

points—(1) that the two verses are by the same pen, and (2) that the land of Goshen *was* the land of Rameses ?¹

J. J. LIAS.

ART. II.—THE CEREMONY OF CONFIRMATION, AND
THE LINK BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

THE earlier comments upon the Confirmation of Dr. Gore, and the proceedings which arose out of it, showed that the majority of English Church-people, including a large proportion of those who write in the press (religious as well as secular) knew very little about the history of the ceremony and its constitutional significance. Most people seem to have thought that it has always been a ceremony which in some way protected the rights of the Church as against the State, and was, therefore, a very precious relic, which ought to be preserved in all its reality. That is a view which was advanced in the Hampden case, but could not then be established.

Let it be remembered that the Popes long fought for the right of being the person to confirm the election of a Prelate. When the Pope got that power into his own hands, was it a triumph for the English Church or a victory for a foreign potentate? As a matter of fact, it was the victory of a foreign potentate over the English Crown and the English Church. When, at the Reformation, Henry VIII. recovered for himself the power which the Pope had held, was that a victory for the English Church or for the English Crown? There is a sense in which it was a victory for the Church, but in a more definite way it was a victory for the Crown. The relation between Church and State then returned to that which it had been the steadfast aim of the Papacy to overthrow.² By

¹ Hommel, "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 230, note, takes this view. So also Sayce, "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," pp. 227, 239. Wellhausen separates between the "best of the land" and "the land of Goshen," because Pharaoh would have acted foolishly in giving them the best of the land if they only wanted pasture for their cattle!

² The circumstances are thus stated in the judgment of the Lord Chief Justice: "From about the year 1316 down to the passing of the statute in 1533, a period of over two hundred years, an entirely different state of things seems to have prevailed. At one time the Popes were insisting upon the right not only to confirm, but to select; at another the Crown was resisting the Papal claims. Sometimes the struggle would appear to have been between the Pope on the one side and the Metropolitan or the electing corporation, be it dean and chapter, or abbot and convent, on the other. Confirmations at times took place at Rome, at times in England under Bulls from the Pope, and during the last fifty years immediately preceding the statute some authorities state that the King

so much the Church gained; but there was to be no mistake about the reality of the power which had supplanted that of the Pope. A Dean and Chapter might refuse to elect the nominee of the Crown for a vacant see. But if they did, what then? For their contumacy they might come under the penalties of *Præmunire*. Boyd, Dean of Exeter, was, at the time of the excitement over Dr. Temple's appointment to that see in 1869, urged by a great Evangelical leader of the day to be valiant, to oppose Dr. Temple's election, and rather to suffer the spoiling of his goods than have part in the choice of a Bishop who had contributed to *Essays and Reviews*. If he had, what then? The Dean and Chapter might have suffered, but nobody else would. They would have made their protest and cleared their consciences, but they would have effected nothing. For under King Henry there was no intention to suffer obstruction in this way. If the Dean and Chapter failed to elect, then the King could go on to appoint his man by letters patent. In like manner any failure by the Archbishop to confirm and consecrate also lays him open to the penalties of *Præmunire*. In both cases it seems that the obstructing Chapter and the obstructing Primate are to be treated as though they were opposing the King's Majesty in the interests of the Church of Rome.

In conformity with this it will be observed that new sees formed since the break with Rome are appointed to by letters patent. There is no election and no confirmation. So, then, if Dr. Gore had been sent to the See of Manchester, or Ripon, or Truro, or Liverpool, instead of to Worcester, there would have been no trouble. The King would have used his power in a constitutional way, and the Church would have had to make the best of the situation.

In fact, the trouble connected with the appointments of Dr. Hampden, Dr. Temple, and Dr. Gore have been useful at least in this—that they have forced upon thoughtful minds one of the disabilities attaching to the link between Church and State. The Church does not appoint its own chief ministers. The very persons whose influence is most powerful in the Church, who can do most to mould the views of the clergy, and through them of the laity also, are selected by laymen who may or may not be members of the Church, and are appointed by the King.

had successfully defended his claim to nominate independently of any interference by the Pope (see Green's 'History of the English People' and Stubbs's 'Constitutional History'). In my opinion, during the period of more than two hundred years prior to 1533, there was no recognised practice at all, but it is sufficient to say that there is no evidence of any such normal practice as that which was contended for by the counsel who supported the rule."

