

# 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)

---

# THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

EDITED BY THE

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

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

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. Prof. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

**THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.** By the Rev. Prof. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

"The first thing that strikes one when he takes up the volume on the Gospels is the uncommon hand-  
someness 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*.

The SECOND VOLUME, consisting of 954 pages, contains:

**THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.** By the Rev. K. J. KNOWLING, D.D., Professor of  
New Testament Exegesis, King's College, London.

**ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.** By the Rev. JAMES DENNY, D.D., Pro-  
fessor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology, Free Church College, Glasgow.

**ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.** By the Rev. G. G.  
FINDLAY, B.A., Professor of Biblical Literature, Exegesis, and Classics, Hadingley College.

The price of each volume is 28s., but for those who **Subscribe Now** the price for two  
volumes is 30s. net.

FULL PROSPECTUS SENT FREE ON APPLICATION TO THE PUBLISHERS.

"The work is one of great merit; the text is always carefully examined, with reference both to Hellenistic  
and Classical Greek, and the exegesis is evidently the work of thoroughly competent persons. Not less con-  
spicuous is the breadth of view. The introduction to the Acts is especially valuable. No book in the New  
Testament demands a better equipment both of learning and of sound judgment."—*Spectator*.

---

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

---

A PERIODICAL FOR THE NEW CENTURY.

## The Commonwealth.

A CHRISTIAN SOCIAL MAGAZINE.

Edited by CANON HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND.

Monthly, 3d. net; post free for a year, 4s. Volumes, cloth boards, 5s. Cloth binding  
cases, 1s. 6d.

"Always interesting."—*Spectator*.

"I have myself found great stimulus from 'The Commonwealth.'"—THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

---

LONDON: WELLS GARDNER, DARTON & CO., 3, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C., AND  
44, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

And of all Booksellers.

---

"A Sane Temperance Paper."

## The Temperance Critic.

AN ORGAN OF CONSTRUCTIVE REFORM.

Monthly, 2d. Post free, one year, 3s. Published on the 15th of each month.

"Nothing could be better. Round this . . . all the zeal and passion of social reform should rally."—  
CANON HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND.

---

OFFICE: 63, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

To be obtained everywhere.

280th  
Thousand.

A NATIONAL GIFT BOOK.

NATIONAL  
MEMORIAL.



"THE QUEEN'S LIFE IS HER BEST MEMORIAL."

The Record says: "It will remain for many years yet to come a bright and happy life-story of England's noblest and best Queen."

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

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE NEW ENLARGED EDITION OF

"THE QUEEN'S RESOLVE,"

And Her Doubly Royal Reign:

WITH

"ENGLAND'S WELCOME TO OUR KING."

**THE TITLE** is derived from the following incident, as narrated by Baroness LEHMEN, Queen Victoria's governess: "When first the particulars of her position in regard to succession to the throne were placed before her, she remarked, 'I WILL BE GOOD.'"

**THE AUTHOR** is the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., formerly Rector of St. Nicholas, Worcester, Editor of *Home Words*, *The Fireside*, *The News*, etc., Author of "The Way Home," "The Crown of the Road," and other well-known publications.

**THE CONTENTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS** consist of 288 pages, with upwards of 73 Illustrations, 33 Portraits, some of which include the most recent taken.

**IT IS BOUND** in handsome red or blue cloth, bevelled boards, gilt, with fine gilt medallion portrait of the Queen on side, and its published price is **1s. 6d.**

**ITS POPULARITY** is evidenced by the fact that between **270,000** and **280,000** copies have already been disposed of.

**IN QUANTITIES**, 25 and under 50, at **1s. each**; 50 and under 100, at **11d. each**; 100 and over, at **10d. each**.

Orders for copies at these prices must be sent **direct** to the Publisher, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, E.C.

**AS A ROYAL GIFT** this book cannot be surpassed in patriotic influence. It is suitable for all classes of Men, Women, and Children. For

the Home Library. For Birthday and other Gifts. For Sunday and Voluntary and Board School Prizes. For Men's Bible and Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Classes. For the Police, Soldiers, Sailors, and Mechanics. For the Rich and for the Poor.

**HOW TO ORDER.** Friends can **combine** to procure copies at the prices. In many institutions, works, and other places employing, the secretary has been appointed to receive names and to arrange for a parcel upon the lowest scale of charges.

In some schools the pupils have been encouraged to subscribe a small weekly sum until the necessary amount has been raised for a copy, the teacher or superintendent acting as treasurer. Local friends have also helped to meet **half the cost** for the whole school.

**SPECIAL INSCRIPTION.** Special Inscriptions of the name of the Donor, School, Society, or otherwise can be placed (not more than two lines) in gold in the space occupied in the ordinary copies by the words "Her Doubly Royal Reign," at an extra charge of **2s. 6d. per 100**, orders for not less than 25 being accepted for special lettering only, with a minimum charge of 2s. 6d.

**A SPECIMEN COPY.** A Specimen Copy will be sent post free on receipt of 1s. 6d. Carriage must in all cases be paid by the purchaser. The average cost of carriage on parcels of quantities is about one halfpenny per copy.

We leave this Memorial Volume to speak for itself. Queen Victoria expressed her interest in its wide circulation, and their Royal Highnesses the then Prince and Princess of Wales, and the Duke and Duchess of York, accepted copies "with much pleasure." If the volume can at once be shown in our Sunday and Day Schools, we feel sure a demand for a quantity would at once be created in any district, however small. In this way the people generally would be reached, and a thorough knowledge of her late Majesty's wonderful life imparted.

Please Note.—Copies can be supplied at the reduced price only upon **DIRECT** application to the Publishing Office.

Price, in cloth gilt, **1s. 6d.** In Quantities for Distribution of not less than 25 at **1s.**, 50 at **11d.**, or 100 at **10d.** each, direct from the Publisher only.

A Specimen Copy sent on receipt of **1s. 6d.**

**TO SECURE SUPPLY ORDERS SHOULD BE SENT AT ONCE.**

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

# ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

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

**A NEW TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH.** With Explanatory Notes and a History of the Life of Isaiah. By Rev. E. FLECKER, M.A.

"The present translation is well done. The notes are concise, clear, and useful, and the life of Isaiah is full and informing."—*The Life of Faith*.

"A valuable contribution to Biblical knowledge, which will not only appeal to the student, but will be found helpful to all readers of the Old Testament Scriptures."—*Newcastle Daily Chronicle*.

In crown 8vo., fancy paper cover, price 1s.

**RESPONSIVENESS AND COMMUNION with the BLEST.**

By the Rev. VINCENT J. LEATHERDALE, M.A., Vicar of East Haddon.

**JUST PUBLISHED.** 8vo., price 1s.

**THE GREAT HEREAFTER; or, The Destiny of Man.** By the Rev. HENRY FAWCETT, M.A., Vicar of Landkey.

"Mr. Fawcett shows evidences of having faced the problem in a painstaking and liberal-minded manner."—*Sheffield Independent*.

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

**MODERN NATURAL THEOLOGY.** With the Testimony of Christian Evidences. By FREDERICK JAMES GANT, F.R.C.S., Consulting Surgeon to the Royal Free Hospital. Author of "The Science and Practice of Surgery," "The Mystery of Suffering," "Mock Nurses of the Latest Fashion, with Auto-Memoir," "Perfect Womanhood," and other works.

In demy 8vo., paper cover, price 3d.

**THE CLAIMS OF ROME.** By SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

"A pamphlet well worth reading, showing the baselessness of the claim of the Pope from a consideration of the early history of the Church, the subsequent growth of Papal demands, the frequent breaking of the succession, and the immoralities of the clergy."—*Christian Million*.

In paper cover, price 2d. each; or 12s. per 100.

**THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND on Infant Baptism and Baptismal Regeneration.** By the Rev. J. FOSTER LEPINE, Vicar of Lamorbey, Kent.

## NEW VOLUMES OF VERSE.

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

**IN THE LAND OF MAKE-BELIEVE.** By OLIVE VERTE, Author of "A Sunset Idyll, and other Poems."

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

**COLLABORATORS.** And Other Poems. By A. W. WEBSTER.

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

**SILVER LININGS TO THE CLOUDS OF LIFE; or, Crowns for Crosses.** By WILLIAM ALFRED GIBBS.

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

**POEMS OF THE RACE.** By MARSTON RUDLAND.

# Elliot Stock's New Publications.

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.

"It would be difficult to overestimate the value of a book like 'Counsels for Churchpeople.' Bishop Creighton is invariably clear, sensible, and suggestive, and his manner of treatment is admirably united to the mental habits of the time."—*Literature.*

**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. Church men 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.

# ELLIOT STOCK'S RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

NEW VOLUME OF SERMONS BY THE DEAN OF ELY.

In crown 8vo., cloth, with a portrait of the Dean, price 6s.

## PRO PATRIA.

Sermons on Special Occasions in England and America.

By CHARLES WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Dean of Ely.

"This book deserves to be widely read and pondered over, and to form the model for many more sermons than it is likely to do."—*Churchwoman*.

"An interesting volume. The sermons are robust and liberal in tone, and deal with questions of living interest."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"The volume altogether is fresh and stimulating reading, and may be recommended to both those who do and who do not accept Dr. Stubbs' advanced social teachings."

*Sheffield Independent.*

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*.

In crown 8vo., **Cheap Edition**, price 2s. 6d.

WITH PHOTOGRAPHIC PORTRAIT.

## THE LIFE WORK OF EDWARD WHITE BENSON, D.D.,

SOMETIME ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

By J. A. CARB, LL.D., Vicar of Whitechurch, and Canon of Christ Church, Dublin.

"A careful and accurate collection of facts regarding one who has every claim to be considered as not the least among the successors of St. Augustine."—*Church Gazette*.

"The writer has given us a very excellent and appreciative sketch of Dr. Benson's career."—*Church Family Newspaper*.

"We can commend it to any who desire a succinct account of a laborious and beautiful life."—*Iris & Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

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

## CHURCH QUESTIONS.

Being the Substance of Six Sermons Preached in the Autumn of 1898, at  
St. John's Church, Paddington.

By GILBERT KARNEY, Vicar.

"The contents of this book display evidence of intimate acquaintance with the historical bearings of the doctrines involved, and the reader is presented with a comprehensive view of the points of controversy at issue between the Bible and the Papacy. Mr. Karney's style is logical, terse, and easy."—*English Churchman*.

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

Now Ready. Price 2s. 6d. net.

# EATING THE BREAD OF LIFE.

A Study of John vi. 30, etc., and its Relation to the  
Lord's Supper.

By WERNER H. K. SOAMES, M.A.,

*Vicar of St. George's, Greenwich.*

"An exhaustive treatise on the remarkable discourse in John vi. 30, etc. For theologians it is perfect, and ought to be widely circulated to ordination candidates and in colleges."—*News.*

"It is emphatically a most valuable addition to the Protestant literature on the great subject (of the Lord's Supper), and a work that should be very carefully read and assimilated."—*Rock.*

"No studious reader can fail to follow with interest the close argument and analytical exposition."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"The treatise evinces a spirit of deep piety and thoroughly loyal recognition of the supreme authority of the sacred Scriptures."—*English Churchman.*

"The book should be a perfect mine for all who desire to know the utmost that can be said in condemnation of transubstantiation or anything approaching to it."—*Elgin Courant.*

"A study of the meaning and bearing of the sixth chapter of St. John. It bears the mark of true scholarship—reverence for truth, patience to discover it, reserve in expressing it."—*Expository Times.*

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

"Not Sunday-School Teachers only, but those in any department of teaching who may occasionally be at a loss for the wherewithal to point a moral or adorn a tale, will find this book a boon."—*Star.*

TWELFTH EDITION. Handsomely printed and bound in cloth, price 5s.

# TOOLS FOR TEACHERS.

Compiled and arranged by WILLIAM MOODIE.

A COLLECTION OF

Anecdotes, Illustrations, Legends, etc.,

FOR THE USE OF PREACHERS, TEACHERS OF

SUNDAY SCHOOLS, BIBLE CLASSES, AND BOYS' BRIGADES,

AND GENERALLY OF

ALL ENGAGED IN THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING  
OF THE YOUNG.

"It will be found that the stories and extracts illustrate moral rather than dogmatic points, and the anecdotes have, as a rule, been wisely left to point their own morals."—*Guardian.*

"The compiler has drawn his matter from sources which are not usually tapped for the requirements of the Sunday-school. The novelty of the plan gives a freshness to the volume that must irresistibly attract a mind that would fain get out of the common rut of illustrative teaching."—*Rock.*

"The selections are upon the whole very good, and, above all, are unhackneyed."—*Literary World.*

"This collection is the work of a practical teacher, and one of its advantages is, that it has been compiled chiefly for Sunday-school teachers."—*Church Sunday-school Magazine.*

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

EDUCATIONAL.

DOVER COLLEGE.

Headmaster: REV. W. C. COMPTON, M.A.

EXHIBITIONS (£20) for Sons of Clergy. Full Fees, £80. Recent Successes include Six Scholarships (open) at Oxford and Cambridge. Nineteen out of twenty-one passed direct, first try, into Woolwich and Sandhurst.

Every Boy has a separate Bedroom.

SEPARATE JUNIOR SCHOOL FOR BOYS UNDER THIRTEEN.

WORCESTER CATHEDRAL KING'S SCHOOL.

Head Master: Rev. W. H. CHAPPEL, M.A.,

Formerly Scholar of Worcester College, Oxford, and lately Assistant and House Master at Marlborough College.

First-Grade Endowed School. Public School Education at moderate cost. Twenty King's Scholars receive Tuition Free. Election annually in November. Valuable Exhibitions at the Universities. Spacious modern Boarding House. Healthy Site. Special Terms to sons of Clergy.

For Prospectus and Honour List apply, THE HEAD MASTER, SCHOOL HOUSE, WORCESTER.

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours.

Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching. Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium, Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy naturally reducing Fees.

For Prospectus apply: REV. H. JOHNSON, Head Master.

WARWICK SCHOOL.

HEAD MASTER: REV. R. PERCIVAL BROWN, M.A., LATE SCHOLAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Fees, £60.

THE School was chartered by Edward the Confessor. Buildings entirely modern on beautiful and healthy country site. Chapel, Gymnasium, Sanatorium, Workshop, Fives' Court, Bicycle House, etc. Excellent boarding-houses for over 100 boarders. Classical and Modern sides. Sober Church teaching. Special Army and Navy classes. Leading Exhibitions of £50. Boys may enter the Junior House from the age of eight.

In large 8vo., handsomely bound in cloth, price 10s. 6d.

THE DUAL LAND.

Being a Collection of Verses from Many Sources for the Great Family of those who have been, who are, and who may be Bereaved.

"A great storehouse of high-class poetry on the subject of bereavement."—*Literary World*.

"The compiler's work has been done with judgment and taste, and a large range of literature has been utilized for the purpose in view."—*Spectator*.

"A volume which will be vastly acceptable to many a pensive and poetical soul whose experience has met with bereavements."—*Church Gazette*.

"A book which will be welcomed in many a shadowed home."—*Christian*.

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

# The National Protestant Church Union.

To Promote the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the  
Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.

Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary H. W. WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.

Treasurer—T. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq., J.P.

The Committee EARNESTLY APPEAL for the INCREASED SUPPORT of 1,000  
NEW MEMBERS to enable them to extend the publication and lecture work of the Society.  
Full particulars of the Society's objects and operations and terms of membership can be obtained  
on application to the Secretary,

**OFFICES OF THE UNION,**

**324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.**

Mrs. HARCOURT MITCHELL writes: "Churchwomen should support an organ of  
their own."

*The Churchwoman is published specially for Churchwomen, therefore Churchwomen  
should support*

## The Churchwoman.

**AN ILLUSTRATED DEVOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL REVIEW.**

EDITED BY

G. M. IRELAND BLACKBURNE and H. P. K. SKIPTON.

WEEKLY, 1d. (post free, 1½d.).

Annual Subscription, 6s. 6d.

### CONTENTS.

DEVOTIONAL PAGE and KALENDAR. CHELSEA CHINA CUPBOARD, and BOG  
OAK, from the MONTHLY PACKET. CHURCH NEWS of the WEEK. ILLUSTRATED  
ACCOUNTS OF GOOD WORKS. FULL REPORTS OF CHURCH MEETINGS.  
BRIGHT NOTES ON CURRENT SUBJECTS. REVIEWS OF NEW BOOKS, Etc.

The most prominent men and women writers of  
the day write for

**The Churchwoman.**

Of all Newsagents and Bookstalls, or direct from the Publisher,  
2, EXETER STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

The Rev. Prebendary W. H. PEPLOE writes: "Very heartily do I commend the EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE to the Christian public. It binds together the Christians of different denominations with a bond of brotherly love and good will towards all men, which is most essential in these days of division; and where brethren have been suffering for Christ's sake in different parts of the world, it has done a remarkable work in calling attention to their wrongs, and in moving the arm of authority in different lands to stay the persecutions and give liberty to the sufferers. I earnestly commend the ALLIANCE to the attention of Christians in the hope that they will support it LIBERALLY with their gifts and prayers."

The Rev. Prof. H. G. C. MOULE writes: "It is a pleasure to send to the ALLIANCE a cordial message of 'good luck in the name of the Lord.' May the noble wish of the ALLIANCE be carried on with more power and with richer results than ever! May our Master use it more than ever to draw His servants together across their minor and temporary demarcations, and may He employ their union of life, of witness, of influence, and of combined prayer, for His holy ends! I thank Him for the existence of a work so truly according to the tenor of His own High-priestly Prayer for unity in the Father and the Son."

