

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

---

---

# MUDIE'S LIBRARY

**TOWN SUBSCRIPTIONS:**

From ONE GUINEA per annum.

LONDON BOOK SOCIETY (for weekly exchange of Books at the houses of Subscribers) from TWO GUINEAS per annum.

**COUNTRY SUBSCRIPTIONS:**

From TWO GUINEAS per annum.

N.B.—Two or Three friends may UNITE IN ONE SUBSCRIPTION, and thus lessen the Cost of Carriage.

**TOWN & VILLAGE CLUBS SUPPLIED ON LIBERAL TERMS.**

Prospectuses and Monthly Lists of Books gratis and post free.

---

---

## SALE DEPARTMENT.

A Special List of Books carefully selected for

### SUNDAY SCHOOL PRIZES, VILLAGE CLUBS, and similar purposes.

These Books are very strongly bound for constant wear, and sufficiently ornamental to be useful as gifts. All complete in One Volume.

ALSO A

### CLASSIFIED LIST OF WORKS BY STANDARD AND MODERN AUTHORS.

The Best Leather Bindings, suitable for School Prizes, Club and College Libraries, Wedding and Birthday Gifts.

THE OXFORD TEACHERS' BIBLES,

THE OXFORD REFERENCE BIBLES.

NELSON'S TEACHERS' BIBLES, with

WRIGHT'S BIBLE TREASURY AND CONCORDANCE,

Also OXFORD PRAYER AND HYMN BOOKS,

Are now kept in stock in various sizes and bindings.

**ALL LISTS SENT GRATIS AND POST FREE.**

**MUDIE'S LIBRARY, Limited,**  
**30-34, NEW OXFORD STREET,**

241, BROMPTON RD., S.W., & 48, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., E.C., LONDON.  
AND AT BARTON ARCADE, MANCHESTER.

# A NATIONAL MEMORY.

King Edward the Seventh and Queen Alexandra,  
when Prince and Princess of Wales, graciously accepted "The Queen's Resolve"  
"with much pleasure."

Two Hundred and Seventy-fifth Thousand. Cloth, Thick Bevelled Boards. 1s. 6d.

## "THE QUEEN'S RESOLVE," AND HER DOUBLY ROYAL REIGN.

By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.,  
Editor of "Home Words," "The Fireside," etc.

CONTAINING

## Leading Incidents in the Life of Queen Victoria And nearly Fifty Portraits and Illustrations.

This Edition also contains Three New Chapters, with Eight Special  
Photographic Engravings of the Diamond Jubilee.

The Record says: "We wish for 'The Queen's Resolve' the widest possible circulation. It will do good wherever it goes, and it will remain for many years yet to come a bright and happy life-story of England's noblest and best Queen."

The Guardian speaks of it as "that extremely popular life of Her Majesty."

The Schoolmaster says: "'The Queen's Resolve' is well written, tastefully bound, and charmingly illustrated."

### TO THE CLERGY AND OTHERS.

#### "The Sunday-School Gift for Every Scholar."

The Church of England Sunday-School Teachers' Magazine says: "No scholar should be without a copy of 'The Queen's Resolve.'"

\* \* \* "The Queen's Resolve" will be supplied from the Publishing Office to the Clergy, School Superintendents and Teachers, in quantities of **25 for 10d. each**, or **100 for 9d. each**. Every effort will be made to produce the large editions needed, but orders should be given *at once* to ensure supply to Mr. CHARLES MURRAY, Home Words Office, 11, Ludgate Square, Ludgate Hill, E.C. A specimen copy will be sent on receipt of 1s.

**NEW EDITION, with Special Illustrations and added Chapter on  
"THE PASSING OF THE QUEEN," now ready.**

By the same Author.

350th Thousand. In Coloured Paper Cover. **One Penny.** With Illustrations.

## THE EARLY DAYS OF QUEEN VICTORIA: A Memory of Her "Doubly Royal" Reign.

\* \* \* Supplied in quantities to the Clergy and others, direct from the publishing Office, for **6s. per 100**, or **500 for 25s.**

"I see I am nearer the throne than I thought. Now, many a child would boast, but they don't know the difficulty. There is much splendour, but there is more responsibility." And the Princess gave me her hand, saying, 'I will be good.'—Baroness Lehzen, the Queen's Governess.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

## ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

In small crown 8vo., cloth cover, price 2s. 6d.

**THE TEMPTATIONS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.** Seven Sermons by the Rev. L. R. RAWNSLEY, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias', Bethnal Green.

In small crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

**THE SIXFOLD TRIAL OF OUR LORD, AND THE PRAYERS OF CHRIST.** Two Courses of Lent Lectures. By the late Rev. G. E. BROADE, M.A., of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, for many years Chaplain of St. Andrew's Church, Biarritz.

"The addresses, though brief, are well and vigorously written, and reverent in their treatment."—*Church Review*.

"The tone maintained throughout these Lent lectures is earnest and spiritual. Those who desire clearer insight into the character of true prayer will be well repaid for a perusal of these pages."—*The News*.

**FOURTH EDITION. SERMONS BY CANON WILBERFORCE.**

In crown 8vo., handsomely printed and bound in cloth, gilt lettered, price 5s.

**SERMONS PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.** By BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D., Canon of Westminster, Chaplain to the Speaker, Select Preacher before the University of Oxford.

"Thoughtful and carefully reasoned sermons, written in the spirit of what the author terms the 'Theological-forwards school of thought of our day.' There is a very great deal deserving of careful study."—*Church Family Newspaper*.

**New Volumes of Verse.**

In foolscap 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.

**FIRESIDE POEMS.** By the Rev. STRATTON, M.A. (Oxon).

In foolscap 4to., bound in cloth, price 5s.

**EYES IN SOLITUDE.** By Rev. W. MOORE, Author of "Nocturnes and other Poems," "Lost Chords," etc.

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

**The Paper for Educated Women.**

# The Churchwoman.

**AN ILLUSTRATED DEVOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL REVIEW.**

WEEKLY, 1d. (post free, 1½d.). Annual Subscription, 6s. 6d.

**WEEKLY CONTENTS.**

**DEVOTIONAL PAGE AND KALENDAR.** By Miss G. M. IRELAND BLACKBURNE.

**CHELSEA CHINA CUPBOARD.** From the MONTHLY PACKET.

**CHARITY PAGE.**

**CHURCH NEWS of the WEEK. ILLUSTRATED ACCOUNTS of GOOD WORKS  
FULL REPORTS of CHURCH MEETINGS. TYPICAL ENGLISH CHURCHES.  
BRIGHT NOTES ON CURRENT SUBJECTS. REVIEWS of NEW BOOKS.**

In the Issue of February 1st there commences a series of articles entitled

**"REASONS WHY,"**

specialy dealing with the reasons why I am a Catholic and not a Roman Catholic, by  
**CHARLOTTE M. YONGE.**

Book Numbers and Specimen Copies can be had upon application.

Offices: 2, EXETER STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

NEW WORK BY THE LATE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and bound, price 5s.

# Counsels for Churchpeople.

FROM THE WRITINGS OF

The Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D.,

THE LATE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

**UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.**

Tastefully printed and bound. Price 5s., post free.

## THE LIFE OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE :

*A Book of Devotional Thoughts.*

From the Writings of F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"An exceedingly valuable work, full of the choicest gems, brilliant and penetrating. Many a dull hour can be made bright and cheerful by studying the thoughts of the venerable Dean, as depicted in the pages of 'The Life of Christian Service.'"—*Family Churchman*.

"Devotional readers will find very little to dissent from in these pages. They will certainly find much from which to profit, and, it is needless to say, many brilliant passages of great eloquence and power."—*News*.

Tastefully printed and bound, gilt top. 5s.

## HELPS TO FAITH AND PRACTICE :

*A Book of Devotional Readings.*

From the Writings of HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"It will greatly please the admirers of the orator and preacher, and gratify his friends as a remembrance of his deeds of kindness."—*Churchwoman*.

"There is not a page which does not contain a helpful thought or an inspiring message."—*Quiver*.

"A very charming book of devotional readings."—*Bristol Mercury*.

"A volume of reflections which will certainly prove helpful to many an earnest-minded person."—*Church Gazette*.

"We can recommend the book to those who have but little time for devotional reading."—*Church Review*.

"The book will prove very useful for short Lenten readings."—*Pilot*.

SECOND EDITION.—In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and handsomely bound, price 5s.

## HELPS TO GODLY LIVING :

*A Book of Devotional Thoughts.*

From the Writings of the Right Honourable and Most Reverend FREDERICK TEMPLE, D.D., LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Selected and arranged, with His Grace's permission, by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"We shall be surprised if this quiet little book does not do a solid amount of good on these lines. Churchmen will receive it with a cordial welcome."—*Guardian*.

"The book is a distinct aid to devotional literature, the presence of an index contributing also to its value."—*Family Churchman*.

"A good and suitable aid to meditation."—*Church Family Newspaper*.

"The work is likely to prove a helpful addition to devotional literature."—*Aberdeen Journal*.

"It is a beautiful book. The best possible souvenir of Archbishop Temple."—*Expository Times*.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

# "FRAME-FOOD" TWINS

Fed on "Frame-Food" from Six Weeks old.



## What their Mother says:

Mrs. OUTRAM, 2, Plains Road, Mapperley, Nottingham, writes, Oct. 29th, 1899:

"I enclose photo of our twin girls, they have been brought up on 'Frame-Food' since they were six weeks old. Before then I had tried them with another food, and with milk and water, but they were never satisfied. After trying 'Frame-Food,' I had no trouble with my babies. My husband often says that we owe a great deal to it, for when Cissie was born neither the doctor nor anyone else thought she would live, but since giving her 'Frame-Food' she has come on wonderfully, and now is the heavier of the two. We have never lost a night's rest since we started with 'Frame-Food.'"

### FREE TEST.

½-lb. Sample Tin of "FRAME-FOOD," or 5-oz. Sample Jar of "FRAME-FOOD" JELLY, sent free on receipt of 3d. to pay postage; both samples sent for 4d. postage. *Mention this paper.*

"FRAME-FOOD" is sold in tins, containing **16 OZ. FOR 1s.** Compare with price of other Foods.

Frame-Food Co., Ltd., Battersea, London, S.W.

**THE CHEAPEST AND MOST EFFICIENT COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE  
EVER OFFERED TO THE PUBLIC.**

The Publisher of the "Biblical Museum" has much pleasure in announcing that this most valuable Commentary has now been issued at the extraordinary low price of

**ONE SHILLING PER VOLUME NET.**

Hitherto it has been published at 3s. 6d. and 5s. per volume, and in these forms has had a world-wide sale among Clergymen, Lay Readers, Teachers, and Bible Students generally. It is believed that the present great reduction in price will place the vast stores of information contained in its pages within the reach of thousands who will be glad to avail themselves of the liberal arrangements now made.

# THE BIBLICAL MUSEUM:

**A Complete Commentary on the Holy Scriptures.**

**CONSISTING OF CRITICAL, HOMILETIC, AND ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES ON AN ORIGINAL PLAN**

The "Biblical Museum" is generally admitted to be the most efficient and useful Commentary on the Bible. **It is now certainly the cheapest.**

**I**T is a complete Commentary on the Bible, as it supplies all the different kinds of help needed in the study of Holy Scripture. It places in the hands of the reader the results of modern scholarship in exposition of the Bible in a readable and popular shape, the most appropriate illustrative matter in a condensed form, and the most useful instructions for arranging each text for teaching. The volumes consist of

### NEW TESTAMENT SECTION.

VOL. I.—GOSPELS ACCORDING TO MATTHEW AND MARK.

" II.—GOSPELS ACCORDING TO LUKE AND JOHN.

VOL. III.—ACTS AND ROMANS.

" IV.—I CORINTHIANS TO PHILEMON.

" V.—HEBREWS TO REVELATION, AND INDEX.

### OLD TESTAMENT SECTION.

VOL. I.—GENESIS AND EXODUS.

" II.—LEVITICUS TO DEUTERONOMY.

" III.—JOSHUA TO SAMUEL II.

" IV.—KINGS AND CHRONICLES.

" V.—EZRA TO JOB.

VOL. VI.—PSALMS.

" VII.—PROVERBS TO SONG OF SOLOMON.

" VIII.—ISAIAH.

" IX.—JEREMIAH TO EZEKIEL.

" X.—MINOR PROPHETS, AND INDEX.

The remarkable success which has attended the issue of the **CHEAP EDITION** of the "Biblical Museum" has induced the Publisher to follow it by the publication, in the same form, of

# The CLASS and the DESK.

*A most valuable work by the same author, which has had an enormous sale among Teachers and Ministers at a much higher price.*

**The Class and the Desk** is a manual of help for teachers and ministers in preparing lessons from the Scriptures, giving, in a condensed and accessible form, most efficient assistance in the exposition of the Word of God in the form of explanation, illustration, metaphor, suggestion, moral lessons, and side-lights of various kinds. The work goes through the whole Bible in the order of the sacred books, taking the chief passages of Scripture and arranging them in the form of Lessons and Addresses.

The amount of useful material packed into one of these Lessons or Addresses is very remarkable, and can only be realized by using the work in preparation for preaching or teaching.

The work is published in four handy volumes, and in this complete form yields a perfect storehouse of helpful material for the teacher and minister.

The four volumes of **The Class and the Desk** were formerly published at 3s. each. They are now to be obtained at

**ONE SHILLING Each net.**

The four Volumes consist of

GOSPELS AND ACTS.  
EPISTLES.

GENESIS TO ESTHER.  
JOB TO MALACHI.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

## EDUCATIONAL.

## EVANGELICAL SCHOOL.

**P**REPATORY for the Public Schools and Navy. Standing in its own extensive grounds in Folkestone. Two or three vacancies for next term. Enquiries may be made of

JOHN SHRIMPTON, Esq.,  
3, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, LONDON.

## WESTON - SUPER - MARE.

**T**HE MISSES RODHAM, assisted by resident governesses and high-class visiting teachers, RECEIVE the DAUGHTERS of GENTLEMEN as RESIDENT PUPILS, whose training and education they personally superintend. For delicate pupils the climate has proved most beneficial. The late Mrs. Pennefather (Mildmay, London) gave to this educational home her interest and influence.

For terms, address : MISSES RODHAM, Weston-super-Mare.

## MONKTON COMBE SCHOOL

(Near BATH).

Evangelical Religious Teaching. Healthiest country life. Highest Educational successes. Most moderate fees (specially reduced for sons of clergy and officers).

For prospectus, apply Vice-Principal.

## SOCIETIES.

## PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The OLDEST Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.  
The ONLY Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

## MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.

Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. E. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent.

Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Organizing Secretary, WALTER A. LIMBRICK.

Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.

Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

**Funds are Urgently Needed.**

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

## THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,

As its name implies, is a Society which combines and federates all Protestants for united action in defence of the truth.

It is THE ONLY SOCIETY which publishes an Illustrated Protestant Paper containing a monthly report of its work.

"The Record" of April 27th. 1900, says: "The Alliance has never pursued an ostrich-like policy, but has always bravely faced, and has sought to get others to face, the real problems with which the Church and the nation find themselves beset. It is only in this way that an effective defence can be made to the friends of Romanism, and it must never be forgotten that but for the vigorous efforts of the Alliance, extending now over a long series of years, the power of Rome might now be much greater in this country than it is." Subscriptions will be thankfully received by

S. W. BRETT, SECRETARY, 490, STRAND, LONDON.



PLEASE HELP THE  
FATHERLESS CHILDREN.

Patron: **HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.**

## ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL.

Founded 1758.

5,500 Children (of both sexes) have been Trained. 500 are now being Maintained and Educated.

Children are received from Infancy to 11 years of age, and are retained until 14 or 15.

**Funds urgently needed.**

Senior School: HAVERSTOCK HILL, MAITLAND PARK, N.W.  
Junior School: ALEXANDRA OBPHANAGE, HORNSEY RISE, N.  
Convalescent Home: HAROLD ROAD, MARGATE.

Treasurer: HORACE BROOKS MARSHALL, Esq., M.A., J.P., D.L.  
Bankers: LONDON JOINT STOCK BANK, Ltd., Princes St., E.C.  
Secretary: ALEXANDER GRANT.

Offices: 73, Cheapside, London, E.C.

## ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LIM.

FIRE INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE.

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects. Already a sum of £28,500 has been so distributed. The above sum includes £500 to the Clergy Distress Fund, and £2,500 to the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Lim., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., Secretary.

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian*.

## CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

FOUNDED 1886. INCORPORATED 1892.

Joint Presidents.—The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

The ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families, exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following Funds:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Personal Accident Fund; 4. Widows and Orphans Fund; 5. Daughters Fund; 6. Other Benefits Fund.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Lim., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., Secretary.

THE SECOND VOLUME OF

# The Expositors' Greek Testament,

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.,

Editor of the "Expositor," "Expositor's Bible," etc.,

CONTAINS:

1. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. R. J. KNOWLING, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, King's College, London.
2. ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By the Rev. JAMES DENNEY, D.D., Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology, Free Church College, Glasgow.
3. ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. By the Rev. G. G. FINDLAY, B.A., Professor of Biblical Literature, Exegesis and Classics, Headingley College.

The first volume of 880 pages, handsomely bound in buckram cloth, consists of the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, by the Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D., and the Gospel of St. John, by the Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D. The price of each volume is 28s.; but for those who subscribe now the price for two volumes is 30s.

"The first thing that strikes one when he takes up the volume on the Gospels is the uncommon handiness of the book. It is a joy to handle it and look into its pages. It is the very book to lure a student into reading. The form is so superb, the paper so choice and so light, the margins so delightfully broad, the type so clear and so tasteful. . . . The two scholars to whom this volume has been committed are the very men for the work. Each is a master of his subject, and each has gone into his task *con amore*. . . . A work worthy of the most cordial appreciation."—*Critical Review*.

LONDON: HODDER AND STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.



## HOMES FOR YOUNG WOMEN AND GIRLS.

OFFICE: 200, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.

This work is dependent upon Voluntary Contributions and Supports—

- A TRAINING HOME for 50 respectable friendless young girls.
- FOUR RE-CUE HOMES for betrayed and outcast young women.
- AN OPEN ALL-NIGHT REFUGE for the immediate succour of both classes.

Estab. 1857. The training imparted in these Homes is both Christian and Industrial. Upwards of 37,000 have been assisted since 1857.

Contributions may be sent to LLOYD'S BANK, Limited, 16, St. James's Street, S.W.; or WILLIAM J. TAYLOR, Secretary, 200, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.

