flinshius has been published in Germany.

anathemas against Metropolitans who had tyrannized over the Bishops and the inferior clergy, and had persevered in a systematic course of violence and wrong; he had annulled the decisions of Councils which contravened the eternal and immutable principles of truth and justice. Hitherto he had endeavoured, in the same manner as his predecessors, to curb the lawlessness of arbitrary power; but now a new weapon was placed in his hands, which he gladly deposited in his arsenal, to be drawn forth when occasion required, to smite down the oppressors of the Church. Others had, in fact, aided him in his ambitious struggles for pre-eminence. *They*, as well as *he*, thought that every effort must be exerted to restore to the clergy the sanctity which had hitherto surrounded their persons and property, and that a court of appeal must be established against this secular and ecclesiastical tyranny. The false Decretals supplied them with the means of accomplishing their object. The alleged judgments of the Popes in former ages, in unbroken succession from St. Peter, supplied them with everything which they could require to establish the sovereignty of the Popes over the monarchs of the earth, and their authority over the doctrines and practices of the Churches of Christendom. Rome was, in fact, stated to be the tribunal to which they were to appeal against the exactions of arbitrary violence. One great object of theirs was to protect Bishops from their Metropolitans and other authorities, so as to insure complete impunity by establishing the superior authority of the Bishop of Rome.

The Bishops were, as we shall see directly, much favoured by the Decretals. The issue, however, has been that they have been placed in absolute subjection to the Pope. Another object was to elevate the priesthood, and to secure for it immunity from the charges of the laity. It was decreed that a layman should not bring an accusation against a priest, nor any inferior priest against his superior priest; that a Bishop could only be condemned on the testimony of seventy-two witnesses, whose qualifications are so defined as to make a successful complaint impossible, a Cardinal-priest on the evidence of not less than forty-three, or a Cardinal-deacon of not less than twenty-seven witnesses; and that anyone in an inferior position in any way connected with the Church could not be condemned on the testimony of less than seven witnesses. Besides, there were directions as to dogma, as to the spoliation and usurpation of Church property, as to the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and extravagant statements, as we shall see hereafter, as to the power of the Pope over the Bishops and sovereigns of Christendom. Personal incidents, too, are found in the Decretals which are calculated to give

an appearance of truth and reality to this fiction. Maxims of vital religion are found throughout the compilation, which impart an air of reverence, as well as of specious purity, to the epistles, and seem to evince the anxious desire of the Popes whose names they bear to promote the Divine glory and to advance the best interests of the human family.

This remarkable volume came on the stage about the middle of the ninth century. Its author or authors are unknown. No one at the time appears to have thought that it was a fiction. Eichorn almost alone maintains its Roman origin. The city of Mentz is designated as the place where it was first promulgated. The suspicion has been expressed that Pope Nicolas had something to do with the compilation of it. We should have thought that as he could not find the least vestige of the decrees among the Archives at Rome, and as he knew that they had never been heard of there, he would at once have pronounced them to be a fraud. But, on the contrary, we find that, so far from expressing indignation against the forgeries, he artfully vindicated their authority and gave them the weight of his sanction.[1] By this act, and by taking advantage of other opportunities, he was enabled to do more than any of his predecessors to extend the Papal prerogative. Perhaps the author deluded himself with the sophistry so common in the Church of Rome, that he was engaged in a hallowed undertaking in restoring the power of the clergy, while, by the moral precepts above referred to, expressed in the language which passed for religion in the Middle Ages, he seemed to evince his desire to promote their progress in holiness. Great skill was shown in the construction of this volume. A few genuine epistles in it seemed to give circulation to the larger proportion, which were forgeries. It would be difficult to give an idea of their extent without a repetition which would be wearisome. Suffice it now to observe that from St. Peter to the Council of Nice there are only *seven* genuine epistles, two of which are those of St. Peter in the New Testament, and *sixty-five* forgeries.

The authority of this volume was supreme till the time of the Reformation. It had done more than anything else to mould the Roman Catholic Church and the Papacy during the Middle Ages. The decrees were calculated, when they could be carried into effect, to place the kings of the earth and the Churches of Christendom in abject submission at the feet of the imperious successor of the fisherman of Galilee.

---

[1] See Planck, iii. 135-137, and Dean Milman, ii. 379, who thinks the Pope's share in the matter even worse than that of the forger.

The Popes, by quoting them without the least hesitation, gave their direct sanction to this great historic forgery. No one but the clergy, during the dark ages in which this volume had its birth, could unveil the imposture; and they, of course, would not do so because it was advantageous to them. The expression of doubt as to its genuineness was regarded in those days as equally sinful with the assertion that the Holy Scriptures are nothing more than a cunningly devised fable. But when the Reformers laid open the secret chambers of iniquity, this volume was subjected to the most searching criticism, and it was discovered that this was the most successful fraud which had been perpetrated in the domain of literature. The learned divines of our own Church, including our own Bishop Jewel, and the learned of the Greek Churches, denounced the Decretals as forgeries. The leading controversialists of the Church of Rome for some time after the Reformation struggled hard to maintain their authority. The evidence against them, however, was so overwhelming that they were obliged at length to allow that they were an imposture. The fraud was admitted by Pius VI. in 1789 in his answer to the demands of the German Archbishops. In recent times the Jesuits at Paris have gone still further. Father Regnon now confesses that "the impostor really gained his end, and altered the whole constitution of the Church as he desired, but did not hinder the universal decay. God blesses no fraud: the false Decretals have done nothing but mischief."[1] Thus we see that they are now condemned by the universal voice of Christendom. The following extract from the works of Dupin, of the Sorbonne, one of the most learned of the Roman Catholic controversialists, sets the question of their genuineness at rest for ever.

"All these Decretals were unknown to all the ancient Fathers, to all the Popes, and to all the ecclesiastical writers who wrote before the ninth century. Now, what rational man can believe that so vast a number of epistles, composed by so many holy Popes, that contained so many important points in relation to the discipline of the Church, could be unknown to Eusebius, to St. Jerome, to St. Augustine, to St. Basil, and, in short, to all those authors who have spoken of the writings of the Popes, or have written concerning the discipline of the Church? Could it possibly happen that the Popes, to whom these epistles were so favourable, would never have cited nor alleged them to raise their reputation? Who would ever imagine that the decisions of these Decretals would never be so much as quoted in any Council or any

[1] "Études de Théol.," par les P.P. Jésuites à Paris. November, 1866.

Canon? He who will seriously consider with himself that, since these Decretals have been imposed on the world, *they have been cited in an infinite number of places by Popes and by Councils, and often copied by Canonists,* will easily be persuaded that they would have gained a mighty reputation, and been quoted by antiquity, if they had been genuine and true."

After having stated that the Scripture cited in these epistles is from the Vulgate translation of St. Jerome, so that they could not have been written, as we have been led to suppose, by the Popes who lived long before his time; that their matter is not at all agreeable to the age of those Popes, since there is no mention in them of persecutions, of martyrdoms, or of the doctrine of the Church in opposition to the first heretics; that they are all in the same style, so that they could not have been written by different Popes, living in different ages, but must have been composed almost at the same time and by the same person—Dupin examines every one of them in detail, and shows in the most masterly manner that all and every one of them in turn were written after the death of the Popes to whom they are ascribed.[1] He concludes with the following remarkable words:

"There are passages taken out of the Fathers, Popes and Councils more modern than the very Popes by whom they are pretended to be written, and in which many things are to be found that do not agree with the history of those times, being purposely said to *favour the Court of Rome, and to favour her pretensions against the rights of Bishops and the liberties of the Churches.* But it would take up too much time to show the falsity of these monuments, which are now rejected by common consent even by those who are most favourable to the Court of Rome, who are obliged to abandon the patronage of these epistles after they have done a vast amount of service *in establishing the greatness of the Court of Rome and ruining the ancient discipline of the Church, especially in relation to ecclesiastical judgment and the rights of Bishops.*"

This is strong language from one who has always been considered as one of the brightest ornaments of the Roman Catholic Church. He has well stated the objects for which these epistles were forged. But during the period of the degradation of the Papacy in the tenth century, when men who outraged all laws, Divine and human, were elevated to

[1] A remarkable proof of spuriousness not given by Dupin is a strange anachronism: a Pope living in the second century corresponds with a Bishop of Alexandria more than 200 years after him.

the Papal throne, they were never used, as the Popes had neither leisure nor inclination to prosecute their schemes of aggrandizement. At length Pope Gregory VII. drew them forth from the Papal arsenal, and applied them to the purpose for which they were intended. He thought that they would aid him in his design of welding the States of Europe into a priest-kingdom, of which he should be the head. He was the first who attempted to introduce by new means a new constitution of the Church. Anselm of Lucca, between 1080 and 1086, in obedience to his commands, threw into a convenient form everything in the Isidorian Decretals which tended to establish the absolute power of the Pope. The Gregorian superstructure was erected on the foundation of the Decretals. Whatever present exigencies required was selected from them, and applied without hesitation to the purpose just referred to. Isidore had made Pope Julius, about 308, write to the Eastern Bishops: "The Church of Rome, by a singular privilege, has the power of opening and shutting the gates of heaven to whom she will." On this declaration Gregory built his scheme of dominion. Now, should he not be able to judge on earth, on whom will hang the salvation or damnation of men? By means of this right of binding or loosing the Papacy was able to establish many of its claims. Thus, when Gregory, who was the first to assert that the power of dethroning kings belonged to the Papacy, wanted to depose the German Emperor, he said: "To me is given the power to bind or loose on earth or in heaven." By the same power he absolved subjects from their oath of allegiance, and gave away the property of others; for he declared, at the Roman Synod of 1080: "We desire to show the world that we can give or take away at our will kingdoms, duchies, earldoms—in a word, the possessions of all men, since we can bind or loose."

Isidore also contributed another very sharp weapon to Gregory, which greatly aided him in his struggle for domination. He had made the earlier Popes declare that no speech could be held with an excommunicated man. This pretended assertion was assigned by Gregory as the reason for declaring that no man could, even in matters of business, hold intercourse with Kings and Emperors if excommunicated, and that they must therefore be deposed from their high dignity. Gregory, though he was well aware that this extension of the idea was unknown to the ancient Church, yet at the Synod of 1078 grounded his claim exclusively on the decrees of his predecessors. He and his party borrowed also from Isidore an alleged rule of Pope Urban I. that even an unjust excommunication by a Bishop must be respected. Thus he

made his spiritual arms irresistible, and mowed down his enemies on the right hand and on the left.

We see, then, how this spiritual autocrat used this volume for the accomplishment of his object. We can have no hesitation in saying that if there had been no Decretals there would have been no Gregory. They were the broad foundation on which he raised his superstructure. But as his designs extended even beyond those contemplated in them, he was obliged to improve on these inventions by new forgeries. Anselm and Deusdedit, whom Gregory appointed to assist the former in working out his new system of Church law, could indeed, as the forger made Pope Julius write in 342 in two spurious epistles that the Apostles and the Nicene Council had stated that no Council could be held without the Pope's jurisdiction, bring forward his authority for the decree vesting the summoning of the Council and the decisions on the good pleasure of the Pope; but they could not simply by means of these epistles remove Synods of particular Churches out of their way altogether, and yet they felt that this removal was indispensable to Papal absolutism, as they were the means of "preserving the independent Church life which they were most anxious to destroy." Accordingly, by a wilful perversion of language, they represented Julius as declaring that no one ever had been or ever could be permitted to hold a particular (not Œcumenical) Synod. Again, a direction of Pope Agatho, at a Roman Synod in 680, that all the English Bishops were to observe the ordinations made in former Roman Synods for the Anglo-Saxon Church, was converted by Deusdedit into a decree issued by Agatho to all the Bishops in the world that they must receive all Papal orders as though they were attested by the voice of St. Peter, and were therefore infallible. Again, they made the medieval Canonists believe that St. Augustine had placed the Decretal Epistles of the Popes on an equality with Scripture by altering the passage "Those writings of the Bible were pre-eminently attested which Apostolical Churches had first possessed" into "Those epistles belong to Canonical writings which the Holy See has issued." Thus, then, the work of forgery was deliberately carried on by the Gregorian party in the interests of the Papacy. Their object was, by the forgeries just mentioned, to establish the Pope's universal jurisdiction over the whole Episcopal order. He would not himself systematically take part in those forgeries; but I do think that, in his eagerness for dominion, he appealed to the first forged document which came to hand in support of his pretensions. He treated, for instance, the "Donation of Constantine," now almost universally admitted to be a

forgery, as a valuable and important document. He occasionally, too, distorted facts so as to show his adherents in what manner to make particular passages bear a totally different meaning from that properly expressed by them. Thus, he has done evil that good might come, and instead of healing has opened wider the wounds of society. His real design was to withdraw the clergy from the control of the secular power, and to reign as a single spiritual despot over the Churches, as well as over the monarchs of Christendom.