PLEASE WRITE TO THE SECRETARY, 7, ADAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.

**A NATIONAL APPEAL. URGENT.**  
**"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.**

TO COMPLETE THE GOOD SAMARITAN WORK OF THE

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 1,543 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.

**SCRIPTURE READERS' SOCIETY FOR IRELAND.**

This Society continues to spread the Word of God in the homes of the people, and never found a more open door; but

**FUNDS ARE MUCH NEEDED TO EXTEND THE WORK.**

Contributions will be thankfully received at the Offices, 27, LOWER PEMBROKE STREET, DUBLIN; 9, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON; and at the Office of the "CHRISTIAN," 12, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, LONDON.

R.V. J. O. GAGE DOUGHERTY, M.A., *Secretary and Joint Treasurer.*

**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 Superintendents to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.

Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. 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 inroads 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, 430, 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 ORPHANAGE, 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.

## 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.

## ECCLIESIASTICAL 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 MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF  
CORNWALL AND YORK,  
K.G.

THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS,  
THE BISHOPS, etc.

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 in 1900, £49,166.

Increased Contributions and Offerories, 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.

# Cook's Conducted Tours.

PARIS every Saturday and Monday.

PARIS, VERSAILLES, and FONTAINEBLEAU.—  
Select and Limited Tours leaving Wednesdays.

BRUSSELS, FIELD of WATERLOO, and Antwerp,  
every Saturday and Monday.

HOLLAND and DEAD CITIES OF ZUYDER ZEE  
every Saturday.

PARIS and SWITZERLAND, including Andermatt,  
Furka and Grimsel Passes, Chamounix, etc.,  
fortnightly during season.

BELGIUM, RHINE, BLACK FOREST, etc., fre-  
quently during season.

NORWAY, SWEDEN, DENMARK, etc.—Select  
Tours occupying 13, 15, 17 days, leaving every  
Tuesday, Friday, and Saturday.

CARPATHIANS, Tours de luxe in Hungary, July  
17th, August 14th.

SALZKAMMERGUT (Austrian Alps), July 10th,  
August 7th and 28th.

HOLLAND, THE RHINE, and BELGIUM, July  
6th and 20th.

PARIS, SWITZERLAND, and RHINE, leaving fort-  
nightly.

A WEEK in SWITZERLAND for 5 guineas, every  
Friday.

EIGHT DAYS' TOUR to INTERLAKEN, GENEVA,  
or LUCERNE, 7 guineas, every Tuesday or  
Friday.

THE ARDENNES, MOSELLE, RHINE, fortnightly  
THROUGH the DOLOMITES, July 12th, August 9th  
and 30th.

SWISS ALPINE TOURS, fortnightly.

BAVARIAN HIGHLANDS, July 15th, etc.

GRAND TOURS to GERMANY and AUSTRIA,  
fortnightly.

THE TROSSACHS and Highlands of Scotland,  
weekly.

IRELAND.—Lakes of Kerry, Killarney, Glengariff,  
Connemara, etc., fortnightly.

SHAKESPEARE'S HOME and ENGLISH LAKES,  
June 24th, July 8th and 22nd.

PICTURESQUE PEAK and DUKERIES, June 29th,  
July 13th and 27th.

ROUND THE WORLD under personal escort,  
August 28th.

Also INDEPENDENT TOURS for all parts of the  
Continent, America, Japan, China, Ceylon, India,  
Egypt, Australia, New Zealand, and Round the  
World Tours.

INDEPENDENT TOURS in ENGLAND, SCOT-  
LAND, IRELAND, NORTH and SOUTH  
WALES, ISLE OF MAN, CHANNEL ISLANDS,  
ISLE OF WIGHT, etc.

Special advantages to holders of Cook's Tickets for  
insuring Baggage against loss. Baggage collected,  
stored, and forwarded.

Illustrated Programmes for stamp; or "Excursionist," by post 4d.

THOS. COOK & SON, Ludgate Circus, London; and Branches.

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 KING. 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 "Countts & Co."

THE  
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1901.

ART. I.—THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:  
II. THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE IN RELATION TO  
SACRIFICIAL DEATH (*continued*).

THE reader can hardly now fail to see the importance of the distinction of the two senses of "spiritual" as indicated in the *dictum* of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. It is presence "to our spirits only," which makes intelligible the spiritual manducation of that which, locally and corporally absent, is not the less really presented as food to our souls. And the Christian faith should be taught to realize that it does verily and indeed feed upon the true *Res Sacramenti*—not simply on its *fruits* or *benefits*, but on the very Body and Blood of Christ, the very sacrifice of His death upon the cross—the "meat *indeed*" and "drink *indeed*" whereby we dwell in Him and He in us.

I must be allowed once more to insist on this truth. Before going further, I desire again to urge its importance. It is an imperfect expression of the full truth of the Sacrament to say, "This is an effectual sign of the benefit which comes of the Thing signified." The meaning, indeed, of such a saying may be perfectly sound, but it should rather be said, "It is the actual conveyance of the beneficial<sup>1</sup> possession of the Thing signified, even the crucified Saviour Himself."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Thou hast received into thine own possession the everlasting verity, our Saviour Jesus Christ. . . . Thou hast received His Body, which was once broken, and His Blood, which was shed for the remission of thy sin" ("Homily of the Resurrection," p. 389).

So Hooker regards it as universally acknowledged to be true that "the efficacy of His Body and Blood is not all we receive in the Sacrament" (Works, vol. ii., p. 355; ed. Keble). See Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 600; also my "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 343-347.

<sup>2</sup> So Cranmer maintained: "That selfsame Body . . . visible and tangible . . . is eaten of Christian people at His Holy Supper. . . . The

Or some, perhaps, might think it preferable that the same truth should be simply expressed by saying that "it gives to our faith just that which is needed for our spiritual apprehension and beneficial appropriation of a past act, a finished work, a once-offered sacrifice, the salutary fruits of which are for the continual satisfying of our spiritual hunger, and for the continual strengthening and refreshing of our souls."

The true faith of the Christian Church can never forget the *ἐφάραξ*—the "once-for-all," the perfection in the past, of the sacrifice of the Cross. And it is needless to insist on the obvious truism that what is past, and abideth not, cannot be received or possessed any otherwise than in its abiding fruits. But the Christian faith (let it be said again) is ever to have before it the view of the *inseparable connection* of "the benefits which we receive thereby"—not with the representing Sacrament, but—with the represented Sacrifice. And so Christians, having ever Jesus Christ evidently set forth before their eyes *crucified*, and in this ordinance continually showing the Lord's death, have the view of this connection secured to them by the words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood"; that so, drinking, for their soul's thirst, of the "living waters," their faith may be assured that they are drinking of that once-smitten Rock which follows them

---

diversity is not in the Body, but in the eating thereof" ("Lord's Supper," p. 224, P.S. See also p. 232.)

Thus it was said by Robert Bruce: "Thus you see that the thing signified in the Lord's Supper is not the fruits so much, as the Body and Blood, and Christ Jesus, the fountain and substance, from Whom all these fruits do flow and proceed" ("Sermons on the Sacrament," p. 51; Laidlaw's translation).

This eminent Presbyterian divine, once in high favour with King James I., has admirably elucidated the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist. The following extract has a special value: "Will you know of us how the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is present? We will say that they are spiritually present, really present—that is, present in the Supper, and not in the bread. We will not say that His true Flesh is present to the hand or to the mouth of our bodies; but we say it is spiritually present—that is, present to thy spirit and believing soul; yea, even as present inwardly to thy soul as the bread and wine are present to thy body outwardly. Will you ask, then, if the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus be present in the Supper? We answer in a word: They are present in the Supper, but not in the bread and wine, nor in the accidents nor substance of bread and wine. And we make Christ to be present in the Supper, because He is present to my soul, to my spirit and faith. Also we make Him present in the Supper because I have Him in His promise, *This is My Body*, which promise is present to my faith; and the nature of faith is to make things that are absent in themselves yet present. And therefore, seeing that He is both present by faith in His promise and present by the virtue of His Holy Spirit, who can say but that He is present in the Supper?" (pp. 129, 130).

with its streams of life-giving blessing through the desert of their pilgrimage.

The Rock and its smiting, in the Old Covenant, may be said, in a sense, to have been in the river from which "all our fathers" drank, as it followed them in the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> And in the same sense Hooker says: "Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies, quickened to eternal life, are effects the cause whereof is the Person of Christ; His Body and Blood are the true well-spring out of which this life floweth" ("Ecc. Pol.," V., lxxvii., § 5; Works, vol. ii., p. 352, Ed. Keble). So we verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ (the cause in its effect) when our faith feeds on His once-offered sacrifice, and apprehends the benefits which we receive from the merits of His death and Passion.

And it should be clearly seen that the absence and distance in place and in time of this *Res Sacramenti* can be no hindrance whatever in the way of this spiritual feeding, so long as it cannot hinder the soul from realizing the truth: "That Saviour was crucified for me; that Blood was shed for the remission of my sins. Here I receive from my living Saviour the pledges of His love for me, and these for a continual remembrance of His death, to my great and endless comfort; here I receive from Him the assurance that His sacrifice on the cross was *for me*; here He verily gives to my hungering soul all that shall enable my heart to say, with the full assurance of faith: 'All—all is mine.' I take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for me, and I feed on Him in my heart by faith with thanksgiving. Henceforth I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

This is that "true Real Presence" which "no true son of the Church of England [nor Albertinus] did ever deny"—the Presence "to our spirits only" of that which is local and corporal, but which is locally and corporally absent.

So it has been well said: "The Body and Blood as they were on the Cross 'are,' literally as such, no more." They "are things historically past, not present, and so the literal eating and drinking of them must be, as to physical contact, impossible. They are, literally and historically, gone, and lips and throat therefore cannot touch them. But spiritually, in their Divine effects, in the blessings and glories they

<sup>1</sup> According to the interpretation of 1 Cor. x. 4, which is supported by Estius, Calvin, Lightfoot, Scott, and others, and which follows that of Theodore (of Mopsuestia?): ἀκολουθούσαν δὲ, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ρυὴν ἀπαξ ὕδαρ εἶπετο αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον. See Cramer's "Catenæ," tom. v., p. 185; Oxford, 1844.

have won, they 'are' indeed. In that respect faith, which conquers time, sees them, touches them, takes them, feeds on them."<sup>1</sup>

Let me quote further from an old divine of Queen Elizabeth's days, who, contending faithfully that "the very Body and Blood of our Saviour are present in the Holy Mysteries to the communicants," thus explains the true Presence. He acknowledges that "If corporal substances cannot otherwise be present than corporally, than locally," then "we have not the Presence of our Saviour's Body and Blood in our Communion." But he urges "That which is absent to our bodies and outward man may yet be present to our faith and inward man." And he quotes St. Ambrose, saying, "By faith Christ is touched, by faith Christ is seen"; and from St. Chrysostom, "Such is the power of faith that it can behold and see things that be even far off." And then he adds, "And this is the Presence that we mean, when we say that the Body and Blood of our Saviour be present to us in the Holy Mysteries; that is, not any carnal or corporal Presence devised by our adversaries, but a Presence therefore called spiritual, because the substance present, though it be corporal, is yet by our spirit and faith made present unto us."<sup>2</sup>

If we have to meet the objections of those who would say that this view of "Real Presence" requires a good deal of explanation, and even then is difficult of apprehension, we may acknowledge indeed that it is not so plain (in some sense) as that of those who, taking (as they think) the words of institution strictly—"ut verba sonant"—have brought themselves to accept the human figment of transubstantiation, with all its stupendous difficulties; nor yet so plain as that of those who, on the other side, in spite of the clear words of Scripture, would reduce the Sacrament to bare signs and a mere commemoration of that which is really absent from body and soul, with no real giving, taking, or receiving of anything beyond bread and wine.

But we have been taught by a great divine to recognise that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is "more true than plain," and to beware of those who in error would make it "more plain than true" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," Book V., chap. lii., § 1); and the same caution may, in measure, be applied to the doctrine of the Christian Sacraments.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Professor Moule, in "Pledges of His Love," pp. 76, 77.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. H. Westfaling, "Treatise of Reformation," folios 108b, 110a and 110b; London, 1582.

<sup>3</sup> On this subject, see Bishop Cleaver's "Two Sermons," pp. 8, 9; Oxford, 1790.

And, further, we will venture to contend that the true doctrine ceases to be perplexing when it is seen how graciously it meets the spiritual hunger and thirst, and adapts itself to the spiritual understanding of those who have been taught by the Spirit to know their great need as sinners in God's sight, and have received into their hearts the word of Him who says "I am the Bread of Life"; and "The Bread which I give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The one grand and effectual solvent for all the difficulties of true Eucharistic doctrine is to be found in the conviction of sin as wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit of God. Let the sinner's guilty heart know the reality of sin and the truth of its condemnation, and know how the Son of God has died to take our sins away. Then the ordinance will be seen to be a merciful provision to meet human needs, ordained for us by Him who knows what is in man. And then the awakened and enlightened soul will find little difficulty in apprehending the true doctrine of the Sacrament in its simplicity and in its blessedness. Well was it said by Archbishop Cranmer: "The true doctrine of the first Catholic Christian faith is most plain, clear, and comfortable, without any difficulty, scruple, or doubt—that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although He be sitting in heaven in equality with His Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance, who by His death delivered us from death, and daily nourisheth and increaseth us to eternal life. And in token hereof He hath prepared bread to be eaten and wine to be drunken of us in His Holy Supper, to put us in remembrance of His said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby, which benefits through faith and the Holy Ghost are exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said Holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, and the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rock can remember and give thanks unto God for the same. This is the very doctrine of the Gospel, with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors" ("On Lord's Supper," Book II., against Transubstantiation, P.S. ed., p. 328).

Let it ever be remembered that in this matter we have to do with what pertains to our spirits. All is spiritual. The word "*spiritualiter per fidem*" is the key to the position—the doctrinal position of the Church of England. The Lord's Supper is a thing of spiritual understanding, spiritual perception, spiritual desire, spiritual satisfaction, spiritual receiving, spiritual eating, spiritual appropriation, spiritual digesting. All this is "spiritually by faith." All is spiritual—not "spiritual" in the sense which makes a corporal Body cease to be corporal

—a Body changed from Body to spirit—but “spiritual” in the sense in which the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, with all its spiritual efficacy for the forgiveness of sins, and all other benefits of His Passion, are spiritually presented to be the very Bread of Life for the hunger of our souls.

In the true use of these Holy Mysteries all our spiritual functions are exercised upon what may truly be called a Corporal reality—a stupendous reality which, in faith’s view, is inseparable from “the Body of His Flesh through death”; a reality which belongs to the “peace made by the Blood of His Cross”; a blessed reality which comes of His death who took our flesh that through death He might destroy Him that had the power of death.

And now the bread which He gives for our spiritual food is His Flesh which He has given for the life of the world.

What a testimony is here to the reality and efficacy, to the glory of that finished work, the great redeeming work of the Cross, which is to be the spiritual sustenance of His people “till He come!”

I had made a number of brief extracts—which might have been largely added to—from the writings of typical Churchmen in successive generations, desiring to show that the position maintained by a certain number at the Conference has the support of divines of name and estimation belonging to different schools of theology in the Reformed Church of England. But such a *catena* is found to occupy too much space, and to be hardly suitable for an article in the CHURCHMAN. These quotations, therefore, are reserved for a reprint.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

I thankfully recognise the candour of Canon Gore’s more recent acknowledgment (in a work which contains much that is valuable, and for which all should be thankful) that “a number of Anglicans have undoubtedly made themselves responsible” for a view “according to which there is postulated in the Eucharist some real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ as they were when He was dying or dead upon the cross” (“Body of Christ,” pp. 181, 182); for these words may very well be understood in the sense which gives, as I believe, the true view of English theology—the view which in this paper I have desired to maintain, and for which, as I conceive, we are bound to contend. I gladly also recognise the fairness with which Professor Moberly (in an article marked by Christian kindness and courtesy) also concedes that the view of the *Res Sacramenti* as “Christ’s Body and Blood as separated in Sacrificial Death for our sins,” “has

a long history, and many-sided support. It is no more partisan than it is new" (*Journal of Theol. Studies*, April, 1901, p. 322). And I fully appreciate his saying (p. 338): "I do not mean to deny that, as a whole, the writers quoted do certainly tend, with more or less distinctness, to shape their thought and language on the subject in the same direction as that of Bishop Andrewes." But when, as against what he regards as "these painful mistakes" of Bishop Andrewes and others, Canon Gore writes thus, "It seems wholly unintelligible how divines who in any sense believe in a real presence can speak of the Eucharistic body—one hesitates even to write the words—as 'the corpse' of Christ" (p. 183), I must venture to think that he is unintentionally importing into the language of English divines a sense of "Real Presence" which (as I am persuaded) they would have clearly rejected. Andrewes has no word to suggest the idea of "the corpse" of Christ as being either reproduced, or "sacrificed afresh," or being *carried forward* to be really present in the Eucharistic elements. The Anglican doctrine is that our faith *takes us back* to feed on the sacrifice of Christ once offered as verily as our bodies are fed with the visible and exhibitivè signs which in the delivery bear the names of His Body given and His Blood shed for us. The words of Andrewes are quite clear: "We are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*Sursum corda*), but we are also *carried back* to Christ as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering."