## METROPOLITAN DRINKING FOUNTAIN & CATTLE TROUGH ASSOCIATION.

PATRONESS—HER MAJESTY QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED. SUPPORTED ENTIRELY BY VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.

Offices: 70, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

President—HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF PORTLAND, K.G., etc., etc.

Chairman—MAJOR-GENERAL HON. H. F. EATON.

Treasurer—HENRY GURNEY, Esq.

Secretary—CAPTAIN W. SIMPSON.

Committee—VENERABLE ARCHDEACON SINCLAIR.

This is the only Society providing FREE SUPPLIES OF WATER FOR MAN AND BEAST IN THE STREETS OF LONDON. The Association being entirely dependent upon voluntary contributions of the benevolent for ability to sustain and extend its work, the COMMITTEE VERY EARNESTLY APPEAL FOR LIBERAL HELP, to continue a work which has done so much to promote Temperance and alleviate suffering.

Annual Subscriptions and Donations will be thankfully received by the Bankers, Messrs. Barclay and Co., 1, Pall Mall, East, S.W., and 54, Lombard Street, E.C., or by the Secretary.

## A NATIONAL APPEAL. URGENT.

TO COMPLETE THE GOOD SAMARITAN WORK OF THE

### "LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron—H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

A further £10,000, or 200,000 shillings, still urgently needed to give relief to hundreds of aged, destitute, and afflicted victims of the great "Liberator" fraud, who were taught and trained in habits of temperance and thrift by their trusted leaders, only to find themselves suddenly robbed of their life savings, and driven to face the dreaded workhouse, in spite of all their praiseworthy endeavours to make some provision for their old age. Ninety per cent. of these sufferers are members of some section of the Christian Church.

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the Law of Christ."

There are 3,014 cases on the Books of the Fund, of whom 1,548 are Widows or Spinsters. 824 are over 70 years of age, 233 are over 80 years of age, 1,486 are over 60 years of age. Deaths through the disaster over 400.

### THE BITTER CRY FOR HELP

is still coming to the Committee from sufferers who have bravely borne with their difficulties, till sickness or great destitution has compelled them to apply, £10,000 required for new and urgent cases.

Cheques and P.O.'s should be made payable to the "Liberator" Relief Fund, crossed "The London City and Midland Bank," and sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.

## PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO THE JEWS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

Honorary Secretaries:

The REV. CANON SIR JAMES E. PHILIPPS, BART., WARMINSTER.

The VEN. ARCHDEACON SUTTON, PEVENSEY, HASTINGS.

Organizing Secretary: The REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

OFFICE: A. C. S. OFFICE, 39, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Society is worked strictly on the parochial system of the Church. Duly qualified men sent as curates, under the incumbents, to parishes in London and other big towns, where numbers of Jews congregate. Information gladly given on application to the Organizing Secretary.

# The St. Giles' Christian Mission.

Treasurer—F. A. BEVAN, Esq.

## VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS ONLY SOURCE OF INCOME.

This Mission assists, amongst other classes, the following :—

**THE BETTER CLASS OF DISCHARGED PRISONERS ;  
THE INNOCENT BUT SUFFERING WIVES AND CHILDREN OF PRISONERS  
THE SICK AND POOR ;  
HOMELESS AND DESTITUTE WOMEN.**

The demands upon the resources of the Mission are very heavy.

Mr. WILLIAM WHEATLEY, *Superintendent*, 4, Ampton Street, Regent Square, W.C.

# SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS.

**DISTRESS IS TERRIBLE** among the poor Jews at Jerusalem. Virulent smallpox, diphtheria, measles, and fever are raging in their wretched abodes, which cannot keep out the gales, rains, and snow of winter. Such crowds have come to Abraham's Vineyard for drinking water that they could only be supplied every other day. From June to November over 40,000 gallons of drinking water were given to poor Jews from the Rock Cisterns at Abraham's Vineyard.

## FUNDS MOST URGENTLY NEEDED FOR FOOD, FUEL, AND WAGES.

*Hon. Treasurer* : F. A. BEVAN, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

*Secretary* : E. A. FINN, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.

## THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.



Patron :  
Admiral of the Fleet  
H. R. H. The  
DUKE OF SAXE-COBURG  
AND GOTHA, K.G.  
Labours afloat and  
ashore, at home and  
abroad, among seamen  
of all classes and na-  
tions, fishermen, barge-  
men, and emigrants.  
Seventy-three harbours  
are occupied.

Expenditure, £22,514.

Increased Contributions and Offerings, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London, W.C.

## THE LONDON & SUBURBAN BANK, Ltd.,

22, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

The Bank opens Current Accounts upon approved introductions.

Interest at 2½ per cent. allowed on minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £20.

Dividends, Coupons, etc., collected free of charge. Approved Bills Discounted.

The Purchase or Sale of Securities undertaken. Moneys received on Deposit at from 3 to 4½ per cent.

Every consideration given to the encouragement of thrift, both by the acceptance of small sums on Deposit, and by affording special facilities to the clergy and others in charge of parochial funds, charities, etc., for the deposit and withdrawal of such moneys.

ALFRED B. HARDING,  
Managing Director.

**NOW READY.**—Bound in Cloth, price 7s. 6d.

# The Volume of The Churchman for 1900

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

**COOK'S CONDUCTED TOURS.**

**ITALY.**—Including Rome, Naples, Pompeii, Vesuvius, Florence, Venice, Milan, etc., leaving March 2, 16, and 30.

**ALGERIA and TUNIS.**—Including Carthage, Biskra, Setif, Fort National, Blidah, etc., leaving March 13 and April 10.

**SOUTH OF FRANCE and ITALY.**—Leaving March 22, visiting Nice, Monte Carlo, Genoa, Rome, Naples, Vesuvius, Capri, Pompeii, Florence, Venice, Milan, etc.

**EGYPT and PALESTINE.**—Leaving February 26, March 5, etc., including Cairo, the Nile, Jerusalem, Jericho, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Damascus, Baalbec, Constantinople, Athens, etc.

**DALMATIA, BOSNIA, and HERZEGOVINA.**—Leaving April 9, visiting Pola, Zara, Sebenico, Spalato, Cattaro, Cetinje, Sarajevo, Budapesth, Vienna, etc.

**EGYPT.**—Special Tour, leaving March 21, visiting Cairo, Pyramids, Sphinx, Alexandria, etc.

*Illustrated Programmes free.*

**THOS. COOK & SON, Ludgate Circus, London, and Branch Offices.**

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.

**Tombs or Temples ?**

**ADDRESSES TO MEN AND WOMEN.**

By the Venerable ARCHDEACON MADDEN (Liverpool).

"These shrewd, wholesome and straightforward addresses are good to read, and were, no doubt, still better to hear. The book is sure to do good to the classes for whom it is intended, and may be read with profit by many who work as teachers or preachers among them."—*Churchman.*

"The book is a quarry in which anyone who wishes to arouse attention may well dig for thought."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"For plain, common-sense, practical speaking, these sermons are most valuable. The illustrations are well selected from the common everyday events of life."—*Church Bells.*

"A collection of spirited addresses."—*Church Gazette.*

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

**BIRKBECK BANK,**

SOUTHAMPTON BUILDINGS, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

**CURRENT ACCOUNTS.**

2% on the minimum monthly balances,  
when not drawn below £100.

2%

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS.**

2½% on Deposits, repayable on demand. 2½%

**STOCKS AND SHARES.**

Stocks and Shares purchased and sold for customers.

The BIRKBECK ALMANACK, with full particulars, post free.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

**HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT**

IS A CERTAIN CURE FOR

**Chapped Hands, Chilblains, Burns, Scalds, Rheumatism, Sciatica, Lumbago, Piles, Old Wounds, Eczema, Erysipelas,**

**AND EVERY FORM OF SKIN DISEASE.**

Manufactured only at 78, New Oxford Street, London.

**Sold by all Chemists and Medicine Vendors.**

# EDE AND SON, ROBE MAKERS

By Special Appointment  
TO HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR, AND THE BISHOPS.

LAWN SLEEVES—ROCHET & CHIMERE. FULL SLEEVE GOWN, CASSOCK & SASH IN ALL QUALITIES,  
SURPLICES FOR CLERGY AND CHOIR.

CLERICAL TAILORING.

Hoods, Cassocks, Scarves, Stoles, Bands, College Caps, Clergy Collars, &c.  
PEERS, LEGAL, AND CORPORATION ROBES.

93 & 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

URGENT DISTRESS; WRECKS AND LOSS OF LIFE.

*"There is sorrow on the sea."*

## THE SHIPWRECKED MARINERS' SOCIETY

(WITH OVER 1,000 AGENCIES)

Has relieved more than Half a Million Persons since 1839.

The rescued sailor, fisherman, instantly cared for on the spot and sent home; the widow, and orphan of the drowned immediately sought out and succoured; the distressed seafarer of every grade at once charitably assisted.

**CONTRIBUTIONS EARNESTLY APPEALED FOR.**

Patron—H. M. THE QUEEN. Chairman of Committee—Admiral E. S. ADEANE, C.M.G.  
Secretary—G. E. MAUDE, Esq., 26, Suffolk Street, Pall Mall East, S.W.

[Telegrams—"SHIPWRECKED, LONDON."]

## HOME MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

### Additional Curates Society.

ESTABLISHED 1837.

More than 1,200 ADDITIONAL CLERGYMEN are now at work in poor and densely-populated Parishes through the help of grants (about £59,000 a year) from this Society.

To maintain this work, at least £50,000 in voluntary contributions must be collected in the course of each year.

No Party considerations affect the appropriation of the Funds.

Contributions will be thankfully received by the Secretary (Rev. Paul Petit) at the Society's Office, 39, Victoria Street, Westminster. Cheques should be crossed "Coutts & Co"

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

MARCH, 1901.

---

ART. I.—SAVONAROLA.<sup>1</sup>

I HAVE to speak to you this morning about the Renaissance, the most complicated movement of thought the world has ever seen, but, I think, most imperfectly understood if it is considered as a movement of thought which took place at one time and has now ceased to be of importance. It really corresponds to tendencies of human thought continually going on, not only in society, but in individual minds. There is a renaissance going on in the mind of every one of you; you have to face precisely the same question the men of that time had to face. The Renaissance is not a movement that is passed away, it is the exhibition, on a large scale, with reference to some particular questions, of active tendencies continuous in all human society. Now, the Renaissance means "the recovery of knowledge"—*renatiamento*, that is the meaning of the word, the "new birth," the new birth of man into a new field of knowledge. But what was the importance of this knowledge? Knowledge, in the first place, is always being acquired, but not that with which the Renaissance particularly is concerned. It was not so much to be considered for its value as regards information, as for the attitude of mind which it involved towards the world. We often forget this when we speak of knowledge. Though it can be divided under separate heads, we omit from our consideration the important thing in all knowledge, and that is the point of view which it engenders towards the world and towards life. This is the importance of the period called the Renaissance. You cannot lay hold of its tendencies in any particular form; you cannot say they pursued knowledge in some things and not in others. It was

---

<sup>1</sup> A lecture delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral on June 13, 1900, by the late Mandell Creighton, D.D., Bishop of London; taken down in shorthand.

a tendency ; it was a point of view ; it was an attitude towards life ; it was the self-consciousness of man then striving to see how it could best express itself—and that is always going on, and that gives the great value to every intellectual movement. You ought to stop and consider the question, How do we differ ? (and each generation does differ). How do successive epochs differ in the point of view they adopt towards life ? The Renaissance was the recovery of this point of view—the point of view possessed by ancient civilization and accepted in ancient literature. It had disappeared, it had gone, it had to be recovered. Why had it to be recovered ? Because it was valuable, because men needed it. Why was it lost ? It was lost because of the faults, the weaknesses to which it had led. Put shortly, the ancient world fell because its progress had been one-sided, because it had progressed in knowledge first of all, and then in culture, and then in refinement, and then in external things, and as it progressed in all these, it lost hold upon the great central formative ideas. Rome and Greece lost their hold upon religion—they lost their hold upon those great ideas which make the character, and the result was that the civilization of Greece and Rome passed away, because it no longer created character strong enough to do the work necessary to keep the world together. Then in that general decay of character Christianity suddenly arose, and Christianity, therefore, had to deal with the remaking of a world that fell in pieces. The decline and fall of the Roman Empire was a period of the greatest falling in pieces that the world has ever seen. It was the long-protracted agony, the decay of a great city, because it could not create the character necessary to move it. It fell, and it fell externally, of course, before the barbarian invasion ; internally (because nothing falls unless from the inside and the outside at the same time), because it could no longer create character. New peoples had to be created, a mixture of the barbarians and the civilized Romans ; the savageness, and yet force, of the barbarians, the elevation, and yet weakness, of the Roman Empire, were joined together, and these had to be brought into one by the instrumentality of the Christian Church. Therefore, during the period we call the Middle Ages, there was the great process going on which we do not sufficiently recognise and look at. It was the process of the creation of character, and before that great process other processes of the human mind fell into the background. But it is always so ; no one generation can be doing two things at the same time. Particular problems, not of men's setting, have to be faced, and wisdom consists in recognising the problem we have to solve, the work that we have to do. What is the special task

fallen upon our generation now? The special task that fell upon the Middle Ages was the remaking of character by means of the Christian faith, and that process was carried out. It was carried out thoroughly and well. In the Middle Ages men were made; you may call them raw, or savage, or what you like, but they were men.

Now, in this process of creation, art, and knowledge, and science in all its branches had fallen into the background. It is impossible to both make your men and at the same time equip them for all their duties. The end of the period of the Middle Ages was when human character again had been formed into strength; and men, becoming conscious, therefore, of what they had to do in the world, looked round to see how they could equip themselves for their task. Then you get the beginning of the Renaissance—*i.e.*, the mind of man going back to the desire for knowledge and seeking some cultivation of its powers. Religion made the powers—religion informed them to a certain point. Not that knowledge was wholly forgotten. Do not suppose that knowledge of classical antiquity ever disappeared; it lived in the monasteries. It was not operative; the operative thing was the creation of character, to wean men from the materialism into which creation had sunk by emancipating them from the exclusive pressure of this world by turning their attention to the thoughts of the world to come.

Now all these things are frequently said to be the causes that killed knowledge. Knowledge was not killed by the influence of the Church at all; it was killed by the decay of character and the downfall of some of the external appliances of civilization. The conscious pursuit of knowledge is always one of the most tender plants, it is the thing immediately affected by any political difficulty. The first thing that anybody economizes in is the education of his children, and it is so always—knowledge, you must remember, is, and always will be, a luxury; it is only something that can be gained when conditions are quiet and life is established, and men are agreed; knowledge always goes into the background when the times become troublous. They were troublous in the days of the downfall of the Roman Empire. Not under the influence of the Church did knowledge go; the Church ordained laws to answer for its own purpose and work, which was the re-creation of character. When character had been formed, then came the question of how to adorn it, for you cannot adorn and equip that which does not exist. The Church created character and then looked for its adornment. Now, the process of the discovery of the right way to equip human character is that to which the name of the Renaissance has

been given, and it took the shape of the recovery of something lost. True ideas can never disappear. They may cease to be operative for a time, but they must be recovered, not in the form in which they existed before, but in a form adapted to the new needs of the time. Now, the question therefore was, How was the knowledge of antiquity gained by men of the past to be brought back again? In what shape was it to be applied to the new conditions of life which had been developed? That was what the Renaissance had to do, and in this process of this recovery of classical knowledge there were two tendencies to be kept distinct and apart; one was the natural tendency, the tendency to reaction, to bring back the past just as it existed, that was towards Paganism. "Forget," said the supporters of that view. "Let us put away this Christianity which is a check upon us, which restrains the natural tendencies of man and hides him from himself; let us put that away and go back to the frank, full, free enjoyment of life which men had before this doctrine was placed upon their shoulders." There was a reaction towards Paganism. And then similarly there was the second line of the Renaissance towards the observation of all that was good in the past and its application to the needs of the present. These were the two tendencies: to apply knowledge to the new state of things, and to bring back the old state of things. I need not speak at length of the Pagan reaction. It was very large, larger than is supposed. There are people who talk of an age of Faith, a period in which all Europe was united in a frank acceptance of Christian doctrine. There never was any such time; anyone who has read the literature of what was called the age of faith, and gone a little below the surface, I think will come to the same conclusion. There was a vast body of opinion which was frankly and absolutely materialistic; not only irreligious, but irreverent, and if you wish to follow it out, you will find it in the songs of a band of Pagan scholars who wandered about in the Middle Ages. Their literature has been quoted by several; it is blasphemous, and that is apparent at the slightest glance.

On the other side there was the desire to bring back the knowledge of the past and adapt it to the needs of the present. Now, that may be approached from a great many sides indeed. Of course, to follow out the growth of European science would be a difficult task, but the Renaissance was not so much concerned with that as with the emotions and mental attitudes of man. Consider the first great exhibitor of the recovery by Christianity of culture, and the enlarging of its attitude towards the world—he was St. Francis of Assisi. He is not usually spoken of in connection with the Renaissance at all,

but the Italian Renaissance entirely sprang from St. Francis. He was a man who held an entirely new attitude towards the world; he expressed a great love of animals, he appreciated glory and beauty in all its forms. This had hitherto been much overlooked. He attempted to realize actually what had occurred in the past; and consequently the preaching of St. Francis was picturesque. Above all, it was popular; it realized the Gospel scenes in simple and straightforward language; and the consequence was, it brought into the world a desire for the realization of things that had gone before, of art and literature. It was this simple process of realization, and not accident, that was the real outcome of the Franciscan movement. On the one side Dante and Giotto were the great exponents of the movement of the Christian Renaissance. To Dante, all the past was equally serviceable; to Dante, things sacred and profane stood upon the same footing. You remember in the "Purgatorio," when Dante wishes to show how those who had been guilty of evil were being purged in another world, he represents them as wandering in a sphere where voices breathed in their ears maxims to call them back to industry; and the patterns for examples with which the air was full were, first of all, the example of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who, when she went to visit her cousin Elizabeth, "rose in haste and went to the hill country"; and Cæsar, who in his haste to put down the rebellion of Pompey, stopped at Marseilles and captured the town on the way—things sacred and profane on a parallel. He gives the analysis of man's inner life; his writings are all full of learning and observation. What is literature since Dante but a carrying on of these ideas? In Dante you have all that literature and art require. And in the same way Petrarch carried a little further a more modern element. The new element was more manifest in this point, that the ideal of the head and the passion of the heart were different. Surely that is the cry of all modern literature. All that we think of as being most pathetic is to point out the war which goes on between the ideal of the head and the feelings of the heart. It is overdone nowadays; but this continual outcry is expressed nowhere more completely than in Petrarch, when he says:

"No peace I find, yet have no power to fight.  
 I fear, I hope, I burn; yet it is all too cold.  
 I lie on earth, and yet in heaven I fly—  
 I nothing clasp, yet all things do I hold."

