

upon the people. "The Church which is to save the people . . . will be not only *for* the people, but *of* the people." "The great spiritual leaders have always been those who made great demands upon their followers; who knew that they could not give except to those who were strenuously exerting themselves to partake; and who knew that the less you ask of human nature, the deeper it falls into apathy and indifference."

These words may be said to contain the moral of the book, the conclusion of the matter. The book is certainly one to be studied by all who desire to help those who seem to stand in need of help. We may not agree with all the writer's assertions. Some will doubtless think she has formed too high an estimate of the strength of the people if only they could be aroused to put forth that strength wisely and in the right direction. These may regard her faith in the possibilities of human nature as too great. But the men and women of faith have history on their side; more than one nation which has seemed "nigh unto destruction" has ere now, by wise guidance, risen to a new life of prosperity and usefulness.

Of all men, it behoves the Christian—one who believes in the possibility of "man's remake in Christ"—not to despair; and I believe that those who have faith in this, rather than in merely material alleviations of human needs, will find that the writer of this admirable book is on their side.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

ART. VII.—THE MONTH.

THE past month has been marked by events of unusual importance and significance in the affairs of the Church. On March 13 the Church Discipline Bill, promoted by Mr. MacIver and Mr. Austin Taylor, together with a Bill of a very different character, but with a similar purpose, introduced by Mr. Cripps, came on for second reading in the House of Commons, and, in anticipation of the debate, a remarkable movement was set on foot in the House of Commons. A deputation of more than a hundred Members of Parliament, headed by Sir John Dorington, waited on the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to put before them, in Sir John's words, "what they believed to be the views held by their constituents as to the present condition of affairs in the Church of England." "They had been brought together," he said, "in consequence of the feeling of alarm at the position into which the Church had got in the estimation of a very

large number of people in the Church of England. He intentionally used the word 'alarm.' A feeling of suspicion and mistrust had disclosed itself, and he thought that that feeling ought to be taken immediate notice of by the rulers of the Church." Among other speakers in the deputation, Sir Francis Powell, an old and tried friend of the Church, who subsequently voted as one of the tellers against Mr. Austin Taylor's Bill, said that "what they objected to was not old practices, but new practices and new developments, which had caused the greatest sorrow amongst the laity, and, in some cases, indignation as well as sorrow." He said "it must be admitted on all hands that, if the evils were allowed to continue, the arguments in favour of the Church of England as an establishment would become most grievously weak. In fact, he believed that in a locality where the mischief abounded it was difficult to prove to the people that the Church of England was a National Church which had a claim upon their allegiance and their support."

These are very grave representations to be made to the rulers of the Church by so large a body of its staunchest supporters in the House of Commons, by old High Churchmen no less than by moderate Low Churchmen. It was evidently the indication of a feeling that the patience of the Laity of all schools of thought was well-nigh exhausted, and that, unless the Archbishops could give some assurance that the recent tendency of thought and practice among the Clergy would be checked, it would be impossible to restrain the House of Commons from adopting some such strenuous measures as were proposed in Mr. MacIver's Bill. The long and elaborate reply of the Archbishop showed that he appreciated the gravity of the occasion, and its ability has been generally recognised. But we wish we could feel sure that he had adequately recognised the cardinal points of the situation, and that his assurances would suffice to afford the guarantees which the public desire. His speech was in the main a skilful defence of the action of the Bishops in dealing with the illegal practices of the extreme High Church clergy. He urged that the action of the Bishops during the last five years had had a considerable effect in "sweeping away" a number of unauthorized services, and he frankly admitted that in certain cases of flagrant illegality still subsisting no further tolerance was possible. With respect to such cases, of which he quoted as illustrations St. Michael's, Shoreditch, and some churches at Plymouth and Devonport, he declared: "I say to you deliberately to-day that, in my view of such cases, tolerance has reached and even passed its limits. The sands have run out. Stern and drastic action is in my judgment quite

essential." So far all is satisfactory in his declarations. But when he occupied a large portion of his speech in elaborate explanation of the reasons why the Bishops had not taken strong action sooner against such illegalities, when he pleaded the discredit into which the policy of prosecution had fallen—even in the quarters represented by the *Record* newspaper—and when he appealed to the example and authority of Archbishop Temple, all that he can be regarded as establishing is that the failure of the Bishops to enforce the law, and to maintain a sounder spirit among the Clergy, is due to motives which may fairly be regarded with much consideration and indulgence. His description of their attitude is but too candid and just: "Bishops are quite as fallible, perhaps at times as timorous, as other public men. They are often wanting, like other men, in courage to face a difficulty or in wisdom to avert it. I claim for them no immunity from criticism as to failure or deficiencies on their part. But this I do say without hesitation or reserve: the picture which represents them as having apathetically or obstinately, and in face of public opinion, abstained from acting themselves and refused to let others act is as inaccurate in fact as it is unfair in argument." Few, we think, will hesitate to admit the justice of this modest apology. But the practical question is not one of the moral blame to be attached to the Bishops; it is the question of the practical results of their action in the past, and of the prospect of their more effective action in the future. Many an army has been sacrificed and many a State ruined by persons of the most unimpeachable moral virtue, whose intentions were admirable at every stage of the career which ended in disaster. The deputation was itself a glaring proof that the present result of all the mild virtues which the Archbishop claimed for his colleagues is that, as Sir Francis Powell said, "he doubted whether the utterances of the Laity had been sufficiently vigorous to convey to the minds of the right reverend Bench their deep and profound sense of the evils and the mischief which now afflicted the Church of England." What is the use of a course of proceeding, however excusable and respectable, which has led to this result? And what security for the future does it afford to be simply assured that this policy will be supplemented by "stern and drastic action" in the case of a few men "defiant of episcopal authority, and really reckless of the true Church of England spirit"? Will that be sufficient to stop a drift and a tendency which has been allowed to get to such a height as to create what Sir John Dorington called "a feeling of alarm at the position into which the Church had got in the estimation of a very large number of people throughout England"?