When Canon Gore speaks of Bishop Andrewes (and such as he) as using language "which is certainly highly misleading, unless they mean—which God forbid!—that there is in every Eucharist a Body sacrificed afresh and Blood shed anew in death" (p. 183), he can hardly, as it seems to me, have in view the possibility of Andrewes holding a "True Presence" except as a Presence *sub speciebus*, such a Presence as will find little support from the writings of Andrewes (see his *Minor Works*, A.C.L., pp. 13, 14, 16, 17, 35).

The very fact that the true *Res Sacramenti* is the Body and Blood as separate in death suffices in the Anglican view to dismiss any such idea of Real Presence as Canon Gore seems (I think) to regard as its only legitimate meaning (see, e.g., Cosin's *Works*, vol. iv., p. 17, A.C.L.). What we feed on as presented and exhibited to our faith (*i.e.*, "Corpus quâ crucifixum et mortuum") is that which actually has now no existence "*in rerum naturâ*." And we shall search in vain (I believe) to find any of our great English divines pleading the omnipotence of God as making credible a Real Presence on the altar of that which can have no actual presence any-

where, seeing it is a *non ens*. I believe it will be found that the Divine working which they often *do* speak of in the mysteries, is the spiritual drawing of the sin-convinced, hungering soul to be spiritually satisfied in feeding on the sacrifice of Christ, made present to our faith, and so being incorporated into the Death of Christ, and so into the Spiritual Union, whereby we dwell in Christ "the living One," and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us. Thus, to take an example: Bishop Morton speaks of the nourishment "which is spiritual, and soul's food," and "is the Body and Blood of the Lord (therefore called Spiritual, because it is the object of faith) by a Union wrought by God's Spirit and man's faith: which . . . is most real and ineffable" ("On Eucharist," Book V., ch. i., sect. 1, p. 308, ed. 1635). It is *thus* that "by the incomprehensible power of His Eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He as in the very act of His offering is made present to us." (See Moberly, p. 323.) And *this* presence requires and suggests no conception of the Blood "as stopping short and remaining in a state of death" (p. 337)—nor any "reproduction of a point in the past as present" (p. 323). Indeed, I venture to question whether, in the whole range of English theology (with the exception of one modern writer), any word can be found which, fairly interpreted, can be said to require such a conception of the Eucharistic Presence as that which, if I understand him aright (and I would gladly believe that I have misunderstood him), Canon Gore would make "a number of Anglicans" responsible for maintaining. But in saying this, I am not intending for a moment to suggest that Canon Gore has wilfully misrepresented their meaning.

I desire to express myself humbly. And I feel that I ought to write diffidently in controverting the views of two such learned divines as Professor Moberly and Canon Gore. I desire not to speak too confidently. I may be wrong. But I find it very difficult to speak honestly and at the same time to express myself doubtfully on this matter. Rather I find myself constrained to entertain something like a confident hope that Canon Gore, on further examination, will see that he has been looking through glasses which have tended to obscure rather than to clear his view of the teaching of our English divines. And I am sure that Canon Gore would not willingly do injustice to the memory of such men.

I cannot help thinking that the words of Andrewes, "If a host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve," contain in themselves the answer to all such conceptions of his meaning as seem to me (perhaps in error) to be involved in Professor Moberly's explanation of his language. I should be sorry to seem to magnify points of difference.

But it is not "the Lamb as it had been slain," but the Lamb "at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering," which the Bishop sets before us, as exhibited to us in the Eucharistic feast. He distinctly asserts (and Professor Moberly quotes the words to demur to them, p. 337) that Christ "as He now is, glorified, is not, cannot be, *immolatus*."<sup>1</sup> It is hard to believe that, for the sake of a "pungent epigram" (p. 337), the Bishop could have expressed so very clearly and distinctly what he did not regard as strictly sound and quite theologically true.

It was truly said by Archbishop Wake, "Whatever Real Presence, then, this Bishop [Andrewes] believed, it must be of His crucified Body, and as in the state of His death; and this, I think, cannot be otherwise *present* than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge—either *figuratively* in the *elements*, or *spiritually* in the souls of those who worthily receive them" ("Discourse of H. Euch.," p. 63, London, 1687).

It is true indeed, as was well said by that remarkable man and truly great divine, the martyr Bradford, that "Christ's Body is no dead carcase; he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit, which is not without grace, I ween" ("Sermons," etc., p. 512, P.S.). But the sin-convicted soul hungers with a hunger which can only be satisfied by feeding spiritually on the sacrificial feast—the Bread which "the Son of Man will give," and of which He says, "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 51).

And so elsewhere Bradford says: "It is not simply bread and wine, but rather Christ's Body, so-called of Christ, and so to be called and esteemed of us. But here let us mark what Body and Blood Christ called it. . . . Christ called it 'His Body which is broken,' 'His Blood which is shed' presently . . . so in the celebration of the Lord's Supper the very Passion of Christ should be as present, beholden with the eyes of faith; for which end Christ our Saviour did especially institute this supper" ("Sermons," etc., p. 102, P.S.).

Longing for life, and life more abundant, in the living Saviour, the believing soul knows (or should surely learn) that it can only be obtained through fellowship with Christ's

---

<sup>1</sup> No one, I imagine, doubts that the Bishop's "immolatus" is patient of the sense which Professor Moberly would fain give it (p. 337). But then, also, no one, I imagine, with the context before him, can believe that it is the sense which the Bishop meant it to bear (see p. 323).

death, through a spiritual partaking of His Body and Blood, as given and shed for our redemption.

The death of Christ is the only deliverance by which the soul can pass from the condemnation and death which belong to the leprosy disease and awful guilt and outcasting of human nature, into that spiritual life of loving communion and fellowship with God in Christ's risen manhood which belongs to the health and truth of human nature.

And, sorry as I am to differ from Canon Gore and Professor Moberly, I would fain hope and believe that in *this*, at least, we may be in substantial agreement.

N. DIMOCK.



## ART. II.—THE EXTENSION OF THE DIACONATE: A CLERICAL VIEW.

IT is an obvious piece of human wisdom that each man should make the best use possible of the materials he has to his hand, and should not waste time in sighing for things which are beyond his reach. The farmer must do the best he can with the land he has; the statesman must put to service the abilities which exist in the men of his country; and the same thing is true of the Church in its efforts to deal with the tasks which it has in hand. The more these tasks increase in quantity, and in the anxiety they cause, the more need there is to keep well in sight all the material which exists for dealing with the tasks, and putting it to the utmost use.

1. The increase of the Church's task is readily represented by the fact that for some time past the population of England and Wales has been growing at about 300,000 a year. This, otherwise stated, is a growth day by day of nearly 1,000; or, stated once again with more accuracy, a growth of about 6,000 per week on an average. The Church's tasks in the face of this increase may be compared with the responsibilities resting upon the parents and elder children in any family. If in any family the standard of uprightness and religion is to be maintained, and the family is to avoid losing its character for right thought and action, it can only be by the elder ones being able to exert a sufficient influence over the younger ones as they are added to the family, to result in naughty tempers and inclinations of these young ones being checked, and desires being developed in favour of what is right, and against what is wrong. If this be not done, the good character of the family must be a declining quantity. The case with

the nation is similar. Here is a very much larger family—its numbers are increased by 6,000 each week. Unless the influence exercised for what is good and right be sufficiently strong to affect the numbers who are added to this great family year by year, the character of the family for uprightness and religion must decline.

Here, then, is the great task of the Christian Church in England and Wales at this moment. It is plain that everything which tends towards the education of the mind, the building up of character, and the development of spiritual power in human souls, needs to be strengthened. A prominent place in this is obviously taken by the settled ministry of the National Church. This, in view of the Church's task, must necessarily be maintained and extended—extended, I say, and not merely maintained—for not only is the total population of the country vastly increased year by year, involving, we might estimate, a complete equipment of fifty new parishes every year on an average, unless arrears are to be left by us for those to overtake who come after us; but also there is the fact that the added population is found almost entirely in and around our cities and great towns. The thousands of small villages which have had, and perhaps to a large extent must continue to have, one clergyman each, do not grow in their total populations; each year young men and young women leave them in numbers quite equal to those of the babies that are born there. The result is that the many thousands of clergymen who have charge of such places cannot help the Church at all *directly* in ministering to the added millions, and the task of providing for these added millions may be realized when we remind ourselves of a few of the more striking instances of the growth of population.

Middlesbrough, for instance, has grown in 100 years from nothing to its present size; in the last twenty years, from 50,000 to 100,000. Barrow-in-Furness has grown in fifty years from practically nothing to over 50,000. The South Wales Colliery Valleys have been increasing during the last twenty years by about 20,000 people a year. London, over the border, we are told by the Bishop of St. Albans, is growing at the rate of over 40,000 people a year; and the present Bishop of Winchester, when taking farewell of his South London clergy, said that the growth of South London was about 35,000 people a year, and that unless the Church could equip in that part one new parish with its permanent Church, and income for vicar and curate, once in every *ten* weeks, it was only adding to arrears which had to be overtaken.

2. Now, what are the facts with regard to the ministry? So far from being able to record an important addition to its

numbers, we have to lament the fact that the number added to the ministry in recent years has been smaller than the numbers admitted some ten years ago. To be precise on this important point, we may state that in the years 1887-88-89 the total number admitted to the diaconate was 2,287; in the years 1897-98-99 it was only 1,951, showing a decline on the three years of 336.

The question at once arises what the Church should do in view of these facts. She must plainly not sit down and waste time in idle weeping. She must certainly not ruin herself by an exhibition of the stern conservatism which would make her neglect new and important tasks rather than modify the methods of older ones. She must see whether some plan cannot be devised for spreading over a larger area those men she has in her ministry who have already been admitted to full Orders, and at the same time see whether she cannot provide in some way for minor ministerial duties in populous places, which are at the present time being done by an unnecessary accumulation there of persons in full Orders. By minor ministerial duties, I mean such duties as the reading of Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, and the Lessons, on Sundays as well as on weekdays; the reading of the Gospel, and the ministering of the chalice at the time of Holy Communion. Obviously much will depend on the arrangements which can be made for this. This leads me at once to the main suggestion I have to make.

3. It is my unhesitating opinion, as the result of a varied experience during twenty-five years, that the Church needs a diaconate of a more real kind than she has at the present time. By the plan now in vogue, we only use the diaconate as a kind of probationership for the priesthood. Most English people, if asked to say something about the diaconate, would be unable to describe the duties actually done in each important parish by the deacons of that parish. They would simply be able to say that a deacon was a young clergyman who was hoping some day to be a priest, but who for the present was unable to take certain parts of the service. We not only make our deacons mere probationer priests, but we require them to dress in priest's clothes; we call them "Reverend," as we do in the case of priests; and we require the separation from secular occupation to come at the time of admission to the diaconate, whereas it might very well be delayed until the admission to the priesthood, when it would come with a great degree of suitability, having regard to the special features of the Service of Ordination to the Priesthood, and also with much practical benefit to the Church in the extension of the ministry, as I now hope to show.

4. It is a fact, which I hope is known to many, and will be disputed by few, that in every large town there are a considerable number of Churchmen engaged in secular business, whose religious convictions and whose devotion to the work of the Church are such as to make them quite worthy of being compared as Christians and Churchmen with those who are in the ministry. Many of them are men whose education has been very nearly equal, perhaps better than some of those who are admitted to the ministry. They are quite qualified by education for reading in public, in church, without offence to educated people, the various parts of Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, etc.; and the standard of their Christian living would make it quite certain that, if admitted to it, their private lives would not render their public ministry an offence to any of the congregation. Many of these men are already devoting the whole of their Sundays and much of their leisure hours during the week to helping Church work; they are doing so without one penny of remuneration, and are thereby showing that they have the cause of the Church at heart. Many of them would feel it to be a very high honour indeed for the Church to offer them admission to the diaconate, an order of Christian ministry which is not only ancient, but goes back even to Bible times. If admitted to the diaconate, they might be expected not to do less for the Church than they are doing now, and this would mean the giving of a large amount of ministerial service without remuneration at all.

5. The results of a step of this kind would be felt in various ways:

(1) Many parishes which now have three priests on the clerical staff could manage with two priests and one, two, or three of these deacons, appointed in the way I have suggested.

(2) As a result, the priest at present serving as the third of such a staff would be released for the charge of some newly-created conventional district.

(3) Parochial and central Church finances would benefit. The parochial Clergy Fund would be relieved of the duty of providing a third stipend of, let us say, £140. It would, as a result, be able to give an augmentation of the stipend of the second priest it retained; it would save itself the task of raising some money it at present has to collect towards completing the third stipend; and it could release the Church Pastoral Aid Society or the Additional Curates Society from the grant for the third priest at present being given, and enable the granting society to apply this money for the development of new work elsewhere.

(4) The Easter Day Communion difficulty would to a large extent disappear. The parish which has two Communions on Easter Day could have them taken by the parish priest, who, with some two or three deacons, could manage the administration to a large number of communicants.

(5) The existence of a large body of intelligent and vigorous deacons would necessarily tend very quickly to raise the standard of general capability in the superior officers—I mean those admitted to the priesthood.

(6) A very important link would be supplied between the ministry of the Church and those men who are connected with commercial life, to the very great advantage of both Christianity and commerce. The gap which at present appears to exist between commercial men and the clergy would necessarily become much lessened.

(7) The plan would be the means of leading many young men to desire a more intimate connection with the Church's ministry, and to be willing to leave commercial life and prepare for the priesthood. This result would work itself out in two ways. First, some of those admitted to this diaconate, if still young men in years, might desire to save up their money for a college course, and then, after obtaining a University degree, ask the Bishop to exchange their deacon's orders for the priesthood. Secondly, the sons of middle-aged men who had continued for many years to serve the Church as deacons might very reasonably feel a desire not merely to minister as deacons as their fathers have done, but to go on to desire the priesthood.

At any rate, it is difficult for the Church to deny that a large amount of good material exists at this moment near to its hand which is not being utilized in the most sensible and effective way. It is quite certain that the Church, by making more effective use of the most earnest-minded and energetic of her sons now in secular business, must, by using enthusiasm, increase its quantity and its power to the immense gain of the Church's health and life and work.

6. The merits of this proposition appear to be these. Firstly, that no modern order of workers is contemplated—it is simply the old diaconate, with the duties of the diaconate as they have always been understood; and, secondly, the only step that is necessary is the recall of the statute (I believe I am correct in describing it as 1 and 2 Vic., c. 106, §§ 29, 30) by which those who are admitted to the diaconate are required

to surrender secular occupation, and this need involve no religious difficulty, unless we take up the absurd mental position that there is something inherently bad in trade and commerce.

It is as well that I should add, in order to avoid misunderstanding, that, according to my idea, the business man, if admitted to the diaconate, should not *ipso facto* have authority to preach. This privilege should only be his if he "be thereto licensed by the Bishop himself"; and he would not have any claim to be advanced to the priesthood unless he could show himself well qualified for the higher office, and be ready to withdraw himself entirely from secular work.

PAUL PETIT.



ART. III.—THE EXTENSION OF THE DIACONATE: A  
"READER'S" VIEW.

IT has been often said that if you define your terms you prove your position, and the very difficulty which I experience in defining the ecclesiastical oxymoron before me affords some indication of the precarious nature of the position which I am to defend or attack, for an ill-defined or nebulous proposition is almost as embarrassing to its opponents as it is to its supporters: Is the lay-diaconate an order or an office? The subject seems to be conclusive in the former direction, the epithet in the latter; but as the greater includes the less, I propose to treat it as a qualified order rather than as an extended office. It appears to me to be easier to defend from an ecclesiastical standpoint the permission to deacons of secular employments, rather than the investiture of laymen with diaconal functions. But, on the other hand, I am bound to say that, should the lay-diaconate ever be established, the average man will be apt to consider its members rather as traders who minister than as ministers who trade, and to regard that interesting hybrid, the lay-deacon, as having superadded the sacred to the secular, rather than the secular to the sacred.

And this, believe me, is no mere dialectical distinction; it goes to the very root of the matter. Πάντα ῥεῖ—there is no absolutely perfect balance either in physics, or in economics, or in morals. No man ever yet exactly and at all times reconciled conflicting duties or even competing aspirations. Your lay-deacon will always be either a good man of business and an indifferent minister, or an excellent minister and only a moderately efficient professional person.

I am, however, anticipating my argument before I have done with my definition. Permit me to hark back to that, and to say that by the lay-diaconate I understand an arrangement whereby either all deacons or some deacons shall be permitted to engage in secular occupations for reward. I pass over the question of the machinery whereby this is to be effected, merely stating by the way that, in my own opinion, there is nothing either in the statutes, or the canons, or the ordinal which in terms forbids deacons at present to exercise professions for reward.

It will be seen from this that, in theory, the lay-deacon will be a clerical person, who, though he preach the Gospel, is not enabled to live of the Gospel, but is constrained to minister to himself in earthly things by the exercise of a profession or a trade as a means of livelihood in competition with those whose sole occupation such profession or trade may be. He will be in all respects a deacon; essentially ecclesiastical, and only casually civil. He will therefore differ from the reader, who is in character essentially civil, and only occasionally performs functions which by repute are ecclesiastical.

