

just as the pre-Tractarian view was revised. The process will result in something very different from that which Dr. Sanday seems to expect, if not to desire. Mr. Pollard's Life of King Henry VIII. is a fine and promising example of what a genuine revision will produce.

Mr. Gairdner seems to ignore the real interests which were at stake in our Reformation. He does not appear to see that our national life, our Imperial greatness, and the causes of civil and religious liberty, were all involved in the struggle of our Reformers. Dr. Sanday is "glad that they showed so much zeal," and he thinks "that we owe them a debt of gratitude." This is an advance upon the scurrilities of Hurrell Froude and Newman, but those who understand the liberties of England will resent the "faint praise" which condemns the heroes who did and suffered so much to obtain them. Dr. Sanday speaks well and truly of Hooker. It is a pity he does not realize that Hooker and the extreme Ritualists among us are incompatibles. The beliefs and practices which they specially desire are one and all condemned in the "Ecclesiastical Polity." There used to be—and there need be—no serious disagreement between the Evangelicals and the older High Churchmen. They could all accept the Anglican *Via Media*, as formulated by Hooker. The New Anglicans have, however, so far departed from our old historical and theological position that some of them are openly advocating a surrender to the Papal monarchy, and others put in the forefront of their teaching those very doctrines and practices for which Cranmer and Ridley were burnt, against which Hooker wrote so decisively, which even Laud and Andrewes opposed with all their strength.

ARTHUR GALTON.



## The Month.

THE Education Bill has aroused new interest during the past few weeks in consequence of an amendment proposed by Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, and accepted by the Government. The effect of this amendment is to place religious teaching in the Denominational Schools under the control of the managers, subject to the tenor of the trust-deeds. It is alleged by lawyers of authority such as Chancellor P. V. Smith that this amendment does but state explicitly what would in any case have been the effect of the Bill; but this does not alter the fact that such an effect was not anticipated by many of the supporters of the Bill, and that it materially alters the position of the Clergy in their schools. Hitherto, the schools have practically been under their management, subject to two restraints: One, that in many trust-deeds an appeal on disputed points in religious instruction was left to the Bishop;

the other, that the clergyman was practically obliged to consider the wishes of those to whom he looked for subscriptions. Henceforth, in every Denominational School, he will be but one of six Managers, two of whom will be appointed by the local authority, and who may very possibly be Nonconformists. The reasons alleged, moreover, for the introduction of the amendment increase its gravity. It was expressly urged that it was desirable to enable the Laity of a parish to have some control over Clergy of extreme opinions, so as to prevent their urging such opinions upon the children. There can be no question that, as a matter of fact, the amendment has been provoked by the distrust which the Ritualistic clergy have created. The Bishops have shown themselves unable to control such extravagances, and this amendment is the layman's act of self-protection. It is very significant of the feeling among members that, although Mr. Balfour left his followers free to vote as they pleased on the subject, less than fifty members voted against the amendment. The feeling in the House is, we believe, very decided on the subject; and, though there is some talk of modifications being proposed in the House of Lords, there is very little chance of the Commons giving way.

There are two considerations which it seems desirable to keep in view on the question. In parishes where the Clergyman is in harmony with the traditional teaching of the Church of England, and where his personal influence commands the usual deference, not only will no appreciable change in his position be introduced, but it will be materially strengthened. He will in such cases have the support of the best laymen in his parish, and he will have the additional advantage of their interest in the schools being guaranteed and increased by their legal responsibility for them. It is even conceivable, in some cases, that laymen of a too ecclesiastical turn may give him more support than is desirable, and that the hold of extreme views in some parishes may for a time be strengthened. In the end, however, there can be little doubt that the discussion and publicity which will be insured by the Bill in such matters, together with the appeal to the Bishop, which will still remain, will tend to promote the cause of moderation. The other consideration to be kept in view is that this amendment is a significant indication of the direction in which opinion among the Laity is tending in respect to Church affairs. They do not like to say much, and they have not said much. But the extravagances of too many among the Clergy, and the utter failure of the Bishops to exert any effective control over them, are steadily convincing them of the necessity of asserting lay control in the Church. When that conviction is put into practice, the control in question will not be of the mild ecclesiastical character which the Church Reform League dreams of. It will be something much more direct and practical; and the House of Commons will never consent to entrust it to another body, even if nominally lay in its constitution. The gentlemen of England will maintain their hold on the Church of England, and will not be greatly concerned about theories as to the constitution of our Episcopal Church, such as the Bishop of Worcester has been urging against Colonel Kenyon-Slaney's amendment. The time is at hand when the Bishops must put their house in order, or it will be put in order for them.

But a distressing incident has at the same time shown that there are still greater dangers in the Church than those with which we are threatened by the Ritualistic school. The Dean of Ripon gave an address the other day, at a meeting of the Churchmen's Union, in which he was understood by the reporters to say that belief in the Virgin birth of our Lord was at least a matter of secondary consequence; so that the article in the Creed which asserts it might be treated as on a par with that which states the descent into hell. The Dean's habitual language is so vague and general that, except for his position in the Church, a state-

ment of his views would not be of great consequence. He has not yet published the paper he read, but he has sent a very ambiguous explanation to a Leeds paper and to the *Guardian*. Mr. Bickersteth, indeed, of Lewisham, put the matter in a striking form in a letter to the *Times*, in which he mentioned the observation of a Deacon in his parish that if in his approaching examination for priest's orders he were to express such views as those of the Dean he would no doubt be rejected, and that it seemed strange that a Dean should be allowed to question doctrines which a Priest was expected to believe. But the matter has assumed greater gravity from some letters in the *Times*, signed by anonymous Presbyters, in which an explicit claim is made for freedom to the Clergy to deny our Lord's Virgin birth; and it is even alleged that there are several Bishops who would not treat such a denial as sufficient ground for refusing to admit a man to Holy Orders. Similar latitude was claimed with respect to the Resurrection; but this is a more speculative subject, on which it is difficult to be sure of the precise meaning of the terms employed. The question of the Virgin birth is, as Chancellor Lias has justly observed in a letter to the *Guardian*, a matter of fact; and nothing so alarming—we will even say so scandalous—has occurred in the Church of late, as that men should openly claim to act as ministers in the Church of England while denying a fact explicitly asserted in the Creed, and believed from the earliest times by the whole Church, without exception.