Well, then, here you have the expression of the Renaissance, this recovery of man to human knowledge, and this desire of man to enter into the mysteries of his own being, and

to grasp the duties of the world that surrounds him. That is the first attitude of mind described by the Renaissance.

But with that came the sharp voices of purpose amongst the scholars. It was the scholars who were understood to be influencing this movement, to be remaking the world, to be bringing back man's knowledge of himself, to be analyzing his character, and discovering the truth about man's own nature. And amongst the scholars was now carried that division which hitherto had prevailed amongst the people generally. There were the pure followers of the antique, who wished to return to the natural Paganism, and whose aims were, first of all, to free the senses from the restraint of Christian spiritualism, and then to rebuild Nature, and assert the power of beauty to direct man. But this is one side, and only one side, of the movement. The other side was a desire to strengthen the national traditions of faith, while at the same time enlarging them and leading them to a broader sphere. Now, those two tendencies ran through everything, not only into literature but politics; and the first of these tendencies, the tendency towards the pagan revival, ended in the acceptance of tyranny as the best form of government, because it supplied the best patronage for men of letters. The Christian Renaissance, as I may call it, strove to maintain republican institutions in Italy founded on national endowments. The division was complete between the two, and yet they went on side by side. In every Italian state you had these two tendencies of thought and feeling.

It was in Savonarola's person and round his person that these two tendencies came into distinct conflict. Savonarola first of all represents the character set forth by the movement of the Renaissance, and, as such, he stands forth as the rebuker and reprover of the purely Pagan Renaissance. In the first place, he stood forth in Florence to maintain Christian morality as against immorality. He stood forth, in the next place, as a maintainer of the public institutions against the members of the Medicæan tyranny. On all those points you have him standing forth as the maintainer and the supporter of the Christian Renaissance as against the Pagan Renaissance; and the danger to Savonarola was that he precipitated this crisis, and that in him the conflict had to be fought. He had to pay the penalty for raising these questions, and he failed. The most important thing is to see why he failed, and what wrecked him.

He failed because he carried his Christianity into the sphere of politics. Savonarola was right when he maintained Christianity against Paganism. Savonarola was right even in the apparent excess of his patriotism, for he knew that it was

necessary. Savonarola was right when he maintained republican traditions against the Medicæan tyranny. But he failed because he was not content with simply maintaining political principles, but proceeded to apply them in his own person. The great lesson to be learned from Savonarola's downfall is the impossibility of one who speaks in God's name and for God's sake to identify himself with any particular measures of current politics. It is always a great temptation so to do. The world is always clamouring that men shall do so. It is continually the cry of the world to the Church, "Why do not you of the Church take decided parties? Why not content yourselves with the statement that one is fighting for the truth, and the other is to be condemned as fighting against it?" It is quite natural; political parties are always struggling to overcome one another; the party wants the assistance of all the forces it can possibly lay hold of. There is a continual pressure upon the teachers of Christian principle and the righteousness of Christian morality to declare the right is all on one side and the wrong all on the other side. But woe betide the Christian teacher who listens to such requests! Then he abandons all that gives strength to his position; then he is himself laid hold of by another power; he enters into practical politics; he becomes their tool. So it was with Savonarola. He was perfectly justified in his political conceptions in themselves, but it is so difficult to be equally justified in their appliance to actual facts. Your principles may be indisputable, but when they are applied to particular cases they must always be a matter open to doubt. So it was with Savonarola.

To reassert the republican institutions, to inspire them with the Christian spirit, to put before them the pursuit of righteousness as their object, was all right; only he identified his own teaching with them, and, still more, he identified his own teaching with great political issues lying beyond the Florentine Republic. That is the mistake for which he paid the penalty. The maintenance of the republican government of Florence could not be brought about solely by the forces Florence itself contained. The French expedition into Italy at that time gave the republican party the help they needed. How natural it was for Savonarola to see in Charles VIII. and his invading army the scourge of God on the sins of Florence! How natural for him to welcome Charles as a divine agent appointed to deliver them! How easy for him to identify the Florentine Government and constitution with alien armies to welcome the support of a stranger! Oh, what a downfall was that from the primary principles of Italy's patriotism! How it exposed Savonarola to the charge of opening his country

to a stranger that he might cause his own party to win in the place where he himself was living! How hard it is to mix in great political questions and keep abstract principles entirely pure; how easy to identify yourself and your own interests with great eternal principles, and work for the one when you think you are working for the other!

That was the misfortune of Savonarola in the first place. And in the next place he posed as a prophet. Not consciously perhaps, but he was converted into a prophet, he was regarded as a prophet, he was considered as being above the ordinary man, and he could not help taking to himself that prophetic position which he had proclaimed in his ears. It is a temptation to one who speaks for God to clothe himself with the prophetic mantle, to suppose that, because of the integrity of his purpose, he has a greater insight into the Divine law, into the Divine will, as it governs the universe God has made. He may have an insight, but only into the operation of those small causes which regulate actual affairs. It is only experience and tried wisdom and statesmanship that enable one to speak with authority. Savonarola was dragged into politics not of his own seeking. Savonarola fell, not, I think, a victim, as is ordinarily said, to a corrupt Papacy (not but that the Pope was corrupt enough: doubtless Savonarola fell with the connivance and by the consent of the Pope); but the fact was that he fell before the forces of the Medicæan principality and the new learning he had attacked.

It was not the Church that slew him; even Alexander regretted condemning him. There have been attempts made from time to time to obtain his canonization. It was not to be said that the Church rejoiced over his downfall; but there was that great difficulty in separating the prophet from the politician. As a practical politician, it was necessary that he should be deposed from his power, and there was the great pathos. To express to you fully what the downfall of Savonarola is, I think I may give you only one instance to enable you to understand practically what were these tendencies of the Renaissance, and the great difference that came over them. Savonarola lived and ruled in the great Dominican monastery of San Marco. Before his eyes he had the pictures of Fra Angelico. It was that which very largely inspired his efforts. What do those pictures show? They show us a childlike soul resting upon God and finding quietness and peace; that was what Savonarola primarily was, that was what he wished others to be. He did not succeed. His downfall marked a period of political disturbance for Italy—a period which disturbed the minds of men, and from

which they have not yet recovered. But who was the man who carried out Savonarola's ideas and expressed them in the next generation? It was Michael Angelo. Compare Michael Angelo with Fra Angelico, and see how they stood as at the parting of two ways, as a man who connected the end of one period and the beginning of another. Compare the difference of the childlike soul resting upon God and finding peace, and Michael Angelo, who is dragging all the power of man's nature through manifold struggles to draw nigh to God. And thus the great issue of his life was only good. He dragged himself through the temptations and troubles of the world; and, being himself no longer in harmony with it, he dragged himself into God's presence at last, bearing the scars and marks of many a conflict, won through so many struggles and by so many elements.

M. LONDIN.

---

ART. II.—PECOCK, FISHER, COLET, MORE.

OF these four distinguished men, whose names are so often mentioned in connection with each other and with the preludes of the English Reformation, Reginald Pecock stands in fact quite alone, apart from the other three. He died in 1460, a year after the birth of Fisher, the earliest of the others—if, indeed, Fisher was in fact born so early as 1459. Men born in England at the time of Pecock's death, and in the ten or twenty years following, lived their lives as grown men in the beginning of a new world, while he died very near the end of the old. Colet died in 1519; Fisher and More were executed in 1535.

The attitude of the four men to the great questions moving the thoughts of Englishmen, during the years in which England was ripening for a Reformation, may be described fairly in the following fashion.

Pecock was too early, by at least a whole generation, for the New Learning, which eventually shattered the fabric of ecclesiastical mediævalism, built up laboriously in the dark and ignorant ages. He knew nothing of it. Fisher fostered the New Learning, but was not greatly touched by it. To Colet and More it was the mainspring of their thoughts.

The disciplinary reform of the Church was the great demand of Pecock's time. To such demands he opposed arguments for things as they were, while allowing that there were matters for which the clergy were worthy to be blamed "in brotherly and neighbourly correction." Fisher favoured the demand

within limits. Colet and More were exceedingly outspoken in their advocacy of it.

The religious or superstitious practices of late mediæval times Pecock upheld. Fisher upheld them too. Colet and More desired reform, Colet at least in a highly trenchant manner.

Of the distinctive Roman additions to the Creeds, as eventually set forth in the creed of Pope Pius IV., I do not know that any of the four expressed doubts. My impression is that of Fisher, Colet, and More, Colet is the only one who might have joined the Reformers had he lived long enough. Pecock's rationalistic treatment was naturally turned in another direction, but I think that if he had lived later he might have been a reformer.

The supremacy of the Pope I do not think that any of them would have called in question. It had become by long iteration a rooted belief. Two of them died rather than deny it.

We may now proceed to some detail.

Pecock was a Welshman; Fellow of Oriel College in 1417, and a lecturer in Oxford; Master of Whittington College in London, near the Three Cranes in the Vintry, in 1431; Bishop of St. Asaph in 1444; Bishop of Chichester in 1450; condemned for heresy in 1459, and sent to live in confinement at Thorney Abbey. The authorities of Thorney received for his maintenance a capital sum, and he soon died. Had the payment for his maintenance taken the form of an annuity, he might have lived longer.

Pecock was condemned as a heretic; but that bare statement has led to complete misunderstanding of his position and views. He has been described as a forerunner of the Reformation; but he was a determined opponent of the Lollards, and he stoutly maintained, as we have said, the later mediæval practices. The accusations of heresy against him covered a wide field. They dealt with his views on the Descent into Hell, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the Infallibility of the Universal Church and of General Councils in matters of faith. He was accused of setting the natural law above the Scriptures and the Sacraments; of disregarding the authority of Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory; and of having written on great matters in English. The charges of heresy were in no small part untrue. We do not find him making erroneous statements as to the Holy Ghost; and as for the Holy Catholic Church, what he maintained was that the Creed declares belief in the fact of its existence, not in the authority which an extreme view claimed for it.

He wrote very boldly and freely on many subjects, and his

writings gave great and growing offence in high quarters, both lay and ecclesiastical. Near the end of October, 1457, Henry VI. held a Council at Westminster, at which were present a large number of Lords temporal and spiritual; among the latter, Pecock. The hatred long entertained against him and his opinions burst forth. Not one of the temporal lords would speak on the business of the Council so long as he was present. He had written, they said, on profound subjects in the English language; what else but mischief to the ignorant vulgar could be expected from such profaneness? He had vilipended and rejected the authority of the old doctors, saying that neither their writings nor those of any others were to be received, except in so far as they were agreeable to reason. When passages from their works had been produced against him, he had been known to say "Pooh! pooh!" He had even made a new creed of his own, and had denied that the Apostles' Creed was composed by the Apostles. He had written last year a letter to Canning, Lord Mayor of London, who had forwarded it to the King. The King had shewed it to some of them; there were in it signs, not ambiguous, of exciting England to a change of faith, and even to an insurrection; and, to crown all, he had therein asserted that many of the nobility agreed with him and his detestable writings. The divines demanded to see copies of his works. Pecock said that copies of all he had written in the last three years should be sent to the Archbishop; but he would not be answerable for books written before that time, because they had only been circulated among private persons, and had not received his final corrections.

On November 11 he brought nine of his works; they were found to have many corrections, and passages written anew. The Archbishop (Thomas Bouchier) and his three episcopal assessors (Waynflete of Winchester, Chadworth of Lincoln, and Lowe of Rochester) received the report of twenty-four doctors on them, in spite of Pecock's claim to be tried by his peers in learning. The report was that the writings contained many errors and heretical opinions. George Neville, elect of Exeter and brother of the Earl of Salisbury, told him the just judgment of God suffered him to incur these reproaches, for having himself reproached those holy doctors Augustine and Jerome, and for denying the truth of their sayings. Pecock replied that he regretted he had so written, not being sufficiently informed on the matters in question. This was not a bad answer from a man of his age, and great learning, and wide knowledge of the Fathers, to a gay young nobleman who had only the year before been elected Bishop, being then only twenty-three years of age. We may compare with it the reply of Sir Thomas More

to Cardinal Wolsey. "You shew yourself a foolish counsellor," Wolsey said to More when he opposed the creation of a new office, that of "supreme constable." "I thank God," More replied, "the King hath only one fool on his Council." Pecock was condemned for asserting in his "Book of Faith" the falseness of St. Gregory's saying that "faith, of whose truth human reason gives proof, hath no merit." His "Repressor" was objected to because in it he maintained that the property of Churchmen was as strictly their own as is the property of laymen; his sermon at Paul's Cross, because it taught that payments to the Pope for "provisions" were lawful. On the Descent in Hell, the authority of the Catholic Church, the sense of Scripture, he was condemned. The Archbishop gave him his choice between public abjuration and being delivered, after degradation, to the secular arm to be burned. "Choose one of these two, for the alternative is immediate in the coercion of heretics." He replied, "I am in a strait betwixt two, and hesitate in despair as to what I shall choose. If I defend my opinions and positions, I must be burned to death: if I do not, I shall be a by-word and a reproach. Yet it is better to incur the taunts of the people than to forsake the law of faith and to depart after death into hell fire and the place of torment. I choose, therefore, to make an abjuration, and intend for the future so to live that no suspicion shall arise against me all the days of my life." The answer does not give the modern reader a very high idea of the depth of Pecock's opinions, the height of his courage, or the breadth of his logic. But the modern reader has not the advantage of standing over against a truculent Archbishop of Canterbury with a good will and ready mind to have him burned, and that speedily. An experience of that kind might stimulate some of us to a less unsympathetic view of Pecock's decision.

The two best-known evidences of Pecock's attitude towards the attacks of the Lollards upon the late mediæval system are his sermon at Paul's Cross and his important book called the "Repressor of over much blaming of the Clergy."<sup>1</sup>

The sermon at Paul's Cross was preached in 1447, three years after he became Bishop of St. Asaph. It offended both the Churchmen and the hostile favourers of Church reform. It justified the Bishops, who did not preach, who absented themselves from their dioceses, who received their bishoprics from the Pope, and paid to the Pope first-fruits. At a later

<sup>1</sup> Rolls Series, No. 19, 1860. It is curious that he should use this Latin word for his title. We might have expected *agen-squeezer*. He will not use the word "Redeemer," preferring *agen-buier*—as, in a well-known title, "Remorse" appears as *agen-bite*.

time he explained under the first of these heads that he would not have the Bishops preach like those pulpit-brawlers, the Friars, but would have them expound like the Fathers. Millington, the first Provost of the King's College in Cambridge, replied in a sermon at Paul's Cross, denouncing Pecock as a national danger, and declaring that England would never suffer those who patronized Pecock to prosper. To enter upon the confused politics of the time would lead us off our line: but it may be remarked that the promotion of Pecock to Chichester proved to be the last act of the political life of William de la Pole, the first Duke of Suffolk. Pecock's promotions were entirely Lancastrian; but in 1455 he signed, as one of the Privy Council, the documents empowering Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, to act as Protector in the "illness" of Henry VI.

In his "Repressor of over much blaming of the Clergy," published in 1455, Pecock sets himself to confute the Lollards' objections on eleven points. The points are these: (1) Images; (2) pilgrimages; (3) clerical property in land; (4) various ranks among the clergy<sup>1</sup>, as the Papacy and Episcopacy; (5) the framing of ecclesiastical laws or statutes by Papal and Episcopal authority; (6) the institution of the religious orders; (7) invocation of saints; (8) rich adornment of churches; (9) ceremonies of the Mass and Sacraments generally; (10) taking of oaths; (11) upholding of war and capital punishment.

One or two examples of his treatment of these points must suffice.

The Lollards, speaking against the endowments of the clergy, declared that on the day of the donation of Constantine an angel's voice was heard in the air, saying: "In this day venom is hild out [poured] into the Church." Against this he advances four arguments: (1) The original authority for the story is Giraldus Cambrensis, about A.D. 1200, and Giraldus says it was a devil whose voice was heard: if it was a devil, endowments are good; (2) the whole thing is fabulous from one end to the other, for there was no such donation: this we might have thought was enough, but (3) no ancient authority now extant supports Giraldus: this again we might have supposed to be expressed in (1); (4) if there was any such voice, it was because the Church was then first endowed absolutely, or then first abundantly endowed; and both of those are untrue, for the Church of Rome had endowments in the time of Pope Urban, A.D. 220-230, and the Church of England still earlier, in the time of King Lucius,

<sup>1</sup> The Lollards would have only priests and deacons, not Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, and Popes.

A.D. 180, and Constantine's gifts to the Church were only small, the donation being all fictitious. He follows this up by a lengthy historical argument against the truth of the story of the donation, a really acute and critical exposure of a fable which in those days it was dangerous to call in question. A similar remark may be made with regard to his rejection of books of the Apocrypha, a rejection so trenchant that it would have gone hard with him if he had lived in the times of the Council of Trent. He explains that "in the beginning of the Church, soon after Christ's Passion," there was such a scarceness of holy books and such a desire for them, that men wrote into their Bibles the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; and this practice has continued in later times, though men knew they were not Holy Writ. "And yet hereby is not the authority of those books raised higher than it was before." The Council of Trent, in its fourth session, specially recited the two books here mentioned among the books of the Old Testament, and declared, "If any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition . . . let him be anathema." Another sharp criticism of the Apocrypha will be mentioned later on.

In favour of pictures, relics, images, etc., he argues that they are commanded by Scripture. For Scripture bids man love God, and in so bidding bids him love all that God loves, and use ways and means for knowing and remembering what these things are; that is, bids him use these outward means—images, and so on. He illustrates this by his own case when he bids his servant go from Whittington College to hear a sermon at St. Paul's. The man must go out of the college gate, though he is not told to do so. He must choose one out of the many ways to St. Paul's, though not told to do so. He must avoid a dangerous way—as, for instance, if a man is lying in wait to kill him in one street. When he gets to St. Paul's, he must listen. When he leaves St. Paul's, the sermon must improve him. And all this and much more is contained in the single command, "Go and hear the sermon at St. Paul's."