Assuming that this is the nature of the lay-diaconate, I am bold to say that I consider the proposal eminently undesirable. I believe it to rest upon a misconception of primitive institutions; upon a misunderstanding of the tendencies of the age and of the exigencies of professional life; and, above all, upon a total misapprehension both of the functions and of the faculties of lay members of the Church of England.

I will try to make my position good under these three heads.

The lay-diaconate has amongst its ardent advocates some who appeal to antiquity in its favour. The New Testament, councils and canons are ransacked and racked to show that what is proposed is a restoration in the twentieth century of an institution which was found appropriate in the first. Indeed, one of its supporters begs the question with ingenious hardihood by speaking of "the revival of a true working diaconate;" while so sober a person as Arch-deacon Emery went so far as to affirm that what is proposed was "beyond all question following the precedent of the first three centuries."

Yet, if I understand the record rightly, the very object of the original institution of the diaconate was to prevent that which it is now proposed to effect—namely, the superadding of the secular to the sacred, or, as I should prefer to say, of the civil to the ecclesiastical. May I add, in passing, that I deeply deprecate the distinction which is drawn so frequently in discussions on this subject between functions which are

called sacred and those which are called secular, although for convenience of discussion it is sometimes necessary to employ the words as if they were antithetical?

That which seems to have been the case with regard to the original institution of the diaconate was, of course, considerably modified in practice during the succeeding centuries, until after the fourth century we find a Church writer stating as an acknowledged fact that the diaconate was, in fact, a "third priesthood"; and it is this character which the office appears to have sustained ever since, for although we are told by those who advocate the establishment of a lay-diaconate that there are decisions of councils which permit the exercise of ordinary employments for gain by deacons in old times, I think it will be seen upon a closer investigation, in the first place, that this permission is given only in cases of extreme necessity, and under circumstances which are confessedly exceptional; and, in the second place, that the permissions thus given are certainly not in terms, and probably not in intention, confined to the diaconate, but are equally allowed to the priesthood. I venture, therefore, to submit with confidence that the proposed institution fails when tested in the direction of primitive practice.

But there are other supporters of the proposal, generally those whose views of Church order are but little influenced by considerations of antiquity, who tell us that the lay-diaconate is appropriate to our times, and is, in fact, peremptorily needed. Now, the advancement of these arguments naturally leads us into the consideration of the way in which the proposed institution is likely to work in practice. I propose therefore to ask, in the second place, with regard to the lay-diaconate, whether it is, in fact, practical.

I do not myself esteem so highly as some of my friends that somewhat cheap objection to the proposition which assumes that it is impossible that the man who works for reward during part of his time should be respected in the exercise of sacred functions. For my own part, I am content to believe that if a man is called of God, and entrusted by Him with a message or a ministry, he will exercise it not the less efficiently—nay, in all probability he will gain in experience—if, in addition to his distinctively ecclesiastical work, he mixes with those to whom he ministers in the ordinary affairs of their life. Surely this is but an extension of that principle for which the clergy so rightly contend, that he is the most effective preacher and minister who is most assiduous in his parochial visitation, for the basis of this idea is, that in the process of visiting—always laborious, frequently disappointing—the minister gains that

insight into the thoughts and the difficulties of his people which he can acquire in no other manner.

But if he whose general sphere is outside the family and business occupations of his flock recognises that by these necessarily casual and intermittent visits he gains a real advantage in his ministry, how much stronger will be the position of the man who day by day, without forgetting his own sacred office, is engaged side by side with other men, rubbing shoulders with them—nay, if you will, competing with them in their own line of life?

But I do say that the proposed institution is contrary to the general tendencies of the age, and not consistent with the real exigencies of the work which has to be accomplished. In every department of life at the present time the tendency is to specialize, and yet this proposal is simply to unite in a single person two differing, though not inconsistent, occupations. If the surgeon to be successful must nowadays devote himself to the lifelong study of some particular organ, if the engineer who hopes to be eminent must give himself wholly to some particular branch of his profession, it is no mere fashion which dictates this course, but a real necessity for that thoroughness in professional matters which can only be acquired\* by arduous toil and assiduous application.

And if on *à priori* grounds the proposal seems to clash with the spirit of the age, I am sure that all the more it is based upon a misapprehension of the exigencies of the work. Here, at any rate, I speak of what I know. It is not fair upon those whom it is proposed to appoint to this office that they should be required to undergo the continual conflict between the competing calls of their double duties.

I assume, of course, that there will be competing calls, for I pass by the case of those people whom it is proposed to appoint to this office after they have given the best years of their life to acquiring a competency in trade, or have been enabled by other ways to retire from their profession—men who, if they are suitable for such an office, should surely be ordained to the regular diaconate, and who, if the whole training of their lives has left them too ill-equipped for that order, should surely not be placed in the position to which it is suggested they should be assigned.

But of course the supporters of the lay-diaconate will say it is no use urging that our proposal is not primitive, because our age is not primitive, but modern, and that it is no use saying that our proposal is not practical, because, if it is really needed, a way will be found in which it can be carried out, and so I come to the question whether the demand for the lay-diaconate is in fact as peremptory as its supporters suppose.

We are told that the number of men who are offering themselves for the service of the Church in its regular ministry is yearly diminishing. But this is not the peculiar accident of the sacred ministry alone; it is that which is happening in many other occupations to-day. The cry of the farmer is the same, that labour is dear and bad, because the labourers are yearly fewer, as the young men drift from the country to the great towns. That which is the remedy for the farmer is in its measure, I am convinced, the remedy for the parson—to make the most of the men that he has by organization and by machinery, by adapting his resources to the claims that are made upon him—to use a popular proverb, “By cutting his coat according to his cloth.”

For what is it, after all, that the lay-deacon is intended to do which no person at present in existence can effect? He is to read prayers in church; he is (not necessarily, I note) to preach; he is to be an almoner, an adviser, a financial officer in the parish; he is to assist in that part of the administration of the Holy Communion which may, I think, without irreverence be called mechanical.

Now, the great majority of these things are things which can be perfectly well done by the laity as they are. We are often told that one of the difficulties of the parish priest is the prevailing idea that a man must attend to his business and his pleasure, and leave religion to the parson, who is paid to attend to it. And yet, if I may be bold to say so to those who exercise that high office, this misconception gains colour from the sharp line of demarcation which is too often drawn by the clergy between their own work and their own functions and those of their lay brethren.

I say nothing with regard to the conduct of services in church, though it has always been mysterious to me why, if, as a layman, I am permitted to do that which is greater—I mean to read the Word of God in the ears of the people—I should not equally be permitted to do that which is less, namely, to read equally in their audience the Book of Common Prayer, a book which, however scriptural and however excellent, is yet human, as contrasted with that which is Divine.

But, apart from this, I am sure that with organization the faculties of the laity could be largely developed, and this, not only from that side which is commonly called secular, but also and more especially from the side of those things which are indeed most sacred. The serving of tables is of course laymen's work, the administration of alms, the ordering of all those material and mechanical practicalities which at present absorb so much of the clergyman's time and often try his temper so severely. But while all are acknowledging more and more

that in this department the laity can be used, I think we are slow to recognise the faculties of the laity in purely spiritual work, and being slow to recognise, the Church has failed to afford to the laity definite training in this particular direction. By spiritual work I do not in the least mean the preaching of sermons. A sermon is an excellent thing in its way, and I cannot for myself see why, if a man, with the necessary spiritual qualifications, has in the exercise of his profession acquired the art of lucid exposition, or is naturally endowed with that most dangerous gift of eloquence, he should not, under proper restrictions and in convenient places, be allowed to preach, by whatever name his service may be called.

But, after all, the best of sermons is but moderately efficient compared with half an hour's conversation man to man. I venture to say that any man who desires to do real work for the extension of the kingdom would rather have an opportunity of half an hour's uninterrupted conversation with any man whom he desires to win, than be afforded the opportunity of preaching him a sermon of the same length. Of course, I know you get more people within the sound of your voice on the occasion of sermons, but the power which is exercised over a large area is inevitably less effective than the same power concentrated on a single point.

I can only, in conclusion, summarize what I want to say by asking, with regard to the proposal of the lay-diaconate, three questions: (1) Whether it is in reality primitive? (2) whether it is in execution practicable? and (3) whether, having regard to things as they are, the call for it is, in fact, peremptory?

G. A. KING.

(London Diocesan Reader.)



#### ART. IV.—MESSAGES FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

##### IV.—*Hebrews vii.*

THERE is a symmetrical dignity all its own in the seventh chapter of the Hebrews. I recollect listening, now nearly fourteen years ago, to a characteristic exposition of it by Canon Hoare, in a well-known drawing-room at Cromer—a "Bible Reading" full alike of mental stimulus and spiritual force. He said, among other things, that the chapter might be described as a sermon, divided under three headings, on Ps. cx. 4. This division and its significance he proceeded to develop. The chapter opens with a preamble, a statement of the unique phenomena which surround the name and person

of Melchizedek in the narrative of Genesis. Then, from the point of view (to whose truth the Lord Himself is so abundantly a witness) that the Old Testament is alive everywhere with intimations of the Christ, and remembering that in the Psalm a mysterious import is explicitly assigned to Melchizedek, the writer proceeds to his discourse. Its theme is the primacy of the priesthood embodied in Melchizedek over that represented by Aaron, and the bearing of this on the glory of Him who is proclaimed a priest for ever after Melchizedek's order. This is presented under headings somewhat thus: *First* (verses 4-14), the one priesthood is greater than the other *in order*. Abraham, with the whole Aaronic hierarchy potentially in him, defers to Melchizedek as to his greater. Hence, among other inferences, the sacred Personage who is a priest for ever after Melchizedek's order, wholly independent of Levitical limits, must dominate and must supersede the order of the sons of Aaron, with their inferior status and with their transitory lives: *Secondly* (verses 15-19), the one priesthood is greater than the other in respect of *the finality*, the permanence, the everlastingness, of the greater Priest and of His office. He is what He is "for ever, on the scale of the power of an indissoluble life." As such, He is the Priest of not an introductory and transient "commandment," but of that "better hope" which (verse 19) has at last "made perfect" the purpose and the promise, fulfilled the intention of eternal mercy, and brought us, the people of this great covenant, absolutely nigh to God. *Thirdly* (verses 20, 21), this second aspect of the supremacy of the greater Priesthood is emphasized and solemnized by one further reference to Ps. cx. 4. There the Eternal, looking upon the mysterious Partner of His throne, is heard not to promise only but to *vow*, with an oath unalterable as Himself, that the Priesthood of "His Fellow" shall be everlasting. No such solemnity attended Aaron's investiture. There is something greater here, and more immediately divine. The "covenant" (verse 22) committed to the administration of One thus sealed with the oath of Heaven must indeed be "better," and must be final.

*Then* (verses 23-28) the discourse passes into what we may call its epilogue. The thought recurs to the sublime contrast between the pathetic numerousness of the successors of Aaron, "not suffered to continue by reason of death," and the singleness, the "unsuccessional" identity for ever, of the true Melchizedek, who abides eternally. And then it glows and brightens into an "application" to the human heart. We have in JESUS (the Name has now already been pronounced, verse 22) a Friend, an Intercessor, infinitely and for ever competent to save us, His Israel. We have in Him a High

Priest supreme in every attribute of holiness and power, and qualified for His work of intercession by that sacrifice of Himself which is at once solitary and all-sufficient. Behold, then, the contrast and the conclusion. To a great dispensation, the preparatory, succeeds a greater, the greatest, the other's end and goal. To the "weak" mortal priesthood of the law, never warranted by the vow of God to be always in possession, succeeds He who is Priest, and King, and SON, sealed for His office by the irrevocable vow, "consecrated for evermore."

Such on the whole, as I recall it, was the exposition of my venerable friend in 1887. Each new reading of the chapter seems to me to bear out the substantial accuracy of it; indeed, the symmetry and order of the chapter make it almost inevitable that some such line should be taken by the explanation. So then it lies before us. It is filled in all its parts with Jesus Christ, in His character of the true Melchizedek, our final, everlasting, perfect, supreme, divine High Priest.

This short paper is not the place for critical discussions. I do not attempt the vindication of the mystical and Messianic reference of Ps. cx. All I can do, and perhaps all I should do here, is to affirm solemnly my belief in it, at the feet of Christ. I am perfectly aware that now, within the Church, and by men unquestionably devout in purpose, our Lord's own interpretation of that Psalm, involving as it does His assertion of its Davidic authorship, is treated as quite open to criticism. One critic, and a Christian one, does not hesitate to say that, if the majority of modern experts are right as to the non-Davidic authorship (and he seems to think that they are), "our Lord's argument breaks down." All I would remark upon such utterances, coming from men who all the while do (thank God) adore Christ as their Lord and God, is that they must surely open the way towards conceptions of His whole teaching which make for the ruin of faith. For the question is not at all whether our Redeemer consented to submit to limits in His conscious human knowledge; I for one hold that He assuredly did so. It is whether He consented to that sort of limitation which alone is the real peril of a teacher, and which is his fatal peril—the ignorance of his own ignorance, and the consequent claim to teach where he does not know. In human schools the betrayal of *that* sort of ignorance is a death-blow to confidence, not only in some special utterance, but in the teacher, for it strikes at his claim, not to knowledge so much as to wisdom. I venture to say that recent drifts of thought show how rapidly the conception of a fallible Christ develops towards that of a wholly imperfect and untrustworthy Christ. And, looking again at

the vast phenomenon of the portrait in the Gospels, I hold that the line of thought which offers by very far the least difficulty, not to faith only but to reason, is that which relies absolutely on His affirmations wherever He is pleased actually to affirm.

So thinking, I take His exposition of Ps. cx. as for me final. And that exposition guarantees at once a typical mystery latent in Gen. xiv., and the rightness of its development in Heb. vii.

But now, what "message" has our chapter for us in view of the needs of our own time?

First, as to its sacerdotal doctrine. It throws a broad illumination on the grand finality and uniqueness of the mediatorial priesthood of our Lord, the Son of God. It puts into the most visible possible contrast the age of "the law" and that of Christ as to the priestly conception and institution. Somehow, under the law, there was a need for priests who were "men, having infirmity." For certain grave purposes (not for all, even in that legal period) it was the will of God that they should stand between His Israel and Him. But the argument of the chapter, unless it elaborately veils its true self in clouds, goes directly to show that such mediatorial functions, in the age of Christ, are for ever withdrawn from "men, having infirmity." Where they stood of old, one after another, sacrificing, interceding, going in beyond the veil, permitted to draw nearer to God, in an official sanctity, than their brethren, there now stands Another, sublime, supreme, alone. He is man indeed, but He is not "man, having infirmity." He is higher than the heavens, while He is one with us. And now our one secret for complete approach to God is to come to God "through HIM." And this, unless the chapter is an elaborate semblance of what it is not, means nothing if it does not mean that between the Church, and between the soul, and Jesus Christ, there is to come *absolutely nothing mediatorial*. As little as the Jew, for ceremonial purposes, needed an intermediary in dealing with his mortal priest, so little do we, for the whole needs of our being, need an intermediary in dealing with our eternal Priest.

In the age of Christ no office can for one moment put a "man, having infirmity," nearer to God than another, if Heb. vii. means what it says. Mediatorial priesthood, a totally different thing from commissioned pastorate, has no place whatever in apostolic Christianity, except its sublime and solitary place in the person of our most blessed Lord.

Then, further, the chapter, far from giving us merely the cold gift (as it would be if it were all) of a negative certainty against unlawful human claims, gives us, as its true, its inmost

message, a glorious positive. It gives us the certainty that for every human heart that asks for God, this wonderful Christ, personal, eternal, human, divine, is quite immediately accessible. The hands of need and trust have but to be lifted, and they hold HIM. And He is the SON. In Him we have the Father. We do indeed "*draw nigh* to God through Him."

Therefore we will do it. The thousand confusions of our time shall only make this divine simplicity the more precious to us. We will continually and quite directly take Jesus Christ for granted in all the fulness and splendour of His high-priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. It is for ever so; it is as new and young to-day in its virtue as if the oath had but to-day been spoken, and He had but to-day sat down at the right hand.

Happy we if we use Him thus. He blesses those who do so with blessings they cannot analyze, but which they know. Many years ago a Christian lady, daughter of a devoted Non-conformist pastor in the west of Dorset, told me how, in a now distant time, her father had striven to teach a sick man, a young gipsy in a wandering camp, to read, and to come to Christ. The camp moved after a while, and the young man, dying of consumption, took a Bible with him. Time rolled on, and one day a gray-haired gipsy came to the minister's door; it was the youth's father, with the news of his son's happy death, and with his Bible. "Sir, I cannot read a word; but *he* was always reading it, and he marked what he liked with a stick from the fire. And he said you would find one place marked with two lines; it was everything to my poor lad." The leaves were turned, and the stick was found to have scored twice at the side Heb. vii. 25: "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."

H. C. G. MOULE.



#### ART. V.—THE PROTESTANT REVIVAL: WHAT HAS IT DONE?

**A**LL who have taken a part in, or have openly encouraged, opposition to the growth of extreme ritual within the English Church, know what it is to be told that they have erred. They have been accused of breaking the peace of their Church, as though until the year 1897 or 1898 all had gone smoothly within her. They have been charged with sowing discord between Bishops and clergy, between clergy

and people, as though up till that period the relations in either case had been entirely ideal. They have been told that they have imperilled the spiritual growth of the Church, as though nothing could be so conducive to the spiritual life as the unrestrained dissemination of false doctrine, and an attitude of studied neutrality towards the sowers. They have even been told that they were making their own party unpopular, as though it were the first and last duty of the Christian man to secure as far as possible prosperity, place and preferment for those who agree with him.