Gratian's work, called the "Decretum," while issued from Bologna, the first school of law in Europe in the middle of the twelfth century, became afterwards the great manual for the guidance of Roman Catholic theologians. For six centuries it ruled all questions of difficulty as to the canon law. During that period references to Gratian are made as frequently as in the present day references to Scripture in a work of theology. In the Roman courts Gratian's code was acted on; in Bologna it was taught. Even the Emperor Frederick I. had his son instructed in it. So great was the importance attached to this work, that the Fathers at the Council of Trent resolved that there should be a new and authentic edition of it. A band of learned editors, two of whom afterwards became Popes, was appointed, who gave sixteen years to the work, and published the result of their labours in 1580. The Papal Bull which accompanies the publication concludes with those awful words with which St. John closes the sacred volume: "It shall not be lawful to make any addition to this work, or to change or transpose anything in it, or add any interpretation to it; but as it is now printed in this our city of Rome, let it be preserved incorrupt for ever."

This work was always the great authority for the canon law in the Church of Rome, which was received in every nation before the Reformation. No book has ever exercised so much influence in the Church. In fact, this system of law constitutes the Papacy. It regulates the powers over Kings and states—when they are to be excommunicated, when their subjects are to be absolved from their oaths of allegiance, and their kingdoms are to be given to another; it settles the rights of the Popes over the Bishops and clergy, as well as the prerogatives of the two latter, and their freedom from the penalties of the civil laws and the national courts of the realm; in fact, it contains all the laws which relate to the Roman Catholic Church, and to the establishment of the supremacy of the Pope over the Churches and monarchs of Christendom. Now, this book, the main support of the system of the Papacy, is founded on the false Decretals, and

on the fabrications of Gratian and of the others. To the first four centuries there were ascribed 107 Decretal Epistles of the Popes, of which 84 were forgeries and 23 were genuine. Gratian has quoted as authority 65 of the forgeries and 1 of the genuine epistles; 324 of his canons are deduced from the former, and only 11 from the latter.

But I have other proofs that the Popes have not done with these forgeries. The next book in the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church is "The Decretals of Pope Gregory IX." It is a book of higher legal authority than the "Decretum" of Gratian. The latest canonist, Archbishop Devoti, says of it, and of the other book which followed it, "Whatsoever is contained in them makes law." Now, we might hardly think of looking for the forged epistles of the earlier Popes in these Decretals of Pope Gregory IX., because that book was intended to be a collection of the later Decretals, as Gratian had already given the former. But we can see that a few of the earlier Decretal Epistles have been introduced into it: (1) One attributed by mistake to Sixtus II., but really the epistle of Sixtus I.; (2) another from Stephen I.; (3) another from Stephen II.; (4) another from Felix II.; (5) another from Felix I. All these five epistles are in a book having a very high authority in the Church of Rome. Let not, therefore, anyone maintain that the Popes and the Roman Catholic Church have altogether repudiated the false Decretals.

But we have not yet exhausted our subject. It was found that the early history of the Christian Church could not be reconciled with the statements of this work. Accordingly, with deliberate purpose, it was falsified by writers in the interest of the Popes, whose works are studied by canonists along with the "Decretum," in order that it might be made to establish the superiority of the Popes to the Emperors. The Roman Catholics of later ages have been forbidden to examine that history, lest they should discover how grossly it has been falsified in the interest of the dominant system. Thus, like the addition of fresh materials to a building, layer after layer of forgeries has been piled up in the Church. The forgery of the Donation of Constantine and of the Isidorian Decretals is now nearly universally admitted, as we have seen, by Roman Catholics themselves. The foundation has disappeared, but the building still rises before us. The advocates of the system, finding that they cannot argue for it in the same manner as heretofore, have been content to fall back upon tradition, and have asserted that the possession of the supremacy and the rights which the Papacy has claimed through past ages, is an indisputable proof of her right to

the continued enjoyment of them. Thus, then, she converts the iniquity of her fathers into an evidence of right, and refuses to withdraw claims which she knows to be founded on the grossest literary forgeries in the history of the world.

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON.

ART. II.—"O WOMAN, GREAT IS THY FAITH."[1]

THIS was addressed to one who was reckoned among the unbelievers, and spoken by Jesus when He visited the heathen coasts, or borders, of Tyre and Sidon. These formed that part of the Promised Land which had never been conquered by the Hebrews. It had been allotted to the tribe of Asher, who had failed to occupy it, and thus the people there were still Canaanites. The clamorous woman of Canaan was at home among them, but the disciples of Jesus would seem to have felt themselves in danger from her fellow-countrymen. "Send her away," they said, "for she crieth after us." She was drawing perilous notice to them, as to Jews among Gentiles.

But though the remnant of the Canaanites was alien, or even hostile, to the house of Israel, reports of the wonder-working Jesus had reached them, and He seems to have been commonly spoken of among them as the "Son of David." That was how the woman of Canaan addressed Him. She was in sore distress, and, like the wayside beggar at Jericho, would not let Him go by without prayer for help.

At first He answered her not a word. This appears strange, but Jesus would seem to have explained His silence by saying: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Such an explanation, indeed, may be taken to interpret the apparent severity of a later utterance, when He said: "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs"; for to the Israelite such were the Canaanites. But this woman breaks through all the barriers of creed, caste, and nationality, and gains praise for the greatness of her faith from Jesus Himself.

The story of the suppliant in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon holds a very marked place in Gospel history, and many are the thoughts or lessons to which it gives rise.

For one, it shows Jesus in touch with that outer world which was abhorred by His nation. Tyre and Sidon were

[1] Matt. xv. 28.

exceptionally outside the Jewish pale. Not only were they Gentile or heathen cities, but they are spoken of by Jesus Himself as representatives of wickedness. When He upbraided the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done because they repented not, He said: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works that were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." This alone is very notable. It indicates the coming revelation of the kingdom of God—how it should be taken to embrace even the most unpromising of those who came from the north, south, and west, as well as the east. It justifies the title of Christ as "Son of *man*," and not the Saviour of one particular nation only, as the Israelites expected that He would be. He was, in the words of our Church Catechism, "the Redeemer of *all mankind*," and, in the *Te Deum*, as one "opening the kingdom of heaven to all *believers*," without any exclusive test of nationality.

But the sentence of Christ on such of His own nation as rejected Him did more than indicate His concern for those beside the lost sheep of the house of Israel. His words, upbraiding the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done because they repented not, might be addressed to professing Christians who bring shame upon His name: "It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you." We may thus be reminded that there is no salvation without repentance. But there is more than this to be gathered from the story before us. When Jesus went down into those very coasts of Tyre and Sidon and commended a woman there for her "faith," we have a significant light shed upon it. After her repeated importunities, he says: "O woman, great is thy faith." It brought the blessing which she desired. Now we must take the story as it stands. We have no right to construct a touching picture of this woman's "conversion," in order to make it fit into some scheme of salvation which we may have adopted. The dog under the table *did* eat of the Master's crumbs. A Gentile, outside the then visible Church, without being first brought to profess the Jewish creed, carried off a blessing by the sheer force of what Jesus called her "faith"; and we have no reason to assume that she thenceforward became one of those who followed and ministered unto Him.

There is a profound significance in all this, for the use to be made of our Lord's recognition of faith in the woman of Canaan would surely lead to a wide acceptance of this word. Faith is a larger thing than can be put into any verbal shape. The profession, and even controversially tenacious holding, of

an accepted creed does not necessarily imply that we have what Jesus called "faith"—that vivid apprehension of Divine power, of a living God, which makes us appeal to, trust in, and rest upon Him. We, *e.g.*, have a creed. Have we faith? Is it our wish to do and bear our Father's will? Do we cling to Him, though His face may even sometimes seem to be turned away, and He answers us not a word? That, indeed, is the oldest exercise of faith we read of in the Bible, that of Job—a faith which can say: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." This, indeed, is a forecast, however undeveloped and remote, of that trust which can ever enable the Christian to repeat from his heart the Master's words: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit." It leads, not to a limited, though real, answer, such as the Gentile woman got, but to the still wider, continuous blessing which comes to those who can truly say, in life and death: "Not what I will, but what Thou wilt."

This is the greatest lesson we can learn from the praise bestowed upon the woman of Canaan. And it may be of wholesome use to us in these days of disputed theological definition and religious exclusiveness, for they survive from the ancient Jewish time to our own.

There is another more obvious lesson to be learnt from the *perseverance* of her who would not be denied. Perseverance is the secret of almost all so-called success; there are few things which can be reached by a single stride. Final efforts which succeed are the outcome of previous patience and advance. Genius may not precisely be the art of taking pains, but it is barren without them.

The woman of Canaan, however, survives as a help to those who continue instant in *prayer*. When our wants are legitimate and we try to cast our care upon God, when we are in trouble and turn to Him, there is often a check to our approach. Our supplications are perhaps damped by what we read in some book or hear from some lips. Their uselessness (as if they could be tested, like drugs) is cleverly demonstrated.

Thus some men lose heart, and discontinue prayer as too childlike, though it is none the worse for that. Or the desire to persevere is threatened from an unexpected quarter. We thought to find certain sympathy from a friend, husband, wife, or promising fellow-Christian, but receive cold water instead—and *that* is often wholesome, if we don't look high enough for help. True compassion never comes to those who whine for it; but all the same, we are sometimes tempted to expect so much that experience bitterly corrects anticipation. We are vexed at being misunderstood, and forget that

others have to be considered as well as ourselves. Good resolutions grow lukewarm, and some lose such reliance on religion as they began with. They begin to doubt God's willingness to help them in hours of disappointment. Prayer becomes conventional and languid; righteous purposes grow barren; we sometimes fail to persevere in efforts to attain them.

Here the woman of Canaan might encourage us. She was in danger of being thwarted by the unsympathetic disciples, and even Jesus Himself answered her not a word. She could only persist in praying till she heard, "O woman, great is thy faith."

Be sure that perseverance in a Godward course will be aided by God, though He bear long with us. The craving for human sympathy may be checked, because we are more ready to receive than to give. The clouds above may be dark, though the sun is behind them. The hill may be steep, but that is the nature of the narrow way, and there is undying virtue in the promise, "He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved." Only we must keep our faces towards the light; let not a man turn his back to that, however foolish or stumbling his steps may have been. The evangelist's ancient story of the suppliant may become a strengthening gospel to us if our righteous desires are ready to faint. Everything was seemingly against the woman of Canaan; but at last she was told, "Be it unto thee even as thou wilt."

HARRY JONES.

ART. III.—SHORT COMMENTS ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

"*Father of us who art in the heavens*" (Matthew).
"*Father*" (Luke).

THIS form of expression is to be found frequently in the Jewish writings and Scriptures. Maimonides gives the Hebrew phrase which exactly corresponds with this title (Lightfoot's "Horæ Hebraicæ"). In the Talmudic tractate Sotah (cap. ix.) we read, "Whom have we to depend on? On our Father who is in heaven." The tractate Yoma (c. viii.) has the words: "Ye are blessed, O Israelites. Who purifies you? Your Father who is in heaven." In the Maaseroth of the Jerusalem Talmud the sentence occurs, "To your Father who is in heaven you did not give it, but to me, the priest."

In Exod. iv. 22 the words are found, "Thus saith the Lord,

Israel is My son, My firstborn." The writer of Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8, was familiar with the expression, "O Lord our Father." Accordingly we must believe that the disciples were accustomed from their cradles to call God their Father. But they were aware of the adoption theory so far only as it concerned themselves. The Master therefore used the well-known words in a new sense, teaching for the first time the universal fatherhood of God, which the disciples, in their turn, proclaimed to the world.

Another form of this address, "Abba, Father," is recorded by St. Mark xiv. 36 in the prayer of Gethsemane, of which we find an echo in Rom. viii. 15: "The Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father;" and in Gal. iv. 6, "God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." St. Mark, according to his custom, preserved the Aramaic original, "Abba," side by side with the Greek translation.

Some critics hold that St. Luke's simple address, "Father," is supported by St. Mark's expression, "Abba," which means simply "Father," not "our Father." The phrase, "Who art in heaven," is regarded as a later addition to the text by those who hold that St. Luke's version, which omits it, is the more original of the two. However, the *Teaching of the Apostles*—perhaps the earliest uncanonical writing in the Church—has the phrase, "Who art in the heaven."

"*Hallowed be Thy Name*". (Matthew and Luke).

The word translated "hallow" (ἁγιάζω) means not to make holy, but to keep holy. The name of God was kept sacred by the Jews in their own peculiar fashion. Whenever they came to the word *J(a)hv(e)h* in their Scriptures they did not pronounce it correctly, sometimes saying *J(e)h(o)v(a)h* and at other times using a different word altogether, *e.g.*, "The Name." The consequence is that no one at the present day can say what is the correct way to pronounce the word that is pronounced Jehovah. St. Peter, in the first of his catholic Epistles (iii. 15), speaks of a different way of keeping God's name holy: "Sanctify (*i.e.*, set apart enshrined as the object of supreme adoration) the Lord as God *in your hearts*."