"For why, if I, being at London in the College of Whittington (*sic*), bid or counsel or witness to my servant there being with me that he go to Paul's Cross for to hear there attentively a sermon to be preached, it must needs be granted that I in so bidding counseling or witnessing bid counsel and witness that he learn or remember somewhat by the same sermon, and that some manner of new disposition (less or more) he take into his affection upon something of that sermon. For why, all this followeth out of the attentive hearing of the sermon. Also it must needs be granted that I in so

bidding counselling or witnessing bid counsel or witness that he go forth out of the College's gate. For why, unless then he go forth from me at the gate he may not come to Paul's Cross for to hear the sermon. Also, since from the said College be many ways to Paul's Cross, and of which each is speedful and good enough to lead to Paul's Cross, it must needs be granted that in so bidding counselling or witnessing I witness that which ever of these ways he take I it allow; and if cause be found in any of those ways that by doom of reason this way ought to be left (as if peradventure in one of these ways a man lieth in wait for to slay my said servant), certis this way is not, as for then, one of the speedful ways for him into Paul's Cross. And also it must be granted that in so bidding counselling or witnessing I will and allow rather that he go and choose the better of those ways than the less good of those ways, and that he in better manner hear the sermon than that he in less good manner hear the same sermon."

In opposition to the Lollard claim that everything must be referred to the Word of God and settled thereby, he argues:

"Thou shalt not find expressly in Holy Scripture that the New Testament should be written in English tongue to laymen or in Latin tongue to clerks; neither the Old Testament; and yet each of these governances thou wilt hold to be lawful, and to be a meritory, virtuous, moral deed for to thereby deserve grace and glory, and to be the service of God, and therefore to be the law of God; since by no deed a man hath merit, save by a deed which is the service and the law of God; and each moral virtue is the law of God, as it is proved well in other place of my writings."

Here, again, is a bold, and at that time a very dangerous, assertion—the meritoriousness of English versions of the Scriptures.

With equal boldness, in pursuance of the same argument, he makes the assertion that it is meritorious to brew ale and beer and to drink them:

"Where is it expressed by word or by any person's ensampling in Holy Scripture that men should make ale or beer, of which so much horrible sin cometh, much more than of setting up of images, or of pilgrimages; and the defaults done about images and pilgrimages be much lighter and easier to be amended than the defaults coming by making of ale and of beer. And also herewith it is true that without ale and beer, without cider and wine and mead, men and women might live longer than they do now, and in less jollity and cheery of heart for to bring them into horrible great sins. And yet thou wilt say that for to make ale and beer and for to drink them is the service of God, and is meritory, and therefore is the law of God."

One other quaint example, under this head, of the non-sufficiency of Holy Scripture as a rule of life in all detail:

"Furthermore, for to justify their bathing, washing, and anointing, women may not allege the story of Susannah, Daniel xiii.; for that process and story is not Holy Writ but Apocrif; and the very book of Daniel (as much as is Holy Writ) is ended with the twelfth chapter of the same book, as Jerome the translator witnesseth. And yet in that story is no mention made of all the women's deeds now re-

hearsed, save only of bathing and washing with oil and soap, and yet not of these by way of commending or by way of ensampling that other persons should do the same."

Bishops had much the same experience then as now :

"Well I wot, as for my part, that how men have judged me and my governance anent my diocese hath come to mine ears. And yet I know the wits and dispositions of the same judgers, that if all the causes and motives and intents, means, helps, and lets, and many other circumstances of the same governance which they blame were opened to them, and if they were made privy to them, they would be of the first which should counsel me to keep and fulfil the same governance."

Fisher was born at Beverley in Yorkshire, probably in the year which saw Pecock sent to Thorney to die. He was student, fellow, and eventually (in 1497) Master, of Michael House, the most important of the ancient collegiate foundations on which Henry VIII., at the very end of his life, established Trinity College in Cambridge. In 1494 he was Senior Proctor, and in that capacity he attended the Court of Henry VII. at Greenwich, and was introduced to the notice of the Lady Margaret, the King's mother, Countess of Richmond and of Derby by two of her three marriages, great-grand-daughter and heiress of John of Gaunt, widow of Edmund Tudor the half-brother of Henry VI. She made Fisher her confessor in 1497, and for twelve important years he guided the actions of her life. In those same years he made a mark upon Cambridge, and upon the studies of the English Universities, which can never be forgotten. They had sunk very low; he raised Cambridge to a much higher standard. In 1503 the Lady Margaret founded at Cambridge a Chair of Divinity, and made him Professor, to give gratuitous instruction in theology. About the same time, and still under his guidance, she founded the Lady Margaret Preachership, for supplying the laity in London and in certain parts of the country with instruction in the Gospel, to be delivered in English, which had fallen into general disuse for pulpit utterances. In 1504 he was appointed by Henry VII. to the bishopric of Rochester, for his great and singular virtue. In 1505 he was made President of Queens' College, in order, it is said, that he might have a residence in Cambridge while he superintended the building of the Lodge of Christ's College. This college the Lady Margaret founded under Fisher's guidance, and in the Lodge she herself lived for some three years, practically for the rest of her life.

Near the end of her life her Oxford friends petitioned her to found a college in that University also, but Fisher per-

sued her in favour of Cambridge, and she obtained from her son the royal license to refound St. John's in 1508. Next year she and the King died, and Henry VIII. endeavoured to appropriate the funds left for this her latest foundation. Fisher was her executor, and he resisted the young King stoutly, obtaining at last a peremptory Bull from the Pope. Henry paid off his grudges in full in the course of time.

Fisher had, apparently, not expected the difficulties which the King put in the way of his grandmother's intentions, for in his sermon on the death of Henry VII., only three months before the Lady Margaret's death, he spoke thus of the young King in describing the last moments of his father's life:

"This noble prince let call for his son the king that now is our governor and sovereign, endued with all graces of God and nature and with as great abilities and likelihoods of well doing as ever was in king, whose beginning is now so gracious and so comfortable unto all his people that the rejoicing in him in manner shadoweth the sorrow that else would have been taken for the death of his father."

This "so gracious and so comfortable" a Prince eventually cut off Fisher's head. But the Bishop's high estimate of Henry's character is completely borne out by other contemporary records, especially the letters of Erasmus and the secret report of the Venetian Ambassador.

Fisher was a man of very strict life. He hated the pompful and worldly life of Wolsey, and opposed him in Convocation. He was a warm admirer of the new Biblical criticism which the knowledge of Greek had introduced. He did all he could to foster the study of that much-suspected language, of which a friar, preaching in London, declared that it was the language spoken by the devils in hell. In a letter from Louvain in 1519 Erasmus contrasts the two Universities, Cambridge and Oxford. "In both," he says, "Greek is taught; but in Cambridge peaceably, because the head of that school is John Fischer, Bishop of Rochester, who, not in learning only, but in life, studies God. But at Oxford, when a certain youth of no ordinary learning professed Greek fairly well, a certain barbarian in a public harangue waxed wanton against Greek letters. The King, however, himself by no means unlearned, happened to be in the neighbourhood, and when More and Pace [who succeeded Colet as Dean of St. Paul's] told him of it, he denounced the opposition, and bade them accept the study of Greek willingly and with pleasure. Thus silence was imposed upon those brawling pettifoggers."

In the same letter we have another story: A certain theologian preached before the King, and impudently and stolidly waxed wanton against Greek letters and the new

interpreters. Pace, who was Reader in Greek at Cambridge under Fisher, looked at the King to see how he took it. The King smiled pleasantly at Pace. After the sermon the theologian was called before the King, and More was set to defend Greek against this Trojan. When More had said many things most eloquently, and it was the theologian's turn to reply, he went on to his knees and begged for pardon, having only this to say for himself, that while he was preaching some spirit possessed him and he poured forth this attack upon Greek. "But that spirit of yours," said the King, "was not the spirit of Christ, but of folly." And he asked: "I suppose you have not read anything of Erasmus's?" for the King saw that he was hitting at me. "No," he said, "he had not read anything." "But," the King retorted, "you openly declare yourself fatuous, to condemn what you have not read." The theologian said he had read something called "Moria." Here Pace interposed. "That, most serene King, suits him exactly." At the end the theologian called to mind another argument to soften his offence: "I am not so very hostile to Greek letters, because they have their origin from the Hebrew tongue." The King was astonished at the folly of the man, and told him to go away and never come there to preach again.

Fisher was a great reformer in the matter and manner of preaching. He wished preaching to be no longer on words and quibbles, but of life. His own sermons were marked by the free introduction of natural similes. He describes the varying phases of weather; tells of the sun calling into life the creatures and plants and trees that had seemed to be dead. He illustrates the force of the direct rays of the sun by the effects of the normal and the oblique impact of a ball upon the wall in a game; and in another simile he uses the principle of the burning-glass. He began his famous sermon against Martin Luther, preached before Warham and Wolsey, thus:

"Full often when the day is clear, and the sun shineth bright, riseth in some quarter of the heaven a thick black cloud that darketh all the face of the heaven and shadoweth from us the clear light of the sun, and steereth an hideous tempest, and maketh a great lightning, and thundereth terribly, so that the weak souls and feeble hearts be put in a great fear and made almost desperate for lack of comfort."

He was urgent against those who neglected their cure of souls. Preaching on Ps. xxxviii. 11, "My kinsmen stood afar off," he spoke as follows:

"They that had cure of my soul stood afar from me. Truly those be very wretches whom sins do subdue and put under the miserable

yoke of servitude or bondage. They be also thrust down into a more straiter corner of misery when their friends and neighbours will not admonish and reprove their wickedness, but suffer them so to continue, when also prelates and parsons do not correct their mis-living and shortly call them to amendment, but rather go by and suffer their mis-governance. What then, truly the soul being glad of his destruction and in manner running on his own bridle, not helped by his friends, nothing cared for of the bishops and such as hath cure of soul, must needs come into the devil's power, which as wood [raging] enemies and ramping lions go about seeking whom they may devour, they do the uttermost of their power, they go sore to the matter, and many times overcome such as be very strong. Therefore what marvel is it if the devils catch the miserable soul, void and utterly destitute of all help, and so taken draw it into the deep pit of hell?"

His view as to the headship of the Church was very decided. He was appointed "by the assignment of the moost reuerend father in god, the lord Thomas Cardinall of Yorke and Legate ex latere from our holy father the pope," to make a sermon "within the octaves of the ascensyon again the pernicious doctryn of Martin luuther." He takes the position "that the pope iure divino is the heed of the vnyuersall chyrche of christ." "Luther," he remarks, "will say that he cannot conceive duos summos" (two heads—Christ and the Pope). But

"St. Paul maketh many heads, saying the head of the woman is the man, and the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God. So here be three heads unto a woman, God, Christ, and her own husband; and beside all these she hath an head of her own. It were a monstrous sight to see a woman without a head, what comfort should her husband have upon her. If then the woman, notwithstanding she hath an head of her own to govern her according to the will and pleasure of her husband, yet she hath her husband to be her head, and Christ to be her head, and God to be her head. How much rather our mother holy Church, which is the spouse of Christ, hath an head of her own, that is to say the Pope, and yet nevertheless Christ Jesu her husband is her head, and Almighty God is her head too."

In the "Spiritual Consolation, written by John Fysshier Bishop of Rochester to his Sister Elizabeth," when he was in the Tower awaiting death, there are many very striking passages. Here is one:

"O ye that have time and space to make your provision against the hour of death, defer not from day to day like as I have done. For I often did think and purpose with myself that at some leisure I would have provided, nevertheless for every trifelous business I put it aside, and delayed this provision alway to an other time, and promised with myself that at such a time I would not fail but do it, but when that came an other business arose, and so I deferred it again unto an other time. And so (alas) from time to time, that now death in the mean time hath prevented me; my purpose was good, but it lacked execution; my will was straight, but it was not

effectual; my mind well intended, but no fruit came thereof. All for because I delayed so often and never put it into effect, that, that I had purposed. And therefore delay it not as I have done, but before all other business put this first in surety, which ought to be chief and principal business. Neither building of Colleges, nor making of Sermons, nor giving of alms, neither yet any other manner of business shall help you without this. . . . Be you your own friend, do you these suffrages for your own soul, whether they be prayers or almsdeeds, or any other penitential painfulness. If you will not effectually and heartily do these things for your own soul, look you never that other will do them for you, and doing them in your own persons, they shall be more available to you a thousand-fold than if they were done by any other."

His sermon on the death of the Lady Margaret, the grandmother of Henry VIII., through whom her son, Henry VII., drew such title as he had to the throne, sets before us his ideal of a devout lady, given to good works. We might have expected that he would dilate upon the munificence of her endowments for the advance of learning; but the only reference I find to this very striking part of her work is in the brief statement: "Weep the Universities, to which she was as a mother." He compares her throughout to Martha, and first, quaintly enough, in nobleness of blood. The Lady Margaret "had xxx kinges and queenes within the iiii degree of maryage unto her, besyde erles, markyses, dukes, and princes," and "the blessyd Martha was a woman of noble blode, to whom by inheritance belonged the castel of bethany, and this nobleness of blode they haue which descende of noble lygnage."

"As to nobleness of nature, first she was of singular wisdom far passing the common rate of women, she was good in remembrance, and of holding memory. A ready wit she had also to conceive all things, albeit they were right dark. . . . Full often she complained that in her youth she had not given her to the understanding of latin, wherein she had a little perceiving, specially of the rubrysshe [rubrics] of the ordinal for the saying of her service, which she did well understand. . . . Her sober temperance in meats and drinks was known unto all them that were conversant with her, wherein she lay in as great wait of herself as any person might, keeping alway her strait measure, and offending as little as any creature might, eschewynge bankettes, resouspers, jonceries betwyxe meales. As for fasting, for age and feebleness albeit she were not bound, yet those days that by the church were appointed she kept them diligently and seriously, and in especial the holy Lent, throughout that she restrained her appetite till one meal and till one fish on the day, besides her other peculiar fasts of devotion, as Saint Anthony, Mary Maudeleyn, Saint Katheryn, with other. And thorough out all the year the Friday and Saturday she full truly observed. As to hard clothes wearing, she had her shirts and girdles of hair, which when she was in health every week she failed not certain days to wear, sometime that one, sometime that other, that full often her skin I have heard her say was pierced therewith. As for chastity, though she alway continued not in her virginity, yet in her husband's days

long time before that he died she obtained of him licence and promised to live chaste, in the hands of the reverend father my lord of London, which promise she renewed after her husband's death into my hands again : whereby it may appear the discipline of her body."

Nor were her devotions less remarkable :

"First in prayer every day at her uprising, which commonly was not long after v of the clock, she began certain devotions, and so after them with one of her gentlewomen the matins of our lady, which kept her to then she came into her closet, where then with her chaplain she said also matins of the day. And after that daily heard iiii or v masses upon her knees, so continuing in her prayers and devotions unto the hour of dinner, which of the eating day was x of the clock, and upon the fasting day xi. After dinner full truly she would go her stations to three altars daily. Daily her diriges and commendations she would say. And her evensongs before supper, both of the day and of our lady, beside many other prayers and psalters of David throughout the year. And at night before she went to bed she failed not to resort unto her chapel and there a large quarter of an hour to occupy her in devotions. No marvel through all this long time her kneeling was to her painful, and so painful that many times it caused in her back pain and disease. And yet nevertheless daily when she was in health she failed not to say the crown of our lady, which after the manner of Rome containeth lx and three aves, and at every ave to make a kneeling. . . . Her marvellous weeping they can bear witness of which here before have heard her confession, which be divers and many, and at many seasons in the year lightly every third day ; can also record the same those that were present at any time when she was houseled, which was full nigh a dozen times every year : what floods of tears there issued forth of her eyes she well might say, 'My eyes gush out with water.'"

It may be of interest to note that Fisher kept fairly close to his time in preaching. The funeral sermon on the Lady Margaret takes about sixty-two minutes to read, that on Henry VII. about sixty minutes.

Fisher's death was a martyrdom for conscience' sake. But if the King had got possession of the secrets of the Spanish Ambassador, he could justly have had him executed as a traitor. Fisher took the so-called divorce of Catharine of Arragon so much to heart that he urged the invasion of England by the Emperor, her nephew, promising that the people would rise against Henry. His death was brought about unfairly. An Act of Parliament settled the succession to the throne upon the children of Anne Boleyn, and another Act ordered that all English subjects should swear to the succession before the Royal Commissioners. This, it appeared in the end, Fisher would have done. But the oath tendered by the Commissioners went far beyond the conditions authorized by the Act. It compelled the assertion that the marriage with Catharine was invalid, and the repudiation of

any oath taken in the past to any foreign authority, prince, or potentate. The refusal of the oath was, under the Act, misprision of treason, and the Commissioners declared that their greatly enlarged oath was the oath under the Act. Fisher replied that he would swear to part of it, not to all, and he was sent to the Tower. This was in April, 1534. In January, 1535, he was deprived of his bishopric.

Early in June he was charged with high treason; on June 17 he was condemned to die; on June 22 he was executed.

Colet was born two or three months after his friend Erasmus, in the end of 1466. In 1485, at the age of nineteen, he was instituted to a rectory and a vicarage. After the fashion of the time, benefices were piled up upon him, long before he was ordained deacon. We shall see how strongly he spoke against this at a later period of his life.

In or about 1493 Colet travelled in Italy, much as Grocyn and Linacre had done shortly before. Being the son of a wealthy father, he could travel as he pleased and stay as long as he would. In foreign Universities he studied the Fathers, and learned to prefer Dionysius, the so-called Areopagite, Origen, Ambrose, Cyprian, Jerome, over Augustine, Duns Scotus, Aquinas, and the other schoolmen in vogue in the English Universities. He probably began to learn Greek at the same time; he never became very proficient in that tongue. In 1496 he was back in England. On December 17, 1497, he was ordained deacon; on March 25, 1498, priest. By that time all his twenty-one younger brothers and sisters were dead, and he was only thirty-one years old. In 1504 he became Dean of St. Paul's. In 1505 his father's death made him a very rich man, and in 1509 he founded St. Paul's School for 153 scholars. There were normally, in a Cathedral of Dean and Canons, three schools—the School of Song, the School of Grammar, and the School of Theology. Colet, as I believe, revived the St. Paul's Cathedral School of Grammar, which had died out, set it up again in the precincts, and gave it and his noble endowments into the charge of the Mercers' Company, mistrusting the Deans and Canons of his own time, and relying upon the care of secular married business men. His confidence has proved to be well placed. He died in 1519, at the early age of fifty-two.