If we may judge by their actions, the persons whose policy is impugned do not seem to have been much affected by these accusations. It is certain, however, that they must sometimes ask themselves whether their action has been justified by events. The lull in the storm which invariably comes with the approach of the holiday season may perhaps be deemed a convenient time for retrospect and inquiry.

But first, it is only fair to ask what provoked the agitation. The Protestant revival of the last few years has occasionally been spoken of as though it had originated in mere wanton love of strife, and had broken into a period of peace during which the progress of extreme opinions within the English Church was steadily losing its force. Nothing could be more untrue or more unfair. A large number of Protestant Churchmen, some of them intimately connected with the Church Association, the National Protestant Church Union, and other organizations, had never ceased to oppose to the best of their power principles which they deemed inconsistent with loyalty to the Church. But it can hardly be said that they had public opinion behind them. Indeed, for something like ten years many Evangelical Churchmen stood apart from all such work. The appeal to the law seemed so far to have failed that they were willing enough that other methods should be tried. Perhaps, it was urged, if active opposition were lessened, the Bishops would quietly but firmly put down the more serious extravagancies of the clergy. It was at least an honourable view. And there was, at the time, something to be said for such a policy. At all events it was tried, and very fully tried. The indisputable evidence of its disastrous failure alone drove again into controversy many Churchmen who desired nothing better than to live in peace with their neighbours.

In truth, there was no resisting the conviction that the years of comparative peace had been used by the extreme High Churchmen to advance their position on all sides. The evidence of this is decisive. The years of comparative quietude were years in which the spread of extreme ritual

went on with ever increasing rapidity. The following figures from the *Tourist's Church Guide* need no commentary :

| Churches using the eucharistic vestments ... .. | 1884. | 1888. | 1892. | 1898. |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Churches using altar lights ...                 | 749   | 1,136 | 2,048 | 4,334 |
| Churches using incense ...                      | 22    | 89    | 177   | 381   |

These figures fail, however, to tell the whole of the story, for they convey no information as to the rapid growth of resort to the more extreme manifestations of Roman proclivities.

If it be asked why progress went on at this accelerated pace, we can only say that the pressure of public opinion being to a great extent removed, the pressure of authority became equally relaxed. A Bishop is but mortal, and he is commonly a very much overworked person. It was not likely, therefore, that he would act in advance of public opinion, or, save with some assurance of support, rush into conflict with men who have hitherto shown the utmost tenacity in resisting the authority of their Bishops.

When at last the absolute failure of the neutral policy became apparent, very little inquiry was needed to prove how urgent the necessity of action had become. The investigations conducted by the *Record* showed that the evil had reached a height of which the main body of Churchmen were quite unaware. Some of them in their innocence supposed that any Protestant indignation was directed against such comparatively familiar facts as the use of the Mass vestments and of altar lights. Some were even known to conjecture that it was choral services, frequent celebrations, and the use of the surplice in the pulpit, which were exciting the anger of stupid Low Churchmen. Even many persons, long honestly indignant at the growth of extreme practices, had not the smallest suspicion of the lengths to which the movement had gone. If conducted to a typical church, they were amazed to find a holy-water stoup, confessional-places, images of saints, evidences of reservation, and all the appurtenances of a well-arranged Roman Catholic church. They did not know these things had arrived. If present at a series of services, they were equally astonished to find the Book of Common Prayer displaced by a mixture of our own Communion Office and the Roman Missal. They were not prepared for All Souls' Day celebrations, the Mass of the Pre-sanctified, the blessing and imposition of ashes, the blessing of palms, the *Tenebræ*, creeping to the cross, and other characteristics of latter-day Neo-Anglicanism. Few who could be induced to look candidly into the facts as they were needed much argument to convince them that action was inevitable. Some Low Churchmen, disliking all con-

troversy, dreading lest it should hinder spiritual work, and fearing that they might be supposed to sympathize with disorderly proceedings in churches, found themselves unable to favour even the most cautious agitation. But they were in a minority. In the main Low Churchmen, Moderate Churchmen and Broad Churchmen agreed that the position had grown intolerable, and that some effort at restraint must at last be made.

Into the details of what was done it is needless to go. That wisdom, propriety, tact, charity marked it all no one will pretend; but in view of the evil existing perhaps we might have looked for more, and not fewer, mistakes. It is time to ask, looking at the movement as a whole, whether it has justified its existence. What has it done? I pretend to no exhaustive statement, but here are some more or less obvious facts:

1. The agitation has made the public aware of the lengths to which extreme doctrine and practice have gone.

There is good reason to believe that many of the Bishops knew nothing of the more fantastic developments in certain churches of their dioceses. The general public, as I have shown, were even worse off. The exposure, not only of ritual excess, but of the attempt to enforce the confessional, of the use of unauthorized services and of pernicious manuals, came as a shock to the majority of people in the nation. But now that the facts are known the danger is to some extent lessened. People are, or should be, on their guard.

2. The agitation has compelled the attention of Parliament to the condition of the Church.

With the sympathies of the Prime Minister on the side of the High Church party, it was but natural that he should move reluctantly, and trust rather to the slow assertion of episcopal authority than to any awkward reminder of the lay power residing in Parliament. But enough has happened to make it clear that Parliament is on the side of "law and order" within the Church. Perhaps we may claim that the general feeling of the House of Commons was well expressed by Mr. A. J. Balfour, when, speaking at Bristol on November 29, 1898, he said: "Obviously it is the plain right of every member of the Church of England to have a service in accordance with the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. Equally manifestly it is the duty of every clergyman of the Church of England to give the laity a service in accordance with the Prayer-Book."<sup>1</sup> That right Parliament expects the Bishops to secure to the people.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Record*, December 2, 1898, p. 1179.

3. The agitation has set the Bishops as a body in official antagonism to extreme practices.

Nothing is more natural than that any person or persons in authority should dislike the appearance of being influenced in the execution of their duty by outside pressure. Let us by all means allow for that feeling; but the fact remains that whilst (with a few honourable exceptions) the Bishops for years left things to drift, they have since this agitation been brought into line against excesses. There is scarcely a prelate who has not issued most edifying directions in regard to the services of the churches, and there are some who insist on seeing that these directions are obeyed. The position of the Bishops is admittedly one of great difficulty, but there are welcome signs that the gravity of the situation is now appreciated by them.

4. The agitation has produced the decisive pronouncements of the Lambeth tribunal in regard to reservation and the use of incense.

Without in any way attaching undue importance to the authority of this quasi-court, it is still impossible not to recognise the value of the definite statements there made by the two Archbishops after the most careful inquiry.

5. The agitation has stimulated inquiry into the doctrinal questions at issue, and has made for an intelligent appreciation of their gravity.

The Round Table Conference has shown the gulf between the two schools of thought. The recent work of Canon Gore has reminded us that some High Churchmen are not upon the farther side of that gulf. Moreover, one undoubted result of the Protestant movement has been the wider diffusion of popular literature bearing on the subject, and a better knowledge of the historical, doctrinal, and moral aspects of the question. In comparison with the Higher Anglicans, Evangelicals are slow to appreciate the value of literature, and, as a result, very remiss in the use of it. But the revival of Protestant feeling has, at least, shown some of them the folly of neglecting an agent so energetically employed on the other side.

6. And, lastly, the agitation has convinced some of the extreme men of the necessity of caution and restraint.

Not the least remarkable result of the Protestant upheaval has been the cleavage it has created within the ranks of the extreme High Churchmen. Whilst many of them stoutly protest that the movement against them is as nothing, and that the process of development cannot be too energetically pushed forward, others are wise enough to perceive that danger is ahead. It must not be assumed that these all think

the development has now gone far enough. It is probable, if not certain, that this is true of some extreme men, as well as of a large number of more moderate High Churchmen, who have hitherto given their warm sympathy to a movement the progress of which they have personally shrunk from keeping in step with. But the Churchmen of whom I am now speaking are those who are quite willing that the advance should continue, only they perceive that the times are now unpropitious. That conviction, it is scarcely needful to say, could hardly have prevailed if the policy of toleration had still persisted.

The leader of this party is the Rev. Henry Linklater, whom Mr. Gladstone sent to succeed an Evangelical incumbent at Holy Trinity, Stroud Green. He developed his policy in a three-column letter, which appeared in the *Church Times* of April 26. Dr. Linklater, in that letter, was at great pains to set out his devout thankfulness for the "present condition" of the Church, and the great advances in teaching and ritual which he has observed. Then he frankly outlines his policy thus: "I venture to think that the calm review of our remarkable advance may well suggest to my reverend brethren that it may be wise policy, true charity, and good generalship to cry 'halt' for a time, both that we may reap the due reward of our victories in the sweeping in to the fold of the Church the millions that are still outside her, who are only waiting to be gathered in, and also, and very specially, that we may give time for the rearguard of our vast army to catch us up, and form close order for further advance and conquest by-and-by. Otherwise the enemy will surely find our Church an easy prey—the advanced guard so very far ahead, the rear so far behind. Is not this bad generalship on our part, and are we not simply playing into the hands of the enemy? Can we wonder if we are intercepted and divided?"

Passing by the plain admission in the closing words of this paragraph, that the extreme men are feeling the impact of the Protestant revival, and the many paragraphs in which, with marked complacency, Dr. Linklater recalls his personal services to the cause of advanced Anglicanism, let us see what his policy is. He applies the general principle of the paragraph I have quoted to the two subjects now under the Episcopal ban—reservation and the ceremonial use of incense. In both he thinks his party should yield—for the present. He has some subsidiary arguments to offer. One is the desirability of being gentle with the new Bishop of London. As to Bishop Creighton, "I have," said Dr. Linklater, "my own opinion about the treatment offered to our late Bishop, and its effect upon his health. I believe we took the heart.

out of him—broke his heart; I am tempted to say, killed him." A second reason is the awkward fact that "we have not proved that our present Prayer-Book sanctions either of these customs." A third is that the people are not quite ready for them. "Is it," he asks, "right (I mean fair to our people) to carry our Lord through our streets until our people are prepared to worship as Jesus of Nazareth passeth by?"

Such was Mr. Linklater's policy, and the grounds upon which he urged it. Its bare statement is a sufficient witness to the force of a movement which some extreme Churchmen have persistently declared has effected nothing.

Now let us mark the spirit in which this appeal was received, and the result which seems to have issued from it.

In the succeeding number of the *Church Times* (May 3) the advanced men at once fall upon Dr. Linklater tooth and nail. If his critics had been some of those terrible Orangemen by whose controversial methods the extreme Anglican affects to be so shocked, they could scarcely have assailed him with more bitterness. The Rev. Arthur Tooth, of St. James's, Hatcham, fame, led the way. Doubtless his valiant plea for insubordination may have suggested the fable of the rat who lost its tail; but in any case all the correspondents of May 3 were against Dr. Linklater. On May 10 a few voices were uplifted on his behalf, one especially deprecating "any kind of cleavage among Catholic priests." On May 17 Mr. Athelstan Riley arrived to tenderly inform Dr. Linklater that his proposal, instead of bringing (temporary) submission, might only "stiffen" those whom the Bishop of Rochester so happily stamped as the "nonconforming" clergy. Mr. Paul Swain, an aggressive Plymouth layman, denounced the letter as "mischievous," predicted a Cave of Adullam, and invited laity who did not agree with Dr. Linklater to pour their sorrows into the sympathetic ear of himself (Mr. Paul Swain).

The storm still raged on May 24 and on May 31. By the latter date Mr. Athelstan Riley found it needful to appear again. He sharply reminded Dr. Linklater that obedience has grave dangers for extreme men; or, as he puts it in his own charming way: "I should have thought that the mere motive of self-preservation would have led him to pause before weakening the position of his friends in front. How long does my dear, inconsistent, ritualistic doctor think his bowings and his sacring bells will be secure when the first line of defence has gone down? Then it will be his turn to feel the pinch, and somebody else's to call him 'extreme,' and to proclaim that genuflections and bell-rings will inevitably wreck the Church of England if persisted in." By this time it has occurred to Mr. Riley also that division has its dangers

for the cause, and he proceeded: "I deprecate the 'advanced' men attacking Dr. Linklater quite as much as the latter attacking the former. 'Sirs, ye are brethren;' the Catholic cause in England is not to be furthered by splitting up our great army into nasty little commandoes, sniping at each other."

Dr. Linklater's defenders have been few in number. Judging from experience of what happens under such circumstances, we may fairly infer that many of those who agreed with him and were for (temporary) obedience, finding the policy unpopular, saw no virtue in publicly identifying themselves with the losing side, and held their tongues. It is unnecessary to pursue the subject further, but the whole correspondence shows that the campaign against extreme practices has been effective. It is something to have made offenders feel that public opinion will not endure much more at their hands. It is something to have made it plain that a certain number of clergy and laity are quite inaccessible to appeal, threat, and even the discipline of their Bishops, and mean at any price to go on.

Perhaps one of the most striking witnesses to the results already obtained is found in a letter from Mr. Paul Swain in the *Church Review* of May 30. He is referring to Dr. Linklater's appeal, and he commends the following consideration to the attention of clergy and laity who are in sympathy with the extreme men:

"1. We have already lost one of the six points for the gain of which those who went before suffered imprisonment and persecution.

"2. Reservation trembles in the balance, and there are priests to be found who only need a little jogging to give it up.

"3. There are not wanting signs (*vide* leading article in this week's *Guardian*, and the latest popular work on the Eucharist) that the rights of the laity to be present at the Holy Sacrifice will be challenged.

"4. The reverence due to the Blessed Sacrament is being called in question. The abortive attempt to explain away the English Church Union declaration has again been made in another form, and we are left in doubt as to whether the author of this last attack believes in any presence of our Blessed Lord in the Sacrament outside communion.

"5. A deliberate attempt is now being made to form a combination of priests to undo the work of the last forty years."

Here I must leave this inadequate survey of the subject. But I do not think the facts will leave on any unprejudiced mind the conviction that the revival of Protestant feeling was uncalled for, or that up to this point it has been ineffectual.

A. R. BUCKLAND.

## ART. VI.—RECENT BOOKS ON CHINA AND CHINESE MISSIONS.

THE course of events in China has produced a literature almost as extensive and varied as that of the war in South Africa. Much of it has been concerned chiefly with the international and military aspects of the question, and a part of it almost exclusively with the missionary aspect. Mr. Savage-Landor's "China and the Allies"<sup>1</sup> gives attention freely to both. Its author will doubtless be remembered as the hero of some extremely sensational adventures in Thibet, his account of which for a time exercised the astonishment of the world and the critical faculties of the more curious. His new book is also offered to us as a record of personal experiences; but, possibly from some defects in the author's style, it is not easy always to see whether he is giving us an account of what he himself saw, or whether he is merely "boiling down" for our consumption the narratives of other people. The point is of importance to at least one class of readers, because Mr. Savage-Landor has much to say, not always in friendly terms, about missionaries. It would have been at least convenient to have known when he was speaking at first hand, and when he was dealing either with the published statements of other authors or merely with the floating gossip of more or less irresponsible persons. As he is an exceedingly frank critic of other people, a little more care and circumstantiality in this respect would have been extremely welcome.

In their general aspects there is much of interest in these two volumes. Mr. Savage-Landor writes in a very vivid way about the operations which he seems himself to have witnessed, and he enables the reader to understand the difficulties as well as the perplexities of the situation. Although (with one very marked exception) he has little that is absolutely new to tell us, he puts his matter into a very readable form. It is, however, in his treatment of the missionaries that the work seems least reliable. It does not appear that Mr. Savage-Landor has any such acquaintance with China and its people as would enable him to form a fair estimate either of the methods of the missionaries or of the results of their labours. Chinese missions are not a subject to be mastered in a few months, even by a traveller of Mr. Savage-Landor's experience. He is, one cannot help suspecting, an excellent specimen of the traveller who, having picked up some hasty impressions,

---

<sup>1</sup> "China and the Allies," by A. Henry Savage-Landor. London: W. Heinemann.

mainly from hostile sources, adopts them as his own, without careful inquiry in other quarters. He admits that there are "good missionaries" as well as "bad ones," but his general attitude towards foreign missions is distinctly unsatisfactory. That there should be a variety of opinions on such a subject is natural enough; but we are entitled to ask that there shall be a fair treatment of the facts. The following passage cannot by any stretch of charity be pronounced fair:

"There are in China, as in every other heathen country, good missionaries and bad ones. The bad ones generally seem to escape unhurt. Nor would there be much ground of complaint if the heathens, in their desire to settle disputed points of religion, would limit themselves to killing outright the male portion of those who try to convert them, after the fashion which I have heard advocated on several occasions during the present war by missionaries, who declare that Christianity should be spread through China at the point of the sword. In fact, in a lecture given by a distinguished missionary, he expressed his opinion that every Chinaman should be seized, and should have the choice given him of becoming a Christian or having his head cut off."

This statement is so extraordinary that we are bound to ask for further information. Upon what authority is the accusation made? Of what nationality and of what Church were these missionaries? Who especially was the "distinguished missionary"? When and where was the speech in question made? Upon whose report does Mr. Savage-Landor rely? These are obvious questions. Until a detailed answer is given to them, it is to be feared that no one who knows the mission-field will regard them as reliable, so far, at all events, as their application to Protestant missionaries is concerned. In any case, so sweeping a charge should have been made with more detail.