In the codex Bezæ, presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Beza, 1581, and containing the Gospels and the Acts, with the exception of a few chapters, in both Greek and Latin, we have the peculiar form of this prayer in Luke xi. 2, which is reproduced in the Latin version, "Hallowed be Thy name *upon us*" (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς). This expression seems to have been adopted from the constantly recurring Jewish formula

now found in the Jewish Prayer-Books, where we read in the Morning Service: "Our Father, our King, be gracious unto us and answer us, for Thy name, the great one, is called upon us." It may, of course, be a reminiscence of another petition found in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa ("De Oratione Dominicâ"), "May Thy Holy Spirit come *upon us*"; or it might have been transferred from the following clause, of which the form that is preserved in the "Bishops' Book" (1537) is "*Thy kingdom come unto us.*" A not unlikely suggestion is that these words, "*upon us,*" came into the Lord's Prayer from the baptismal formula found in the Acts of the Apostles (xxii. 16): "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name—ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ."

Of course, these words, "*upon us,*" were not given by the Master, as they are not found in the best MSS. of the Gospels. They are a later liturgical addition to the Prayer, and may have been incorporated into it from the prayer of the Gnostics, which was originally based on the Lord's Prayer. In the "Acts of Thomas" we find this prayer, "Come, Holy Spirit, and purify the hearts and inward parts, and seal them in the name of Father and Son and Holy Ghost." In the Liturgy of Clement we have this expression: "The name of Thy Christ is called upon us." Tertullian, in one passage, adds the words "*in us*" to the original "hallowed be Thy name." Cyprian, in his work on the Lord's Prayer, thus comments on the clause: "Not because we hope that it is made holy for God by our prayers, but because we ask from Him that His name be kept holy *in us.*" Cyril echoes that remark in these words: "We pray that the name of God may be hallowed *in us;* not that from not being sacred it becomes sacred, but because it becomes sacred in us who are being sanctified and perform deeds worthy of the sanctification."

These writers evidently had before their minds the expression of St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (i. 12), "That the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you and you in Him."

"*Thy kingdom come*" (Matthew and Luke).

It was an axiom of the Jewish schools that prayer which made no mention of the kingdom of heaven was no prayer. It was the saying of one teacher: "To this there is a parallel in the word of the Rabbi, 'I have not transgressed thy precepts, nor have I forgotten them' (Deut. xxvi. 13)—that is, 'I have not transgressed by not paying thanks, and I have not forgotten'—that is, 'I have not forgotten to make mention of Thy name.'"

Rabbi Jochanan used to say, "I have not forgotten to make mention of Thy name and Thy kingdom." In Zech. xiv. 9 we read, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day the Lord shall be one and His name one."

It is supposed that our Lord simply adopted the frequent Jewish prayer for the coming of the kingdom of Messiah, giving it a new significance by its new connection. A remarkable variant of this petition, already slightly alluded to, is found in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa (331-396 A.D.), who says in his work on the Lord's Prayer: "Perhaps the same idea is more clearly interpreted by Luke, who, in praying for the coming of the kingdom, invokes the help of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, he says in that Gospel, instead of 'Thy kingdom come,' '*May Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us.*'"

Maximus, in his work against the Monothelites (650 A.D.), is another witness to the existence of this reading, saying that Matthew used the word "*kingdom*," but that in another place another of the evangelists wrote "May Thy Holy Spirit come and purify us"; and that therefore the expression "Thy kingdom" is a synonym for the Holy Spirit.

Tertullian, in a treatise against Marcion, when expounding the articles of the Lord's Prayer, alludes to this petition of the Holy Spirit in these words, "From whom should I demand the Holy Spirit," but has no reference to the petition "Hallowed be Thy name."

We gather from these quotations that this clause, "May Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us," came into the Lord's Prayer at a comparatively early date, having been occasionally inserted to suit the different offices and services in the Liturgy. And, indeed, it would form a very appropriate addition to the service of the Holy Communion, or to the Ordination offices.

From being used in this way the phrase gradually became recognised as part and parcel of the Prayer, and, as we have seen, was in some places actually used as a substitute for "Thy kingdom come." These words "Thy kingdom come" are supposed by many to have a deeper and wider reference than to either the extension of the Church or the Second Advent; for their full meaning can only then be realized when God's realm shall be perfectly established, and all hearts are God's, and everything is as He wishes.

"*Thy will be done as in heaven, so on earth*" (Matthew alone).

"What is a short prayer?" says Rabbi Eliezer. "Do Thy will in heaven, and give quiet of spirit to those who fear Thee below

or in the earth" (*vide* tractate Berakhôth of the Babylonian Talmud). The expression "as in heaven, so on earth," was most likely taken from the daily prayer of the Jews: "May Thy name be hallowed in this world as they hallow it in the height of heaven,"[1] which seems to be an echo of 1 Chron. xxix. 11: "For all that is in heaven and in earth is Thine." The word which is rendered "be done" (γενηθήτω) is the same word that occurs in the Septuagint rendering of Gen. i. 3: "Let there be light," and therefore means, "Let Thy will come into existence now and for ever, not merely in this act of mine, but throughout the whole world."

These three petitions which we have considered form a sort of climax, or ladder. The first round in that ladder is the acknowledgment of God as He has revealed Himself to us, *i.e.*, His name. The second is the acceptance of His kingdom. The third and highest is the prayer that His will, and whatever it includes—revelation, kingdom, etc.—may become a fact among men, as it is among the angels in heaven.

The prayer of the Garden teaches us the reality of this petition: "My Father, if this cup cannot depart from Me unless I drink it, *Thy will be done*" (Matt. xxvi. 42)—the very word that He gave His disciples (Matt. vi. 10).

In the old Syriac version the word *will* is in the plural. The passage may be rendered, "And let Thy wills be done." The plural brings out the manifold nature of God's will, although the singular has the support of all the MSS. and of the corresponding passage (Matt. vii. 21): "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the *will*[2] of My Father in heaven."

Bengel points out that the pastor is admonished by the "Catechismus Romanus," put forth by the Council of Trent, to impress upon his people that the phrase, "As in heaven, so on earth," belongs to each of the three petitions, thus:

"Hallowed be Thy name, as in heaven, so on earth."

"Thy kingdom come, as in heaven, so on earth."

"Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth."

"*Give us this day our bread for the coming day*" (Matthew).

"*Be giving us daily our bread for the coming day*" (Luke).

There is a very interesting discussion as to the meaning of the word translated "for the coming day."[3] The suggested renderings bring out the various shades of the meaning of the

[1] *Cf.* Col. i. 20: "Whether things in earth or things in heaven."

[2] The Codex Sinaiticus has the variant "the wills"; *Cf.* "the wishes of your father that ye desire to do" (John viii. 44).

[3] ἐπιούσιος.

Greek word, although not one of them singly is adequate in itself to express the full force of ἐπιούσιος.[1] De Wette rendered it "our bread in sufficiency"; Meyer, followed by Lightfoot, after the Hebrew *Lachem makar*, "bread to come," or "bread for the coming day"; Alford translates "bread proper for our sustenance"; Jerome "bread supersubstantial"; Maclellan "needful bread," "bread for the life to come," or "bread of life eternal."

Bishop Lightfoot ("On Revision," p. 234) sums up his essay in these words: "Thus the familiar rendering 'daily,' which has prevailed uninterruptedly from the beginning, is a fairly adequate representation of the original; nor, indeed, does the English language furnish any one word which would answer the purpose so well." Dr. Maclellan concludes his criticism ("New Testament," p. 646) in an equally dogmatic spirit in favour of the rendering "proper to the future world"—a meaning which, according to him, "etymology, original tradition, sense and context unite in establishing."

Dr. Maclellan is certainly wrong in limiting the word to the future world. The compilers of our Catechism knew what they were about when they explained it as meaning "all things that be needful both for our souls and bodies." And in our practice we invariably think of both senses of the word. In the morning we ask for bread sufficient for the day; in the evening, bread for the coming day. With our physical wants before our minds, we ask for natural food, and, conscious of our spiritual needs, we ask for food supernatural.

The simplicity of the petition, which is so brief but so comprehensive, reminds one of the Hebrew saying in Bab. Berach.: "The necessities of Thy people Israel are so many, and their knowledge so slight, that they cannot tell all their needs. Be it Thy will to give each one what suffices for his food."

The unfailing nature of the gift is brought out in St. Luke's "be giving"; its immediate supply in the "give" of St. Matthew.

"*And remit to us our debts as we have remitted to our debtors,* or *as we remit to our debtors*" [the latter reading not so well attested] (Matthew).

"*And remit to us our sins, for we also remit to everyone that is indebted to us*" (Luke).

The "Didaché" retains the word *debt*. The primary meaning of the original verb *chub*—in the Hebrew language

[1] This word is found five times in the writings of St. Luke, once in St. Matthew, and nowhere else in the New Testament.

"to bind"—is the predominant one in the Hebrew religion. In the Parable of the Debtor this aspect of sin, not the most essential but the most popular, is dwelt upon. It is wrong to interpret these words as meaning "Forgive us, and we shall also forgive"; for our forgiveness of others is the condition of God's forgiveness of us, although no doubt Divine forgiveness is intended to inspire human forgiveness (*vide* Parable of Unmerciful Servant). The Syriac Version has been accordingly rendered "Remit to us *in order that* we may also remit to others," although it is extremely improbable that the conjunction used can bear this meaning.

This petition is interesting from the fact that no parallel has been found to it in the Jewish writings. "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you" (Matt. v. 43). This was no unjust attack upon the Jewish codes. One has only to read the commission to destroy and kill the Canaanites root and branch (Deut. vi. 2), and the words forbidding the children of Israel to seek the peace and prosperity of the Ammonites and Moabites (Deut. xxii. 6), commands that were only too eagerly and terribly fulfilled, to be convinced of the truth of the Lord's words.

Even the Gentile writers Tacitus and Juvenal remarked upon the hatred and discourtesy the Jews persisted in showing to strangers. The former ("Hist.," v. 5) characterizes their hatred towards all strangers as that of an enemy—"Adversus omnes alios hostile odium," while Juvenal in his fourteenth Satire says they "were too churlish even to direct a stranger in the way"—"Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti"; while the Mishna abounds with such passages as "Do not show kindness or mercy to the Gentiles" (Talmud, Midr. Teph., f. 26, 4). Our Lord therefore took occasion to press home the principle by an argument, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."

"*And bring us not into temptation*" (Matthew and Luke).

It was generally believed in early times that God's permission was required by the evil one before he could tempt men. Accordingly this sentence is frequently found rendered in the Fathers, "Suffer us not to be led into temptation"—"Ne nos patiaris induci in temptationem" (Cyprian). That Father also quotes the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 13): "There hath no temptation taken you but such as man can bear: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be

tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make a way of escape that ye may be able to bear it."

Hilary in his version, given in a commentary on the 118th Psalm, "Abandon us not [an expression that found its way into the Lord's Prayer from the Latin of Ps. cxviii. 8] in temptation which we are not able to bear," brings out an important point in this deprecation. In the "Bishops' Book" (1537) we read, "And leade us not into temptation," but in the "King's Book" (1543), "And let us not be ledde into temptation."

The Syriac verb (in Aphel) means "*make* us not *enter*."

"*But deliver us from the Evil* [*One*]" (Matthew only).

Tertullian, one of the first commentators on the Lord's Prayer, explained the passage so: "Draw us away from the malignant one—that is, lead us not into temptation by giving us over to him; for then we are drawn out of his hands when we are not handed over to temptation."

The difficulty in the interpretation of this petition is to decide whether the Greek word translated "evil" is of neuter or masculine gender, seeing that one and the same form represents both. The Revised Version of 1881, following Meyer, Fritzsche, Ellicott, Wordsworth, and Lightfoot of modern, and Origen and Chrysostom of ancient, commentators, renders it "the evil *one*," while the Authorized Version reads "evil" and is supported by Augustine, Tholuck, Alford, Stier, Maclellan, and others. A very bitter protest was raised against this reading of the revisers by Canon Cook, but to no purpose. The Greek can throw no light on the meaning of the word, but as Bishop Lightfoot pointed out, the Syriac Version strongly makes for the reading "the evil one;" for there is a passage in the New Testament (Rom. xii. 9), "Abhor that which is evil" (neuter gender), where the word "evil" is distinctly "the evil thing," the Greek article being in the neuter. In that passage the Syriac word for evil is *bish-to* (the feminine), whereas in the passage[1] (Matt. xiii. 19) where the Greek must mean the "evil one" the Syriac Vulgate has the word *bish* (the masculine form), the same that is used in the Lord's Prayer. From this we infer that the Syriac translators, guided no doubt by tradition and testimony, correctly believed that our Lord's meaning was, "Deliver us from the evil one;" and this view receives support from many of the ancient offices and liturgies, especially the forms of baptismal renunciations (*vide* the Lord's Prayer in "Cambridge Texts and Studies").