We hope and believe that it is in the Archbishop's mind to exert other influences of a more powerful and active character; but it is, we think, to be regretted that he did not avail himself of the occasion to appeal, with all the force of his position, to that central body of opinion and feeling among the Clergy and Laity to which alone it is possible to look for a reassertion of the true position of the Church of England, and to call upon them to discountenance, by every means in their power, not mere flagrant illegalities, but that spirit of alienation from the principles of the Reformation, and of the Anglican Church of the two or three centuries after the Reformation, to which the distrust now prevalent in the public is mainly due. The reason of the failure of the Bishops does not lie in their reluctance to resort to prosecutions, but in their not having used their great authority, personal and official, to discountenance the un-Anglican, if not Romanizing tendencies, which have prevailed so long among the Clergy. If the face of the Bishops had been steadily set against the tendencies which, in their extreme form, are represented by the lawless churches of Plymouth and Devonport, those extreme practices would never have been reached; or, if they had, the sense that the Bishops as a body were resolutely opposed to them would have prevented the distrust of the laity from reaching such a height. The only hope of salvation for the Church at this juncture lies in the possibility of rallying once more the old Church of England spirit, High as well as Low, against tendencies which are radically inconsistent with the whole historic position of the Church, and which tend inevitably, whether with deliberate purpose or not, to assimilate its position to that of the Church of Rome. The moment has arrived when resolute action by the Bench of Bishops is imperative if dangers of the greatest gravity are to be averted. Notwithstanding the Archbishop's apologies, the second reading of Mr. Austin Taylor's Bill was carried by a majority of fifty-one, although Mr. Balfour, in a speech of great consideration for the position of the Bishops, threw his personal opposition against it. At the same time, two elections, both in constituencies whose former members were Conservatives, have resulted in overwhelming votes for the Liberal candidates; and there can be no question that the opposition to the Education Bill has had a great part in these results, and that that opposition is in great measure due to profound distrust of the Church. The Bishops have allowed a feeling to become widespread among the constituencies that the sympathies of the Clergy are in the direction of Roman doctrine and practice. Unless that distrust of the Church can be checked, the consequence plainly stated by Sir Francis

Powell is inevitable, that "the arguments in favour of the Church of England as an Establishment would become most grievously weak." The Archbishop of Canterbury has now a great opportunity for checking this feeling, but there is reason to fear it is the last opportunity which any one in his position will have. If a General Election comes upon us while the present distrust is prevalent, the consequences to the Church are likely to be disastrous. But that distrust cannot be checked by apologies, however skilful, for the past or present inaction of the Bishops. It can be reversed only by a plain manifestation of "stern" opposition on the part of the rulers of the Church to all un-Anglican and anti-Protestant tendencies, by an encouragement, on the part of the State as well as the Church, of the men and the influences that represent true English Churchmanship, and by a revival of the great principles of the Early Church and the Reformation. The Church of England owes its present position to the fact that the nation recognised in it, in former days, the best bulwark of those principles. Let it recover its character in that respect, and the nation will still prize and support it. But let that character be a little further damaged than it is at present, and the nation will seek its religious sustenance elsewhere.

Notices of Books.

Clement of Alexandria: Stromateis, Book VII. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Indices. By the late F. J. A. HORT, D.D., and J. B. MAYOR, M.A., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin. London: Macmillan, 1902. Price 15s.

WITHIN the past few years there has been a growing tendency towards bringing the less-known writers of antiquity within the purview of students. This tendency has not been confined to classical antiquity, though it is there that it has been most pronounced. Such publications as the Oxford "Studia Biblica" and the Cambridge "Texts and Studies" have done much to familiarize students with some of the theological writings of the early days of Christianity; while such first-rate works as Bishop Wordsworth's (still unfinished) edition of the Vulgate and the Cambridge LXX. (edited by Dr. Swete) have rendered signal service in similar directions. It may seem, perhaps, strange to speak of "familiarizing" students with the Vulgate and the LXX., yet the word is correctly employed, for the serious student of either of these celebrated versions had been *rara avis* till Tischendorf, Swete, Nestle, and Lagarde began to work upon the existing text for the purpose of critical recon-