One other characteristic of these volumes calls for protest. The illustrations are scattered freely over the work, and in places are admirable; but the ghastly and indecent realism of some of them is quite intolerable. The people who can find pleasure in looking at a photograph of a dog tearing at a corpse, of a Boxer leader gazing at the head of a decapitated brother, of a naked eunuch hanging by the neck, of a severed dripping head suspended by its pig-tail, of a murdered family hung up in a row, or of the newly-slain on a battle-field, are, we hope, few in number. The temper which prompts its owner to "snap" and reproduce subjects of this order strikes one as marked by too great a love of sensation to suggest perfect reliability in other respects.

his wife in the Legations during the siege. Mrs. Russell kept a diary, and this, a short complementary narrative and some official documents, make up the Professor's little book.<sup>1</sup> Unpretentious as it is, the volume conveys a clear idea of the peril of the besieged and the spirit in which they met it. The general calmness of the daily narrative seems to be a mark of British documents of this character. Professor Russell is at one with other observers as to the causes alleged for the outbreak. He notices amongst them the ill-feeling of the heathen against converts to Christianity, a feeling which is occasioned by something more than "the inborn dislike the Chinaman bears to the 'foreign devil.'" Professor Russell says:

"The Roman Catholic Church, and to some extent the Protestant Church, in China is an *imperium in imperio*. The convert looks not to his own official for protection and justice, but to his priest or pastor. In case of a lawsuit, he invokes the powerful aid of the foreigner, and may possibly win it, even though justice may have been on the side of his heathen opponent."

Professor Russell fairly adds in a footnote that the Chinese official "is often corrupt, which makes it difficult for the missionary not to interfere"; but that does not extenuate the position claimed by the Roman Catholics. We have heard from Dr. Morrison and others of the great service rendered by the native Christians in the defence of the Legations. Professor Russell says that: "After our relief, when the military men saw the barricades and other defences, they were astonished at their strength and extent, and wondered how we could accomplish so much. All the work was done by native Christians, under the supervision, for the most part, of missionaries. The native Christians by their labour more than repaid us for all the protection they enjoyed." The general impression created by the conduct of the native converts during the siege was excellent, and should not soon be forgotten:

"The missionaries and native Christians worked so hard and unselfishly for the common weal during the siege as to win the admiration and goodwill of even those who were not favourable to Christian missions. After the siege the missionaries found themselves in a very difficult position. Homeless themselves, they had over 2,000 native Christians, both homeless and penniless, to provide for. Food could not be bought. By the consent of the military authorities they took possession of large native compounds which had been deserted

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Story of the Siege in Peking," by S. M. Russell, M.A., F.R.A.S. London: Elliot Stock.

by their owners, and got food from deserted grain-shops. As far as I know, no missionary was guilty of looting in any ordinary sense of the term."

Professor Russell adds to the diary of the siege some useful extracts from the official *Pekin Gazette*, which reveal the attitude of the Government during the crisis. The official announcements are marked by the hypocrisy and cunning so freely displayed also in other ways, but occasionally reveal the true aims of the authorities with a good deal of candour. Thus, on June 17, when the Legations were already hard beset, it was gravely announced that: "Lately the people and Christians have sought means to stir up enmity, and bad language has arisen on every side. Vagabonds have taken occasion repeatedly to burn and rob." It was thoughtfully added that "all foreign ministers ought to be really protected." On July 2 a decree was issued dealing with the Chinese converts and their position. They were, it was pointed out, subjects owing loyalty to the Throne, and "if they can change their hearts, there is no reason why they should not be allowed to escape from the net." The attitude towards both missionaries and their converts is then defined thus:

"All those among the converts who repent of their former errors and give themselves up to the authorities shall be allowed to reform and their past shall be ignored. The public shall also be notified that in all places where converts reside they shall be allowed to report to the local authorities, and each case will be settled according to general regulations, which will be drawn up later. As hostilities have now broken out between China and foreign nations, the missionaries of every country must be driven away at once to their own countries, so that they may not linger here and make trouble. But it is important that measures be taken to secure their protection on their journey. The high provincial authorities shall make close investigation into the circumstances of all places within their jurisdiction, and speedily take the necessary steps. Let there be no carelessness."

These directions might be interpreted in more ways than one. Indeed, the more the facts are laid bare, the greater seems the responsibility of the Chinese authorities for the ruthless outrages committed.

Dr. Campbell Gibson, of Swatow, has published in volume form some lectures<sup>1</sup> delivered by him on the appointment of

---

<sup>1</sup> "Mission Problems and Mission Methods in S. China: Lectures on Evangelistic Theology," by J. Campbell Gibson, M.A., D.D. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier.

the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. He deals, so far as actual work is concerned, with that of the English Presbyterian mission only; but his lectures are a solid contribution to the scientific study of foreign missions. The book is the kind of work which can be put into the hands of a candid inquirer, who can hardly fail to be influenced by its quiet, forcible treatment of the subject.

It is refreshing to meet with an author who deals with the cause of foreign missions with the firmness of Dr. Campbell Gibson. He recognises the "lurking uneasiness" in regard to the work which exists in so many minds at home, but he deals quite decisively with it. What we are putting to the proof is, he reminds us, "not a scheme of a few enthusiasts, nor an optional offshoot of Church work; we are putting to the proof the Gospel itself." That is a fact too little realized at home, for some seem to doubt whether the message of Christ is for all races and all creeds. But, as Dr. Campbell Gibson exclaims: "What kind of grasp of the Gospel have men got who doubt whether it is to-day, under any skies, the power of God unto salvation?"

After considering the principles at the root of missionary enterprise, Dr. Campbell Gibson proceeds to deal with his particular field. Like a wise teacher, he fills in his background, showing us the country, its people, their social life, and their religion. Then he shows us the stages through which a healthy mission passes—the evangelistic stage, the planting of the Church, and the organization of the Church, with the cultivation of the Christian life amongst its people. The outlook from Swatow is, we gather, hopeful enough to warrant the appeal for more workers. Recent sorrows in China are hailed as part of "the struggle between darkness and light which always ends in the dawn." "The hope of China lies in the building up of a pure and strong Christian Church." "Those are to be envied who shall witness during the coming twenty years the great ingathering in China—the greatest triumph of the Church and of the Church's King since the Christian centuries began to run their glorious course!"

H. C. L. STOWELL.



## ART. VII.—MANASSEH, KING OF JUDAH.

A CURIOUS interest has come to circle round the Book of Chronicles which, in one sense, can hardly be said to exist in the case of any other book of the Old Testament. That it is a post-exilic work, written by an historian with a very special intent, is agreed on all hands. But "post-exilic" is a rather vague word. Are we to think of such a period as (say) the reign of Artaxerxes (464-425 B.C.) or thereabouts, or must we look on much later, when the Greek régime had succeeded the Persian? This is a question which it is not altogether easy to answer, nor does it matter for our present purpose. A very much more important question arises as to whether the Book of Chronicles is to be viewed as honest history. Of course it is readily allowed, and is, indeed, obvious, that the author keeps a very special purpose steadily in sight. The most casual reader can see that he is no mere supplementer, filling in topics which the writer of the Book of Kings had passed over. The Septuagint and Vulgate, and the Douay Bible, do indeed call the Chronicles the *Paraleipomena*, "the book of things passed over," but this is an extremely onesided aspect of the truth. The writer of the Chronicles is one to whom the annals of the various kings is a very secondary matter compared with the history of the Jewish Church; with him the idea of the theocracy is ever the guiding principle. Thus matters which to the annalist are of supreme importance here fall into the background. For example, to the author of the Book of Kings the history of Hezekiah's reign is focussed in the great event of the Assyrian invasion and the Divine intervention; while the author of the Chronicles devotes nearly thrice the space to the account of Hezekiah's religious reforms to what he gives to the account of the war. Or, again, to the writer whose mind was filled with the all-absorbing thought of the theocracy the mushroom dynasties of the northern kingdom were of little moment, except when now and again the kingdom of Judah was brought into very close connection with its neighbour. Accordingly the allusions to the northern kingdom are but few.

It may probably be conceded that a writer with such an aim would somewhat idealize, would view the story through a softening medium. A modern historian, whether treating of Church or of secular matters, will write from a certain standpoint, with a certain set of sympathies; and yet to recognise an author's sympathies is not tantamount to saying that he has played unfairly with his facts. A man may be an upright, honourable gentleman, however strong a partisan

he be. The only question for us is: Whence did the chronicler get his facts, and how did he treat them? Whence, then, did he get his facts? On the twofold answer given to this, and to the other half of the question, will hinge the resulting matter, the view we must take of the historic trustworthiness of the Chronicles. That the chronicler had before him our present Book of Kings is, of course, obvious, and is admitted by all; there is a large amount of matter common to the two works, to say nothing of various explicit references in the later book to the earlier.

At this stage an important question arises. There are numerous statements in the Chronicles which have no parallel in the Kings. A convenient way of realizing how much we have of such details will be found by consulting such a book as Canon Girdlestone's "Deuterographs," or Mr. A. Wood's "Hebrew Monarchy." Whence did all this independent matter come? For our own part, we fully believe that the writer had access to a number of historical documents now no longer existing. Where are the prophecies of Ahijah the Shilonite (2 Chron. ix. 29), or the vision of Iddo the Seer (*ibid.*), or the Book of Shemaiah the prophet and of Iddo the Seer concerning genealogies (xii. 15), or the story of the prophet Iddo (xiii. 22), or the Book of Jehu, the son of Hanani (xx. 34), or Isaiah's history of the reign of Uzziah (xxvi. 22), or Hozai's<sup>1</sup> history of Manasseh (xxxiii. 19), and many others? We are content to believe, until the contrary is *demonstrated*, that they were documents, more or less official, entering into the details of this or that reign, accessible to the author of the Chronicles, and utilized by him. Such would be the natural inference to be drawn from the constantly recurring references, and such would certainly be the line which men would take if the case arose in connection with a Greek or Latin historian.

But, then, certain very definite consequences follow. If behind the Book of Chronicles are a mass of detailed pre-exilic histories on which the compiler has drawn, may we say, with average care and average honesty, then we must accept in a general way his historic picture of the pre-exilic age. But in that case what is to become of certain latter-day theories? It seems just now as if we must submit to be told that, however fallible Old Testament history may be, the scheme

---

<sup>1</sup> So the word is rendered in the Revised Version and Authorized Version margin [Hosai], and if we hold to the Masoretic text, we can hardly render otherwise. It is, however, by no means improbable, having regard to verse 18, that we have a scribal error, and should read Hozim ["the seers"]. So the LXX.

of Wellhausen and his followers must not be challenged. In that case we must allow, for example, that the rule as to one sanctuary dates from the reign of Josiah, and that the mass of the details of the Levitical code are to be assigned to the exile or even later. It is clear that if we believe the Chronicles to be genuine, honest history, we cannot accept these theories as gospel, and if the theories are to be accepted in anything like their entirety, then we must surrender the Chronicles. The two can scarcely co-exist as parts of the circle of our belief. That this is no exaggeration may be seen from the language used about the Book of Chronicles by various leaders of the neo-critical school. Let us take just one example. Wellhausen asks:<sup>1</sup> "With what show of justice can the chronicler, after his statements have over and over again been shown to be incredible, be held at discretion to pass for an unimpeachable narrator? . . . It is, indeed, possible that occasionally a grain of good corn may occur among the chaff," etc. Moreover, the good points are but "paste pearls" after all.

It is quite clear that, in a trial when the views taken of a leading witness by the advocates of both sides differ *toto caelo*, when by the one side the witness is held trustworthy, and by the other utterly untrustworthy, and when the views urged by the two sides are such as not to compare each with the other, there is a very awkward deadlock. In the case of the Chronicles, the old-fashioned believer held that (to pass over here any argument resting on his belief in inspiration) a weighty argument might be drawn from the inclusion of the book in the Canon of the Jewish Church, where certainly we are justified in a belief that an unauthorized claimant did not readily find entrance. The glory of the privilege of being entrusted with the oracles of God would be hardly worth laying any stress on, if the author of a cunningly-devised forgery could manage to get his work included. On the other hand, the neo-critical school tell us that, in virtue of their subjective theory, which, probable or improbable, is but theory, the Chronicles cannot be historic.

In this deadlock it might be said that we must agree to differ, and if things stood where they did a generation ago, there would be nothing more to be said. Happily they do not so stand. Recent archaeological discoveries have revolutionized the old fields of battle in many parts of the Bible. It is this which gives point to the wise words of Dr. Fritz Hommel: "External evidence' must be the banner under which all students of Old Testament literature are to range themselves

<sup>1</sup> "Prolegomena," p. 224. English translation.

for the future." A good many soldiers are finding their way to that banner, and are likely to do good work in the future. It is true that archæology has not done much for the Book of Chronicles as yet, but it has done something, and that in connection with Manasseh, the persecuting King of Judah.

There is one point in which the authors of the Books of Kings and Chronicles agree in their account of Manasseh's reign: they compress the story of fifty-five years into the small compass of about twenty weeks. The subject must have been one inspiring the intensest grief and shame and indignation. Nor was the feeling a transient one: long ages after the Talmud sets forth the name of Manasseh as one of the three kings who have no portion in the world to come. There must be an infinity of history summed up in the few curt words: "Manasseh shed innocent blood till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another." Yet not one name of those saints, valiant for the truth, has come down to us—unless, indeed, the tradition be true which would include Isaiah among them, a tradition possibly had in view by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 37). In any case, we believe that there is much to be said for the belief that the grim picture set forth to us in Isa. lvii. represents the period of Manasseh's persecution.

The chronicler, it will be observed, says nothing of that persecution. Possibly, filled with enthusiasm as he was for the house of David, as the embodiment of the theocratic kingdom, he felt that the picture was black and terrible enough without any further aggravation. What could be worse, he might say, than the action of a king who built idol altars in the house of the Lord, nay, could even set up a graven image there?

What we are concerned with now, however, is a statement of the Chronicles which does not occur in the Kings. We read that "the captains of the host of the King of Assyria took Manasseh in chains, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon." While there he repented, and God "brought him again to Jerusalem with his kingdom." Why this part of the story should be passed over by the author of the Book of Kings it is impossible to say. Perhaps the appalling thought of the persecution blotted out everything else. Whatever Manasseh's repentance was to him personally, the awful effects of his reign on the nation remained. Even in the reign of Jehoiakim, after the long reforming reign of Josiah, the bitter memory remained (2 Kings xxiv. 3). Our business now, however, is to ask, not why the story of the imprisonment and repentance is not given in the Book of Kings, but whether the chronicler was warranted in inserting it.

Three points have to be noticed. In the first place, we have a reference to military activity on the part of Assyrian generals in the West-land at a time when there is no other allusion to it in Scripture. Secondly, it might be maintained, as indeed it has been maintained, that the captive vassal of an Assyrian king would certainly be taken to Nineveh and not to Babylon. Thirdly, it has been maintained that an offending vassal of the King of Assyria, when brought before his overlord, might make up his mind that he would be very fortunate if simply condemned to death, without very grim torture accompanying it.

Before taking these points seriatim, it may be well to point out how the succession fell in the Assyrian Empire about this time. The wording of the Bible story of the murder of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix. 37) might seem to imply that it befell at once on his return to Nineveh; but the Bible does not say so, and as a matter of fact, as we learn from the monuments, twenty years had then elapsed since his return from the invasion of Judah. The murder of the tyrant may be referred to 681 B.C., when he was succeeded by his son Esar-Haddon, who reigned till 668 B.C. Esar-Haddon's son and successor, Assur-Bani-Pal, was perhaps the most renowned of all the Kings of Assyria.

If it now be asked which King of Assyria it was who showed Manasseh mercy, it must be admitted that we cannot speak with absolute certainty. Mr. T. G. Pinches connects the story with the invasion of Phœnicia and Palestine in the fourth year of Esar-Haddon's reign. He thinks that, while the whole district gave in its submission, Manasseh was seized on a charge of rebellion and carried off. On the other hand, a majority of experts take Assur-Bani-Pal to be the merciful overlord; and on this later view history seems to furnish a more reasonable clue to explain Manasseh's rebellion, as we shall seek to show. Probably the available evidence is insufficient to establish a conclusion, but for our present purpose, an inquiry whether a particular statement in the Chronicles is history or fiction, the one King is just as good as the other.

We know that Manasseh was a vassal to both these Kings of Assyria. He is one of the twenty-two princes of the West-land, of whom Esar-Haddon says: "I gathered twenty-two princes of the land of the Hittites, who dwelt by the sea and in the midst of it: all of them I summoned." In the list which follows, *Mi-na-si-i sar ir Ja-u-di*, i.e., "Manasseh, king of the land (lit., city) of Judah," comes second. Among other familiar names, the Kings of Tyre, Edom, Moab, Ashkelon, and Ekron meet us. Sidon is not included, for it had

been destroyed by Esar-Haddon. There exists also a list of the twenty-two States in an inscription of Assur-Bani-Pal. They are ranged in absolutely the same order, and it might have been thought that the son was seeking to glorify himself by reproducing his father's list, were it not that two of the States had changed hands. The King of Ammon is no longer Puduil,<sup>1</sup> but Amminadab; and the King of Arados is no longer Matanbaal, but Jakinlu. This shows that account was taken of changes occurring in the interval. It is worth noting that Padi,<sup>2</sup> King of Ekron, of whom we read so much in Sennacherib's great inscription on the Taylor Cylinder, has now disappeared, and another King, Ikasamsu, reigns in his stead.