[1] Then cometh the evil *one* and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart.

The Greek preposition (*ἀπό*) that is used here leads us to the same opinion, that it is an evil person rather than a thing from which we implore deliverance; not that the personality of the devil is at all made light by the reading "the evil," for in the last instance it is an evil will, and therefore an evil person, that originates evil. There is a great reserve on this subject in the Old Testament. Here and there we find scattered glimpses of an evil spirit, which are focussed in the drama of the temptation of Job. But there is no doubt that the Jews imbibed from Persia the Manichæan conception of two rival empires, a kingdom of light and a kingdom of darkness. This subject the Lord Himself illustrated by His suffering and His teaching. He who gathered up humanity in Himself gathered up that ancient quarrel (Hilary). Thus in the LIGHT of His own temptation this clause of His Prayer stands out in greater significance, while in His teaching He ever impressed upon the people that the devil was a personality. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you will to do" (John viii. 14).

In the dramatic account of the fall of Judas we read that Satan entered into him (Luke xxii. 3). "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me," the Master said, alluding to the success of that temptation; and in His prayer for His own disciples (John xvii.) He said: "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil one" (*men bisho*).

"But he who is born of God keepeth himself, and the *evil one* toucheth him not" (1 John v. 18).

"*For Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen*" (not found in the best MSS.).

The Jews responded to the prayers of the Temple service with a doxology. Of this expression of praise two forms have been preserved for us; one of these began with the word *bless—e.g.*, "Now bless the Lord your God" (1 Chron. xxix. 20); and "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel" (Luke i. 67); the other is like that attached to the Lord's Prayer—*e.g.* (1 Chron. xxix. 11): "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty."

Of this doxology several forms passed over into the liturgy of the Christian Church. In that very short work the "Didaché" we have no less than three variations of it. In the thanksgiving after the bread and the cup the form is "Thine is the glory for ever." In the prayer for the unity of the Church the ending is, "So let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the world into Thy kingdom, *for Thine is the glory and the power, through*

Jesus Christ, for ever;" and after the prayer, "Lord, remember Thy Church, to deliver it from every evil and to make it perfect in Thy love, and gather it from the four winds, *it*, the sanctified into Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it, *for Thine is the power and the glory for ever.*"

Westcott and Hort believe that the doxology originated in liturgical use in Syria, and found its way from thence into the Greek and Syriac versions of the New Testament. This addition would certainly adapt the prayer for use at the office of Holy Communion and other thanksgiving services.

The Rabbins related how Jacob made use of this prayer when he called his sons together and said, "Blessed be the name of His glory." And in the public liturgy of the Temple it was the custom of the people to use this form of response instead of the "Amen" which was used in the synagogue.

In the tractate Berakhôth of the Jerusalem Talmud we read: "The tradition is that 'Amen' was not the response in the House of the Sanctuary. What, then, did they say? 'Blessed be the name of the glory of His kingdom for everlasting.'" In the tractate Yoma of the Babylonian Talmud we have another witness: "And the people replied, 'Blessed be the name of the glory of His kingdom for everlasting.'" And in another passage, "After the concluding words of the prayer of the high-priest, 'Cleanse yourselves before Jehovah,' the priests and the people standing in the court, when they heard the name Jehovah clearly and solemnly pronounced, fell upon their faces and worshipped, saying, 'Blessed be the name of the glory of His kingdom for ever and ever.'"

The response "Amen" was thus peculiar to the synagogue worship. The combination of these two responses in the doxology that is used in the Christian Church is a very strange one, and is a proof in itself of the comparative lateness of the expression. We may fitly conclude this paper with the remark of Bengel, that the whole prayer shall hereafter be one doxology, when God's name is hallowed, His kingdom has come, and His will *is done* on earth as it is in heaven.

F. R. MONTGOMERY-HITCHCOCK.

ART. IV.—THE ALBIGENSES.

THE author of the article on "the Albigenses" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" says: "The attempt to discover the precise doctrinal opinions held by the Albigenses is attended with a double difficulty. No formal creed or definite doctrinal statement framed by themselves exists, and in default of this

it is impossible to depend on the representations of their views given by their opponents in the Church of Rome, who did not scruple to exaggerate and distort the opinions held by those whom they branded as heretics."

The object of this series of articles, therefore, is to lay before the reader the principal documentary evidence which refers to the doctrines held, or alleged to have been held, by those Dissenters from the Church of Rome, who, in the history of those times, were generalized under the name of Albigenses. In these days, when history, so far from repeating itself, often contradicts itself, when research has compelled us to regard accepted fact as obvious fable, it is imperative that every seeker after truth should have the statements of the original authorities themselves placed before him, for only when thus provided are we justified in forming an opinion upon any historical period or problem; and only when we have such materials can we hope to defend our opinion with success. The final appeal must after all be framed upon the Scriptural principle, "To the law and to the testimony."

The study of the history of the Albigenses is one of considerable interest, because, on the one hand, they have been regarded as the rankest heretics—out and out Manichees; and, on the other hand, they have been claimed as forerunners of the Reformation—the Protestants of the Dark Ages. I think a careful weighing of the evidence which will be submitted will show that neither of these opinions is right to the exclusion of the other, but that the Albigenses held opinions of a very miscellaneous nature. The solid foundation upon which we can build our historical edifice is the fact that from the first arrival of Christianity in these parts there was manifested a sturdy independence from all outside interference, and in later times a jealous resentment against any encroachments upon this "free-thought" from the Pope of Rome. This feeling is traced by Allix in his "Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of the Albigenses," in which he defends this religious movement from the charge of schism which had been brought against it by the Bishop of Meaux. He instances the decrees of the Council of Frankfort, which were made binding upon the whole kingdom of Charlemagne, and which simply annulled the decrees of the second Council of Nicæa, although the Pope had given it his sanction. Council in the East, Pope in the West, might approve and enjoin image-worship: the Franks would have none of it. Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, who spent his early years in Gallia Narbonensis, also condemned the use of images and pictures in Christian worship. He eulogized Hezekiah for breaking up Nehushtan, "because the mistaken multitude worshipped it as an idol."

He ridiculed the translation of Gen. iii. 15, "*Ipsa* tuum conteret caput," and the inference therefrom in favour of Mariolatry, maintaining that the true rendering was "*Ipse.*"

Many other instances might be adduced, all proving that the inhabitants of this district for many centuries looked at dogma for themselves, and did not accept a thing just because it came from Rome. It is obvious that such a country would be especially attractive to all and sundry who held doctrines other than those recognised as orthodox. Here they found rest; here they were tolerated; nay, more, here they found a congenial soil in which their distinctive teaching would take root and thrive. Hither came the Paulicians, the Petrobrussians, the Henricans, the Waldenses; all these left their several marks upon the Albigenses, but no one of them could claim an absolute monarchy; neither were they welded together to form one creed. Its closest counterpart will be, perhaps, found in the Dissent of modern times, in that the Albigenses had, in the matter of religion, great divergences amongst themselves, but united in their opposition to the "established" Church, with which they nevertheless had many things in common.

We are now in a position to examine the documents from which an estimate may be formed of the articles of belief current in the South of France before and during the Albigensian Crusade. As, in spite of their most indignant denials, the Albigenses were and are called Manichees, it will be well, for purposes of comparison, to set down the fourteen heads of what the Inquisitor Eymericus in his "Directorium Inquisitorum" calls "*recentiorum* Manicheorum errores" (Part II., pp. 273, 274; Venice).

I. They assert and confess that there are two Gods or two Lords, viz., a good God, and an evil Creator of all things visible and material; declaring that these things were not made by God our heavenly Father . . . but by a wicked devil—even Satan . . . and so they assume two Creators, viz., God and the devil; and two creations, viz., one of material and visible things, the other of invisible and immaterial.

II. They imagine that there are two Churches, one good, which they say is their own sect, and declare it to be the Church of Jesus Christ; the other, however, they call an evil Church, which they say is the Church of Rome. . . .

III. All grades, orders, ordinances, and statutes of the Church they despise and ignore; and all who hold the faith they call heretics and deluded, and positively assert (*dogmatizant*) that nobody can be saved by the faith (*in fide*) of the Roman Church.

IV. All the sacraments of the Roman Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, viz., the Eucharist, and Baptism which is performed with material water, also Confirmation and Orders, and Extreme Unction and Penance (*pœnitentia*) and Matrimony, all and singular they assert to be vain and useless.

V. They invent, instead of holy baptism in water, another *spiritual* baptism, which they call the Consolation (*consolamentum*) of the Holy Spirit.

VI. Instead of the consecrated bread of the Eucharist of the Body of Christ, they invent a certain bread, which they call "blessed bread," or "bread of holy prayer," which, holding it in their hands, they bless according to their rite, and break and distribute to their fellow-believers seated.

VII. Instead of the Sacrament of Penance they say that their sect receives and holds a true penance (*pœnitentia*), and to those holding the said sect and order, whether they be in health or sickness, all sins are forgiven (*dimissa*), and that such persons are absolved from all their sins without any other satisfaction, asserting that they themselves have over these the same and as great power as had Peter and Paul and the other Apostles . . . saying that the confession of sins which is made to the priests of the Roman Church is of no avail whatever for salvation, and that neither the Pope nor any other person of the Roman Church has power to absolve anyone from their sins.

VIII. Instead of the Sacrament of carnal Matrimony between man and woman, they invent a spiritual matrimony between the soul and God, viz., when the heretics themselves, the perfect or consoled (*perfecti seu consolati*), receive anyone into their sect and order.

IX. They deny the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ from Mary ever virgin, asserting that He had not a true human body, etc., but that all things were done figuratively (*in similitudinem*).

X. They deny that the blessed Virgin Mary was the true mother of our Lord Jesus Christ; they deny also that she was a woman of flesh (*carnalem*). But they say their sect and order is the Virgin Mary, and that true penance (*pœnitentia*) is a chaste virgin who bears sons of God, when they are received into their sect and order.

XI. They deny the future resurrection of human bodies, imagining in its place certain spiritual bodies. . . .

XII. They say that a man ought neither to eat or touch meat, nor cheese, nor eggs, nor anything which is born of the flesh by way of generation or intercourse.

XIII. They say and believe that in brutes, and even in birds, there are those spirits which go forth from the bodies

of men when they have not been received into their sect and order by imposition of hands, according to their rite, and that they pass from one body into another; wherefore they themselves do not eat or kill any animal, nor anything that flies.

XIV. They say a man ought never to touch a woman.

(The Roman figures are given instead of the original Latin headings for the sake of brevity, and for purposes of reference.)

That some of these "errors" were to be found in the South of France appears from the earliest notice that we possess of the existence of heterodoxy there. Ademar, in his Chronicle (A.D. 1010), says: "Shortly afterwards there arose *throughout Aquitaine*[1] Manichees, seducing the people, denying baptism and the virtue of Holy Cross, and whatever is of sound doctrine (*cf.* IV.-XI.), abstaining from food (*cf.* XII., XIII.), and feigning chastity (*cf.* XIV.), 'sed inter se ipsos luxuriam omnem exercentes.'"

Again (A.D. 1030), he says Duke William summoned a Council. "There were present all the chiefs of *Aquitaine*, whom he enjoined to keep the peace and reverence the Catholic Church of God" (*cf.* II., III.).

In 1119 a Council was held at Toulouse, over which the Pope himself presided. The third canon of that Council is as follows: "Moreover, those who, pretending to a sort of religion, condemn the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, and baptism of *children*, the priesthood and the other ecclesiastical orders, and the compacts of lawful nuptials (*cf.* III.-VIII.), we expel from the Church of God, and condemn as heretics. Their defenders also we consign to the yoke of the same sentence until they abjure."

Fuller light still is thrown upon the religious beliefs of the Albigenses (and let it be borne in mind that "Albigenses" is the name of a *people*, not a *denomination*) by Maurice de Montboissier, better known as Petrus Venerabilis, Abbot of Cluny (1122-1156), in his letter or tractate to the Bishops of Arles and Embrun, dealing with the Petrobrussians, so called from their founder and leader, Peter de Bruis. In the preface he sums up the tenets of these "heretics" under five heads: "(i.) They deny that little children below the age of intelligence can be saved by the baptism of Christ, nor can another's faith benefit those who cannot use it, . . . for God said 'whosoever believed and was baptized was saved.' (ii.) No temple or church ought to be built, and those already built should be destroyed, and for Christians sacred places for praying

[1] It may here be convenient to note that the region affected by Albigensianism contained the provinces of Guienne, Gascony, Foix, Languedoc, Provence, Lyonnais, and Avignon.

should not be required, since equally in a tavern or church, in market or temple, before altar or stall, God when invoked hears and hearkens to those who deserve. (iii.) All holy crosses should be broken up and burnt, since that instrument, by which Christ was so fearfully tortured and so cruelly killed, is not worthy of adoration, veneration, or other reverence. (iv.) Not only do they deny the truth of the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament offered daily and continuously in the Church, but they declare that it is absolutely nothing, and ought not to be offered to God. (v.) They deride sacrifices, prayers, alms, and other good things done on behalf of the faithful departed, and affirm that these things cannot help any of the dead in the smallest degree."