Here let it be at once admitted that the attitude of Bishops is not final and decisive as to the movements within the Church. The Evangelical Movement came into being without their sympathy, and flourished in the face of their opposition. The Oxford Movement was able quite early to find Episcopal encouragement, and that from very strong men. But it was long before its principles could claim to have the sympathy or open toleration of a majority amongst the Prelates. Nevertheless, it thrived, just as the tendency to grow more and more Roman in doctrinal teaching and in the adaptation of foreign ritual develops year by year, in spite of the fact that only a very small minority of the Episcopal Bench appear to like either the one or the other.

But with all allowance for this, it would be absurd to question the greatness of a Bishop's power in influencing the type of clergy in his diocese. An interesting illustration of this may be found in the changes which are understood to have come over the Diocese of York since the rule of Archbishop Thomson was exchanged (after the brief and unimportant interlude of Dr. Magee) for that of Archbishop Maclagan. It is but natural that an Archbishop or a Bishop should feel the ordinary influence of human nature, and should cherish the conviction that men who hold his own views are after all the best persons, as a rule, to be entrusted with the work of parishes, and to receive those interesting little distinctions which it is in the power of a Bishop to distribute.

Now, it is easy to see that the difficulties which arose in the cases of Professor Hampden, Dr. Temple, and Canon Gore represent a type of case which might happen in a much more exaggerated form. Let us suppose, however much the suggestion may be displeasing to some minds, that Mr. Chamberlain became Prime Minister. Mr. Chamberlain is understood to be a Unitarian. Or let us imagine that, as a result of a great Radical reaction, Mr. Morley was entrusted by the King with the duty of forming a Ministry. Mr. Morley is understood to be an Agnostic.¹ Both, we may be sure, would exercise their

¹ It may not be unprofitable to observe that the mind of the Liberation Society seems to be powerfully influenced by possibilities of this kind. The following passages occur in a leading article in its monthly organ, the *Liberator*, for February: "The nomination by the Crown is a farce, the real Bishop-maker being the head of the dominant political party, who may be a Catholic, or a Unitarian, or an Agnostic. . . . The control of the State is not the control of the nation or of its representatives, but the control of a Minister of the Crown whose position depends upon almost anything but ecclesiastical considerations. The patronage of the State is at the arbitrary disposal of a man who may be the wisest of statesmen and yet utterly unfit by natural disposition, or moral conduct,

ecclesiastical functions in the most conscientious way, but how strange, how galling in some of its aspects would be the situation thus created! But it is even possible that under circumstances less extreme than those grave difficulties might very well arise. What, for example, would happen if a Prime Minister recommended and a King appointed (by letters patent) to one of the modern sees one of the distinguished clergy (I refrain from suggesting names) whose published opinions in regard to the Bible seem absolutely incompatible with the formularies of the English Church? Is it not probable that the feeling of a Premier, whose own attitude towards faith was not, to put it delicately, that of the English Church or of orthodox Christianity, would run in the direction of appointments such as these? It may be urged, and urged reasonably, that there is the force of public opinion to be counted with. That is so, and no doubt this fact has availed hitherto to restrain, in some measure, the personal predilections of Prime Ministers. But it has to be borne in mind that the opinion of the Church is not absolutely united; that the opinion of the Church is not by a very long way co-extensive with the opinion of the nation; and that in the event of a Radical reaction any endeavour of the Church to set itself in opposition to the constitutional powers of the Crown would be certain to produce an anti-clerical feeling, such as already exists in some Continental nations. One thing at least we may take for granted, and that is that any such opposition would be seized upon by the Liberationist party of the time, and would give them in the country the very impetus their cause would need in order to bring about the separation of Church and State.

There is, then, a possibility that the choice of the Bishop by the Crown might under circumstances not at all difficult to imagine precipitate a conflict between Church and State. Such a conflict could have but one end—the victory of the State, and the separation of the Church under such conditions and at such cost to the Church as the victorious element in the electorate might determine. That is a possibility which ought to be kept in mind. It may be that the political conditions of the present render such possibilities remote, and suggest that speculation on such topics must be profitless; but the Church is not for to-day or to-morrow only, and the political conditions prevailing just now ought not to settle our conduct as to the future.

or religious belief, to exercise such an influence on the Church. It is only an accident that Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury were strong Churchmen. The staunchest believers in apostolical succession would shudder at the idea of Nero appointing a successor to St. Peter, but at some not distant day England may be ruled by a statesman as alienated from Christianity as a pagan Roman Emperor" (pp. 25, 26).