A study of the two lists renders it probable that the periods to which they point are the later years of Esar-Haddon's reign and the earlier years of his son's reign; but whether the incident recorded in Chronicles is to be associated with either it is impossible to say.

Before summing up under the three points of which we spoke before, it is worth while to call attention to one clause in the statement in Chronicles. In the Authorized Version we read (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11), "which took Manasseh among the thorns," while the Revised Version renders, "which took Manasseh in chains." The former is not very intelligible (though the word *chochim* occurs elsewhere in the Bible in the sense of "thorns"); the latter might with advantage have been more exact. The noun in the clause is literally "hooks" (so Revised Version, margin), reminding one of the ring put through the nose of a bull or other animal which it is desired to control. Thus, in the question as to Leviathan (Job xli. 2; xl. 26, Heb.), "Canst thou bore his jaw through with a thorn?" we have the same word in the Hebrew as here.

The Assyrian régime was the very apotheosis of cruelty, and we know from the monuments that prisoners were often secured in this way. Professor Maspero, after remarking on the frequent representations of "the impaling stake, rebels being flayed alive, and chiefs having their tongues torn out," gives us a picture, taken from bas-reliefs at Nineveh, germane to our present topic. Before an Assyrian King, who is standing, kneels a captive in fetters, through whose lip a ring

<sup>1</sup> Puduil was the King of Ammon at the time of Sennacherib's invasion, and is named on the Taylor Cylinder as one of the kings bringing tribute.

<sup>2</sup> It may be remembered that Padi had been imprisoned by Hezekiah in Jerusalem, and the party hostile to the Assyrian rule had become dominant in Ekron; but after Ekron was stormed by the Assyrians, and the rebels had been impaled, Padi was reinstated on his throne and his territory augmented.

has been thrust, attached to a cord, the end of which is in the King's hand. With a spear he is about to put out the eyes of his captive, while two others, similarly fastened, are waiting their turn ("Passing of the Empires," p. 546). Well might the voice of the nations cry aloud at length, like Nahum in his impassioned ode, "Woe to the bloody city!"

We must now turn seriatim to the three points to which we referred above. As regards the first, there was certainly military activity in the West on the part of the Assyrians in the reigns both of Esar-Haddon and Assur-Bani-Pal. The former in his fourth year made an expedition against the cities of Phœnicia, and in his several expeditions against Egypt he must have traversed the great road through Palestine. Had Manasseh been suspected of treason against his overlord then, we can hardly doubt but that there would be some allusion to it in Esar-Haddon's inscriptions.

We may now look on to the reign of Assur-Bani-Pal, and here we are faced by a highly suggestive fact for our attempt to fix the time of the trouble in which Manasseh was involved. The inscriptions of Assur-Bani-Pal show that the West-land, the *mat aharri*, by which we are to understand Phœnicia and Palestine, was concerned in the revolt raised against Assur-Bani-Pal by his younger brother. Esar-Haddon had appointed Assur-Bani-Pal to be his successor as the head of the Empire, with his seat at Nineveh, while making a younger son, Shamash-shum-ukin (Sammughes-Saosduchin), a subordinate King, ruling in Babylon. The younger brother, evidently disliking the position of a vassal, attempted to assert his independence; but after a long struggle he was completely crushed, and, Babylon being taken, burnt his palace over his head to save himself from falling into the hands of the Assyrians. This happened in or about the year 648-647 B.C. Now, since we know that the western States were involved in the attempt, it seems reasonably probable that Manasseh was one of the rebels. Dr. Schrader goes so far as to say, "We may assume with perfect confidence that Manasseh was included among these Palestino-Phœnician rebels." Even if he had not openly committed himself, he may well have had understanding with the rebel King of Babylon, and so was led away, secured in Assyrian style, to clear himself or to meet his fate.

At this stage comes the crucial difficulty. Surely an Assyrian vassal would be taken to Nineveh and not to Babylon. Yet, as it happens, the difficulty is apparent rather than real, and that, whichever of the Assyrian Kings we take count of. Esar-Haddon, reversing the brutal policy of his father Sennacherib, who had wasted Babylon with fire and

sword, rebuilt the city, and attempted to conciliate his Babylonian subjects. The inscriptions show that he was King of Babylon as well as King of Assyria, and therefore it may be assumed that from time to time he held his Court there. As regards his successor, a like statement could not be made so long as Shamash-shum-ukin, though really a mere viceroy, was called King of Babylon; but on his overthrow, when Assur-Bani-Pal had assumed the title of King of Babylon, we may feel certain that he would reside there for a time, and would there meet his vassals. Such a residence would be but putting the seal on the assumption of his new dignity. Dr. Schrader gives an instance in which this actually happened. After Sargon's conquest of Babylon, when he had placed its crown upon his head, the ambassadors of seven Kings of Jatnan (Cyprus) brought presents to the great King to *Babylon*. In the light of this fact, the attempt to treat the reference to Babylon in the case of Manasseh as fictitious falls to the ground. What actually happened in the case of Sargon cannot be called inherently improbable, under like conditions, in the case of Esar-Haddon or Assur-Bani-Pal.<sup>1</sup>

Our remaining point was the question of the probability of the release of an offending vassal, one who had suffered the disgrace of being placed in fetters, with a hook through his lip. It happens curiously enough that the reign of this very Assur-Bani-Pal gives us an undoubted instance. In one of this King's inscriptions we are told of two vassals, Sarludari and Necho, whom "they bound with iron bonds and iron chains, hands and feet." When Necho arrived in this style at Nineveh, the Great King "bestowed favour on him," and allowed him to return to Egypt. The parallel is perfect, and we may confidently sum up, with Dr. Schrader, "that there is no reason to cast any suspicion on the statement of the chronicler . . . and that what he relates can be satisfactorily accounted for from the circumstances that existed in the year 647 B.C."

Let us once again take the illustration of a great trial in court before a judge. A witness is produced on the acceptance or rejection of whose statements great issues depend; yet from the nature of the case proof and disproof appear

---

<sup>1</sup> It is matter for regret to see in a book which is characterized alike by learning and sobriety (Professor M'Curdy's "History, Prophecy and the Monuments," ii., 386, n.) the remark that "Babylon" is simply an error of author or copyist for "Nineveh." This style of criticism, consistently carried out, would mean the reversal of the familiar canon, *Proclivi scriptioni prestat ardua*.

alike impossible, and the whole seems to become a matter of subjectivity for or against the witness. If at this juncture some fresh evidence, definite objective facts, is brought to light, and a severe cross-examination in the light of those facts fails to discredit the witness's testimony, in ordinary life practical men would say that this testing on some unexpected point—some point perhaps where special obloquy had been cast on the witness—was, at any rate, reasonable ground for holding that, if the means arose for taking the witness in twenty points, similar results might be looked for. It is only a case of *ex pede Herculem* after all.

Let men have the courage not to be browbeaten by being told that "all critics are agreed" that the Book of Chronicles is quite untrustworthy—which, indeed, is not true, unless we explain "critic" in a special sense. If the Book is treated as simply so much Jewish literature, then its claim to be historic must be tested by such little outside evidence as we have got. In the only case where as yet comparison is possible, a rather trying test has been satisfactorily undergone. Those who are content to believe that the Book of Chronicles is a legitimate part of God's Word will not maintain that in lapse of centuries errors of text may not have crept in, or that the author was necessarily at all times absolutely accurate in statements of detail, and especially where numbers are concerned; but they will feel confident that, so far as our evidence goes, we are justified in believing the Book of Chronicles to be honest history, not a concoction of dishonest priests.

R. SINKER.

---

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

WILLIAM HOWLEY.—I.

I HAVE now come to a Primate that I have seen. It was in 1845, at the annual meeting of St. Mark's College, Chelsea; and his tall thin figure, his tremulous voice, his wig, his nervous rubbing of his hands together all the time he was speaking, the simultaneous standing up of the whole assemblage when he rose to address them—all these things remain fixed in my memory. I saw him again at the annual meeting of the National Society, in 1847, listening to Mr. Gladstone, and portions of the famous statesman's address on that occasion I can also remember.

William Howley was the only son of a country clergyman,

the Rev. William Howley, Vicar of Bishop's Sutton and Ropley, two contiguous villages in Hampshire. He was greatly beloved there. My father was a native of the former village, and my grandmother had always an affectionate word of memory for the old parson that she remembered well. When I first saw his two churches they were be-galleried and be-lion-and-unicorned in the most thorough Georgian style; they are now both in good and reverent order. Mr. Howley's marriage register is in the neighbouring church of Privett, and it shows that his wife was unable to write. Her signature is the usual cross made by such persons to somebody else's writing of the name. And thus it is seen that "the last prince Archbishop" was, on one side, of peasant origin. It is by no means an unusual case, one rejoices to say so. That he claimed no relationship with others of the same name was shown in due time by his refusing to place on his carriage the arms borne by other Howleys; he obtained a grant of arms for himself and issue. His comparatively humble birth did not prevent him from "magnifying his office"; he was a magnificent builder, always travelled in state, four-horsed coach, and invariably with outriders.

He was born at Ropley on February 12, 1765, was educated at Winchester under the well-known Dr. Wharton, and laid the foundation of an excellent education. He won the prize for English verse at Winchester for two successive years. All those years he was remarkable for that steady calmness and equanimity of manners which marked him through life. Sydney Smith, one of his schoolfellows there, used to say that he was the only friend who ever put him in a rage. They had been playing chess together, and Howley having got out-and-out the worst of it, was so teased and bantered by his opponent that he lost his temper and in a fury broke his head with the chess-board. From that time forward, said Sydney, I took care to let him win more games than he lost. In 1783 he matriculated as a scholar at New College, Oxford, graduated in 1787, became a Fellow, and was ordained on his fellowship. His refined taste and scholarship received recognition early; he had won prizes for English verse at Winchester, and now was appointed tutor to the Prince of Orange, afterwards King of Holland, and to the Marquis of Abercorn. The tutorship to the Prince of Orange was a mark of high royal favour; for it will be remembered that it was quite intended to marry the Prince to the Princess Charlotte, and that this meant the prospect of a position exactly parallel to that of our late Prince Consort. Howley was selected because King George III.; always a good judge of men, had formed a high opinion of him, not only on account of the

manner in which he discharged his duties as a College tutor, but also because of his learning, the purity of his life and his marked but unostentatious piety. And he proved himself worthy of the trust, for the young Prince went out from the University as good a scholar as could be formed out of royal materials. The marriage project, as we know, came to nothing: the Princess married Prince Leopold, afterwards King of the Belgians, and died in her first confinement. The friendship of the Dutch Prince and his tutor remained unbroken until death, and the King of Holland, so long as he visited England, always paid a friendly visit to his old instructor. By successive advances Howley arrived at his D.D. degree in 1805. By this time he had become a Canon of Christ Church, Oxford (1804), and in 1809 he was made Regius Professor of Divinity in his University in succession to Dr. Hall, who had been advanced to the Deanery of Christ Church. In 1796 he succeeded his father at Bishop's Sutton, to which preferment were added the livings of Andover in 1802 and of Bradford Peverell in 1811. The last he took as Fellow of Winchester College, a distinction which he had held since 1794, and this living was in the gift of the College. In 1805 he married Mary Frances, daughter of John Belli, E.I.C.S. She brought him a large fortune, and became the mother of two sons and three daughters. The first son, born in 1810, died at Lambeth in his twenty-third year; the youngest died in 1820, aged six. The eldest daughter married Sir George Beaumont; the second, William Kingsmill, Esq.; the youngest, John Adolphus Wright, a clergyman, on whom the Archbishop conferred the living of Merstham. This last marriage proved most unhappy. Her death was, so I was told at Addington, caused by her husband's cruelty.

On October 3, 1813, Howley was consecrated Bishop of London in succession to John Randolph. The consecrators were the Archbishop (Manners-Sutton) and the Bishops of Gloucester (Huntingford), Salisbury (Fisher) and Chester (Law). Queen Charlotte was present. She had never seen a consecration before, though she was now seventy years old.

Howley's is a case, almost without precedent, of a man whose influence was unmistakably very great from the time when he was first placed in a post of responsibility, and yet who has left so little to show for it. He was a first-rate classical scholar. Hugh James Rose, certainly no bad judge, used to say he was the best scholar he had ever met. Whilst he was tutor to Lord Abercorn, he met George J. Spencer at Stanmore. The latter was absolutely delighted with him, and declared to his friends that Mr. Howley possessed abilities which would cause him to excel in any line in which they

should be directed. "When Howley first came to Stanmore," he wrote afterwards, "his shy and reserved manner prevented his extraordinary merits from being fully appreciated; but when I went there soon after, I found all the women in love with him and all the men envious of him." He expressed his surprise that though Howley was such a good scholar, he never came before the world as an author, and the reason which he gives is, we venture to assert, the true one—he was never satisfied with himself or his performances. A less fastidious man would have rushed into pen and ink, well contented to win the applause of men; Howley judged his own work with such scrupulousness that he kept it to himself, fulfilling the proverb, "Better is the enemy of good." It was even thus with his public speaking. A *writer* who is continually scratching out and revising gets into no trouble, because when his work finds itself in type it all comes out smoothly. Anybody, for example, who has ever seen Charles Dickens's "copy," especially in his later days, will wonder whether the printers can possibly have kept their temper with the erasures and interlineations, and altered sentences. But a man who does that with speeches which he is delivering to an audience comes to unutterable grief. "Scratching out" then is fatal. There are ludicrous stories in abundance of the poor Archbishop's blunderings in his speeches, simply because the sentence in hand was not quite to his taste, and he proceeded there and then to reconstruct it, until he got into hopeless entanglement.

It was by no means the case that Howley was hesitating in his convictions. He was a strong Tory and did not shrink from showing it. Almost immediately after entering his see, he made his primary visitation; and his charge, which was forthwith published, though written with moderation, was also a very able and vigorous assault on the Rationalism which was gaining ground. The Unitarians, he said in the course of it, "loved to question rather than to learn," and this greatly excited Belsham, who immediately took up the defence of his co-religionists with perhaps more zeal than power, and accused the Bishop of "enforcing the slavish doctrines of Popery rather than the free and enquiring spirit of Protestantism." The Bishop accepted the challenge and replied with dignity as well as with vigour. One of the first duties of a Christian, he said, is to "approach the oracles of Divine truth with that humble docility, that prostration of the understanding and the will, which the great theologians of every age and almost of every Christian Church, have earnestly inculcated." How far he succeeded in convincing his readers, we cannot say, but any man who dispassionately

reads his published charges will probably say that they are not only orthodox, but written with spirit and sometimes with very considerable power. Granted that reasonings more profound may be found on the shelves of any good theological library, the Archbishop certainly thought in a most amiable temper, and also with an abundant fund of common-sense. And let it be remembered that he wrote amid the intervals of hard work with his clergy. I have noted in a previous article how one of the bishops in the Midlands besought to be translated from his diocese to London "because he was overworked in his present sphere of labours, and the Bishop of London had nothing to do." This was not Bishop Howley's view of his diocese, nor has it been that of any of his successors. He recognised his responsibility to his three or four millions of the most mixed population in the Empire, and saw that the clergy appointed to minister to this mighty multitude were pre-eminent among their brethren for their learning, ability, and zeal, as well as for some of the faults and mistakes closely allied to these excellent properties. He was called to lead, superintend and control a body so circumstanced and so constituted, and it will, I believe, be granted by students of the ecclesiastical history of the times that his fifteen years of administration of the See of London were marked with a success which attested at once his prudence and piety, his mild firmness and regulated energy.

Within that period many important events occurred, of which he was by no means an unconcerned spectator. Of the close of the great war and the fall of Napoleon, I have already had to speak. The return of peace was followed by strong internal excitements, the agitation for Parliamentary reform, Queen Caroline's trial, and the struggle for Roman Catholic emancipation. The general excitement on each of these questions was shared by the retiring and gentle-minded Bishop Howley, though he mostly restrained himself within bounds, so as not to become an angry striver or vehement politician. Whenever he addressed the House of Lords, he certainly never made any mark as a speaker. Yet in spite of his changes of phraseology and his reconstructed and therefore involved sentences, his hearers saw that he brought to bear upon his subject a competent acquaintance with it, the result of careful study, an impartial spirit, and a flow of genuine good feeling. He was no such reasoner as Bishop Lloyd, could deliver no such vigorous discourse as Thirlwall, could not play the advocate or the satirist so well as Philpotts; his bearing and presence were not so noble as those of Archbishop Beresford, or his manner so hearty and good-humoured as that of Archbishop Harcourt. And yet

no member of the Upper House enjoyed more personal respect all through his life. Although he gave thirty of his best years to a College life, he was no pedant, and although he was an earnest theological student, he rarely dogmatized. Residing near the Court, a man of his character necessarily acquired considerable influence with the Royal Family. They often consulted him, and many members of the illustrious house sought from him counsel and consolation in their supreme hour.