Colet's life was throughout chaste, temperate, and simple, though his natural inclinations and his wealth pointed in an opposite direction. He exercised careful and serious discipline to keep the flesh in subjection, and guarded himself at all points. His mother was a remarkable woman. Among many other ecclesiastical preferments, he held the vicarage of

Stepney, in the Hall of which place his father lived. One of his letters to Erasmus is dated from his mother's house "in rural Stepney." In it he describes her as growing old beautifully, and very often making joyous and sweet mention of her friend Erasmus. Years after she had lost the last of her twenty-two children, the man perhaps of greatest promise then in England, a son handsome and well grown, Erasmus describes her as approaching her ninetieth year (in 1532), and so hale in aspect and so cheerful in spirit that it might have been supposed she had never shed a tear nor borne a child. She was Christian Knyvet, of gentle birth, daughter of Sir John Knyvet, of Ashwellthorpe, and his wife Elizabeth, daughter of the second Baron Clinton.

Colet's chief mark on the thought of the time was made by his sermons in St. Paul's. They were, in fact, courses of lectures on continuous portions of the New Testament, treated in the new light of the New Learning. We are told that his hearers were chiefly those who were inclined to Lollardism. His freedom of thought and expression gave great alarm to the Bishop of London of the time, an aged man, trained in the strictest sect of the schoolmen, one who could not conceive that anything which he had learned in his youth could be wrong; his whole thoughts were completely confined within the narrowest limits of late mediævalism. Colet was accused of dangerous doctrines, of heretical preaching, and even of heretical purposes in his new school. But the King (Henry VIII.) and the Archbishop (Warham) gave him their firm support. In the end, he told his friend Erasmus that the persecutions of the old Bishop (Fitzjames) made him desire to retire from public life and make his home among the Carthusians at Sheen. As a matter of fact, he did die there.

In 1512, when Convocation was summoned to consider the recrudescence of Lollardism, Warham appointed Colet to preach the Latin sermon. It was a bold appointment, considering the liberality of his views; but no doubt Warham, with his kindly breadth of view, desired that Lollardism should now be met on the new ground, in the light of the new knowledge, and no longer on the old ground, so much of it untenable. Certainly Colet astonished the assembled Bishops and clergy by saying much more about their own need of reform than about the erroneous views of the Lollardists. The sermon was immediately published in an English translation. The tone of it may be gathered from a few sentences. Evidently some great change or some great catastrophe was near, and Colet would have it the change, not the catastrophe.

"We wish that ye would remember your name and profession, and would mind the reformation of the Church's matter. Never did the state of the Church more need your endeavours. The spouse of Christ whom ye would should be without spot or wrinkle, is made foul and evil favoured, as saith Esaias, 'The faithful city is made an harlot.' Be you not conformed to this world. Priests and bishops are conformed to this world by devilish pride, by carnal concupiscence, by worldly covetousness, by secular business.

"How run they, yea, almost out of breath, from one benefice to another! There is nothing looked for more diligently of the most part of priests than that doth delight and please the senses. They give themselves to feasts and banquetings, they spend themselves in vain babbling, they give themselves to sports and plays, they apply themselves to hawking and hunting, they drown themselves in the delights of this world. Procurers and finders of lusts they set by. What other thing seek we now in the Church than fat benefices and high promotions? We care not how many, how chargeful, how great benefices we take, so that they be of great value. O covetousness! St. Paul justly called thee the root of all evil. Of thee cometh this heaping of benefices upon benefices. Of thee, so great pensions from many benefices resigned. . . . We perceive contradiction of the lay people; but they are not so much contrary unto us as we are our selves. We are nowadays grieved of heretics, men mad with marvellous foolishness; but the heresies of them are not so pestilent and pernicious unto us and the people as are the evil and wicked lives of priests."

Then, turning to the Bishops, he exclaimed:

"This reformation must needs begin of you. You are our heads: you are an ensample of living unto us. First taste you the medicine of purgation of manners, and then after offer us the same to taste."

Erasmus wrote an account of Colet in 1520, soon after Colet's death. Some notes from it will tell us much of his views. Erasmus says of him:

*Of Monasteries.*—"To monasteries (which, for the most part, are now falsely so called) he was in no degree well inclined . . . not that he entertained any hatred of the religious orders, but because their members do not act up to their vows."

*Of Celibacy.*—"He was wont to remark that he had never found morals less corrupted than amongst married people, because the natural affections, the care of children, and household affairs, act as it were as barriers to restrain them from lapsing into every kind of vice."

*Of his Tolerance.*—"He had derived some things from Dionysius and the other early theologians, upon which he still did not so absolutely rely as to induce him ever to contend against the decrees of the Church, but yet so far that he was less opposed to such as do not approve the all-prevailing image worship in churches, whether as paintings, or in wood, stone, brass, gold, or silver; and also to such as doubt whether a priest, notoriously and openly reprobate, should perform any

sacramental function; by no means favouring the erroneous judgment of such thinkers, but indignant at those who, by a life openly and unbecomingly corrupted, afford occasion for this kind of doubt."

*Of Colleges.*—"The Colleges which with great and magnificent expense are established among the English, he used to say were an obstacle to efficient study, nor were anything more than the lounging places of idle fellows."

*Of Confession.*—"Whilst he strongly approved of secret [or auricular] confession, asserting that he had never derived from any other source so much spiritual consolation and support, he equally strongly condemned its anxious and too frequent repetition."

*Of Frequent Masses.*—"Although it is customary with the priests in England to perform Mass almost every day, yet he was content to do it only upon the Sundays and Feasts, or, at least, on very few days besides these."

*His Dissent from Received Opinions.*—"There are numberless things now most fully maintained in the public schools from which he very far dissented; of these he was accustomed sometimes to debate among his friends, though with others he was more reserved, from fear that whilst on the one hand he might effect no alteration, unless for the worst, he might also on the other suffer loss of influence himself."

*His Study of Heretical Writings.*—"There was no book so heretical that he had not attentively read; saying that he occasionally derived more profit from such than from those authors who so mystify everything as often to cajole their followers and sometimes even themselves."

*His Love for Children.*—"He delighted in the purity and natural simplicity of children, remembering how Christ had called upon His disciples to be like unto them; and used to compare them to the angels." So Erasmus tells us. We should have known that it was so from the wonderful sweetness and simplicity of the introduction to his Latin Grammar for St. Paul's School. He calls it his "little preface" to his "little work" for making learning "a little more easy to young wits," for "nothing may be too soft nor too familiar for little children." "In which little book I have left many things out, of purpose, considering the tenderness and small capacity of little minds;" "whom, digesting this little work, I had alway before mine eyes, willing to speak things often before spoken, in such manner as gladly young beginners and tender wits might take and conceive." "Wherefore I pray you, all little babes, all little children, learn gladly this little treatise, trusting that of this beginning ye shall come at the last to be great clerks. And lift up your little white hands

for me, which prayeth for you to God. To whom be all honour, empire, majesty, and glory. Amen.”

There remains Sir Thomas More. It is quite in the spirit of More's time to say with all gravity, "There is no room for more."

G. F. BRISTOL

---

ART. III.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY  
SINCE THE RESTORATION.

JOHN MOORE.

THE *Annual Register* for 1805 begins its biography of our present subject thus: "This amiable prelate was a native of the city of Gloucester, where his father was a butcher, and in circumstances that would not permit him to give his son that liberal education which he desired and deserved. He was therefore brought up at the free-school of his native city; and on account of the docility of his behaviour and promising talents, some friends procured him a humble situation in Pembroke College, Oxford, whence he some time afterwards removed to Christ Church in that university." This summary of his early years has, however, been in part disputed. A descendant, if I mistake not, of his, the late Canon Scott-Robertson, once wrote to me with reference to a short paper of mine, "You are mistaken in supposing that Archbishop Moore was the son of a butcher." I could only reply that I found it in the *Annual Register*. His rejoinder was very short: "He was not the son of a butcher." The reader must weigh the evidence for himself. On the one hand we have a biography written at the time of the prelate's death, when there must have been plenty of living memories of his young days. On the other, the testimony of one who probably had family archives. His father, Thomas Moore, is called "Mr." in the parish register, and "gent" in the Gloucester municipal records in 1761, where John's name was entered on the free-men's roll. All probability seems to point to his having been, like Shakespeare's father, a possessor of some land and a grazier, with which he combined the business of a butcher. The son was baptized in St. Michael's, Gloucester, on January 13, 1730, educated at the Free Grammar School of St. Mary de Crypt in the same city, and then, assisted by whomsoever it may have been, to Pembroke, Oxford, where, however, he also assisted himself by gaining a scholarship. He took his B.A. degree in 1748, and his M.A. in 1751. Meanwhile a somewhat

romantic incident had occurred. The Duke of Marlborough (son of the great General) came to Oxford to look for a tutor to his two little sons, and the authorities there recommended certain young men who had taken good degrees. He inspected them one by one, and did not seem to care for any of them. Whilst he was still in doubt, he was walking with one of the dons down the High Street, when he saw a very handsome young man walking towards them, and being taken with his appearance, asked who he was. "His name is Moore," was the reply, "but he is nothing of a scholar, though a very respectable, well-behaved man." Probably the Duke did not care for high scholarship; anyway, he knew enough to have taken his degree, and without any difficulty he engaged him, and away they went to Blenheim, the Marquis of Blandford, his eldest pupil, being then just ten years old. Moore took Orders and became chaplain to the Duke, and Macaulay may very likely have had him for one in mind when, in his well-known third chapter, he described the humiliating condition of the "young Levites" who acted as chaplains in great men's houses. The Duchess of Marlborough was a very proud and haughty personage, a daughter of Lord Trevor, and she would not allow the young chaplain to sit at her table; he had to take his place with the upper servants. This continued for ten years, at the end of which the Duke died, three months before his son attained his majority. By this time the feelings of the Duchess towards the handsome young tutor had undergone a complete change, and in a very few months she offered him her hand. But he declined the honour, and acquainted his former pupil of the proposal. The Duke was full of gratitude to him, and eager to prove it; he settled upon him an annuity of £400, and from that time he lost no opportunity of pushing his fortunes with the great. This Duke did credit to his tutor in the way of scholarship and general attainment, and was a connoisseur of considerable taste in the fine arts. He was Lord Privy Seal in the Grenville Ministry. In 1761 Moore received a prebendal stall at Durham, in 1763 a canonry at Christ Church, Oxford. On that occasion he took his D.D. degree. In 1771 he was made Dean of Canterbury, and in 1775 Bishop of Bangor. When Archbishop Cornwallis died the primacy was offered to Lowth, but he pleaded old age and recommended Hurd. He also declined, and then the Prime Minister asked them both to recommend somebody. They joined in choosing Moore, who thereupon received his translation in April, 1783.

He owed his good fortune to powerful Court influence, for he was neither a great scholar nor theologian. But he was a respectable Primate, amiable, of dignified presence and manner,

assiduous in the administration of his diocese, and also in the promotion of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. In his time the establishment of Sunday-schools took place. Robert Raikes, a printer of Gloucester, who had already done good work by his endeavours to ameliorate the condition of prisoners and to compass their conversion, saw what was the most likely instrument in the hands of God for this end. He opened a Sunday-school in 1780, and it was most successful. Three years later he published an account of it in the *Gloucester Journal*, a paper which he edited, without mentioning his own share in the work. It attracted much attention, and imitation so quickly followed that in 1786 it is said there were 200,000 Sunday scholars in England. In 1785 a London Society for the Establishment of Sunday-schools was started in London. Jonas Hanway and Henry Thornton were members of the original committee. Archbishop Moore very warmly took up the work, as did also Porteus and Shute Barrington, Bishops of Chester and Salisbury. Wesley urged his followers to do all in favour that they could. Adam Smith wrote to Raikes that "no plan so promising for the improvement of manners had been devised since the days of the Apostles." Another wise and far-seeing ecclesiastic, a few years later, looking back on the progress of the movement, declared that nothing so important for the improvement of popular intelligence had been devised since the invention of printing. The movement quickly spread in Scotland, Wales, Ireland, and the United States.

The great movements for popular education which came in the early part of the nineteenth century somewhat lessened the necessity of the Sunday-schools, but it would seem as if they have yet a very important part to play in forwarding the knowledge of the doctrines of the Church and of definite Christianity.

We have to turn aside for a while to consider an act of Wesley's, which was really an abandonment of his old principles, and which was very mischievous in its consequences. He began as a High Churchman, a very High Churchman. He owed his religious impressions principally to the Nonjuror Law. The hymns of his brother Charles on the Holy Communion are some of those most eagerly quoted by the High Churchmen of our own time, as they were also by the authors of the early Oxford Tracts. Wesley's first idea was to constitute a body of lay-preachers who were to work in harmony with the clergy, to receive the Sacrament regularly in the parish churches, and not to hold their services or prayer-meetings in the hours of the Church service. They were not to wear clerical costume unless they were ordained, as some of his

preachers were. But things went crooked. The clergy opposed him, some because they saw that his doctrine of conversion might be turned into most unscriptural and mischievous channels, others because they preferred sloth and indifference to earnestness and self-denial. There was unseemly violence of language, such as in these less rough and coarse days we should flee from, used on both sides. Thus Whitfield in America called Tillotson "a mitred infidel"; and Warburton had called the preachers "a crew of scoundrels," and talked of "dusting the rogues' jackets for them." And thus a very serious cleavage began. And unfortunately Wesley was not drawn to the Evangelical clergy, who were arrived at great influence before his death. For they were repelled by his High Sacerdotal and Sacramental views; they were Calvinistic, after Whitfield, which Wesley detested. They were ardent admirers of the sixteenth-century reformers, he of the Primitive Church. They were sticklers for their parochial rights, he never had any scruple about going into any man's parish. And the result was that he was more and more isolated, became irritated and disgusted, and yielded to the spirit of separation which his followers had long been urging upon him. In the years following Moore's translation to the See of Canterbury, Wesley took his first great departure from Church order. Hitherto he had ruled with absolute power over the whole movement, but in 1784 he executed a Deed Poll, substituting for himself a permanent governing body of a hundred members, to be known as "the Conference." He chose the first hundred all himself, out of the 191 preachers in full connexion.

But his next step was still more decisive. A Dr. Coke, who in 1777 had been dismissed from his curacy for giving notices of Wesley's meetings in defiance of the rector's orders, and from that time had entirely thrown in his lot with Wesley, urged him now to ordain ministers for America, and to appoint *superintendents*, or, in other words, *bishops*, over them. Wesley hesitated much, but at last he agreed, justifying himself by Peter King's treatise on *the Primitive Church*. Curious that a man, now eighty-one years old, should be led to such an error by the writings of a young man of twenty-one, and writings which, after all, condemned the step he was taking. But Wesley was really failing in mental power. He and Dr. Coke, and another clergyman named Creighton, who had also turned methodist, ordained two "presbyters" for America, and Coke went out as superintendent. He drew up a liturgy for them to be used on the Lord's Day; they were to use the Litany every Wednesday and Friday, pray extempore on the other days, and to administer the Lord's Supper every

Sunday. Such was the beginning of American "Episcopal Methodism."

If it be said that the English Bishops were slow to act, it must be said in their defence that it was the Americans themselves who had thrown obstacles in the way. Before the Declaration of Independence in 1776, they had looked upon the English endeavour to establish the Episcopate as a plan of strengthening royalist sentiments and weakening their liberty. If Wesley would have waited in accordance with his own innermost convictions, things would have come right and a schism been prevented. The acknowledgment of the Independence by England was made on November 30, 1782, and this made a great alteration in the position. The majority of the clergy had remained faithful to the English Crown, but a considerable minority had been in favour of the Declaration. When the first Congress was opened, an Episcopal clergyman had acted as chaplain, and all through Pennsylvania the neglect of any clergyman to read the prayer for Congress was immediately followed by the congregation rising and leaving the church. In some cases the royalist churches were shut up. Thus was brother set against brother and friend against friend. But the amity is deep and heartfelt now between those whose forefathers believed it their duty to fight to the death.

When the war came to an end and the great republic took its place among the nations, the Church was in the very lowest state of depression. Most of the churches were in ruins or deserted, the few clergy who were left were hated as supposed Royalists, and their incomes had all disappeared. When the war began Virginia had 164 churches and 91 clergy. At the end 95 churches had been destroyed and only 28 clergy remained. But the zeal of these and of their brethren in the other States was unabated—was even enlarged, and they were more than ever crying to God for the Episcopate. Two names rose above all others—Samuel Seabury and William White. Seabury had graduated at Yale in 1748, and had studied medicine in Scotland, but finally chose Holy Orders; was ordained by Sherlock, Bishop of London, in 1754, and became Rector of Christchurch, New Brunswick, New Jersey. During the war he remained loyal to King George, and for part of the time acted as chaplain in the royal army. When the English cause was seen to be hopeless the other side had so great a respect for him that the Churchmen readily welcomed him in his endeavour to restore the life of the trodden-down Church. It was in Connecticut that the clergy were the first to rally to the rescue of a cause which to the world seemed lost, and they saw at once that the

first step to be taken was to have a Bishop among them. They met "in a house still standing in Woodbury, Connecticut," says an American writer, "an interesting relic of a great epoch in American ecclesiastical history," and unanimously elected Seabury to be their first Bishop. He started immediately to England for consecration, arriving in June, 1783. But here he met with most serious difficulties, which nothing but unflinching determination could have surmounted. Moore, who had only just become Archbishop, and the other Bishops were willing to consecrate, but without an Act of Parliament it could not be, because no subject of a foreign State could take the oath of allegiance, and the Archbishop had no power to dispense with it. What was to be done? Parliament might provide for the emergency, but it must take time, and Seabury was determined not to go back until he had obtained the boon for which his countrymen were pressing. He went to Scotland, to the country already familiar to him, and where he had worshipped in the Episcopal Church, which the Nonjurors had supported when Presbyterianism was established. He found a splendid supporter in George Berkeley, a son of the great Bishop, who had shown such sympathy for the Americans in past years. Berkeley was a man of high character and position, a Canon of Canterbury, who had been an intimate friend of Archbishop Secker, and had two years before refused an Irish bishopric. Bishop Skinner, in his turn, made difficulties. The English people, he said, were suspicious of the Scottish Episcopal Church for having received their succession from the Nonjurors, and would hate and persecute them now if they found them corresponding with the revolted colonists. But Berkeley reassured him. The Scottish Church, he said, was a proof that an Episcopal Church could exist without an Act of Parliament, and if there, why not in America? He assured him also that Archbishop Moore would not disapprove of the consecration, and so, on November 14, 1784, Samuel Seabury was consecrated in Aberdeen as first Bishop of Connecticut.