Later on he adds: "The heretics say that God is mocked by Church hymns, because He delights in pious affections only, and cannot be summoned with loud voice, or appeased with musical notes."

In the letter itself he writes: "In your parts people were rebaptized, churches profaned, altars thrown down, crosses burned, meat publicly eaten on Good Friday (*die ipso passionis dominicæ*), priests scourged, monks imprisoned, and compelled by terrors and tortures to marry wives. The heads of this pest you have driven out of your district by God's help, and the assistance of the Catholic princes. . . . But the slippery serpent, gliding out of your regions . . . has betaken himself to the Province of Narbonne, and whereas with you he used to whisper in deserts and hamlets in fear and trembling, he now preaches boldly in great meetings and populous cities. But let the most distant shores of the swift Rhone, and the adjacent champaign of Toulouse and the city itself, more populous than its neighbours, drive out this opinion; for the better informed the city is, the more cautious it ought to be against false dogma."

Compare this extract with that from Zymericus, and it at once becomes apparent that this "Puritanism" has nothing Manichean about it. On the other hand, Radulp Ardens (A.D. 1130) testifies in his "Sermons" (p. 325) to the existence of religious opinions widely different from those of the Petrobrussians: "Such, my brethren, are the heretics, *Manichees*, in that they have polluted by their heresy your country of Agen, who falsely assert that they observe the life of the Apostles, who under the pretext of abstinence and continence condemn meat and marriage. . . . They condemn also the Old Testament; of the New, part they receive, and part not. And, what is more serious, they preach two authors of things —God the author of things invisible, and the Devil of things visible. Also they say that the sacrament of the altar is

mere bread. They deny Baptism. They preach that none can be saved but by their hands. They deny also the resurrection of the body."

Hugo of Cluny, Archbishop of Rouen, writing in A.D. 1130 against heretics, does not mention their name, but attributes to them the following opinions: (i.) The recognition of the Old Testament. (ii.) Opposition to *Infant* Baptism. (iii.) Denial of the Trinity. (iv.) Disregard of all ecclesiastical orders. (v.) "(Hæretici) dicunt se communem in domiciliis suis vitam habere et more Apostolico secum mulieres habere." (vi.) Three orders: Virgins, *continentes*, *conjugati*. (vii.) The Eucharist and Matrimony held to be Sacraments. Whoever these "heretics" were, they differ in several important points from any previously mentioned.

Bernard of Clairvaux is worth attention, if only for his extensive vocabulary of abuse. He describes the "heretics" as sheep in clothing, foxes in cunning, wolves in cruelty. They are "rusticani homines, et idiotæ, et prorsus contemptibiles." "The Manichees were so called from their chief, Manes; Arians from Arius. But by what name or title will you call these? By none, since their heresy is not of man. It is by the deceit of devils. . . . There are some, however, who differ from the rest, in that they profess that matrimony can be contracted *inter solos virgines*. . . . They do not believe that the fire of purgatory remains after death" (S. Bernard: Serm. in Cant. lxvi.; text, S. of Sol. ii. 15).

A Council was held at Tours in A.D. 1163, and the title of its fourth Canon is "Ut cuncti *Albigensium* hæreticorum consortium fugiant." It states that "in the parts about Toulouse a damnable heresy has lately risen, and like a canker is slowly diffusing itself into the neighbouring localities, through Gascony and other places. . . ." Certain repressive measures are to be taken against them by the ecclesiastical and civil powers. But the doctrines of these Albigensian heretics are not specified, and the need for more precise instructions was acutely felt as soon as the authorities began to put the prescribed measures into operation. Accordingly, a special Council was summoned to meet in the heart of the disturbed district—namely, at Lombers, a small town in the diocese of Albi. At this Council were present the Archbishop of Narbonne, the Bishops of Nimes, Agde, Toulouse and Lodéve, eight abbots (four of whom were of the diocese of Albi); also Trenvecal, Viscount of Albi, Béziers, and Carcassone. Binius calls this "the Gallican Council against the Albigenses," while the official account of the Council states that its sentence was directed against those who call themselves

"Boni homines."[1] Now, for the first time apparently, an official inquiry was held into their opinions. Certain of their leaders, of whom Olivier was chief, were cited to appear before the Council, and the examination was conducted by Gaucelin, Bishop of Lodève, by command of Girald, Bishop of Albi. From this inquiry it transpired that they rejected the whole of the Old Testament, but received all the New Testament. They would say nothing about their creed unless forced. As to the Baptism of infants, and whether they were saved by Baptism, they said nothing of themselves, but only quoted texts from the Gospels and Epistles. They were questioned on the body and blood of the Lord, as to where it was consecrated, through whom they received it, and who received it, and whether its consecration was affected by the good or evil character of him who consecrated. They answered that those who received it worthily were saved, and those who received it unworthily acquired for themselves damnation. It was to be consecrated by a good man, clerical or lay. Further than this they would not answer, maintaining that they ought not to be compelled to answer *de fide sua* (where *fide* seems to mean mere opinion as distinct from creed or dogma). They declined to commit themselves to any definite views about matrimony and penance, being content to leave these matters where St. Paul and St. James place them. As for fasts, scourgings (*afflictionibus*), alms, as penances in satisfaction of sins confessed, they replied that they did not wish to be wiser than the Apostle St. James in his Epistle (v. 16). Many things they volunteered, without being questioned—*e.g.*, that we should "swear not at all" by any oath (*per aliquod sacramentum*); that St. Paul states in his Epistle what kind of men should be ordained Bishops and Presbyters, and if men of other character and qualification were ordained they were not Bishops or Presbyters, but ravening wolves, hypocrites, and seducers, and obedience should not be given them. They were, however, condemned as heretics, and a refutation of their doctrines, taken only from the New Testament, follows the sentence. They retorted that the Bishop who had given sentence against them was a heretic himself; and, turning to the people, they said: "We believe (the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, with the exception of 'the Holy Catholic Church') confession with heart and

[1] The date of the Council was either 1165 or 1176. In support of the former we have (1) the MS. of Sirmond, given by Labbe; (2) "The Archives of the Inquisition of Carcassone," in which it is dated 1165; (3) Trenvecal, who was present at the Council, died in 1167. For the latter we have the authority of Roger de Hoveden, whom Labbe and Fleury follow.

mouth; that he who does not eat the body of Christ is not saved; that it is not consecrated except in the Church and by a priest, good or evil; that no unbaptized person is saved; that infants are saved through baptism; married persons are saved." They were ready to believe anything that could be proved from the Gospels and Epistles, but they would not by any means swear to it. This inquiry did not strengthen the case for the Church of Rome; it only served to focus the views of the sectaries, and to give them greater publicity. They felt, too, that they had been unjustly condemned, and in their resentment they became more zealous in propagating their doctrines. In fact, things looked so black that the Pope called upon the King of France and his vassal the King of England to lead an army into the infected district and stamp out the heresy by force. The Kings did not see their way clear to do this, but sent instead Peter Chrysogonus, Cardinal and Legate, a Cistercian monk, and some Archbishops and Bishops, "in order that by their *preaching* they might convert them to the Christian faith." A Council met at Toulouse, A.D. 1178, but the heretics answered, "Sane et circumspecte ac si Christiani essent." What these answers were we learn in greater detail from a letter which the said Peter Chrysogonus published "to all the world." "They confessed and strongly asserted the one God, most high, made all things visible and invisible, which they proved out of the Evangelical and Apostolical writings; that a priest, good or bad, can make the body and blood of Christ, and through the ministry of such a priest both the body and blood of Christ are transubstantiated; that infants and adults baptized by our baptism are saved; that Archbishops and Bishops must be saved (*salvandos esse*); that churches founded in the honour of God and His saints should be approached and entered with the highest devotion; that tithes should be paid and alms given." All these, though they were said before to deny them, they asserted they understood into our sound meaning. Some of the Council were so astonished at this that they charged the heretics with lying. But as before, so now, they refused to swear to these opinions, and were accordingly again condemned and excommunicated. Henry of Clairvaux, who accompanied Chrysogonus, and likewise addressed a letter "to the Catholic world," says that if they had deferred their visit for three years scarcely anyone would have remained orthodox.

H. J. WARNER.

ART. V.—POETRY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

(Concluded.)

IN passing from the poetry of Tennyson to that of Browning we pass out of the atmosphere of some exquisite flower-garden into that of a wide moor, bleak, and exposed to the east winds, yet healthful, and possessed of a glory all its own. No poets could be less alike than these two eminent contemporaries; yet a comparison as well as a contrast would be a fruitful source of instruction. Both "saw life steadily and saw it whole," but from totally different points of view. Tennyson, touched by all the sadness of life, loved to muse upon its mystery, and was haunted by that "sense of tears in human things" which is the characteristic of some of the noblest thinkers, from the Preacher onwards; Browning, not really less sensitive of heart, knew little of that melancholy of temper, that wistful regarding of human life, to which his brother poet was so keenly alive. Browning was intensely optimistic; perhaps the fervour of his belief simply prevented him from watching the clouds while his thoughts were busied with the sun—that sun which (he knew) shone behind them not less radiantly because, for the time, hidden.

> God's in His heaven,
> All's right with the world

was more than a pious exclamation with him. He believed it with all the fervour of a strong nature, and that belief simply dominated his whole life, and life-work. From the day when he wrote the first lines of "Paracelsus," early in 1835, till the day when, after having composed the epilogue to "Asolando" (his final word to the generation), he laid aside his pen for ever, he never faltered in his faith, nor in the vigorous expression of it. True, he saw—none more clearly—the seamy side of human life, the pity of it all, and the darker elements in human passion and motive; but what of that? He saw—possibly more clearly than anyone else of his generation—that this was not all the truth, even in this world; that the law of compensation did redress many bitter grievances even in this life; but, above all, that *this* life was only the entrance-portal to a life beyond. Apart from such a conclusion to earthly existence, man's place in the cosmos would be simply an insoluble riddle, a meaningless blank; and truth, goodness, beauty, justice, love, a mere congeries of empty terms, as void of meaning or of rationality as a dream. This conviction was, for Browning, verily

> The master light of all his seeing,

and his poetry cannot be understood if this vital element fails to receive just recognition.

Many readers are apt to be discouraged in their first attempts to read Browning; he seems harsh and uncouth—"broiled bones and brandy," as the poet once humorously said of his work. And so he often is; for, unlike Tennyson, he is no master in the art of exquisite phrasing. A sound musician, a painter of no mean ability, with an observant ear and eye, and an all but boundless knowledge of the human heart in all its intricacies, it is singular that he should so often fail in giving his thoughts that artistic beauty, that graceful proportion, and that harmony of diction which other poets, far less amply endowed than he, eminently possess. Browning was a great genius, of rugged order, with a touch of native perverseness that often hampered the best expression of his art; but for sheer insight into character, dramatic intensity, and brilliant vigour of conception, he can only be compared with the very greatest in our literature.

The charge of obscurity, though often levelled at Browning, is only half true; much of the difficulty which meets us in approaching him is akin to the difficulty which faces the student of Hegel, when first he essays to grasp the great philosopher's secret. The obscurity is oftener on our side than on that of the poet. So swift is Browning in his thought, so instant to perceive what is real and essential in human conduct, so unerring in piercing to the root of motive and laying bare the springs of action, that our laggard wits flag in the endeavour to keep pace with him. Then, in his dramatic method, he reverses the usual procedure. The *objective* treatment, which is that generally followed, takes a subject in hand, and does not attempt to analyze character till it has sufficiently made clear to us the ruling circumstances; in the *subjective* treatment, the character is built up from the inside. Through the vision of the poet we watch the infinite play of hidden motive, of those strange and far-away phases of a man's personality that seldom rise to the surface, yet profoundly touch his life. And this is the way in which Browning loves to treat his subjects; he gives us no mere character sketches, which are, after all, of surface value; he probes deep into the main wonder of the human heart. Hence something of his difficulty; he is not only poet, but psychologist too—a mental physiologist searching out the secrets of the soul, and finding in the development of that soul, in all its ascending or descending stages, the only thing worth studying—

> Man's thoughts, and loves, and hates.

About these clusters his interest; in depicting them he has lavished all the treasures of his vigorous genius, and splendidly decisive and incisive style. A strong masculine personality was Browning's, with a strong faith in the Unseen, a noble belief in his fellow-man—one who indeed

> Never turned his back, but marched breast forward,
> Never doubted clouds would break,
> Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
> Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
> Sleep to wake.