Something, surely, should be done. But here it will doubtless be alleged that the choice of Bishops by the Crown has upon the whole worked very well. This is true so far as in the last century the avoidance of scandal or grave distress to the Church is concerned, so far as it applies to a general average of high capacity and personal fitness amongst the clergy selected for the office, and so far as the details merely of ecclesiastical government in the dioceses are concerned. There has been in the past no lack of Bishops who neglected their diocesan responsibilities—Bishops who were worldly rather than spiritual, Bishops of a type which we never see now. But their choice may fairly be ascribed to the character of the times. It is not so certain that if the Prelates of those periods had been chosen by the clergy alone, or by representative bodies of clergy and laity acting together, the results would have been very different.

In the last century we have seen the choice of Bishops reflect the personal feelings of the Prime Minister or of his advisers in ecclesiastical affairs, but we have seen no clergy chosen of whom it could be said that lack of personal piety, of zeal for their work, or of distinction of one sort or another, disqualified them quite obviously for their high office. It is a more or less familiar fact that Premiers take advice as to the exercise of their patronage, that Archbishops have repeatedly been asked to provide lists of men suitable for the Episcopate, and that the choice of men for submission to the Sovereign is a matter of grave anxiety to the Sovereign's advisers.

But whilst admitting all this, it would nevertheless seem that the Church is in some danger of finding itself on the verge of conflict with the State in this matter, and that in the eyes of a considerable part of the nation it does really suffer from the complete subordination in this particular to an authority which is practically external. The answer, however, to all complaint is that this is one of the disabilities attending the union of Church and State, that it is part of the price which the Church must be prepared to pay for certain privileges which are presumed to be of value to it.

Now, are Churchmen bound to acquiesce in this view? Must we agree that the appointment of Bishops by representative Church bodies is a change which can only be brought about by Disestablishment? It is convenient for the opponents of the link between Church and State to put it in that way, and perhaps even to see without regret this disability made as galling as possible to Churchmen. But we need not accept that view. The movement towards autonomy is a distinct assertion of the belief that the Church can remain the National Church, and yet as a Church be left (within well-

defined limits) to manage its own affairs. It would be no unfair or unreasonable extension of the claims so far advanced. There are some who regard those claims as already impossible of attainment, and would deem any enlargement of them only as an increase of folly. But attempts at progress have always had to pass through this stage. No reform in Church or State has yet been won which was not at first received in this way; nor was any great reform ever reached which did not boldly advance its real demands, and not try to creep towards the attainment of its ends. Let us be frank, and say that the control of the Church's affairs by the Church implies the choice of the Bishops by the Church. Concession of this would imply a break with the past, and yet also a return to the past. But if Parliament can be brought to allow any measure of autonomy worth possessing, we are entitled to believe that it would allow this also.

STAMFORD McNEILE.

ART. III.—ON THE COURSE OF PROTESTANT
THEOLOGY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

II.

LET us proceed to consider the manner in which the cardinal principles of the Reformed Theology, indicated in the previous article, affected in the course of their development the general system and the ordinances of the Church. Of course, they had at once the momentous effect of removing any sense of necessary dependence on the Hierarchy for the highest of all spiritual blessings—that of peace with God, and for eternal salvation. If peace with God was recognised as open for Christ's sake to everyone who would seek it and accept it by faith, it followed that no one was dependent for his salvation upon Pope, Bishop, or Priest. It was the removing of this apprehension from the popular mind, by means of the primary principle of the Reformation, which rendered it possible to effect reforms opposed by the Hierarchy. If, in any sense, the Pope, with the clergy under his jurisdiction, held the keys of Heaven, then, although they might be resisted, yet, in the last resort, it was impracticable to disobey them; and it was this apprehension which lay, like a paralysis, upon the nations of Europe for some centuries. Episcopal and priestly organization might be indispensable to the best welfare of the Church; and Melancthon, in his signature to the Smalcaldic Articles, expressed his willingness even to recognise the Primacy of the Pope, as a matter of human