Meanwhile, in America the Churchmen were still busy. In May, 1784, a meeting of delegates from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey met at Brunswick, New Jersey. The meeting was presided over by Dr. William White, a most pious and holy man, mild and meek of manners, and withal firm in holding his views. On the outbreak of the War of Independence he had at once joined the American cause. He is said to have been the only Episcopal minister left in the State of Pennsylvania at the end of the war. Washington was a regular worshipper at his church

and had unbounded confidence in him, and it was felt all round that he would show wisdom in the difficult task of constructing an American Church.

The work proceeded carefully, as was needful over ground new and untrodden. Difficulties were pointed out, and White, by his courage, to which keen discernment was also added, met them successfully. They drew up some resolutions, and then adjourned till Seabury should return. The principal fear was the prominence given to the laity in the needful legislation; the clergy feared lest the Book of Common Prayer should be unduly tampered with. The Convention met September 27, 1785—sixteen clerical and twenty-five lay delegates from seven States. Seabury had returned, but was not present, and Dr. White presided. The Liturgy, as altered by that Convention, is known by American Churchmen as "The Proposed Book." The principal matter, however, was the Episcopate. Most of the delegates accepted the validity of Seabury's consecration, but there was a unanimous desire that the Episcopate should be obtained from the English Bishops also, and an address was drawn up to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, declaring their desire to perpetuate a union with the loved Mother Church, and asking them to consecrate such divines as the delegates might send. The meeting then adjourned until June, 1786, in order to give time for the reply. The English Bishops made strong objections to some features of "The Proposed Book." Some parts differing from our own use they approved—notably, the Communion Service, which was like that of the Scottish Church, and, in fact, like the First Book of Edward VI. But they objected to the omission of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and of the article of Christ's descent into hell in the Apostles' Creed. If these obstacles were removed, the Bishops expressed their belief that Parliament would remove the legal difficulties.

When this message was laid before the Convention the fears were great that it would result in shipwreck, but the fears were not realized. The debate was unrestrained and earnest, but never angry. The other changes objected to were abandoned, but the Athanasian Creed was put into the same category as the Articles, and not ordered to be used in public worship. Three divines were selected for new Bishops—Dr. White; Dr. Provoost, of Trinity Church, New York; and Dr. Griffith, of Virginia. The two former started for England; the last-named was prevented by home difficulties at the last moment. They made the voyage in eighteen days, the shortest time in which the Atlantic had yet been crossed, and were consecrated in Lambeth Chapel

on Sunday, February 4, 1787. From that day till now the chapel has been specially dear to the American Church. They returned at once, and landed on a bright Easter day. This was a happy day in Archbishop Moore's life, and he certainly deserves much honour for his patience in carrying out the good work. On August 12 in the same year he consecrated Charles Inglis as Bishop of the American Colonies which had remained faithful to the English rule. Charles Inglis, Bishop of Nova Scotia, may thus be regarded as the first missionary Bishop sent out by England. During the war many of the clergy of the States had fled thither. On July 7, 1793, Moore consecrated Jacob Mountain as first Bishop of Quebec.

But there was yet more to be done. At the first General Convention the clergy of New Hampshire petitioned that the Rev. Edward Bass, whom they had elected Bishop of Massachusetts, should be consecrated forthwith. The Convention acted promptly and wisely. They resolved that the Church in the United States was now possessed of a complete order of Bishops, through both the English and Scottish lines, who were fully competent to consecrate others and to perform all other episcopal functions, and invited the Church of New England to accept their fellowship. They also drew up an address to the English Bishops gratefully acknowledging what they had done, and requesting their approval of the present proposals, and they made some modifications of their constitution. To their address Archbishop Moore replied that it would be well for them to have the English succession complete, and as it was usual to have at least three Bishops to unite in the act of consecration, he suggested that they should elect another Bishop and send him to England. They did so, choosing James Madison, President of William and Mary College, Dr. Griffith having died. Moore, assisted by the Bishops of London and Rochester, consecrated him on September 19, 1790. But the Americans were, to their honour, careful to recognise the full validity of Seabury's consecration, and no discordant voice was raised when he took his seat in the House of Bishops. The President, George Washington, was greatly delighted. In 1792 they consecrated Thomas Claggett Bishop of Maryland. That year there were 176 clergy in the States to a population of 3,100,000 people. Since then the Church has increased rapidly. The late Dean Stanley once expressed to me his belief that the Episcopal Church of America would in the end carry all before it. Bishop Seabury died in 1796. His mitre is still preserved at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut. White lived till 1836, and no man is more held in honour by his countrymen. Though he was of

the theological school of Tillotson and Burnet, he supported Seabury loyally in retaining the Athanasian Creed in the Prayer-Book, though without any rubric enjoining its use. He also supported Seabury in voting for the placing in the Communion Service the prayer of invocation and oblation after the use of the Scottish Church; and he set his face firmly against any relaxation of the law of divorce. When he died the city of Philadelphia went into universal mourning, and a portrait of him was placed by public subscription beside that of Washington in Independence Hall.

Events of vast importance occurred during the primacy of Archbishop Moore which it is necessary to glance at. The same year which saw his translation to Canterbury saw the notorious coalition Ministry of North and Fox; next year saw the beginning of that of Pitt, which lasted with one slight interruption until his death in 1806. We may note the famous trial of Warren Hastings in 1787, and the commencement of settlements in Australia in 1788. But the stupendous event which changed the politics of Europe was the French Revolution, which began in 1789. When the King was put to death in 1793, England entered into an Austrian alliance against France. Bonaparte was made First Consul in 1799. The hollow peace of Amiens in 1802 was followed by the renewal of a war which was only ended at Waterloo in 1815. The victories of Nelson at Copenhagen and the Nile, and the early victories of Sir Arthur Wellesley in India, the union of England and Ireland, all came within Moore's lifetime, the abolition of the slave trade in the year following his death.

Archbishop Moore was twice married, first to the daughter of Robert Wright, Chief Justice of South Carolina, secondly to Catherine, daughter of Sir Robert Eden, of Auckland. Her brother, Thomas Eden, was great-grandfather of the present Bishop of Wakefield. The reproaches which have been poured upon Moore for his nepotism have this palliation, that he followed the prevalent custom of his time, and had greater opportunities than most Bishops. One of his sons, who died not many years ago, held the rich living of Hunton in Kent for more than seventy years. His father placed him in it on the first day that he was old enough according to the canon, and he lived some years past ninety. He had a canonry and other fat livings besides. At the time of the Reform Bill agitation he rather rashly promised to speak at a public meeting held against the Bill. Some wag on the other side published a poster announcing that the meeting would be addressed by a Canon of Canterbury and the Rector of A, B, C, etc., naming all the parishes of which he held the

incumbency. Everybody enjoyed the joke, and Mr. Moore exercised a wise discretion by staying away.

The Archbishop died at Lambeth, January 18, 1805, and is buried in Lambeth Church. There are two portraits of him at Lambeth; that by Romney in the guardroom shows him as a remarkably handsome man. In the smaller dining-room beside the long corridor is another, full length, but in profile. And tradition has it that this was so painted because in later years the Archbishop had a large wen growing on his face, to his disfigurement, and therefore that side of it is turned away from the spectator.

W. BENHAM.

---

#### ART. IV.—JESUS CHRIST'S USE OF THE TITLE "THE SON OF MAN."

OUR Lord's self-description as "the Son of Man" has been spoken of as "a riddle which has come down to our own day."<sup>1</sup> This may, perhaps, need some measure of qualification if it is to escape criticism on the score of overstatement; but it is, at any rate, the case that the title, as we meet with it in the Gospels, has been felt to be not free from serious difficulty. If we found it there alone, it would indeed surrender itself to more or less easy and satisfactory explanation; but the source of the perplexity, of course, is that we do find it elsewhere, and that we are at a loss to determine the real relationship between its employment outside the Gospels with the application that it receives in their pages. Was it, as Jesus Christ made use of it, "a new title"? Did it, as Godet<sup>2</sup> says, "spring spontaneously from the depths of Jesus' own consciousness"? Or did our Lord directly borrow it from the literature of a preceding generation? If He did, what was the new colouring that He gave to it? Was it recognised in His day as a Messianic phrase? Did He adopt it because it was admittedly Messianic in its character?

Such questions suggest themselves at once to every careful reader of the New Testament; but directly he turns to critical books or commentaries for assistance, he finds them mutually contradictory. If he opens Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures, he sees the phrase dealt with as conveying a clear claim to be the Messiah: "It was in itself, to Jewish ears, a clear assertion of Messiahship. . . . As habitually used by our Lord, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology," English translation, i., 60.

<sup>2</sup> On Luke v. 24.

was a constant setting forth of His Messianic dignity in the face of the people of Israel. . . . For the disciples, the term 'Son of Man' implied first of all the Messiahship of their Master."<sup>1</sup> But if He examines Bishop Westcott's famous commentary on St. John, he finds such a view flatly contradicted: "There is nothing to show that the title was understood to be a title of Messiah."<sup>2</sup> But if the student turns to Edersheim—a well-known and highly-credited authority in Jewish matters—he has a guide in agreement with Canon Liddon. The phrase is again treated as a "well-understood" reference to the Messiah.<sup>3</sup> So, too, Mr. Ottley, in his work on the Incarnation, declares that "the title 'Son of Man' had already acquired what may be called an official sense. It had come to be used as a title of Messiah, with special reference to its use in the Book of Daniel."<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, Dr. Martineau agrees (in part, at any rate) with Bishop Westcott. He does, indeed, think that, "for the Evangelists themselves [the expression] had settled into its Messianic sense"; but he denies that it was in this sense that Jesus Christ Himself adopted and used it: "If, then, Jesus occasionally spoke of Himself as 'the Son of Man,' it by no means implied any Messianic claim. It might, on the contrary, be intended to emphasize the very features of His life and love which are least congenial with the national ideal."<sup>5</sup>

If the average reader turns from these most divergent interpretations to a consideration of the matter for himself, the argument that will at first make most impression upon him will probably be that of Bishop Westcott: "It is inconceivable that the Lord should have adopted a title which was popularly held to be synonymous with that of Messiah, while He carefully avoided that of Messiah itself"; and, acquiescing in this argument, he will go on to accept, on the Bishop's authority, the further contention that there is linguistic distinction traceable between the phrase in the Gospels and the supposed parallels to it elsewhere. But should he find leisure to pursue the matter further, and to read for himself the Book of Enoch, this confidence is like to receive a very rude shock. He then discovers that the distinction, upon the accuracy of which he had relied, cannot apparently be maintained. And if he consults Professor Charles—the latest English editor of Enoch—he finds him correcting the Bishop of Durham with much the same sort of confidence as a tutor might correct the exercise of an undergraduate: "Dr. Westcott asserts that the title in Enoch is 'A Son of

<sup>1</sup> Lecture 1.<sup>2</sup> P. 31.<sup>3</sup> "Life and Times," i. 505, note.<sup>4</sup> Vol. i., p. 72.<sup>5</sup> "Seat of Authority," 3rd edit., pp. 336, 339.

Man'; but wrongly, for it is as definitely 'The Son of Man' as the language and sense can make it. The being so named, further, is superhuman, and not merely human, as Dr. Westcott states."<sup>1</sup> Under the pressure of the very justifiable perplexity that his discovery causes him, the student's next impulse is to take refuge in the post-Christian date of these parts of the Apocalypse in question. But here once more he finds it very difficult to obtain any repose for his weary feet. He is told that, though there are indeed excellent scholars who will support him in such a contention, the majority are against him; and if he goes for himself into the merits of the discussion, he will quickly feel the force of what Dr. Sanday says: "No sooner is such a view seriously entertained than the difficulties begin to accumulate."<sup>2</sup> He will, therefore, have to retrace his steps, only to find that now, when he reads the Gospels, there is a strong sense of confusion and incomprehensibility often with him: for to understand the Scriptural narrative we need to postulate a continuous and deep-seated reserve attaching almost throughout to the self-revelation of our Lord, and abandoned wholly only at the absolute end of His ministry, except so far as some isolated individual need might be concerned. For example, Canon Liddon's interpretation of Matt. xvi. 13 deprives the question, not indeed of all force, but, at any rate, of the vigour of meaning which otherwise attaches to it, and renders it difficult, or even impossible, to understand the magnitude of the reward promised to St. Peter. To Canon Liddon "the point" of the question was this: "What is He besides being the 'Son of Man'? As the Son of Man He *is* Messiah; but what is the Personality which sustains the Messianic office?" In other words, St. Peter's glory was not that he saw in the lowly ministry of our Lord the fulfilment of the hopes of centuries, but that, having been told plainly that Jesus was the Messiah, he solved with success the problem of the theological significance of what he had learnt. In the same way, to take another illustration, Professor Charles's interpretation of John xii. 34, though by no means impossible or even far-fetched, seems to deprive the passage of its simpler and more natural meaning. "It is," he writes, "just the strangeness of this *new* conception of this current phrase of a Messiah who was to suffer death that makes the people ask, 'Who is this Son of Man?' We have heard of the law that the Christ abideth for ever."<sup>3</sup> But most readers of the verse will feel that the puzzle was in the phrase itself, and not in

<sup>1</sup> P. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Expositor*, vol. iv., series 3, "The Son of Man." <sup>3</sup> P. 317.

the particular adaptation of it. In other words, the emphasis falls on the expression "Son of Man," and not on the word "this." Neither, however, of these difficulties would, perhaps, be fatal by itself. We could—if these two passages stood alone in their seeming opposition to the plainness of the Messianic character of the phrase, as it comes before us in the Gospels—bring ourselves to accept, it may be, Canon Liddon's reading of the question in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, a reading exactly identical with that of Lightfoot in "*Horæ Hebraicæ*," and Professor Charles's accentuation in John xii. 34; but they do not stand alone. The feeling of semi-unintelligibility, which comes from this conclusion as to the meaning of the expression, may be said to extend to the Gospels as a whole. And the student, when he reaches this stage, simply feels that he has been harried into something like a quagmire, and that his footing is no longer on any solid path to which he can trust to lead him through the various parts of the Evangelists' narratives in which this title occurs.

I propose in this paper to add one more to the many contributions which have already been made to the matter of this riddle, and to endeavour to ascertain whether "the conclusion of the whole matter" really is one of more or less darkness and confusion, or whether it is not possible so to arrange all the known or conjectured facts in such a way as to produce an orderly scheme of doctrinal development, and to bring clearness and good sense into the Scriptural records of our Lord's use of the term.

The real fountain-head of the phrase is almost undoubtedly Dan. vii. 13. Godet does indeed suggest that we must go behind this, and not content ourselves with tracing the allusion back to this Apocalyptic passage, and he suggests that its real origin is to be found in Gen. iii. 15. But it is very difficult to find any solidity of connection, and we may be content to commence our investigation with the vision in Daniel. Not that we have there the full phrase of the Gospels, as Bishop Westcott points out, and as a reference to the Revised Version will also show. The revelation is of One like unto a son of man. "The thought on which the seer dwells is simply that of the human appearance of the being presented to him." But there, at least, in the middle of the second century before Christ, in a work dating, as modern scholarship has proved beyond all reasonable doubt, from the Maccabean era, and emanating, as the presence in the book of the doctrine of immortality clearly shows, from the first beginnings of the school of the Pharisees—there we do have the real, unmistakable origin of this title.

The important change of the indefinite article into the definite—the change which was to give the phrase linguistic finality and completion—probably came, roughly speaking, within the next hundred years. It is in the Similitudes, or Allegories, of the Book of Enoch—*i.e.*, in chapters xxxvii. to lxxi.—that we meet with it, in all likelihood, for the first time. The passages in which we find it are familiar enough, but it may nevertheless be well to quote parts of the more important references. I give them in Professor Charles's translation.

Chap. xlvi. 1 to 6: "And there I saw One who had a head of days, and His head was white like wool, and with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me, This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty ones from their couches and the strong from their thrones, and will loosen the reins of the strong and grind to powder the teeth of the sinners. And he will put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms because they do not extol and praise him, nor thankfully acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them. And he will put down the countenance of the strong and shame will cover them: darkness will be their dwelling and worms their bed, and they will have no hope of rising from their beds, because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits."

Chap. xviii. 1 to 6: "And in that place I saw a fountain of righteousness which was inexhaustible: around it were many fountains of wisdom, and all the thirsty drank of them and were filled with wisdom, and had their dwellings with the righteous and holy and elect. And at that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits and his name before the Head of Days. And before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits. He will be a staff to the righteous on which they will support themselves and not fall, and he will be the light of the Gentiles, and the hope of those who are troubled of heart. All who dwell on earth will fall down and bow the knee before him and will

bless and laud and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits. And for this reason has he been chosen and hidden before Him before the creation of the world and for evermore."

Chap. lxii. 8 to 14: And the congregation of the holy and elect will be sown, and all the elect will stand before him on that day. And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth will fall down on their faces before him, and worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man, and will petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands. Nevertheless, that Lord of Spirits will (so) press them that they will hastily go forth from His presence, and their faces will be filled with shame, and darkness will be piled upon their faces. And the angels of punishment will take them in charge to execute vengeance on them, because they have oppressed His children and His elect. And they will be a spectacle for the righteous and for His elect: they will rejoice over them because the wrath of the Lord of Spirits resteth upon them, and His sword is drunk with their blood [lit. "from them."] And the righteous and the elect will be saved on that day, and will never again from thenceforth see the face of the sinners and unrighteous. And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up for ever and ever."

Chap. lxix. 26 to end: "And there was great joy amongst them, and they blessed and glorified and extolled because the name of the Son of Man was revealed unto them: and he sat on the throne of his glory, and the sum of judgment was committed unto him, the Son of Man, and he caused the sinners and those who have led the world astray to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth. With chains shall they be bound, and in their assemblage-place of destruction shall they be imprisoned, and all their works vanish from the face of the earth. And from henceforth there will be nothing that is corruptible; for the Son of Man has appeared and sits on the throne of his glory, and all evil will pass away before his face and depart; but the word of the Son of Man will be strong before the Lord of Spirits. This is the third Similitude of Enoch."