The forces of the early part of the century which have served to guide the destinies of the age are all but exhausted; we await at length the advent of some fresh quickening impulse, of newer sources of intellectual and social activity. That we should now be conscious of a reaction is inevitable, for we are passing through a period of mediocrity. But nothing can take from us the heritage of past splendours. Other bards may come to charm us, to instruct us, and to give us stronger confidence in the unseen universe of spirit, while, nevertheless, not uncareful to open the eyes of our understanding to the endless beauties, which, in this visible part of God's creation, surround us on all sides. But Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning—these are, spiritually, with us still; their pages are ever unsealed for us, to learn therein the lesson that genius inspires, or to find the abundant solace that springs from the contemplation of noble thought and high imaginings. To flash a glory upon the sum of man's life, to strike a music from the story of his hopes and joys, his despair and tears—this is the unique privilege of genius.

E. H. Blakeney.

Art. VI.—THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

In introducing to you the subject of spiritual work in North and East London, it is right that I should first briefly explain to you why I venture to introduce it to your notice.

It is twenty-six years since I left the University of Oxford. In my undergraduate days I was greatly interested in the condition of the poor in London, and was constantly talking about the subject both to my friends and tutors. That was long before anybody had thought either of Toynbee Hall, or Oxford House, or School or College Missions. It was before Arnold Toynbee had entered at Balliol. It was therefore

peculiarly satisfactory to me to be appointed in 1880 (seven years after I took my degree) to a well-equipped parish in the slums of Westminster, with a population of between 6,000 and 7,000, all of them belonging to the labouring classes, where I was able to work practically at the problems which had attracted me in my college days. Still more interesting was it to me, after nine years at St. Stephen's, Westminster, to be appointed to my present duties by Bishop Temple, to be one of his official advisers and aides-de-camp, and that in reference to the vast Archdeaconry of London.

The Diocese of London now consists of the county of Middlesex. In the first half of this century it contained the counties of Essex and Hertford, and the northern parts of the counties of Kent and Surrey. It is not much more than twenty years ago that the Surrey portions were given up. Bishop Jackson used to confirm at Kingston, Richmond and Wimbledon. The present diocese is divided into two archdeaconries, that of London and that of Middlesex. The dividing-line is at Temple Bar, and the line runs north and south. The Archdeaconry of London contains the City, and the districts of Spitalfields, Shoreditch, Whitechapel, Bethnal Green, St. George's-in-the-East, Stepney, Bromley, Bow, Hackney, Hoxton, Haggerston, Islington, Holloway, Highbury, Clerkenwell, Bloomsbury—in all about 250 parishes, and upwards of 1,500,000 inhabitants.

There is something truly appalling in looking down from the Golden Gallery of St. Paul's Cathedral over the interminable billowy sea of houses which spreads itself in every direction beneath. What incalculable aggregates of poverty, misery, and sin does that vast dusky province of streets present! If you think that in that awful region which lies spread out, with its dumb, helpless appeal, beneath your feet there are more than 600,000 children attending elementary schools—more children, that is, than the whole population of Glasgow, or Birmingham, or Manchester—what problems does that alone suggest to the mind! And the heart feels more specially pitiful as it turns towards the grim and monotonous East; it is with something of an indignant pathos that the eye glances over the unbroken dreariness of the dwellings of more than a million toilers, of many races and many conditions, but leading a life which cannot be reckoned natural or healthy. Misery and poverty there are in the slums of Westminster and in North Kensington, and in St. Giles; but where else shall be found on so prodigious a scale such congested masses of ignorance, hopelessness, and irreligion? Not that the whole district is the same. I shall presently show of what different classes its population

consists, and how cruel and unwarrantable are the exaggerations which have been entertained as to its character; but where else shall we find an area at so dead a level, with a lowness of ideal so uninterrupted, with an outlook so inhumanly uninteresting? Where else can we speak of a population with habits so degraded as in that dismal tract, known as Spitalfields, between the soaring spires of Whitechapel and Shoreditch, where from the very nature of the case a long series of the most hideous murders had no chance of being discovered?

But it is not that the people in the East End of London are worse than anywhere else; it is merely that the lower levels of our social life are there congregated together in a manner beyond all precedent. Seventy years ago, when London was not much more than a tenth of what it is now, an acute and independent thinker—William Cobbett—used to lament what even then was its disproportionate overgrowth. He used to call it the Great Wen. "The dispersion of the Wen," he wrote, "is the only real difficulty that I see in settling the affairs of the nation and restoring it to a happy state. But dispersed it must be."[1] Since his day the evils which he deplored have become tenfold in magnitude; but the dream of dispersion is as far off as ever. London has grown to its present portentous and even horrible dimensions by the absolute license of the English system of civic government. Wherever any man wished to build, and could obtain a site, he has been allowed to build, provided he followed certain elementary directions for streets and construction. No presiding forethought, no genius of prevision, has been present to direct its increase and to lessen the evils of its preposterous size. Water and drainage are provided for the general good of the whole; but fresh air, open spaces, the admixture of classes, easy and rapid communication with centres of labour, considerations which would have mitigated the intolerably dreary conditions of life, have been from the beginning neglected. When, with the advance of the Funding System and the approach of railways, the population first began to increase with new and alarming rapidity, how easy it would have been to secure, for instance, a belt of free ground a quarter of a mile in breadth all round old London; but now it is all covered with houses, and it is too late. The illimitable, parasite, poverty-stricken population has come, and it only remains for us to see how we can best improve and brighten its hapless lot.

---

[1] Cobbett's "Rural Rides," p. 42.

Mr. Charles Booth, the statistician, divides the population of East London into eight classes:

1. The lowest sort of occasional labourers; loafers; semi-criminals.
2. Those who make casual earnings, and can only be described as very poor.
3. Intermittent earnings.
4. Small regular earnings. 3 and 4 make together the poor, as distinct from the very poor.
5. Regular standard earnings; above the line of poverty.
6. Higher class labour.
7. Lower middle class.
8. Upper middle class.

The numbers of the lowest class he puts at 11,000, but confessedly on very rough data—that is, 1¼ per cent. of the population. We may be thankful that they are not more.

The second class—those who make casual earnings and are very poor—he reckons at 100,000, or 11¼ per cent. of the population.

The third class—those who make intermittent earnings—number nearly 75,000, or about 8 per cent. of the inhabitants. These, he says, are more than any others the victims of competition, and on them falls with peculiar severity the weight of recurrent depressions of trade.

Next come those who make small regular earnings, who come to about 129,000, or 14½ per cent. They include the better end of the casual dock and waterside labour, those having directly or indirectly a preference for employment. The section embraces also a number of labourers in the gas-works, whose employment falls short in summer, but never entirely ceases. The rest of the section are the men who are in regular work all the year round at a wage not exceeding 21s. a week. As a rule, these men have a hard struggle to make both ends meet; but they are, as a body, decent and steady, paying their way and bringing up their children respectably. The work they do demands little skill or intelligence.

The fifth class is composed of those who make regular standard earnings—artisans, the best kind of street-sellers and general dealers, a large proportion of the small shop-keepers, the best off amongst the home manufacturers, and some of the small employers. This is by far the largest division, adding up to 377,000, or over 42 per cent. This class, says Mr. Booth, is the recognised field of all forms of co-operation and combination, and I believe, and am glad to believe, that it holds its future in its own hands. No body of men deserves more consideration.

Next come those who form the higher class of labour, who are the best paid of the artisans, and amount to 121,000, or about 13½ per cent. They are a distinct and honourable section of the people, earning from 30s. to 45s. or 50s. a week —foremen, warehousemen, the non-commissioned officers of the industrial army. Their sons take their places as clerks and their daughters get employment in first-class shops and places of business.

The lower middle class number 34,000, or nearly 4 per cent. They are chiefly found in Hackney and the outskirts of the East. The upper middle class number 45,000, or 5 per cent., more than two thirds of whom belong to Hackney.

We cannot but regard a very large part of the population of East London as, in its present circumstances, superfluous. Those who do not earn more than supports themselves can be regarded as no gain to the community in which they live. Such must be a parasite population, living one upon another. There is no reason in the nature of things why London should be so large; it is only the attractive force of its enormous area and its inflated reputation as offering chances of employment which maintains its size and increases constantly its bulk. London in Middlesex increases every year in something like the ratio of 50,000, and though I am unable to say what proportion of this belongs to the East End, it must be something like half. This would not be the case if London was left to itself. It is strongly alleged, though there is no absolute proof of the statement, that Londoners in the third generation become degenerate, and would diminish rather than increase in numbers. London is fed from the country and from abroad. It is a very remarkable fact that out of every 1,000 inhabitants of East London and Hackney 280 are immigrants from the outside. Out of the whole 900,000, 252,000 were not born in London. Those born in foreign countries amount to 21,426, the population of a considerable town. The Jewish community, to a large extent born in London, are on good grounds reckoned at from 60,000 to 70,000. Every great work undertaken in London brings up fresh blood from the country. Besides these broad main facts, there is a constant kaleidoscopic shifting of population in all parts. Thus the difficulties of the problems with which we have to deal are ceaselessly on the increase.

The greatest physical evil with which we have to contend is from overcrowding. It lies at the base of almost every other disease, social and religious. So heavy is the pressure of competition for shelter that amongst the people of whom we are speaking there are very few who spend less than a fifth of their weekly income on rent. The number of families who

occupy each a single room has not been accurately estimated, but it is enormous. Not infrequently there are more families than one in the single-roomed tenement. Four shillings is the average rent of one room, six shillings of two. From such a state of things the imagination shrinks back appalled. There is no need to multiply horrors; they have been detailed with point and brilliancy by picturesque writers. The fact is enough. Under such conditions morality and even decency are impossible. The child of these surroundings has never known what is meant by purity.

We do not wonder that in this state of things no very large number of the population attends church, chapel, or mission-room. A census on a particular day is somewhat misleading, as it is not always the same people who attend public worship on successive Sundays. Still, a census is a rough guide. On October 24, 1886, the Church of England had upwards of 72,359 worshippers, distributed between morning and evening; other denominations, 81,699. These numbers added together give a total of a little over 154,000. No doubt for the Church of England the numbers are considerably underestimated, as no account is taken of those present at early Communions or at afternoon services. To this we must add the census of attendance at mission-halls, taken on November 27, 1887. Morning, afternoon, and evening, the Church of England had 5,142 present on that day in those adjuncts to the parish churches, and other denominations 43,543; the total being 48,585. It will give us a rough but not unfair conclusion if we add the mission-hall census to the church and chapel census; and thus we arrive at the result that 202,585 might be supposed to be in church, chapel, or mission-hall on some particular Sunday. The consequent reflection that, in spite of all deductions, there must be something like 700,000 persons who are not often seen inside a place of worship, must give us ground for deep and painful thought. We cannot be surprised that the language of the greater number of those whose condition we are considering is, probably through no fault of their own, redolent of the foulest coarseness and of ceaseless blasphemy. We cannot be surprised that amongst the greater number of the young people prostitution or concubinage is the rule. When, in addition to the unhealthy conditions in which from infancy they are steeped, the astounding state of our marriage laws makes matrimony legal for a boy at fourteen and for a girl at twelve, we cannot be surprised to find the majority of marriages reckless and unthrifty, and in a vast number of cases only contracted to cover the coming birth. We cannot be astonished that the one institution which flourishes in

East London is the public-house; that it exists everywhere in countless numbers; that men, women, and young people drink; that on drink is spent so huge a share of wages which might have gone for thrift and comfort; that side by side with the public-house flourishes the pawn-shop; and that directly there comes some depression of trade or want of employment, even those who before were in receipt of good wages, habitually and regularly exist on the pledge of their clothes and possessions. There may be good-nature and kindness amongst this great mass of our fellow-citizens; they may be on the whole wonderfully well disposed to obey the law; but their outlook is dark, their standard of life low; and too many of them can only be described in the words of St. Paul as "without hope and without God in the world."

When we come to consider in the next place the resources of the Church of England in the district we have under review, we cannot but be surprised to find their woful and lamentable insufficiency. This is not the occasion to speak of the truly magnificent efforts and achievements of Bishop Blomfield and Bishop Tait, followed up by Bishop Jackson, by the indefatigable and enlightened Prelate who is now our Bishop, and by their suffragans. These things can be read in the admirable manual of Prebendary Walsh. Without them our condition would be indeed hopeless. The foundations have been laid. There are in the Archdeaconry (not reckoning the City of London) 187 parishes, with an average population of between 6,000 and 7,000 each. But these parishes are of most unequal size. There is one with over 21,000 inhabitants; one over 20,000; one over 19,000; three over 18,000; one over 17,000; two over 15,000; six over 14,000; three over 13,000; five over 12,000; eight over 11,000; ten over 10,000; sixteen over 9,000; and thirteen over 8,000. It would be idle to pretend that these parishes are not deplorably deficient in church accommodation, and in ministerial supply.