When Lord Liverpool brought in his Bill of Pains and Penalties to divorce the Queen of George IV., Bishop Howley very strenuously indeed supported the measure, and thereby, so it would appear, won the warm favour of that King, as he had done that of his father. The history of the trial after all the years which have flown by since reads like a horrible nightmare from which the nation has awoken. Traditions of it were still rife when I was young, and cottages had pamphlets and squibs and pictures generally against the King. Bishop Howley, according to the *Times*, which went hotly for the Queen, in his zeal for the Bill went so far as to say in Parliament that the King could do no wrong morally or politically. This is probably a misrepresentation. The King kept out of the miserable struggle so far as his public action was concerned, and probably, if one could run the speech to ground, the Bishop was simply warding off the popular wrath from the monarch, and bidding it direct itself against his responsible ministers; but it must be allowed that it seems to have greatly gratified the selfish King. The Bill was abandoned by ministers, in face of the very alarming menaces of the middle and lower classes of the population; the Queen lost her popularity by accepting a large annuity by way of what was regarded as a bribe, and after a few months wild and ill-judged gyrations she died. But a terrible amount of bad blood had come out of the strife, and the Church had to share for many a year the unpopularity of the national rulers.

It would be a great defect in this paper to leave out any mention of Bishop Howley's work as a builder. The Gothic movement, which soon assumed such large proportions, had as yet hardly begun; Howley may be regarded as one of its pioneers. It cannot be denied that in the first outburst of zeal for neat and decent churches much ignorance was shown, and much excellent work destroyed or marred. Here I will just chronicle (using Mr. Féret's book as my authority) the changes which he made at Fulham Palace: (1) Built the porter's lodge by the stone bridge; his arms are over the doorway. (2) The fountain in the quadrangle (since replaced by one by Bishop Temple). (3) The east front, built by

Bishop Terrick (1765), pulled down and the present substituted for it. (4) The hall, turned into a chapel. It was never consecrated, but was used as a chapel from 1814 to 1867. Bishop Tait built the present chapel from the designs of Mr. Butterfield, and removed the marble floor thither which Howley had placed in his chapel. He also gave much care to the improvement of the gardens. During his episcopate he consecrated the two churches of St. John's, Walham Green, and St. Mary's, North End, both in the parish of Fulham.

When Archbishop Manners-Sutton died in July, 1828, the Duke of Wellington was Prime Minister, and he nominated Howley for the vacant Primacy, who at once rose with ease to his new dignity. He evidently felt safe and sure of his position, for knowing his countrymen, he expressed his strong conviction that they would never suffer hereditary wealth, or titles, or "any species of proud pretension to look down with scorn upon an office which they look up to with reverence." Experience, he declared, had convinced him that "a free, a generous, and an informed people honour the high magistrates of their Church." This might easily have been taken for arrogance, but the whole tenor of his life contradicts that. It was the conviction of his life that he was bound to magnify his office, not himself, but the Church; this was his aim.

He soon showed that he meant to carry out his convictions, for when next year the Duke of Wellington brought in the famous Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill Howley very strenuously opposed it. At his consecration he said he had sworn to stand by the Church of England, and this Bill he considered put the Church in imminent danger. We can easily smile now at the alarm which he expressed; certainly he was the mouthpiece thereby of nine-tenths of the members of the Church. And so we must say of the Reform Bill of 1831; he was equally hostile to that, and thought that it was "mischievous in its tendencies, and would be extremely dangerous to the fabric of the constitution." It was then that the Prime Minister, Earl Grey, uttered his ominous warning to the Bishops to "set their houses in order." He would not have done this, but that it was evident that public feeling was deeply exasperated against the clergy. It was the general belief of the faithful lovers of the Church that its downfall was imminent; and certainly the Whig Government of that day were not desirous of saving it. They were as short-sighted in their interpretation of the popular voice as Howley had been in his diatribes against reform. "They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength." In 1833 the Archbishop strongly opposed the Irish Temporalities Bill; but meanwhile another event was occurring which was to

change for a while the whole current of thought in the history of the Church of England, and with the mention of it I must close now. The first of the "Tracts for the Times" was published in the latter part of 1833.

W. BENHAM.

---

## The Month.

IN his appointments to the three vacant Deaneries, Lord Salisbury seems to have satisfied most people. The choice of Dr. Barlow for Peterborough was not only justified by his long and varied services to the Church, but also gave peculiar satisfaction to the Evangelicals. For Dr. Barlow has for many years been in the forefront of that school, identified more or less closely with all its chief organizations, and taking part in its Protestant as well as in its less distinctive work. Hitherto in recent years, whilst Evangelicals who have disclaimed party ties have occasionally received promotion, the choice for high office of one associated with the Evangelicals as a party has been rare. Very open partisans on the High Church side have found their tenets and their actions no bar to advancement; but it has been otherwise with the Low Churchmen. The selection of Dr. Barlow for a Deanery may, like the preference of Bishop Straton and Dean Lefroy, be the occasional exception only; but it may also imply the return to a fairer treatment of a school which would have been in a very much stronger position if the two great Premiers of the recent times had not been decided High Churchmen. It is quite unnecessary in these pages to recall the manifold services of Dr. Barlow, and it is pleasant to know that the comparative leisure of a Deanery will still allow him to aid some of the agencies which have long profited by his wide knowledge of men and his skill in administration. Dr. Barlow, it may be worth remembering, is one of the very few people who have ever taken quadruple honours at Cambridge. The late Dr. Hort and Professor Gwatkin are other examples.

It can now be no secret that a strong committee representing Dr. Barlow's friends are organizing some recognition of his great services to the Church at large and to the Evangelical cause within it. In recent years the value of the Vicarage of Islington has grown, and the net income must have been about £1,000 a year with a good house. The Deanery of Peterborough now produces an uncertain stipend of from £500 to £700, with a rather costly residence, recently let for £200 per annum. Dr. Barlow will, however, live in the Deanery.

Bishop Webb, late of Grahamstown, the new Dean of Salisbury, is one of the decided High Churchmen who have held office in the South African Church. There has, however, apart from all such considerations, been a general disposition to welcome the advancement of one who gave the best of his life to Colonial and missionary work. The claim of such clergy upon the Church at home is now being more and more fully recognised. The old sneering tone adopted towards the Colonial prelate who returned home is happily falling out of use. Perhaps the development of closer bonds of union between the Home Country and the Colonies may be helping in the change; but there is also a better appreciation of the value of work done in the Colonies and the mission-field. The two things can hardly fail to react on the attitude of the clergy at home towards the needs of the Church abroad.

The appointment of Mr. T. B. Strong to the Deanery of Christ Church is rather a college than a diocesan event. Mr. Strong will be the youngest Head of a House in Oxford, but he has held with success a difficult office in Christ Church, and is expected to make a good Dean. His University distinctions were modest, but he has thrown himself into theological study, and made a place amongst the High Churchmen who are not tainted with Neo-Anglican heresy.

The prospect of a succession of Round Table Conferences at Fulham does not seem to have excited marked enthusiasm in any quarter. The last was in an academic way both interesting and useful, but it has exerted no influence whatever, so far as Churchmen know, upon the position of the clergy who are in open conflict with their Bishops, and it has left the current controversy, on all save its academic side, exactly where it was before the Conference met. The passion for consultative bodies is, however, strong just now, and there are even some persons who appear to suppose that the theological and ritual differences between, let us say, Lord Halifax and Professor Moule are of such a kind that they would disappear if the two parties could only talk across a table long enough. It is easy to understand why Lord Halifax and those who move with him are so anxious to minimize on certain occasions the differences between themselves and other schools of thought in the Church; but we can see no reason why others should be equally complacent. Opinion as to the possible value of the second Conference, which the Bishop of London is to summon at the request of his Diocesan Conference, may well remain in abeyance until the subject is known.

One difficulty in attaching much importance to the plea of Lord Halifax for more of these interesting engagements is the fact that we seem to have two distinct personages in Lord Halifax. One is a very truculent controversialist, whose advice is responsible for the amazing expedients adopted by some of the clergy who claim to have yielded obedience to their Bishops. The other is a very mild and inoffensive peer, whose public utterances—save when, as recently, he is addressing some English Church Union gathering—have a marked tendency to take on a very homiletical form. It is not always easy to reconcile the two, and those who are amazed because the suavity of the one Lord Halifax is not always responded to with equal unction must remember that everybody cannot forget the other Lord Halifax.

The announcement of the new Bishop of London that he means to regulate the ritual in the extreme churches of his diocese has been received in some quarters as though it implied the stating of a new policy. As a matter of fact, however, it only means that the Bishop will not revert to the attitude of benevolent neutrality which prevailed under Dr. Temple, but will take up and carry on the policy initiated by Bishop Creighton. In London, as in other dioceses, an effort will be made to bring the clergy within the four corners of the two Lambeth opinions. Possibly the Bishop may over one or two details offer something like a compromise, but at present it does not look as though terms would be accepted. There comes the Bishop's difficulty. What will he do with the incumbents which stand to their guns?

People who are familiar with the energetic proselytizing of the Roman Church in England may feel some surprise at the hostility of the Roman priests in Ireland to the work of the Irish Church missions. We give them the fullest liberty; may not the Irish Church claim as much in

return? The extraordinary attack on the Irish Church missions made by Lord O'Brien from the judicial bench in Limerick has been followed by some even more extraordinary proceedings, to which attention has been called by a correspondent of the *Record*:

"On Sunday, June 2, Dr. Long, of the Limerick Medical Mission, was called in to visit a Protestant patient in the city suffering from a severe inflammation of the knee. Shortly after the arrival of the doctor, a Romish priest of the city, named O'Leary, encouraged no doubt by the words of Lord Justice O'Brien at the late assizes, followed him into the house, told the people of the house to turn him out, and demanded from the doctor his business there. In no mild terms this gentle preacher of peace told the doctor his opinion of him, and refused to leave the room when requested to do so, though informed that the family being Protestant, his presence was an intrusion. Finally, the priest left the house, to become one of a hostile crowd which had assembled outside to do honour to the 'soggarth aroon' who was bearding the Protestants in their own houses. The doctor, undeterred by hostile crowds, continued daily to visit his patient, till on Wednesday last the priest called on the crowd to have nothing to do with him, as he was a proselytizer, and ordered the doctor to 'go away out of this.' Urged to violence by the presence and language of their priest, the not unwilling people proceeded to make the doctor leave the place by throwing stones and other missiles at him. After much patient endurance of the conduct of the priest and his allies, Dr. Long thought it better to appeal to the law for protection. The priest accordingly was summoned before the Limerick bench of magistrates to account for his conduct. Although evidence was given by the police as well as the doctor as to the violence of the priest and his flock, and the threatening attitude of both, the magistrates dismissed the case."

The resident magistrate made a speech advising the boycotting of Dr. Long, and a Roman Catholic priest was then allowed to harangue the crowd in court. An unfortunate family whom Dr. Long was attending (Protestants by birth and still Protestants) have been persecuted with the utmost malignity. Unhappily, there are signs that the hostility to Protestants is growing in violence. According to the *Record*: "The other day an aged clergyman was assaulted in broad daylight in the streets of Dublin. The excuse offered was that the victim was 'a b—— old Protestant minister.' Elsewhere Protestant poor complain to their clergy that their lives are made a burden to them by their neighbours." It seems time that the authorities of the Church of Ireland took steps to make the condition of affairs better known on this side of the Channel.

---

## Reviews.

---

### GENERAL LITERATURE.

*Henry Broadhurst, M.P. The Story of his Life from a Stonemason's Bench to the Treasury Bench.* Told by HIMSELF. With an Introduction by AUGUSTINE BIRRELL, K.C. London: Hutchinson and Co.

**M**R. BROADHURST has for many years incurred the peril of those of whom all men speak well. A Labour representative in the House of Commons, an ardent Radical, and a very staunch Nonconformist, he

nevertheless enjoys the confidence, not merely of the party, but of all who value integrity, firmness of purpose, and superiority to temptations under which meaner spirits fail. His autobiography has accordingly been received with general interest, and those who read it will agree that Mr. Broadhurst loses nothing by taking the world at large into his confidence. He tells the story of his life in the same frank and outspoken way that he lays down his political opinions, and his candour never lacks charity. Mr. Broadhurst was born at Littlemore, near Oxford, in 1840, the son of a stonemason. He was apprenticed to his father's trade. Leaving home soon after he had served his time, he had a variety of experiences up and down the country, not always finding it easy to get work, and for one period knowing real hardship. He early interested himself in the position and organizations of Labour, with the result that he was soon recognised as a leader of the men. At the early age of thirty-two he laid aside his tools to become in and out of Parliament one of their official representatives. He entered Parliament at the age of thirty-eight, and in time Mr. Gladstone made him an Under-Secretary of State. It is clear that he has found friends amongst the most austere of Tories no less than on his own side of the House. In dealing with politicians and employers, Mr. Broadhurst preserves, for the most part, a judicial and kindly tone. He has many pleasant things to remember about old masters, and nothing to say in the spirit of the social fanatic. One of Mr. Broadhurst's most pleasant recollections seems to be that of the visit he paid to Sandringham, when he was appointed a member of the Commission on the Housing of the Poor, of which the Prince of Wales was Chairman. He explains with infinite gusto how—

“On my arrival His Royal Highness personally conducted me to my rooms, made a careful inspection to see that all was right, stoked the fires, and then, after satisfying himself that all my wants were provided for, withdrew and left me for the night. In order to meet the difficulties in the matter of dress, dinner was served to me in my own rooms each night.”

Mr. Broadhurst had, it is clear, an exceedingly pleasant time, and he “left Sandringham with a feeling of one who had spent a week-end with an old chum of his own rank in society rather than one who had been entertained by the Heir-Apparent and his Princess.” He was true to his Nonconformity, and thus explained what happened on the Sunday:

“On Saturday night, before retiring, His Royal Highness consulted me about my wishes for Sunday morning. I told the Prince that I was not a member of the Established Church, but a Dissenter, and that I hoped to find a Methodist place of worship in the neighbourhood. He himself did not know of one, but assisted me by all means in his power to discover the whereabouts of the nearest chapel, which turned out to be several miles from Sandringham in the direction of the coast. Thither I wended my way on Sunday morning, but found there was no service, only a Sunday-school being held. I listened to the teaching awhile, and then returned to Sandringham. In the afternoon the Prince inquired how I had fared in the morning, and I took the opportunity to suggest that a chapel nearer the centre of the estate would be a great boon to such of the villagers as were Nonconformists. I reminded His Royal Highness that some of the stoutest patriots and most loyal citizens were to be found among hereditary Nonconformists, and that the Throne had no more valuable and trustworthy subjects than the great majority of Dissenters. The Prince took my remarks in very good part, and thanked me for my words, especially as being spoken in the presence of his two sons.”

People who want the biography of a typical working-man who has risen from the ranks to a place of prominent usefulness in the life of the State should read this book.

*The Mind of the Century.* London: Fisher Unwin.

The sixteen articles which this book contains deal with the progress made in Great Britain during the last century in poetry, drama, fiction, essays, music, art, history, travel, theology, philosophy, economics, education, chemistry, medicine, natural science, and applied science. The Rev. Arthur W. Hutton gives precedence to the Church of Rome in theological progress, but admits that she has lost, to a great extent, the unquestioning allegiance of the masses of the population in countries still nominally Christian. Writing on medicine, Dr. H. J. Campbell tells us that at the beginning of the last century, when vaccination was in its infancy, the average annual death-rate from small-pox was 3,000 per million. In London nearly one-tenth of the deaths were caused by small-pox, and many who recovered from the disease were rendered sickly, deformed, blind or deaf. "The Mind of the Century" is a very readable book.

*Seed Thoughts for Public Speakers.* By A. T. PIERSON, D.D. London: Funk and Wagnalls Co. Pp. 361.

Dr. A. T. Pierson is so widely known in England that this collection of pointed and pithy extracts should be welcome. Preachers and platform speakers will here find much that is suggestive. An excellent index facilitates use of the book.

#### MINOR THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

*Confession and Absolution. The Sixth Book of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity."* Edited, with Introduction, Analysis, Notes, and Appendix, by the Rev. JOHN HARDING, M.A. London: Charles Murray.

The present use of the confessional in the English Church is likely to receive more and more of public attention. It is of great importance therefore that intelligent Churchmen should have easy access to the works of great divines which treat the subject in complete loyalty to the position of our Church. For such a purpose nothing could be better than this edition of Hooker's Sixth Book, intelligently and carefully edited by Mr. Harding.

*The Passion and Resurrection of our Lord: A Consecutive Narrative from the Four Gospels.* London: Elliot Stock.

In the matter of devotional reading there is often too much of devotional comment and too little of the Bible itself. This little book proceeds on other lines. It presents a harmony of the Gospel passages dealing with the Passion and Resurrection. Each page of text is faced with a blank page for personal notes. Such a volume may well be in constant use, and grow increasingly valuable.

*Early Church Classics: St. Polycarp.* By the Rev. BLOMFIELD JACKSON, M.A. London: S.P.C.K.

This contains the Letter of St. Polycarp to the Philippians, and the "Letter of the Smyrneans" narrating his martyrdom. These are two of the most valuable of the classics of the Church, and the task of translating and editing them has been performed with manifest skill and fulness considering the limits of this little volume. The editor's notes are extremely clear and interesting.

*The Unity of the Church.* By the Rev. T. A. LACEY. London: S.P.C.K.

This is vol. xxxv. of the series issued by the Church Historical Society. Due regard being had to the ecclesiastical predilections of the learned author, this little treatise will be found a useful presentation of the theory of the one and indivisible Church. The first part of it appeared in the *Revue Anglo-romaine* of June, 1896, and was written at Rome under circumstances which will be well remembered.