The date of these celebrated passages is the first of the problems that offers itself for solution in connection with our subject. If, indeed, they are post-Christian, or if they are pre-Christian in substance, but owe the fulness of their present shape to later interpolations, then it is obvious that their use of the title under discussion has no bearing upon our Lord's employment of it as His favourite mode of self-designation. On the contrary, it was He who indirectly gave this great patch of interest and brilliancy to a Jewish apoca-

lyptic work ; and, as I have said, there are scholars who adopt this view. Drummond does so in his *Jewish Messiah* ; so, too, does Kuenen.<sup>1</sup> Stanton is quoted by Charles as of a similar opinion. Hausrath also "thinks that the Messiah-passages may have won somewhat of a Christian colouring in the process of translation from Hebrew to Greek and Greek to Ethiopic by Christian hands."<sup>2</sup> Professor Charles, however, is of a totally different mind : "All evidence internal and external will, as we shall see presently, prove not only that they are Jewish, but also pre-Christian."<sup>3</sup> Schürer takes the same sort of line, though his date for them is much nearer the time of Christ than Professor Charles's. The latter assigns them either to the years 94 to 79 B.C. or 70 to 64 B.C., and he prefers the earlier of the two periods. Schürer, however, fixes the reign of Herod the Great as the "terminus a quo," and the fall of Jerusalem as the opposite limit.<sup>4</sup> And Professor Sanday, to judge from his article in the *Expositor* to which allusion has already been made, is quite willing to acquiesce in this verdict. Anyhow, we have it on his authority that the majority of the scholastic world prefer a date before the Incarnation to one which admits of the introduction into the book of existing Christian phraseology. And if we turn from a balancing of names to a counterweighing of arguments, there are more than one consideration which make a great impression upon us. There is, in the *Similitudes*, no allusion to the destruction of the sacred city by Titus. But, apart from this, there is no mention of the earlier interference and domination of Rome in the very place where we should expect to find it, if the power of Rome, at the time of writing, was either an existing tyranny or a formidable element of danger on the horizon. Rome is not referred to either openly or apocalyptically. It is from the wild hordes of the Parthians and Medes that Jerusalem needs

<sup>1</sup> "History of Israel," iii. 265.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Charles thus states Hausrath's views (p. 17). As he quotes from the third German edition, and the English translation is made from the second, the discrepancy which the reader of the English version will notice may be explained by supposing that the author modified his opinions in the interval. But in the English translation Hausrath does not—so, at least, I understand him—place the *Similitudes* "in the reign of Herod the Great," but "forty years before the first appearance of the Romans in Palestine," and I can find no mention of later Christian handling. Bishop Westcott's statement in "Dict. of Bible" (new edition of vol. i.), that Schürer thinks these portions of the book to be "of Christian origin," I can only understand by supposing a misprint of "Christian" for pre-Christian.

<sup>3</sup> P. 16.

<sup>4</sup> "Hist. of Jewish People," E.T., Div. II., vol. iii., 67, 68.

deliverance, not from the iron legions of Italy.<sup>1</sup> But there is an argument of a wider and more general character, and at the same time of more searching efficacy than either of these. If the passages under discussion date, whether in their origin or in their present form, from such a part of the Christian era as will give time for the pressure of Christian influence, they are either the outcome of genuinely Jewish feeling, which sought to rescue the phrase "Son of Man" from Christian keeping, and to turn it to account for Israelitish purposes as well, or they are the product of Christian piety working on a Jewish original. They cannot, however, be the first. No Jew would have ventured to introduce into any apocalyptic book a term rendered for ever odious to his countrymen's ears by its association with the crucified Jesus. It would have been an outrage which would have condemned the work from the very first. The tide of prejudice and hatred was running far too strong for any such endeavour to be within the bounds of feasibility, and, so far as I know, it is not contended by anyone who has a right to a hearing that it is in such an explanation that we may look for the truth. If there is Christian influence at all, it is Christian influence coming directly on to the product of a Jewish brain with the intention of Christianizing it. If the lineaments were altered in any way, it was from strictly Jewish to Jewish-Christian. But if such an alteration were made at all, why was it not carried out with much greater fulness? How is it that the Christian hand did not do its work far more decisively? Why is not the impress sharp and distinct?<sup>2</sup> We need, if we are to suppose Christian influence, allusions, however veiled, to that which was the great stumbling-block to Jewish minds. We need the familiar doctrines of the Christian faith vindicated at least by implication. But there is no shadow of any such attempt at vindication in the Similitudes. We do indeed find in them doctrines which the inspiration of the Church was to adjudge worthy of permanence, which were to be worked into the Christian interpretation of the Lord's person, which, for that matter, our Lord was Himself to take

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* chap. lvi. and Charles's note. Schürer thinks that this passage supposes the Parthian invasion of 40 to 38 B.C. to have already taken place, and he brings the date of the Similitudes lower down in consequence.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer has put the point with clearness: "An anonymous Christian author would scarcely have been so reserved as to avoid making any allusion to the historical personality of Jesus. Surely, if the writer had any object in view at all, it would be to win converts to the faith. But could he hope to accomplish this object if he always spoke merely of the coming of the Messiah in glory, merely of the Chosen One as the Judge of the world, without making the slightest reference to the fact that, in the first place, He would have to appear in the estate of humiliation?"

up and weave into the wondrous web of His self-understanding and self-revelation. We do find there divinity, pre-existence with God, exaltation as Judge of the world; but we do *not* find self-abasement, self-oblation, self-sacrifice. We do not find the glory of the Incarnation, and of the ministry, and, above all, of the Cross. And, as we do not find them, it is most difficult to suppose that there has been Christian handling. We can scarcely, in the presence of such immense lacunæ, claim for these "allegories" a genuinely post-Christian date.

But if we once bring ourselves to concur in a distinctively Jewish source for these chapters, it does not much matter for our present purpose whether we date them early or late in the first century B.C. It would, it is true, suit the argument of this essay better to place them, with Schürer, in the reign of Herod the Great, rather than with Professor Charles, fifty to seventy years before; and there is no such trace in the New Testament of the influence of this section of Enoch as would necessarily forbid our doing so.<sup>1</sup> I need not, however, dwell upon this minor question, for, whichever way we decide to answer it, the bearing of our decision upon this discussion will not be very serious. The really momentous thing is the complete pre-Christianity of this use in Enoch of the expression which the affection and reverence of more than eighteen centuries connect so closely with Jesus Christ.

---

<sup>1</sup> The only possible exception (so far as I am aware) is Luke i. 52: "He hath put down princes from their thrones;" *cf.* Enoch xlvi. 5: "He will put down the kings from their thrones." This, of course, opens up the question of the date of the *Magnificat*, with regard to which there seems to me to be very strong reason for supposing it to be, more or less, as given by St. Luke, since it bears no signs of the discipline of the crucifixion. But if we attribute it to Mary, this one reflection in it of Enoch—if it be a reflection, and not a coincidence—may be explained by recollecting her connection, through her kinswoman Elisabeth, with a priestly family, which was apparently (Luke i. 6) in sympathy with the Pharisees. The Book of Enoch is, of course, mentioned in Jude 14, where it is quoted practically as Scripture; but the quotation is from a section of Enoch different to that under discussion, and unquestionably earlier. It does not follow from this reference that the author knew the Similitudes, though it would not affect the argument if it could be shown that he did; for that the educated world knew them is part of the main contention of this essay.

(To be continued.)



## ART. V.—RENOVATION.

WE are still living under the shadow of a great sorrow, and when we shall pass out from it we can hardly say. Churches may put off their trappings of woe, because the varied lessons and associations of the Christian life demand it; the days of public grief may come to an end; the year of the mourning of the Court may give place to the splendour of the coronation; but in the hearts of all of us there will remain a quiet abiding sense of sorrow for her who has been with us all our lives long, and who has passed so suddenly to her rest. Fresh proofs accumulate every day to show how wonderfully dear to us all she has been, and our sense of personal loss is absolutely genuine and unaffected. A railway porter said the other day to a Bishop, "It's like losing one's mother over again." Never have such scenes been witnessed in this country as those with which we have been familiar since the blow fell. Day after day, for instance, at the four o'clock service, the whole of St. Paul's Cathedral has been filled with a quiet throng of sincere mourners. They came in spontaneously, without concert, uninvited, from all parts, each day from 4,000 to 5 000. On the Sunday morning after the death the Inspector of Police told us that 30,000 had been turned away from morning service, unable to obtain admission; the throng was even greater in the afternoon and evening. There was no sensation about it; the feeling was quiet, unobtrusive, continuous, and will last. It is the same all over the kingdom and Empire—in some degree all over the world. Why was all this? Because of the intensity of our gratitude for all that Victoria the Beloved was to ourselves and her people during sixty-four untiring and unflagging years—her goodness, her wisdom, her self-control, self-denial, patience, perseverance, her devotion to duty, her sympathy, and her love. We feel now the incalculable value of these gifts in a position of such world-wide influence, and nothing shall ever take from our hearts our deep and reverent appreciation of our inexhaustible indebtedness.

But it is our duty to look to the future as well as to the past. Life has to go forward day by day with its varying calls and duties. Bells cannot always ring muffled peals. There comes an end at last to Church dirges and funeral anthems, however consonant with our feelings they have been. The example of the Queen herself on a like occasion gives us the right note of encouragement and inspiration. We remember how in the same year she lost her tenderly-cherished mother and her ideal husband. When, after a few months, that still deeper and most unexpected anguish came,

we can recall how she declared to her family that, though she felt crushed by the loss of one who had been her companion through life, she knew how much was expected of her, and she accordingly called on her children to give her their assistance, in order that she might do her duty to them and to the country. That is now her message to us from the long and touching record of her life: that we should each recognise the place of responsibility which God has given us in the world, be quick to understand the duty that lies nearest to us, and devote ourselves heart and soul to getting it done as well as our powers admit.

“Lay her to rest. O hour of grief and awe!  
 We say not England's happier days are done,  
 But who with that magnetic touch shall draw  
 And weld our world-spread Empire into one?  
 May He, who gave the mother grace the son!

“So simply noble, that almost she made  
 Of earth-born sovereignty a thing Divine.  
 Love was her law, by purity she swayed,  
 A power nor grief nor age could undermine—  
 Her throne an altar, and her heart a shrine.

“Queen, wife and mother peerless—even so:  
 And this shall be her fame in after years—  
 Or alien, or akin, or friend or foe,  
 Old jealousies forgot, old feuds and fears,  
 The whole earth wrote her epitaph in tears.

“Lay her to rest. Her memory shall be blown  
 Like pure sweet air upon a tortured clime.  
 She made for peace, and passes to her own  
 With those who reign—O recompense Divine!—  
 Beyond the folding gates of space and time.”<sup>1</sup>

The lessons of Septuagesima are in strong harmony with the leading thought of this sad fortnight. It is a time for looking back and looking forward. We only look back in order that we may look forward. We turn our thoughts to the early days of the world, and the majestic description of the Almighty Being working out His purpose in the Creation, in order that we may consider the meaning of that purpose, which was, in truth, that in the long course of ages the visible earth might be transformed and glorified into the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, or, as St. John describes it: “I saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.” In reading the description of the Creation we are not to take it literally any more

<sup>1</sup> James Rhoades.

than we are to understand literally the details of the heavenly city. Both are parables, giving suggestive pictures full of spiritual truth. We must remember that the Holy Scriptures are not intended to teach us science either in the future or in the past. Scripture was communicated to us for quite a different purpose: "All Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable also for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." In other words, the purpose of Scripture is moral and religious, not scientific. Moses had learnt that God's creation went by stages, but he was not inspired to teach us geology. As the greatest of all theologians, St. Augustine, has taught us long ago, the language of Moses is to be taken allegorically and poetically. It would be useless to calculate the length of the six days, or to adjust the order of the successive developments. It would be idle to search for the Garden of Eden, or to trace the course of the four rivers of Paradise. The great truth which these visions are intended to convey is that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, and that He did it gradually, and according to laws of succession, and in regular order and harmony. Man was the final result of the progressive thought of the Almighty; and man God intended to live, like Himself, in virtue, uprightness, and happiness. And it was man's misuse of the Divine gift of freewill that led him so far from his true ideal, the secret of his proper destiny and satisfaction.

It is a vital principle of Divine revelation that from every point of its long roll of truths it teaches us to look forward to the future, from the very fact that we are permitted to see clearly into the past. The same Divine, Omnipotent, Omnipresent Cause of all things, Who called matter into being, Who scattered the star-dust over the eternal universe, Who whirled it together into innumerable suns and constellations, Who ordained that our little earth, exclusively interesting and wonderful as it is to ourselves, should be one of the smallest planets attendant on one of the smallest suns in the whole vast glittering expanse of never-ending space, has also revealed to us, both by science and inspiration, that the heavens shall pass away with a great noise and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up. "Behold, I create a new heaven and a new earth," cried Isaiah; "and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind." "I saw a new heaven and a new earth," proclaims St. John in his vision; "for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away."

Why would not the present material universe answer God's

purpose? Because it was only a process. It was not complete or perfect. Look round, and see what decay there is in all that is of earth: the mountains being gradually carried down to the plains by ages of rain and ice and snow; vast tracts of sun-cursed deserts; animal preying upon animal, "nature red in tooth and claw," as Tennyson described it; the heat of the sun gradually dying out; some constellations and worlds already reduced to ashes; others not yet begun. We are in the midst of a process, an evolution, a progress of change. "The earnest expectation of the creature," said St. Paul, "waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." Creation is not complete. Matter is not perfect. The whole shall some day be spiritualized and transformed into redeemed and perfected beings, who shall to all eternity, in endless bliss and happiness, perform the will of God. "*Change and decay in all around I see*"; but a day shall come when God's purpose in the material creation shall be accomplished, and there shall be no more change, no more decay, but security, and ceaseless youth, and untiring activities, and unbroken peace, and pure universal spiritual existence for ever and ever!

In the meantime, God's law for material existence is one of renewal. Lest the inroads of change and decay should be too rapid, there is the Divine process of renovation. Nothing is wasted in God's kingdom, either earthly or spiritual. What is it that you see every year? The glorious changes of the seasons. Lest the burning suns of summer should continue for ever, and dry up the produce of the soil, the earth turns away her face, and the mild days of autumn shine softly, and the cooled surface yields us its fruits. And lest the soil should be too rank and rich, the cold bracing days of winter are given us, to brace the air and to give the fields their time of rest and sleep. Then once more the earth turns to the sun, and the flowers come back, and the meadows flush green with spring, and life returns to bird and beast and man. What is it that you see going on between sea and land? Constant renovation. The bountiful ocean sends up her gracious clouds and mists, and lo! they pass over the hills and valleys, and pour themselves down in enriching dews and rains. And the rain that is not needed flows back through the fertilizing rivers once more into the broad bosom of the ocean. All is in constant renovation.

So it is in the moral world. Sometimes there comes a period of moral corruption and stagnation. High standards are forgotten, great truths are ignored, bad examples are set, evil triumphs over good, decay sets in. Then in the wise providence of God there arises some great character, whose influence stems the tide and brings back the old reverence for truth and goodness. The process of renovation sets in. It is in the power of each, of all of us ; but far greater is the effect when the position is conspicuous and the power widely known. Such a renovating influence has been that of our beloved and revered Queen. In a profligate and corrupt age she and her husband determined to live a true and sincere life, and devote themselves to duty. She came to the crown when it was overwhelmed with debt, and despised for the evil conduct of its wearers. She and her husband for years led a very frugal life, and paid off the vast incubus of money obligation. They frowned on vice and took virtue by the hand, and the whole face of society was changed. They gave themselves to the consideration of the necessities of the poor, the cultivation of arts and sciences, the promotion of peace and goodwill at home and abroad, the encouragement of all things wise and true, and beautiful and of good report. The Prince Consort was taken early, but during her remaining forty years wonderful indeed has been her gift of renovating power. Her gifts were not of the brilliant kind, but they were better : they were gifts of wisdom, discretion, character and conduct. To her as a woman might be applied much of what was said to Dr. Arnold by his son :

“ We were weary, and we  
 Fearful, and we in our march  
 Fain to drop down and to die.  
 Still thou turnedst, and still  
 Beckonedst the trembling, and still  
 Gavest the weary thy hand.  
 If in the paths of the world  
 Stones might have wounded thy feet,  
 Toil or dejection have tried  
 Thy spirit, of that we saw  
 Nothing—to us thou wast still  
 Cheerful and helpful and firm.

Then in such hour of need  
 Of your fainting dispirited race,  
 Ye like angels appear,  
 Radiant with ardour Divine !  
 Beacons of hope ye appear !  
 Languor is not in your heart !  
 Weakness is not in your word !  
 Weariness not on your brow !

Ye alight in our van ; at your voice  
 Pain, despair flee away !  
 Ye move through the ranks, recall  
 The stragglers, refresh the outworn,  
 Praise, reinspire the brave !  
 Order, courage return !  
 Eyes enkindling, and prayers  
 Follow your steps as ye go !  
 Ye fill up the gaps in our files,  
 Strengthen the wavering line,  
 Stablish, continue our march  
 On to the bound of the waste !  
 On to the City of God !"

Our beloved Queen, in her wisdom, her love, her devotion to duty, her high principle, was, in her great place of influence, such a renovator. She belonged to the servants and daughters of Him who sat on the heavenly throne, and said, "Behold, behold, I make all things new." But by the whole power of her life she calls on us to do the same. She exhorts us to devote our whole time and energy to making that little sphere better in which we are placed. She summons us to patriotism, to sympathy, to unselfishness, to devotion to duty, to faith, hope and charity, to love to God and love to our suffering and sinning fellow-men. She inspires us to start afresh with the new century, the new age, the new reign, in the ceaseless campaign against sin, vice, ignorance, ungodliness, intemperance, the greed for gold, the lust for pleasure. Above all, she urges us to transfer to her son, the King, the loving care we had for her ; to rally round his throne, and each make the powers of good stronger by our own purity of motive and conduct ; never to acquiesce in evil as inevitable, or to accept corruption as excusable, but always to struggle for the recognition and reign of the highest principles, the purest ideals. The renovating power of God ! The renovating capacities of man when inspired by God ! No limit can be set to them, when we give ourselves to faith and prayer. And when we think of these things we will pray once more, in the words of our own Archbishop : "O God, whose Providence ruleth all things both in heaven and earth, by whom Kings reign, and Princes decree justice : we thank Thee for all the blessings bestowed upon us through our most Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, of glorious and blessed memory, lately taken from us. We thank Thee for the wisdom of her counsels, for the care and love with which she watched over her people, for the bright example of her noble life, for the prosperity which we enjoyed during her happy reign ; and we pray Thee to fill our hearts with fruitful gratitude for all these benefits, and to give us grace that we may use the memory of them as a perpetual call to live according to Thy will, for the good of our fellow-men,

and the glory of Thy great Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

---

THE GRIEF OF NATIONS.

FLAGS half-mast high on many a castle wall,  
 Deep-throated cannon booming hoarse and slow,  
 A sable pomp, a ceremonial woe.  
 Such sombre gauds may mock a tyrant's pall,  
 But in the silence of the royal hall,  
 And round the quiet bier where She lies low,  
 How vain these symbols half our grief to show!  
 How true the tears that round her softly fall!  
 The Mother of her people lies asleep,  
 Her counsels hushed, her labours at an end,  
 Her brave heart stilled, her many sorrows o'er.  
 As sisters in their grief the nations weep,  
 As one in loving rivalry they blend,  
 To honour her dear name from shore to shore.