The plea of "Another Presbyter" in the *Times* that much latitude is recognised in the interpretations placed on the Articles has no weight except on the supposition that there are no Articles or beliefs of a fundamental character. It is one thing to allow a liberal interpretation of an Article which some persons think—we believe erroneously—to imply a view of the case of the heathen which was notoriously repudiated by some of the greatest of the early Fathers, and a wholly different thing to admit the express denial of a matter of fact asserted explicitly by the Gospels, the Creeds, and every Father without exception. Since Dr. Newman introduced the Jesuitical method of interpreting Church Formularies into our Church, it is no doubt possible for men to hold such a position as that of "Another Presbyter" without conscious dishonesty. But it is requisite for the reassurance of the Laity, and for the vindication of the simple honesty of the Clergy at large, that some conspicuous protest should be made against the toleration within the ministry of the Church of such license of opinion. The position of Canon Cheyne, and the silence of his Diocesan, the Bishop of Rochester, on the subject, constitute a sufficient scandal. But if the position apparently assumed by the Dean of Ripon, and explicitly assumed by "Another Presbyter," is allowed to pass without protest, the position of the Church of England as a true branch of Christ's Church will be gravely compromised; and we must expect to see many more members of our Church seeking refuge in a Communion which, like the Church of Rome, at least requires her Clergy to believe the Creeds. As to the assertions of "Another Presbyter" that several of the Bishops would admit to Holy Orders men who avow his view, we can only say that it is slanderous, and ought not to be made anonymously. The Bishops may well think that they are not called upon to condescend to take notice of such reckless accusations; but they may be assured that it would be a great comfort to many faithful sons and daughters of the English Church if they would denounce such views and allegations as they deserve. It is satisfactory that the Bishop of London should have at length resolved to prosecute one of the most extravagant of the Ritualistic clergy in his diocese; but Lord Halifax has expressed an opinion, which will be very widely shared, that it will be a great injustice if Mr. Mydleton Evans is prosecuted and deprived for offences against the law which are, at any rate, compatible with Christian belief, while

persons like Canon Cheyne, "Another Presbyter," and, perhaps, the Dean of Ripon, are allowed to deny a fundamental Article of the Christian Creed with perfect impunity.

---

## Reviews.

CANON AITKEN, from the immense experience he has had in dealing with the spiritual needs of others, and in teaching and instructing them, as well as from his own personal experiences, could not but write a telling book on the all-important subject of *The Divine Ordinance of Prayer* (Wells Gardner, Darton and Co.). His style is plain and clear, and his chapters are divided into short numbered sections, each dealing with one particular point. Thus in section 20 (p. 26) he deals in a few pungent sentences with the truth "that Prayer is a constant witness to the Divine Personality." He also deals with such difficulties as the one that in a time of war between Christian nations there is the "antagonism of Prayer against Prayer." There is also a valuable caution against too great familiarity in prayer. A sentence or two on this subject may illustrate the style of the writer. "The man Christ Jesus again and again addresses His Father as a son should, but He never once uses any such expression of endearment as might bespeak familiarity rather than intimacy. Intimacy is permitted to man even in his relations with the Most High, but familiarity is out of place. 'Righteous Father' and 'Holy Father' are the epithets which He feels to be in keeping with His reverent love; but we look in vain for the 'dear Father' or 'dear Lord' that one has so often heard at prayer-meetings, and that one is almost constrained to repeat in certain popular hymns, unless one determines to be silent while others are singing" (p. 205). Some things in this book may be put, perhaps, too strongly, others not strongly enough, but there is much in it full of help for the prayerful Christian.

*St. Paul and the Roman Law and other Studies on the Origin of the Form of Doctrine*, by W. E. Ball, LL.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902), is a disappointing book. The study which gives its name to the book is interesting so far as it goes, but it is by no means complete or exhaustive. He includes within his study of the subject the Epistle to the Hebrews and the use made in it of the word *διαθήκη*, but honestly and courageously allows that he has not yet, after reading many commentaries, been "able entirely to understand the argument" (p. 20). The other studies are interesting enough, but they do not throw much additional light on the subjects treated of. There is an interesting comparison in parallel columns of the language of the Athanasian Creed and that of Tertullian (pp. 83 *et seq.*), and we are glad to find that Dr. Ball opposes the view which is held by very many nowadays, as the necessary outcome of the doctrine of evolution, that the more spiritual forms of religion have been evolved from fetishism, or some such degraded form, as human intelligence has advanced. "Investigation," he says, "invariably proves that their multiplied divinities (*i.e.*, those of Oriental religions), elaborate ceremonial, and degrading superstitions are morbid growths and excrescences upon an elder faith in a single supreme being" (p. 110).

Perhaps one of the greatest points of interest in Canon C. H. Robinson's *Human Nature, a Revelation of the Divine* (Longman, Green and