After having given you the dark side of the picture, let me show you some brighter touches.

First of all there are the Suffragan Bishops, who have to be missionaries in the truest sense of the word. I was chaplain to Bishop Jackson when the first suffragan was appointed for East London. There were great debates as to the fittest man. I strongly urged two names: Boyd Carpenter and Barry, but Bishop Jackson thought they were both men of too great powers for a subordinate position. One has since become Bishop of Ripon, the other Primate of Australia. The choice of Walsham How was very happy, and amply justified. He was the founder of the East London Church

Fund, which the present Suffragan, Dr. Winnington Ingram, so well known in Oxford, has raised to £20,000 a year. Bishop How did much to stimulate the energies of the clergy, and to give them hope and courage in their difficult and trying work. I have known five suffragans in my Archdeaconry, and each has brought special gifts to the work: Bishop Billing, an abounding geniality, and wide pastoral experience; Bishop Browne, a power of organization and a personal authority surpassed by none; Bishop Winnington Ingram, a personal charm, a power of hopefulness, and a gift of sympathetic speech which are given to few; and Bishop Turner, the new Suffragan for Islington, a fund of good sense and a capacity for organization which have made him a valuable administrator and counsellor to three successive Bishops of London.

Another point is that although the Church-people who gather round the different churches must be numbered by hundreds instead of thousands, and though the surrounding masses of indifference seem almost overwhelming, and the churches themselves are not more than a glimmer here and there amongst the prevailing carelessness; still, where a man is a genuine friend of the people, and gives himself heart and soul to the work of turning them to God, the response is equally genuine and thorough. I should like to offer each of you the annual parish year-book, for instance, of such churches as St. George's-in-the-East, Bromley-by-Bow, St. Stephen's, Old Ford, Whitechapel, St. Mark's, Dalston, Stoke Newington, and many others. And it is a mistake for either party in the Church to claim any superiority in parish works. Wherever there is real affection individually for the people themselves, real self-devotion, real primitive Christian unworldliness, there the genius of Christianity shines out, the people feel it and recognise it, and solid Christian work is the result. Amongst the most extreme parishes in my Archdeaconry are St. Alban's, Holborn, St. Peter's, London Docks, and St. Augustine's, Hackney. Their influence amongst the very poor is splendid and exemplary. But it is not because of elaborateness of ritual, but because of the genuine Christian lives, the true Christian love, of the men who work those parishes.

The most promising feature of all is the way in which large bodies of working men are being led to consider their relation to God by what are known as Men's Services. Two parishes I will mention as instances—one St. Peter's, Holloway, the other St. James the Less, Bethnal Green. The services in both of these churches were inaugurated by one man, a very remarkable person, Mr. Watts-Ditchfield, formerly a young

Methodist minister. He was curate in Holloway, and is Vicar in Bethnal Green. He gave himself up for six months to make personal friends of all the working men he could meet. He gained their individual confidence and affection. Then he started the Men's Service. The church on Sunday afternoon was given up to working men. He got a committee, a secretary, an instrumental band. His addresses were pointed, epigrammatic, and earnest. Very soon he had a regular congregation of 500 or 600 men. Confirmation followed, and then Communion. Morning and evening services were replenished. Social work grew out of this great congregation. Personal advice was sought and given. The whole neighbourhood was improved. The women insisted on having a special service for themselves, and that was given them on Tuesday afternoons. After a few successful years the Bishop removed Mr. Watts-Ditchfield to a parish in Bethnal Green. The same results followed there as if by magic. Nothing of the kind had occurred in Bethnal Green before. The old Vicar came down to meet me on my first address there, and thought there was a riot, so many men were crowding into the church. What was better still, we found a young man to take up the work at Holloway. He had the same success as Mr. Ditchfield. At the annual festival, the other day, at the Town Hall of Holloway, when the Bishop of London addressed the men, hundreds were turned away. As long as we can get a succession of men like Watts-Ditchfield and Arthur Hart the institution may be considered permanent.

The Deaconesses' Institution now numbers 16 deaconesses, as well as 12 church-workers, and 8 associates, helping in 20 parishes. It has also 30 associates in different parts of the county, spreading sympathy for East London to the utmost of their power. We have also St. Margaret's House, the new home of the ladies' branch of Oxford House. That branch was formed in 1889, and formerly worked with the Cheltenham Ladies' College Guild. It has now a separate house for nine resident ladies. Then, again, we welcome the York House Ladies' Settlement for North London, an institution of a similar character, promoted by Mr. Hocking, Vicar of All Saints', Tufnell Park. The S.P.C.K. Training College has continued its admirable work. The institution has been already an incalculable blessing to young men with an evangelistic impulse amongst the lower middle classes, and to the Church at large. It is a sign of the great development of lay-work in our generation, and it is a wholesome acknowledgment of the need of careful training. It would be desirable if a number of bursaries could be attached to this college, as the young men are seldom able to keep themselves, and yet during their

training must abandon their secular employments. In this connection we note with satisfaction the increase in the number of diocesan readers who are allowed to preach in churches at extra services. We should notice also the Church Army headquarters and their work at St. Mary-at-Hill, the jubilee of the Scripture Readers' Association, and the continued work of the London City Mission.

It is hardly necessary for me to mention the popular and successful operations of Toynbee Hall and Oxford House. They have the signal merit of encouraging sympathy for the spiritual and temporal interests of the poor amongst highly-placed and highly-educated young men. The self-denying example of the members and associates has done much to increase the sense of Christian brotherhood amongst all classes. Their debates have helped an intelligent view of current events.

The work of Toynbee Hall and Oxford House is of course more directly educational and social. Religion is not mentioned in the clubs for men and boys, except in the Sunday Bible-class. Directly spiritual, on the other hand, are the aims and objects of the various colleges and school missions which act as the nucleus of a new parish. Of these there are five in the part of London of which I am speaking—Eton, at Hackney Wick; Christ Church, Oxford, at Stepney; Marlborough School Mission, at Shoreditch; Merchant Taylors' Mission, at Hackney; and Highgate School Mission, at Dalston. Of the important and increasing help we have received from the various public school and college missions it is hardly necessary that I should remind the present audience.

Amongst other grounds for satisfaction, I should mention the development of the Church Lads' Brigade and the Seaside Camp. Both deal in a most hopeful manner with a class of youths whom it is not easy otherwise to reach.

Let me give you some individual instances of growth. Take a parish in Islington. During the five years ending with 1892, as compared with the previous five years ending with 1887, it increased its baptisms from 133 to 687; its confirmations from 72 to 299, the majority of whom were grown-up persons; its Communions from 7,000 to 15,000, and its contributions to Home and Foreign Missions from £900 to £1,100.

Take another parish in Islington. In 1889 its Communions were 607; in 1893 they were 3,398; and in three years it had 298 confirmations, far more than half of the candidates being over twenty years of age.

Again, it is important that the country should be reminded of the obligation it owes to London by being relieved of its surplus population. The number of persons residing in London

who were not born there is 1,452,348. Every county in England sends its contribution of souls—Kent, 102,000; Essex, close on 100,000; Surrey, 65,000; Suffolk, 52,000; Sussex, 47,000; and so on in varying degrees. Scotland, too, is relieved of 53,390. On the other hand, London only contributes to England and Wales some 350,000. So the net addition to London from the provinces and elsewhere is 1,100,000. We draw the conclusion that every great centre in England and Wales should feel the duty of contributing something, at any rate, to the spiritual provision for these vast hordes whom they send up to the metropolis, and who, of course, multiply themselves in their new surroundings. We are glad, indeed, to have a hundred places in the provinces helping us, but that does not in any adequate degree express the debt of the country to us for taking the overflow of its inhabitants, for whom the provinces themselves would have otherwise to provide.

Once more, a large part of the increase of London exists for the sake of those many thousands of wealthy people who have beautiful homes and estates in the provinces, and who spend the spring and summer seasons in London for the sake of Parliament and Society. These eminent people consider their interests and sympathy are chiefly due to their country properties and neighbourhood. Yet, in reality, they owe more to London. London gives them the chief impulse in their lives, and it is in London that their most important functions are performed. It is from the vast merchandise of London that they obtain the chief adjuncts for their stately and beautiful homes, and for their constant and wide hospitality. We must try and make them recognise these facts. London is sadly deficient in public spirit and local patriotism. We sigh with admiration when we hear that one single donor has given the Bishop of Manchester £50,000 for purposes kindred to those which we are advocating.

And besides these considerations, whatever affects London affects England in every corner. Nearly one-sixth of the inhabitants of England and Wales are living in London. There is hardly a family in the country but has members, connections, or friends in London. London is more than the heart and brain: it is a large part of the body too. The tone and feeling of London is echoed in every county. The songs of London spread with astonishing rapidity to every village-platform and taproom. Scepticism prevalent in London would mean a general decay of faith. We long to see a thoroughly Christian London, strong in self-respect, self-restraint, temperance, thrift, virtue, unselfishness, and all good works. The light is already dawning; the recognition of the truth is growing. We rejoice of course at every Chris-

tian effort made, whether by ourselves or not—Wesleyan, Congregationalist, Baptist, we thank them for their work in the Lord; for we wish them God-speed for His gifts of grace and the Holy Spirit. But that does not relieve us from the imperative duty of earnestly striving together for the faith. All kinds of evidence show us that the harvest is ready. We only need more labourers, and for the labourers their own proper wages and support. The Holy Spirit is waiting to bless us. Shall our feebleness and backwardness check His Divine operations?

No! we have not reached the limits of our efforts or of our resources. We will go on in faith, believing that there are yet hundreds and thousands of hearts which the Lord is ready to open for the increase of His work and the extension of His kingdom. He is but waiting for the further manifestations of our own faith, zeal, and sincerity. We will claim His promise and beseech Him with our prayers, and He who never turned a deaf ear to the cry of the poor and the humble, will shower upon us a tenfold blessing.

What I should like to urge this afternoon would be that many more of you should seek orders in London for this inspiring work of evangelizing the greatest city in the world, and giving its multitudes the hope of the life that is in Christ. If you want a curacy write to me, and I will find you what you want; the superintendence of the Bishop of London's ordinations is one of my principal duties. We need all who can come. And as Oxford is constantly sending her sons to London, both the university and the town, and as I have shown you that every county in England is pouring its superfluous population into the vast bewilderment of the Metropolis, I would ask you all to think about the Bishop of London's Fund—that is, the London Spiritual Aid Fund—and see if Oxford cannot do something to raise it to its proper proportions. An increase of 40,000 souls every year in the diocese and an income that never grows of about £22,000 or £23,000 a year, and vast arrears of work to be overtaken! You all owe a duty to your capital city. Can you not become annual subscribers to the fund? Missionary clergy, additional curates, Scripture readers, mission women, mission halls and buildings, new churches, some sort of pittance for the new clergy—these are the things that are wanted in an ever-increasing ratio. Where they are provided, the blessing and encouragement are evident. God grant that you may all take an interest in a work that is really imperial; that you may inquire how we are progressing with it; that you may help us with your sympathy and your prayers!

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Short Notices.

Nature and Spirit. By C. M. B. Elliot Stock.

Brief as it is, the book is not without suggestiveness, and is worth reading.

The Study of the Bible. By CHARLOTTE L. LAURIE. S.P.C.K.

A little book intended (the authoress tells us) to help girls who have left school or college in their study of the Bible at home. Nicely written and reverent in tone.

Popular Objections to Christianity. By the Right Rev. A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, D.D. S.P.C.K.

A book of this kind should deal with "objections" thoroughly, and go to the root of the matter, otherwise we do not think it will convince those for whom it is obviously meant. The Bishop of Stepney's words would commend themselves to those in sympathy with him, and even to those who are, if not actually Christians, at least biassed in favour of Christianity; but to those whose difficulties and doubts are deeper and of long standing, this tiny book—less than fifty pages—would hardly carry conviction. The Bishop is so thoroughly competent to deal sympathetically with the difficulties of modern unbelief (or misbelief), that we hope he will enlarge the scope of his little work, and so intensify its value a hundredfold.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation. By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, M.A. London: Methuen. In 2 vols. Price 15s.

By an unfortunate oversight these two instructive volumes have escaped notice hitherto in our pages. Unserviceable, then, as a review would be at this late date, we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of commending in the highest possible terms Mr. Ottley's most valuable contribution to the history of doctrine. The history he traces from the earliest witness of the Old Testament to the times of the Reformation, and in so doing affords a careful clue to the intricacies which beset the path of the student. Not the least striking portions of the book are (1) the Introductory matter, which deals generally with the *fact* of the Incarnation, and (2) the last section (Part x.), which discusses the actual content of the doctrine.

We have read the book throughout with the highest sense of its timely value. That it is scholarly in the best sense is only what might have been expected from a man of Mr. Ottley's calibre. We commend the book to the attention of theological students and all others to whom the history of Christian doctrine is something more than a dry concatenation of facts, but a most potent reality in the life of the world at large.