S. J. SMITH.

SANDIACRE RECTORY.

---

Short Notices.

*A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* By W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 12s.

Professor Ramsay has become our foremost interpreter of St. Paul, and his works are essential to every student. In the present volume he first elaborates and defends his theory (now almost unanimously accepted) as to the Galatian churches to which the Epistle was addressed, and in this matter Lightfoot is superseded. In the second part he brings all his wealth of local and antiquarian knowledge to bear upon the text, and all his suggestions are worthy of study and consideration, and in many cases new. His standpoint—that of regarding St. Paul as the first great Christian statesman—is one that throws a new light on the life and work of the great Apostle. The maps which accompany the volume are the best that can be got. We hope that many more volumes of the same order may come from the same learned and fertile brain.

*Christ our Example.* By CAROLINE FRY. London: C. J. Thynne, 1900. Has deservedly reached its twenty-fifth thousand.

*Holy Matrimony.* By the Rev. W. J. KNOX-LITTLE. London: Longmans, 1900. Price 5s.

A new volume of the "Oxford Library of Practical Theology." The practical parts of this treatise are very good. Its theological and ecclesiastical sections are disfigured by an unreasoned and unreasoning partisanship.

*The Dates of the Pastoral Epistles.* Two Essays by the Rev. the Hon. W. E. BOWEN, M.A. London: Nisbet, 1900. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Bowen has done the Church good service by restating tersely and soundly the arguments in favour of the Pauline authorship of the pastorals. He pleads for an earlier date—A.D. 57 for 1 Timothy—than those commonly assigned. The arguments are worthy of attention.

*A History of the Origin and Development of the Creeds.* By the Rev. C. CALLOW. London: Elliot Stock, 1900. Cheap edition.

Mr. Callow's scholarship, as shown by his list of authorities, is not quite adequate to his task. He seems to be quite oblivious of the newer light thrown upon the origin of the Athanasian symbol by the researches of Mr. Bowen, and this part of the book, therefore, is out of date. The rest may pass.

*Church Discipline and Auricular Confession.* By FRANK SLATER. London: A. H. Stockwell, 1900. Price 1s. net.

A fair historical statement of the growth and development of auricular confession.

*Design in Nature's Story.* By WALTER KIDD, M.D., F.Z.S. London: Nisbet, 1900. Price 3s. 6d. net.

A restatement of the argument from teleology. A little, perhaps, overstated. Dr. Kidd does not appear to remember that John Fiske has said that "evolution replaces quite as much teleology as it displaces." It is only really a question of what the purpose of certain organisms and functions really is.

*Our National Church Trouble: Diagnosis and Remedy.* By ANDREW SIMON LAMB, Barrister-at-Law. London: Nisbet, 1900. Price 1s.

A moderate and powerful plea for the preservation of the Protestant character of the Church of England.

*Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice.* A report of a Conference held at Oxford, December 13 and 14, 1899. Edited by W. SANDAY. London: Longmans, 1900. Price 7s. 6d.

A work of exceptional value, because of the men who took part in the Conference: Mr. Puller, Dr. Moberly, Canon Gore, Canon Scott Holland, Mr. C. G. Lang, Archdeacon Wilson, President Ryle, Professor Moule, Canon E. R. Bernard, Professor Sanday, Principal Fairbairn, Principal Salmond, Principal Davison, Dr. Barrett, Dr. Forsyth.

The contributions made by some of these, first and most notable, that of Archdeacon Wilson, and then those of Drs. Salmond and Forsyth, are of great value. The only real obscurantist appears to have been Mr. Puller, who contributed the first instalment to each discussion, and said not one word further, implying, apparently, that he had nothing to unlearn or learn from the rest. The other members of the Conference endeavoured to understand each other's standpoint, and to find common ground if possible.

*The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.* By F. W. PULLER; with an Introduction by the Bishop of Lincoln. Third edition, revised and enlarged. London: Longmans, 1900. Price 16s.

This is a very much enlarged edition of a work that is very well known. It is a well-written, historically sound treatment of the question of the relation of the See of Rome to other Churches in the early days of Christianity. The only point on which we think Mr. Puller needs to further consider his position is in relation to the residence of St. Peter in Rome. He has not dealt with the archæological evidence, nor with the changed aspect of the question, if Ramsay and Swete be right, and the martyrdom of the Apostle belong to the Flavian period, and not to that

of Nero. There is then time for the long episcopate. Nor does this matter to the main argument. If St. Peter were Bishop of Rome (sole or coadjutor), it does not follow (1) that his unique position as Apostle descends to his successors; (2) that he was infallible; (3) that he had universal dominion. But so far as it goes Mr. Puller's work is trustworthy.

*The Art of Extempore Speaking.* By the Rev. HAROLD FORD, M.A., LL.B., B.C.L. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Elliot Stock. Pp. 122.

This treatise on the practice of extempore speaking is well calculated to enable its readers to attain to fluency. The only criticism that we have to offer rather concerns the use of the word "art" where the word "practice" would have been perfectly appropriate. We have no doubt that a certain kind of public talker could be made out of almost any persevering man of average general ability. But we have no sort of doubt that an artist could not be expected with a like frequency and certainty. In fact, an art can only be expressed by one who has some natural love for the art's form of expression. You cannot make a musical or pictorial artist, though, with the requisite application, you can make many fair performers of copies.

From this arises a criticism of Mr. Ford's praise of fluency. Fluency—common fluency—is often lacking in the greatest orators. A practised, even habit of garrulousness is no artistic help.

True facility in oratory is not a tendency to bubble forth words on all occasions, but rather a faculty for connecting an occasion for speech in a becoming way with some sentiment or picture that can claim beautiful and moving language.

It should also be remembered—as a check on dogmatizing counsel—that the speaking art, unlike other arts, brings in an audience, and that to some speakers this factor is most important. Previous writing may be a positive hindrance to a speaker who is liable to be stirred by an audience with a sort of creative enthusiasm.

We readily admit, however, that this criticism is open to the criticism that such peculiar people are a negligible quantity because they are few and unmanageable. We admit the criticism, and cordially recommend this little book as a very useful guide to fluency in extempore speaking.

*Confirmation.* By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. Oxford Library of Practical Theology. Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. 226. Price 5s.

This volume fulfils very well the aim of the series to which it belongs—the aim of translating solid theological learning into the vernacular of everyday practical religion. There is an earnestness and lucidity in Bishop Hall's treatment of his subject that will commend his book to many readers who have no great passion for technical theology.

*Oliver Cromwell.* By the Right Hon. the Earl of ROSEBERY. Andrew Melrose. Pp. 35. Price 6d.

This address, delivered by Lord Rosebery at the unveiling of the Cromwell statue, is quite worthy of "the brilliant man who comments." No eulogy of Cromwell can be expected to satisfy the mass of the inheritors of Cavalier tradition, and Churchmen may think the words, "Episcopalians were not allowed to practise their faith as freely as they might have desired," a good deal too gently euphemistic. But some pride in him as a very strong man of Imperial instincts, who was dominated, more or less frequently, by a burning zeal for principles that can with difficulty be regarded as contemptible, is in these days universally permitted.

*Church of England Sunday-School Notes : The Life of Our Lord. Fifty-two Lessons for Teachers.* By a CLERGYMAN. Published by Albert Gait, Grimsby. Pp. 52. Price 2s. net.

These lessons seem well arranged. The outline of each lesson is printed on one side of a single sheet; and in this small space a large amount of useful teaching is ingeniously accommodated.

---

## The Month.

ON February 1 the remains of Her Majesty, the late Queen Victoria, were escorted from Cowes across the Solent by a flotilla of torpedo-destroyers, after having been brought from Osborne House by a party of Her Majesty's Highland servants and of blue-jackets. The track of the funeral procession from Cowes lay through a double line of warships, fifteen of them being battleships, and two first-class cruisers. These vessels, which were all British, composed the northern line. The southern line was made up of torpedo-boats, ocean liners, and foreign men-of-war. The sight was a singularly impressive one, and the majesty of the whole thing was enhanced by the beauty of the day, which was like a piece of summer weather.

On February 2 London witnessed, for the last time, the passage of the Queen through its midst. The coffin lay, as the Queen had willed, on a gun-carriage, and was followed by the royal mourners from Victoria to Paddington. Some 33,000 troops lined the route, and everywhere the crowds were enormous. For the most part, the people behaved with admirable decorum.

From Paddington the coffin was taken to Windsor by train; and in procession from Windsor all the Ambassadors and Envoys of foreign States took part, walking after the Princes. At St. George's Chapel the procession was met by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Winchester and Oxford, and the Dean of Windsor.

After the funeral service in the Chapel the coffin was taken to the Albert Memorial Chapel, where it rested till Monday. On Sunday, however, the King and Queen, with their guests, attended service in St. George's Chapel; the sermon was preached by the Bishop of Oxford.

On Monday, February 4, the actual burial took place at the Mausoleum; this ceremony was a private one, and only an official account is forthcoming, so far.

Such was "the passing of Victoria," the best and most beloved Sovereign that has ever occupied the English throne. The whole world is the poorer since her presence has been removed from it; and though other Kings and Queens will wield the Imperial sceptre over the mightiest world-empire known in history, and, we firmly trust, will wield that sceptre well, ages may pass before such another rises

"So sweet, so great, so true."

It was a happy decision that the King made when he declared his intention to be known as Edward VII. Judging by the tributes of the press and the tone of the people, the King will have no need to complain of any lack of heartfelt loyalty in these his realms. The King's own messages to his peoples, both here and over seas, and his speech at his first Privy Council, are excellent examples of that fine tact for which, as Prince of Wales, he has been long famous.

On February 14 the King opened Parliament in person, and the state function was a noteworthy one in every way. Not only was it impressive

in itself ; not only was the pageant at Westminster extremely interesting from the point of view of a lover of quaint medieval ceremonies and that massing of colours for which the Middle Ages were unrivalled ; but the scene was interesting both from a historic and a religious aspect—historically, because a full state opening of Parliament has not been known for forty years ; religiously, because of the oath taken by the King on the question of Transubstantiation, worship of the Virgin, and the Mass. While thoroughly agreeing with the spirit of this declaration, we cannot but think that an alteration in its wording is desirable ; why employ language likely to cause needless pain to a large section of Englishmen who, Romanists though they be, are just as loyal subjects of the Crown as Protestants ?

---

The sympathy shown by the German Emperor to the Royal Family, and therefore to the nation, in its recent bereavement has touched a chord in all hearts. We are sorry that in some quarters in Germany a political interpretation has been put upon simple acts of kindness and sympathy done by a monarch who, if often impulsive, is always warm-hearted. The "critical" spirit in Germany has been evincing itself by its angry criticism of the Emperor for conferring the Order of the Black Eagle on Earl Roberts.

---

The following extract from a recent leader in the London *Guardian* is interesting :

"There are a good many indications that we are approaching a "home-reunion" period, or perhaps it would be more accurate to call it an "approximation" period. We have lately reported several conferences, of more or less weight, between Churchmen and Nonconformists. Canon Armitage Robinson devoted a large part of his sermon at the Bishop of Exeter's consecration to the topic, a good deal of combined action in social matters has taken place here and there, while on the Nonconformist side the marked activity of the Free Church Council, taking shape just now in the great united Mission, is a fact the importance of which ought not to be overlooked, though its bearings are not quite easily discerned. It is possible that the failure of the well-meant attempt some years ago to draw England and Rome more closely together may have turned men's thoughts in the other direction, and led them to look to Nonconformity ; but, whatever the cause, it is a fact that many minds are inclining that way. We do not, it is well to say at the outset, anticipate any great or definite results from the movement at this moment, nor from the next effort of the same kind, nor from the next after that ; but each makes a certain impression, shakes down some part of the barrier that separates the two bodies, and is worthy of attention, if only on that account.

"A distinction has to be drawn between definite proposals for corporate reunion, with actual measures for carrying them into effect, and efforts to promote greater sympathy between Churchmen and Nonconformists, with co-operation and intercourse among individuals. For a long time past Churchmen, and especially the clergy, have been urged to take every opportunity of coming into friendly contact with Nonconformists, and to act with them, so far as it is possible to do so, without prejudice to the truth and to the traditional claims of the Church. We believe that this process is and has been going on to an extent which is not generally recognised. Among the clergy, especially, perhaps, in towns, intercourse and co-operation with the ministers of other denominations is by no means uncommon. The laity are very often under great misapprehension on this subject. They are apt to assume—and the assumption has some justification in the tone and traditions of former days—that the clergy

will, as a matter of course, hold aloof from the Dissenters among their parishioners, and will object to meet or co-operate with the ministers. So far as our knowledge goes, though there must, of course, be many exceptions, this assumption has little or no foundation in fact. In all well-worked parishes the Nonconformists are regularly visited by the clergy, except in cases in which the visits are definitely rejected, or when the parish is too large for any regular visitation at all. Further, the various organizations for purely social work, in which representatives of religious bodies are expected, as such, to take part, have grown so numerous of late years that there are abundant opportunities for intercourse and co-operation between the clergy of the Church and other ministers. No sensible or instructed Churchman, so far as we know, regards this with anything but approval and sympathy, and we believe that the tendencies which we have indicated are likely to increase rather than diminish in force, and to act as powerful influences in promoting the things that make for peace."

On February 13, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York received at Lambeth Palace a deputation, organized by the Church Reform League, which will request them to give their assistance to the Convocations Bill. The deputation was introduced by the Bishop of Rochester, and Bishop Barry, Canon Gore, Sir John Kennaway, and Sir Richard Jebb spoke. A list of the members of the deputation, as issued by the League, shows that it comprised 21 suffragan or assistant Bishops, 17 Deans, including those of Canterbury and St. Paul's, 51 Archdeacons, and 79 Proctors in Convocation, including the Prolocutor of the Lower House of York Province. The laity were represented on the list by 13 peers, 42 Members of Parliament, and 59 members of the Houses of Laymen.

The "Convocations Bill," though spoken of in some quarters as a panacea for our troubles, is meeting with considerable criticism. The ablest criticism we have yet seen comes from the Bishop of Sodor and Man, who dealt with the Bill at some length in his address to his Diocesan Conference at Douglas. The Archbishop of Canterbury's reply to the deputation was characteristically clear and to the point.

According to the last returns, the sum of £38,141 3s. 6d. has been subscribed to the diocesan fund which is being raised for the maintenance of the new see of Southwark. An appeal for funds towards the restoration of the collegiate church of St. Saviour—the cathedral-designate of the future diocese—as well as towards the cost of erecting a collegiate house, has been circulated. For the former purpose a sum of £6,000 is urgently required. £300 of this is for the repair of the tower, and other exterior and interior work is equally needed. For the purchase of a site and the erection of a choir vestry the sum of £3,000 is required. At present the choir have to vest and keep their robes in one of the side chapels. The sum of £4,000 will be required for the erection of the collegiate house. All these works are described as urgent.

Londoners sometimes forget that there is a Greater London, and that beyond the Greater London there is still a "London over the Border." But Lord Cross has been pointing out the great growth and urgent demands of this outer London, and showing how far the Church has lagged behind in coping with a population which in the last generation has grown from 75,000 to 700,000, and is still growing at the rate of 40,000 a year. An immediate demand for twenty new churches and as many mission buildings is now made, and an appeal is being circulated widely.

We note with satisfaction the appointment of Dr. F. Chase to the Presidency of Queens' College, Cambridge, in succession to Dr. Ryle, the newly appointed Bishop of Exeter. Dr. Chase is a learned and thoughtful scholar, and we hope his new post will allow him the necessary leisure to continue his theological studies, which have proved so fruitful hitherto.

At the invitation of Canon Christopher, about three hundred members of the University, representatives of the corporation, and local clergy, attended the twenty-fifth annual Church missionary breakfast in the municipal buildings on February 9. Among those present were the Vice-Chancellor, the Mayor of Oxford (Mr. G. Claridge Druce), Bishop Mitchinson (Master of Pembroke), the Provost of Queen's, the Rector of Exeter, the Provost of Oriel, the Principal of Brasenose, Dr. Ince, Professor Cheyne, and Dr. Sanday. An interesting address was delivered by the Bishop of Mombasa, East Africa, who was for nearly twenty years a missionary of the C.M.S. in India. He said it was useless for them to think that by European blood alone they would evangelise the world; the people of the soil must be the people to bring the Gospel to their fellow-countrymen. He pointed out the great openings there were at the present time in India and East Africa, and appealed to the Universities to furnish young men qualified for the work. Dr. Ince, in proposing a vote of thanks to the Bishop, said that these missionary breakfasts had now become one of the institutions of the University.

News from the seat of war is rather more encouraging. Lord Kitchener's plans for sweeping the enemies out of the Orange State, and for settling the guerilla bands in the Transvaal, are being carried, slowly but surely, into effect. What is done will, one may reasonably expect, be done once for all. Kitchener's task is a very difficult one indeed, and it is satisfactory to know that his appeal for more troops has been duly attended to. 30,000 men are being despatched forthwith.

#### NEW BOOKS, ETC.

*Modern Criticism and the Teaching of the Old Testament.* By Prof. G. A. SMITH, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

*The Neo-Platonists; a Study in the History of Hellenism.* By THOMAS WHITTAKER. Cambridge University Press. Price 7s. 6d.

*The Greek Thinkers.* By Professor THEO. GOMPERZ. London: Murray. Price 14s.

[An English translation of Professor Gomperz's work.]

*Counsels for Churchpeople.* From the writings of the late Bishop CREIGHTON. Stock. Price 5s.

*The Life of Archbishop Benson.* By his SON. (Abridged edition.) Macmillan. Price 8s. 6d. net.

*Encyclopaedia Biblica.* Edited by Professor T. K. CHEYNE and J. S. BLACK, LL.D. Vol. ii. A. and C. Black. Price 20s. net.

[The second instalment (E—K) of this remarkable work.]

*Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship.* By the Rev. Canon MEYRICK. Skeffington. Price 5s.

*A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Ephesians.* By the Rev. H. G. MILLER, M.A. Skeffington. Price 12s.

Among literary items, one of the most interesting (theologically) is the announcement that the Rev. H. B. Swete, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, is preparing an elaborate commentary on the Apocalypse, on the lines of his edition of St. Mark's Gospel. Messrs. Macmillan, we understand, will probably publish the work.