The Book of Job. By Rev. G. H. FIELDING. Elliot Stock.

This book consists of a revised text of the Book of Job, with a brief Introduction and a few notes. The translation is not a new one, nor does it bear signs of original study of the Hebrew; it is simply an eclectic text formed out of materials supplied by the Revised Version margin, the "Student's Commentary," and Davidson's edition of Job, the whole being based on the Authorized Version. It is a useful book on the whole; the notes and introductions are, so far as they go, sensible enough, but they

are too meagre to be of any real value. The lack, too, of explanatory notes, however brief, is to be regretted. Still, we think it should serve a good purpose by calling attention to the greatest literary work of antiquity.

The Month.

CANON FLEMING, the Vicar of St. Michael's, Chester Square, was recently presented with a cheque for £2,000 on the completion of twenty-five years as a Vicar. The Duke of Westminster presided, and the Princess Louise, Marchioness of Lorne, was present.

A banquet to the Archbishops and Bishops was given at the Mansion House on July 11. The Lord Mayor, in submitting the toast of the evening, paid a tribute to the clergy for their self-denying labours. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who responded, remarked that just now they were getting some rather hard names, and strange accusations were being flung at them, but seeing what kind of work they were doing, surely some allowance should be made for them if they went wrong here and there. He believed their troubles would disappear if only they were allowed time to deal with them quietly. Personally he was not very much perturbed. There was no danger that they would let the Church go or slip into wrong ways because they were not attending to their business. He and the Archbishop of York were entirely at one in every step they had taken.

The Canterbury Diocesan Conference was opened on July 11 in the Library at Lambeth Palace, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Among those supporting the chairman were the Bishop of Dover, the Dean of Canterbury, Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., and Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, M.P., and there was a large attendance of members. In his opening address Dr. Temple said : I do not on this occasion desire to say anything about what is called the crisis in the Church. I will just briefly say what I believe myself, that by quiet endeavours on the part of the authorities we may gradually get rid of the crisis. I am not, I confess, very much afraid of it. There is something very serious in it ; that I do not question ; but I am not much afraid of it. And I certainly believe that the line that the Archbishops have taken will in all probability very seriously diminish the excitement of all sorts of agitation. We shall of course have a good deal of agitation about it, because, well, I remember once—I think it must have been about thirty years ago—reading in one of the High Church papers an expression to this effect : "We don't want to condemn our opponents ; we only want that they shall cease to exist. We want them to get rid of their mischievous Low Church opinions." The other side are now saying plainly what they want is that the High Church party shall cease to exist. They have the highest respect for them, and think them very good men indeed, but they want them no longer to be inside the Church. Well, I do not agree with that at all. I do not think that will be the end of it. At the same time, I do very much want to restore peace to the Church. And as I should ask the High Church party to abandon such an idea as the turning of Low Churchmen out, or making them cease to exist in any other way, so I should now certainly ask the Low Church party to help me to make peace, and to keep the Church of England as comprehensive as it has been

for so many generations. We can live together and we can do work together, and the sooner we learn to tolerate each other the better. But for that purpose we must not irritate each other by allowing ourselves in our likes and dislikes to depart from the laws of the Church, and to make laws for ourselves without any authority from the Church in doing so. I hope I have not said anything that may rightly give offence to any one of my brothers here present.

The Rev. Prebendary Covington, Vicar of Brompton, has been appointed Vicar of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields. This is not exactly promotion as the world counts it, but it is well for cavillers at religion to be reminded that not all the clergy seek smooth things for themselves, and that many of their number are bearing heavy responsibilities upon a mere pittance. At St. Giles's, for example, which is a most arduous parish, there is, we believe, merely a small margin of income for the Rector after the necessary outgoings have been met.—*English Churchman.*

The announcement that two principal assistant secretaries are to be appointed under the new organization of the Education Department has (says the London correspondent of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*) caused serious alarm among the supporters of secondary education, seeing that the new secretaries are named for primary and technical education, and it is therefore assumed that secondary education is to be subsidiary to the technical branch. Questions are to be addressed to the Government in the Lords by the Earl of Morley, and in the Commons by Professor Jebb, both of whom will press on Ministers the necessity for appointing a principal assistant secretary for secondary education of the same status as the two already announced. Dr. Jebb will remind the House of the speeches made by the Duke of Devonshire in August, 1898, and in May this year, which conveyed the impression that there would be a department for secondary education proper, separate from that for technical education, or including the latter as a subdivision.

At the annual general meeting of the Corporation of the Church House, the president, the Archbishop of Canterbury, being in the chair, it was stated that the record of the work of the House during the past year was one of steady progress. Every room was occupied, and the necessity for the erection of the west front block was very great. The plans of the new building, which had been revised by Sir Arthur Blomfield, had received very careful attention. The plans for the Hoare Memorial Hall, which was originally designed to seat 300 people, had been enlarged, so that, with the addition of a gallery, an audience of 450 to 500 could be comfortably seated. The total cost of the new block would be £20,000, of which sum £11,000 was in hand or promised. The Council conclude their report by emphasizing the fact that the Church House is not identified with any party in the Church. The statement of accounts showed that the income for the year exceeded the expenditure by over £300.

Lord Halifax, speaking at the annual meeting of the Gloucestershire district English Church Union, said the Union had derived great benefit from the ritual agitation, which had increased their numbers in unexpected proportions. The Church must be governed according to arrangements which Christ made for its government, and not by a Parliament composed of men of all creeds.

The Bishop of Thetford, who presided at the annual meeting of the North Sea Church Mission, held at Church House, Westminster, on July 10, said that theirs was the only Church of England society working throughout the year among the trawling fleets. There were in the North Sea a number of what might be called permanent floating parishes, containing a population of over 14,000 men and boys. The North Sea Mission, by means of its two equipped vessels, aimed at providing these fishermen with a clergy of their own on their own fishing grounds. It was stated in the report that an anonymous donor had presented the mission with a new twin-screw hospital and mission ship of 146 tons, which had been dedicated and fitted up with reading and recreation rooms.

Progress is being made at last in connection with the Three Towns Extension Scheme. On June 21 the foundation stone of the first of the seven new churches was laid by the Bishop of Exeter. St. Mark's, Alexandra Road, is under the fostering care of the parishes of Charles, Emmanuel, and St. Matthias, the site being within the last named. A Plymouth Churchman is bearing the cost of the lower part of the new building, which will be used as a temporary church. The Mayor of Plymouth has given the granite and a handsome foundation-stone.

The members of the Convocations of Canterbury and York reassembled in conference on July 7, in the Great Hall of the Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York presided as joint-presidents. At the close of the meeting the Press were informed that the following was the resolution unanimously carried after the private meeting of the joint committees of the whole Houses of the Northern and Southern Convocations, held on July 6 and 7: "That this meeting of the committees of the whole Houses of the Northern and Southern Convocations, after considering the various propositions which have been discussed during its sessions, is of opinion that further consideration of these propositions is necessary before practical steps are taken in the direction of legislation; and that the Archbishops be requested, in accordance with the law and custom of Convocation, to bring the matter before their respective Convocations at their next session." It was further resolved: "That, in the interests of the Church, it is desirable that a joint meeting of the two Convocations should be held in each year." Subsequently the Convocation of Canterbury was prorogued until October 31.

The programme of the Church of Ireland Conference to be held in Dublin, October 3-5, under the presidency of the Archbishop, has now been issued. The preacher at the opening service in Christ Church Cathedral will be the Archbishop of Armagh, and at the closing service in St. Patrick's Cathedral, the Dean of Canterbury.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Goschen were present at the Speech Day at Rugby School, and the Archbishop afterwards unveiled a statue of the late Tom Hughes, the author of "Tom Brown's School Days."

The Bishop of London has had a garden-party at Fulham Palace for the London Diocesan Branch of the Church Defence Committee. He expressed the opinion that he would rather have the Church disendowed than disestablished.

The most noticeable feature of the year's work in connection with the Palestine Exploration Fund has been (according to the report presented at the annual meeting of the Royal Institution) the discovery, by means of extensive excavations, of the remains of a number of fortresses built in the sixteenth century before Christ. They were erected by King Rehoboam, who built so many cities for defence, and several of them were referred to in the Old Testament as forming a girdle of fenced cities round Jerusalem.

The *City Press* states that two massive candelabra will shortly be placed in position at the entrance to the nave of St. Paul's. One of the bronze pieces is the gift of Mr. Douglas Murray, in memory of his father, a prebendary of the Cathedral; and the other has been presented by the members of the Decoration Committee. The subject-matter has been taken from the first chapters of Genesis, the underlying motive being *Benedicite omnia opera.*

A meeting of clergy and laity was held at Norwich recently, to promote the Victoria Clergy Fund. The Bishop of Norwich said there were 910 benefices in his diocese, and the incomes of 73 of them were less than £100 per annum, while in nearly 400 cases the income was below £200. The Bishop of Lichfield said during the last thirty years the income of the clergy of the diocese of Norwich had depreciated to the extent of £135,000 per annum.

The new Bishopric for Upper Egypt will soon be firmly established, and money is coming in for endowment. The inhabitants number 10,000,000, of whom 9,000,000 are Moslems.

There is a feeling current that the English missionaries in Uganda do not work smoothly with the Government officials. This is contradicted by Archdeacon Walker, who says the missionaries fully appreciate the advantages of the British occupation.

By the time that these notes are in our readers' hands, another great Protestant demonstration—this time at Cardiff—will have taken place. Lord Wimborne is to be the chairman; he will be supported by the Earl of Portsmouth, Lord Kinnaird, Canon Fleming, and others. The demonstration is fixed for July 26.

We sympathize with Lord Wimborne in view of the unjust attacks made upon him, and the aspersions cast upon his Churchmanship, owing to the position he has seen fit to take up in connection with the Church difficulties. In the course of a letter addressed to the press, Lord Wimborne writes as follows: "As I have in the last thirty years built, restored, and enlarged in the sees of Salisbury and Llandaff about a dozen churches and rectories, beside adding to their endowments and responding to appeals of a similar nature by large sums, I think I may without vanity fairly claim to have been hitherto a loyal and liberal upholder of the Established Church and the ministers, with whom, as self-sacrificing men, not sacrificing priests, I have always felt the deepest sympathy."

The offer of a wealthy American—Mr. Pierpoint Morgan—to light the interior of St. Paul's Cathedral with electricity has been accepted, and experiments in lighting the vast building have been made. These, says the *City Press*, have proved most satisfactory, and arrangements are in progress to equip the Cathedral with a most complete installation of

electricity. It is estimated that the cost of the work will be £5,000. If, however, that sum is exceeded, the balance will be met by the donor.

A sum of more than £21,000 has been raised in two years from voluntary sources for the restoration of the Church of St. James-the-Less, Bethnal Green, and for providing the parish with suitable buildings. The plans of the vicar, the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, include the laying out of the old graveyard as a recreation-ground, and the erection of new schools, new mission buildings, men's club, etc. He also proposes very shortly to erect some model lodging-houses.

At a general meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, money and book grants amounting to £3,297 were voted. The former included £550 for the enlargement of St. Hilda's Training College, Durham, £500 for the additional endowment of the bishopric of Bloemfontein, and £508 for the building and rent of Sunday-school premises in England and Wales.

Sir John Stainer was entertained at dinner by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's at the Chapter House, on the 12th inst., in commemoration of the completion of the fiftieth year of his association with the Cathedral.

The Midland Clergy College, for graduates of Oxford and Cambridge only, will be opened for the reception of theological students in Edgbaston next October, with the Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, Vicar of St. Aubyn, Devonport, as first principal. The College will train students on the lines of Dr. Vaughan and Bishop Lightfoot, viz.: (1) A special devotion to the study of Holy Scripture; (2) a loyal adherence to the Prayer-Book, without unauthorized variations; (3) a large measure of instruction in practical work.

Princess Henry of Battenberg, on Friday, July 14, visited Kensal Rise, in order to lay the foundation-stone of a church which is to be a memorial of Dean Vaughan. Her Royal Highness performed this task on behalf of the Queen, who has taken much interest in the memorial.

The treaties have just come into force by which Japan is thrown open to all Western peoples, who will now, however, be under the general laws of the country instead of having their own Consular jurisdictions.

DONATION.—The Rev. Arthur W. Jephson, Vicar of St. John's, Walworth, has received £5,000 for the erection of a young men's institute in Walworth.

Obituary.

WE regret to have to record the death of the Bishop of Limerick, which took place on Monday, July 17, in Dublin. His Lordship had been in indifferent health for many years, and had recently been in the doctors' hands under special treatment. The venerable Prelate, who was eighty-six at the time of his death, retained his faculties to the end, his mind being singularly clear. He was more of a scientist than a theologian, as his writings indicate. As an antiquary he was well known, and leaves behind him several valuable papers on mathematics and Irish antiquities in the proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy.