

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1910.

The Month.

The WE gladly call attention to the stirring appeal made
Archbishops by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York on
and Canada. behalf of work in Western Canada. The ground of
the appeal is given in the following remarkable facts :

“In Western Canada a great nation is advancing to a foremost place in the world. The resources of the land are immense, and rapidly on the way to be developed. The two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta alone are larger than France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, and the British Isles all put together. England one way, Japan the other, are distant little more than a week’s journey. An ever-increasing tide of immigrants is pouring in, thousands after thousands. Last year 180,000 entered Canada, most of them bound for the West. Plainly, the history of the world will largely depend upon what this multitude comes to be in character, in faith, and in life.”

The question is whether our Church is “doing its duty by this vast and swiftly growing nation.” Other Churches are hard at work, and, as the Archbishops say, “our own Church, bound by its position to care most of all, seems to lag behind.” That part of the appeal which refers to the remarkable work of Principal Lloyd will have the special interest and sympathy of our readers :

“The large and important work which is being accomplished in the diocese of Saskatchewan, under the powerful leadership of Principal Lloyd, supported by the Colonial and Continental Church Society, demands especial mention. It is vital that this work should be strengthened both with men and money. It lies in the very centre of the foremost need.”

We commend the appeal most earnestly, and beg our readers to send their contributions to the Colonial and Continental Church Society, 9, Serjeant's Inn, Fleet Street, E.C.

The
Voluntary
Offerings of
the Church.

As year by year we are told, through the medium of that admirable and indispensable publication, "The Official Year-Book of the Church," that the voluntary contributions of the Church of England make the magnificent total of several millions of pounds (this year over eight millions), we naturally feel surprised and glad that our Church should be able to show its liberality in this splendid way. It is a striking testimony of what is being done by Missions, of the vast and varied opportunities afforded by the Church of England, and yet it is impossible to question the truth of the following remarks of the *Record*:

"We do well to rejoice over the more than eight millions raised in voluntary offerings, and we know that, large as it is, it does not represent the whole total of the gifts of Churchmen, seeing that their contributions to interdenominational societies are excluded. But there is another side to the question. We could do better. Those who give liberally and cheerfully to the Lord's work are usually—though we know there are exceptions—but a small proportion of the general congregation of any church; the others give but little, not because they have not the money to give, but because they choose to spend it upon themselves and their own pleasures."

There is, indeed, another side. The workers and givers in our Church represent, as a rule, a very small proportion of the communicants, to say nothing of the general congregations. If only all who "profess and call themselves Christians" gave according to the New Testament principle, "as the Lord hath prospered him," the result would be stupendous. It would pretty certainly be a repetition of that unique day in the life of Moses when the people had to be restrained from giving because enough had been provided for the work of God. Alas! we are very far from this consummation; there is no sign, perhaps no likelihood, of a repetition. It would mean the possession of a far deeper spiritual life than we now possess.

Convocation
and the
Missionary
Conference.

It came as a great surprise the other day that even a small minority could possibly exist in our Church who were unprepared to offer the forthcoming World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh their cordial sympathy. The occasion will be unique, for such a gathering of missionary workers has never yet been held, and its influence is certain to be deep and far-reaching. And yet a small number of extreme High Churchmen were ready to withhold the expression of sympathy, in spite of the fact that large numbers of Churchmen will be included among the delegates, and will take a leading part in the deliberations of the Conference. It is another illustration of the impossible position taken up by those who hold a view of Apostolical succession which is warranted neither by Scripture, nor by scholarship, nor by the overwhelming testimony of Christian life to-day. Happily, however, Convocation did not listen to this opposition, and with the Bishops in the Upper House unanimous in the expression of good-will, the resolution was passed in the Lower House by a large majority. The words of the *Guardian* take a line on this matter with which all true Churchmen will gladly associate themselves :

“We can only regret that any note of hesitation or misgiving should have been sounded. Perhaps, in the circumstances, it was well that the show of hands was insisted upon, for this made it plain that the members who were for sending the greeting in the strongest terms were in an overwhelming majority—the proportion was five to one. When it is added that the Bishops of the Upper House concurred with markedly emphatic approbation, we may reasonably hope that those to whom the resolution is sent will accept it as the expression of our very sincere regard for their labours. We gladly acknowledge that their missionary zeal is a constant incentive to us, and we rejoice to believe that we are being brought ever nearer to the time when we shall be of one mind, as well as of one heart, in the endeavours which we make to further the Divine will for the Church and for the world.”

It is natural and inevitable, in view of such an attitude, even of a minority, that the *Times* should remark that—

“It will not be surprising if there remains in the minds of the laity an uncomfortable fear that the large conception of the National Church may

yet shrink into the mere expression for the narrow exclusiveness of a small sect."

During the Debate in Convocation the public was informed that the S.P.G. had not seen its way to be represented officially at the Missionary Conference. This decision is all the more remarkable because of the way in which those who are responsible for the Conference have endeavoured to obtain the support of Anglican High Churchmen. Indeed, it is confidently said in certain quarters that it was only by the omission of South American missionary work among Roman Catholics from the purview of the Conference that it became possible to obtain the support of certain leading High Churchmen. Be this as it may, the fact is clear that in the nine Commissions which constitute the Conference definite High Churchmen occupy a prominent part, and one of the Commissions is presided over by the Bishop of Birmingham. To many it has been somewhat of a surprise to realize that the vast interests of the C.M.S. in the Mission Field should not have been represented in the Chairmanship of one of these Commissions. It might have been thought quite natural that the Bishop of Durham, or some other leading Evangelical prelate, should have been Chairman of one of the Commissions, as representing the C.M.S. What makes the action of the S.P.G. all the more surprising is that it is well known that Bishop Montgomery, the Secretary, has been asked to nominate no less than fifty delegates to the Conference, so that the S.P.G. will be undoubtedly represented, even though its representation cannot be strictly called official. We had hoped that the narrow policy of former days associated with the S.P.G. was at an end, but it is evidently not the case. Meanwhile Churchmen will not fail to understand the meaning of this object-lesson. Evangelical Churchmen, without in the slightest degree compromising their Churchmanship, are always ready to give the right hand of fellowship to those who are labouring with them in the Mission Field. Happily there is an increasing comity of Missions in

The S.P.G.
and the
Missionary
Conference.

various parts of the world, and, like David Livingstone, we ought to be ready to welcome with all possible heartiness all who endeavour to heal the sores of humanity by proclaiming the everlasting Gospel of the grace of God.

The Danger
of
Specialization.

In one of those illuminating articles contributed to the *British Weekly* by "Claudius Clear," which are well known to be from the pen of its brilliant editor, Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, the following suggestive passage occurs :

"The judgment of experts is no doubt very valuable, but it is not infallible, and it is especially apt to err when genius appears in the field. When the course of literature or of thought is to be altered, those who have been walking by the river for long, and complacently following its flow, generally throw up their arms in protest and in anger. The new genius with new ways is likely to find his appreciation among younger and more daring spirits. This fact might be illustrated over and over from the history of literature. Again, experts are apt to postulate a uniformity in style and merit which is not the characteristic of genius. Hence the excessively precarious character of much literary criticism that is based on internal evidence. Now that the superstition about Shakespeare's uniform excellence has been broken by Jusserand and others, critics will come to perceive that much which has been written on the composite authorship of the plays is futile. Let no one say that this is an idle question. It is a question which goes deep down, and involves much that is very precious."

The bearing of these ideas on Biblical criticism is only too patent. In these days of increasing specialization in all branches of knowledge there is a constant danger lest we fail to appreciate the due proportion and perspective of things. Literature must be continually balanced by history, philology by archæology, physics by metaphysics, and it is only in a constant appreciation of the various departments of human thought that we can ever expect to arrive at the truth. The most pressing danger to-day in connection with the Bible is the concentration of particular scholars on their own specialization of thought to the forgetfulness of other branches equally important and equally valid. The deeper a man bores into the ground the less of the sky he is likely to see, and the more a man penetrates into one realm of knowledge the more he is in danger of forgetting other

realms. Let us ever be on our guard against what has been rightly called the tyranny of the expert. Let us insist upon keeping as far as possible a due proportion in regard to our avenues of knowledge.

There are doubtless many among our readers who are not aware of the interest and work of the The Victoria Institute. Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain. It was established for the purpose of investigating the most important questions of philosophy and science, but more especially those that bear on the great truths revealed in Scripture. To this end it associates together men of science and authors who have been engaged in such investigations, and all others who may be interested in them, in order to strengthen their efforts by association, and by bringing together the results of such labours after full discussion in the printed transactions of the Institution. The Society consists of Members and Associates, and among the names on the list are some of the best-known and highly honoured in the various Churches. The Institute has done much to advance the cause of Biblical scholarship and true learning, and it is a bare duty to call attention to it and commend its valuable work. The Secretary, H. Charleywood Turner, Esq., at the office of the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, W.C., will be glad to give full information to any who may desire it. The Institute affords a welcome rallying-point for those who wish to prosecute their study in the realms of religion and science.



Cambridge Biblical Essays.¹

I.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR ORR, D.D.,

Glasgow.

IN the wake of the Cambridge *Theological* Essays of 1905 there comes this volume of Cambridge *Biblical* Essays, under the editorship of Dr. Swete, who also contributes the final essay on "The Religious Value of the Bible." The essays, sixteen in number, are divided between the Old Testament and the New, the latter having rather the larger share. The essays are all by able writers, and, in their fearless and independent character, have the merit of showing where, in the opinion of Cambridge scholarship, present-day criticism of the Old and New Testaments stands, and what kind of results are held to flow from it. As a mirror of existing phases of thought, the volume is of distinct value.

The essays represent different standpoints, and the results seem satisfying, as a whole, to the writers themselves. Dr. Swete is persuaded that nothing is lost and not a little is gained through them for the religious value of the Bible. This optimistic estimate, as respects a great part of the contents of the volume, does not seem to the present writer to be justified. There are papers of a more moderate and reassuring tendency, but there is no shutting of the eyes to the fact that in several of the essays it is nothing less than a revolution which is seen in process. If the revolution is based on truth, it is, of course, useless to contend against it; it must have its way. But there is no good in that case in comforting oneself with the idea that the Bible, Christ, the Gospel, Christianity itself, are going to remain the powers they have been, or sustain the life and activities of a Christian Church as they have done. It may be true, as Dr. Swete says, that a conviction of the

¹ "Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day." By Members of the University of Cambridge. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. London: Macmillan and Co., 1909.

unique religious nature of the Bible can, in some cases, survive the critical disintegration, the rejection of miracles, and even an "abandonment of the Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ" (p. 550, Harnack is quoted); but this is not the Christianity the Church of Christ stands for. This of itself warrants a very keen attention being given to the new methods, and to the sweeping conclusions reached by them.

It would be well if writers who have so keen an appreciation of the weaknesses of "traditional" opinions would do a little more justice to the positions they reject. When Mr. A. A. Bevan, in his essay on "Historical Methods in the Old Testament," writes, "The belief in the infallibility of the Old Testament historians long discouraged all such investigations, for it seemed impossible to institute any comparison between narrators whose information rests on human testimony, and *narrators, whose information is communicated from heaven*" (p. 5, italics ours), it is pertinent to ask, Did he ever know or hear of anyone who held this absurd view? If he will take the trouble to consult any of the standard books on the subject he will find that every writer acknowledges that historical information came to the inspired writers through the ordinary channels of knowledge (see, in illustration, Mr. Scott's essay, pp. 336 *et seq.*). Why raise and argue upon a false issue of this kind?

A further curious anomaly is that, while it is constantly claimed that the very wide divergences in standpoint and details among critics do not in the least affect agreement and security in the essentials of critical theory, the adherents of "traditional" views are held down to the strictest views of inspiration and literality, and are not allowed to move one inch from the positions their fathers occupied a century or half a century ago. Any recognition on their part that discovery and learning have done something to change the perspective in dealing with certain questions is fastened on as a "concession," carrying with it the penalty of accepting all the critical extravagances that are going! Critics really should get to see that one may welcome many things as a legitimate increase of knowledge, while yet,

on good grounds, retaining a view of Divine revelation, of religious development, and of the historicity of the great facts of revelation, which is the antithesis of views wrought out from naturalistic premises, and dependent largely on these premises for their cogency. This is perfectly compatible, within limits, with divergences on points of detail.

Mr. Bevan, above quoted, is as assumptive as most writers of his class in his assurance that Israel had no *continuous* historical tradition going back farther than the founding of the monarchy—*i.e.*, the eleventh century B.C. (pp. 6, 7). In the Book of Judges, he contends, we find no continuous tradition, but clear proof that such did not exist when the narratives were compiled (p. 8). With this we read, strangely, that “the older parts of the Pentateuch and of the Book of Joshua (namely, those parts which are conventionally known as JE) date from about the same period as the older part of the Judges” (p. 8). Does JE, then, contain no trace of a “continuous tradition” at the time it was written? The argument is to show that even if the Israelites knew writing, there is no reason to suppose that it was used for history earlier than the monarchy. “To the Israelite historians the period before the Kings was what the *Jahīlīya*, or age of heathen barbarism, was to the historians of Arabia” (p. 8). It is ignored that the well-ordered patriarchal and Mosaic narratives speak to an entirely different kind of past from that of the Arabian historians, and that the Pentateuch itself contains many notices of the application of writing, in the days of Moses, to narrative, legislative, and hortatory subjects. It is easy to set all this aside, but it is not so easy to establish the right to do it. If only the critical writers could put themselves for a little in the position of those who believe it possible that the course of the history—its revelations and events—was, in the main, what these narratives declare it to have been, they might find less difficulty in believing in the careful literary transmission of the tradition even from an early time.

The present writer has been often blamed for insisting on the rationalistic root from which a good part of the modern

criticism of the Old Testament, as of the New, has sprung, and for contending that a theory of Old Testament religion and literature growing out of this root can never be satisfying to the Christian mind. It seems to him to be a truism, and he must be pardoned for reiterating it. Dr. Swete speaks gently of "the transition from the old to the new" as being, in England, "made under the guidance of scholars so reverent and conservative of essentials as Robertson Smith,¹ A. B. Davidson, G. A. Smith, Dean Kirkpatrick, and Professor Driver," and adds, "It has been made with general consent" (p. 548). Possibly; but the fact that reverent-minded men have gone a long way in accepting theories which had their origin in a very different spirit from their own, and which few of them carry out to their logical results, is no reason for not looking very carefully into the nature of their theories, or for, off-hand, pronouncing them innocuous. The men whose names appear in this volume as identified with the origination and advocacy of the Wellhausen movement—Vatke, Von Bohlen, George (of older date); then Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Popper, Kosters, Kayser, Duhm, Wellhausen himself (pp. 57, 58)—were men of a totally different order of thought and feeling in regard to the element of supernatural revelation in the Old Testament from those above named, and it is a simple delusion to suppose that their historical criticism is not affected by this fundamental difference in principle.

Dr. Driver, *e.g.*, is constantly made use of as a proof of how "moderate" and "safe" an Old Testament critic may be. But it must be frankly said that Dr. Driver, with his caution and would-be mediating position, is in no real way representative of the nature and aims of the movement with which his name and works are associated. He is not at one in principle with the writers above referred to, and just as little does his "moderate" position represent the real trend of the movement at the present hour. There is a logic in these things,

¹ Whether Robertson Smith, in some of his writings and utterances—still more in the trend he introduced—was "conservative of essentials" is a point on which opinions may differ.

which is bound to work itself out, and no protests of cautious scholars, as Mr. Stanley A. Cook, for one, is well aware (p. 87; *cf. Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1907, pp. 811, 818-19), are likely to stay it. Dr. Driver is really as far away from many of the positions even in this book as he is from those of the more conservative writers for whose slowness of heart to believe his censures are mostly reserved.

Things, in fact, are moving far and fast, and the critical situation gets more radical and complicated with every new advance. *E.g.*, in his last (revised) eighth edition of his "Introduction," Dr. Driver writes of the constituents of the Hexateuch: "Although, however, critics differ as to the *relative* date of J and E, they agree that neither is later than *circa* 750 B.C.; and most are of opinion that one (if not both) is decidedly earlier" (p. 123). Will anyone affirm that this adequately represents the recent or existing attitude on the dates of these supposed documents? Would the writers of the Oxford *Hexateuch* accept it unreservedly? Would Mr. Cook in this volume accept it? It need not be asked if Mr. Kennett, who writes the fourth essay—perhaps an extreme case—would accept it. With a theory of Deuteronomy which carries it down (with earlier "nucleus") in its most characteristic provisions till after the Exile (pp. 104-5), he places the completion of J after the reformation of Josiah in 621 B.C., and possibly as low as 586 B.C. The union of J and E is in the Exile, as a result of the fusion of the Bethel and Judæan worships. Mr. Kennett's whole essay is a fine example of untrammelled historic *imagination*; but he hits on some conspicuously weak points in the ordinary critical construction, which furnish him with "motives" for his own. His theory is fatal, of course, to the historical character of the books; but this is frankly admitted to be true of nearly all the essays.

Mr. Cook's essay on "The Present State of Old Testament," following on that of Professor C. H. W. Johns on "The Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament," has a character of its own, as acknowledging the difficulties

which have arisen from this new quarter for Old Testament criticism, and as endeavouring to appraise the results. Dr. Johns favours the view of a deep-reaching influence of Babylonia upon the Old Testament—an influence creating, he says, “a vexation which attacks modern critics quite as virulently as orthodox traditionalists” (p. 43). Mr. Cook sees in this influence an alteration in the form of the critical problems, which will have to be faced in a more radical spirit than has ever yet been done. The Babylonian movement has attracted notice “partly through the strength of its adherents, and partly for its tendency towards conclusions which, among some of the scholars, are considerably more conservative, but among others distinctly more radical, than those which represent the modern prevailing critical standpoint” (p. 56). “The situation,” he admits, “is not a little bewildering and unsettling to those who sympathize with modern efforts to study the greatest of the old Oriental writings with the aid of the highest scholars.” We are reminded, of course, that “critical scholars are almost unanimously agreed upon the essential literary and historical conclusions”¹; while “conservative writers” “usually misunderstand the problems, and generally confuse fundamental questions with those which are purely secondary or tertiary” (p. 66). One thing, at any rate, which the “conservative” people appear to be right in is that criticism is drifting into a considerable muddle as the result of these new views, and that neither the Winckler nor the Wellhausen school seems to be able to get satisfactorily out of it. Would it not be wise, in these circumstances, to stop throwing stones at “traditional” views, until it is seen whether, with what suitable modifications the facts may require, these older views do not after all hold the true solution of the problem? The partially conservative trend in Baentsch, Volz, and others, would certainly go a great deal farther but for their essentially naturalistic presuppositions. “It will be perceived,”

¹ Mr. Cook, however, should not represent Hommel as endorsing the literary analysis and conceding that the Wellhausen theory “explains everything” (p. 80), in face of Hommel’s subsequent explicit disavowal (see “Problem of Old Testament,” p. 397).

says Mr. Cook himself, speaking of these writers, "that the arguments which vindicate certain traditional views would also prove a great deal more than the most moderate of the 'Babylonists' would admit. Hence it is that some have seen in the new movement the likelihood of a return to a more conservative position in Biblical criticism. It would probably be more correct to say that the choice lies between the traditional history itself and such views as shall follow from a more comprehensive study of the problems in the future" (p. 83). Is this position less nebulous than that attributed to the "conservative" writers? It hints, however, at developments which leave Dr. Driver far behind.

Dr. Driver finds (*cf.* his "Genesis") a substratum of historical fact, if idealized, in the patriarchal narratives. The present volume will be searched in vain for any admission of the kind. Dr. Driver, again, concedes a considerable nucleus of Mosaic civil and ceremonial legislation ("Introduction," pp. 152, 153), and assumes the Priestly Narrative and Code to be completed by the time of Ezra. Few writers in this volume would concede as much on the former point, and critical scholars take greater liberties with the Code. In the newly published volume on Ezra and Nehemiah, *e.g.*, in the "Century Bible," it is held that the Code which Ezra introduced and tried to enforce was still not the Priestly Code, and a date *circa* 400 B.C. is ascribed to this. The ground is the admitted difference of the P legislation from that of Nehemiah's time—a fact which points rather to the antiquity of the Code. Mr. Kennett, in his essay, defends the radical position that there was no return under Cyrus. His whole conception, as indicated, is subversive of the history.

It has already been stated that there are papers in the volume of a much more positive tendency—that, *e.g.*, by Dr. W. E. Barnes on "The Interpretation of the Psalms," in which there are some useful cautions, and a keen criticism of Duhm on the Messianic Psalms; that by Mr. A. E. Brooke on "The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel," a counterpoise,

so far, to Dr. Inge's freer treatment in his essay on "The Theology of the Fourth Gospel"; Professor Anderson Scott's discussion of "Jesus and Paul," in criticism of the extremer representations of the relation of Master and Apostle; and the fresh paper of Dr. J. H. Moulton on "New Testament Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery." One of the most interesting essays in the book is that written from a Jewish standpoint by Mr. I. Abrahams on "Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis." It is sane and fair. Mr. F. C. Burkitt's contribution on "The Eschatological Idea in the Gospel" does not carry us far beyond the idea of "a good time coming" (on earth) as the essence of the eschatological conception. The paper on "Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament" sums up the facts very fairly, but disposes of Christ's mistaken attitude to the books of the Old Testament, and to their historical contents, by the theory of the "kenosis." "He stood, as man, at the intellectual standpoint of His day and country. And He *could not, because He would not*, know otherwise, for us men and for our salvation." Other papers serve the useful purpose of exhibiting the present state of thought on New Testament questions—as on the "Synoptic Problem" (H. L. Jackson) and on "New Testament Textual Criticism" (A. V. Valentine-Richards). Here, again, the general effect is "unsettling." On Synoptical Criticism, *e.g.*, the result is that "a shifting of the position is inevitable." The Evangelists "have gleaned their material from a variety of sources; it has been freely handled and embellished by them. Of their subject-matter a great deal is unquestionably genuine tradition, stretching back to apostolic times and to the days of Jesus. A remainder will have to be assigned to the purely legendary, to accretion, to historic incident, to ecclesiastical development, to ethics elaborated by the Primitive Church, to sayings which came to be ascribed to Jesus" (pp. 456, 457). The idea must be discarded that we have three independent sources in the Gospels; but we have original sources in the Mark Gospel and in the "Q" document (the so-called "Logia") embedded in Matthew and Luke. Even this "narrowed ground is not un-

challenged. . . . For the sake of argument—be it so ” (p. 458). We have still the citadel in the nine passages—the “ foundation-pillars ”—accepted by Schmiedel, which are “ proof conclusive for the existence of Jesus as a real historical personage ”! There are other sayings which have on them the incomparable stamp of originality. To this the matter is refined down. No wonder the essay ends with the ambiguous sentence: “ There is sometimes ground for the objection that to keep the divinity of Jesus within the limits of the purely human, while not denying that He is worthy of worship (Neumann), is to affirm too little or to affirm too much ” (p. 459).

II.

By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.,

Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law.

Those who may turn to the essay on “ The Present Stage of Old Testament Research,” by Mr. Stanley Arthur Cook, in the hope of finding an up-to-date and impartial presentation of the topic with which it deals, will be disappointed. The book appeared in October, 1909, but there is no reason to suppose that the essay was written in the same year. The internal evidence as to its date and composition would be satisfied by a hypothesis ascribing the original writing of the essay to the month of May, 1908, and postulating a subsequent “ redaction ” (presumably in proof) in or about the first half of November, 1908. With regard to impartiality, Eerdmans is never mentioned, although his book on Genesis appeared long before November, 1908; and Professor Sayce is spoken of (p. 67) as being “ no less opposed to methodical principles of criticism,” the subject of comparison being Professor Orr.

In a short notice it is not possible to deal exhaustively with all the points that might be criticized, and in this case it is certainly not necessary, for there is one great outstanding criticism that suggests itself at once. Let the following sentences

be considered, for they formulate the foundations of Mr. Cook's positions :

"Consequently the old Testament student has only two positions between which to choose—the one with and the other without the indispensable preliminary treatment of the literary problems ; the one critical, the other non-critical, separated by a long series of stages, to some of which we have referred" (p. 69).

"The Pentateuchal problems are those upon which conservative writers and professed critics are most diametrically opposed. Meanwhile a new movement has gradually come into existence which takes its stand upon external evidence, and demands that criticism should reconsider its attitude towards the five books of Moses in the light of modern knowledge. It appeals to the results of modern discovery in Palestine and the lands surrounding it, and in particular to the ancient civilization of Babylonia. . . . It is certain that the assured results of investigation cannot support all the antagonistic positions and contradictory tendencies of the present day. It is no less certain that here are the factors which will shape the Old Testament research of the future" (pp. 55, 56).

As against the view expressed in the first of these extracts, I hold that there is a *tertium quid* ; as against the view expressed in the second, I hold that there are other factors which will take their share in shaping the Old Testament research of the future.

1. Every schoolboy who has worked through a book by a Latin or Greek author knows that in the case of a writing that has for centuries been dependent on a manuscript text, errors and additions will have crept in that were absent from the original autograph. To deal with these there has come into existence the science of lower or textual criticism. This science is recognized and applied in the case of the classical literatures ; it is recognized and applied in the case of the New Testament ; it is recognized, but not applied, in the case of the Pentateuch. Accordingly, it has come about that the whole of modern higher critical work is built on a textual foundation that would not be tolerated in any other field of literary research. There exists a vast quantity of material in extant Hebrew variants and in the Ancient Versions which, when properly utilized, disposes of large portions of the higher critical case. Of course, in textual criticism, as in other sciences, sanity, sobriety, and judgment are essential ; and it is possible to have a textual

criticism which could not for a moment commend itself to any man of sense. But in writing of textual criticism, I mean such a textual criticism as shall be pursued with the necessary safeguards.¹

It may be well to drive home the importance of textual criticism by an illustration. For one hundred and fifty years the higher critics have declared that the use of the Divine appellations in Genesis afforded a secure clue for the partition of the book. As readers of the *CHURCHMAN* are aware,² the textual evidence now disposes of this view. Considerable interest attaches to the methods employed for dealing with that evidence. A number of notes on the subject have appeared in the *Expository Times* (May, July, September, 1909) under the title "The Name of God in Genesis," and anybody who will read these consecutively will see that the followers of Astruc are at a loss for a reply. The notes in the two last-named issues have had to go unanswered. No attempt has been made to challenge Professor Schlögl's statement (p. 563 of the September number) that it is "quite unscientific to determine the analysis of a source by the names of God." Dr. Driver—the recognized leader of the Wellhausenites in this country—has recently published a pamphlet entitled "Additions and Corrections in the Seventh Edition of the Book of Genesis." The preface is dated August 2, 1909. Is there any attempt to deal with the point either by way of answer or by way of modification? None whatever. Silence is his only weapon. In the circumstances it is the plain

¹ It is proper to add another remark. The textual criticism of the Pentateuch must depend mainly, first on the evidence of the Bible itself (as in cases where Deuteronomy may be called as a witness to the text of the earlier books), and secondly on the evidence of men like Aquila and Origen, Jerome and Onkelos, the renderers of Septuagint and Peshitto. It follows that such textual criticism can never affect religion, for one and all of the witnesses to be examined were either sincere Jews or sincere Christians, and it is therefore safe to say that the Bible as *they* knew it will never prove subversive of *our* religion. I have thought it right to make this remark because, in dealing with matters of scholarship that in any way affect theology, it might be feared that some fresh discovery might have an untoward influence on religion. I believe this to be quite impossible in the case of sane textual criticism.

² *Ante*, April, 1909, pp. 281 *et seq.*

duty of conservatives to do everything in their power to compel the Wellhausenites to break that silence, to answer the notes in the July and September numbers of the *Expository Times* if they can, or to modify their theories if they cannot, and to cause every critic and every disciple of a critic to know that the method pursued for the last century and a half has now been seen to be "quite unscientific."¹

A word of warning may not be out of place. Higher critical editions, etc., habitually quote variants from a number of sources, and give the impression that textual criticism has been systematically used. This is not so. As a rule, the reference to the authorities has been quite occasional. It is never anything like exhaustive. In matters of textual criticism our higher critics are devotees of the sporadic.

Our first principle, therefore, must be that a scientific text is the first desideratum for scholarly work, and that in so far as any higher critical theory rests on textual corruption it is entirely valueless.

2. A second main principle must be that technical work can only be done by those who possess adequate technical knowledge and training. This operates in more than one way. It operates as against the critics by showing that the supposed antinomies are due, not to anything in the texts, but to the limitations of the critics. It operates against the pan-Babylonians by showing that their theories, again, are due to defective equipment, for a man does not become, *e.g.*, a competent jurist merely by reading the code of Hammurabi and a few contracts. It operates against the critics, again, by producing solid internal and external evidence of the authenticity of the Mosaic laws. I have so often given illustrations that none are here necessary.²

¹ A number of other instances of the use of textual criticism will be found in my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." I have recently been working at the story of Joseph, and have been interested and pleased to find that the textual evidence there disposes of the whole of the higher critical case. The results appear in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January and April, 1910.

² See especially the articles "Law in Old Testament," "Crime," "Homicide," "Family," "Firstlings," in Murray's "Illustrated Bible Dictionary," together with the literature there cited. An examination of

3. One great fallacy underlying the critical case requires special notice. Buffon said in a celebrated epigram: "Le style c'est l'homme même." It is now recognized that that is not true of classical antiquity. "Style," says Norden, "was in antiquity not the man himself, but a garment that he could change at will." To some extent this is true even of our own day. The style of Macaulay in the Indian Penal Code bears no resemblance to the style of his poetical works, and both are markedly different from the style of the essays and the history.¹ There can be no doubt, on the statements of the Pentateuch itself, that different portions were intended primarily for different purposes, and, in the first instance, different audiences. Deuteronomy, we know, was intended for public reading to the people, and the bulk of it was originally delivered as a series of speeches. On the other hand, we are told of other portions of the Law that they were to be taught by the priests, while it is tolerably clear that the so-called "Book of the Covenant" was intended for memorizing. In these circumstances, it cannot reasonably be held that differences of style necessarily imply differences of authorship, and it becomes unnecessary to apply to the Pentateuch a line of reasoning that has been abandoned elsewhere.

In a word, I hold the answer to Mr. Cook's essay to be: "First ascertain by a scientific use of all the available materials what the true text of the Pentateuch is; next apply to it the best available knowledge of the day, wielded by the best available skill, and you will then find that the questions of authorship, to which you attach so much weight, have either disappeared or else shrunk into insignificance, while your theories of history and religion will have ceased to exist."

"The First Three Chapters of Wellhausen's Prolegomena" will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1909, and is reprinted in volume form with the "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," (*Elliot Stock*).

¹ See further the *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1907, pp. 605-630.

To Rome and Back.

BY THE REV. A. W. HUTTON, M.A.,
Rector of Bow Church, Cheapside.

I. ATTRACTION TO ROME.

EVERYONE knows that, during the last century, while the life of Evangelical Protestantism in this country went on very much as usual, devoting itself to missionary effort and to other good works, preaching the Gospel and visiting the fatherless and the widows in their affliction, there were in movement two great theological waves, the one the wave of Liberalism, which may better, perhaps, be described as anti-theological, and the other the Catholicizing wave, which is more especially my subject now. Neither of these waves was confined to our own Church or race; and it may be interesting to note how the two waves crossed each other in the middle of the nineteenth century. Both the incidents that I am about to mention occurred in the month of October, in the year 1845. This was just three years before I was born, and I mention the fact because it explains how that, when at school I became keenly interested in questions of theology and religion, I found myself in the midst of this storm, and both the waves affected me profoundly. Ernest Renan and J. H. Newman shall be my illustrations. Sixty-four years ago (that is to say on October 6, 1845), a young man, clad in priestly dress and evidently anxious to avoid observation, might have been seen descending the steps from the famous seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris, and then entering a private clerical hotel in the opposite corner of the square, whence later he emerged in lay attire, the flowing soutane and the tricorne hat having been laid aside for ever, since the theological ideas that are associated with such a costume had already deserted the mind, if not the heart, of that shy and nervous student. He was not a priest: he was only in minor orders. But from his childhood he had

lived in an ecclesiastical atmosphere ; his first and last teachers had been priests ; for ten or twelve years he had continually aspired towards a like position with theirs ; his studies had been directed solely towards that end, and, by his diligence and the brilliance of his genius, he had progressed in those studies, not only beyond his fellow-students, but beyond the professors themselves. Coming from the old-world province of Brittany, its quaint and often instructive local legends had been dear to him from childhood ; but now, just as he was reaching the goal towards which his mother's prayers and hopes as well as his own inclinations had directed him, he found himself pulled up sharp by that noble instinct so fittingly expressed by Shakespeare, "To thine own self be true." Not that he was perturbed by objections to Catholicism widely felt in our own day. Against its political and moral régime it had not occurred to him that there was anything to object. Its ritual observances did not offend him. Its claim to work miracles did not offend him ; for at that date he had not studied natural science, and had no conception of the ordinary uniformity of natural law. It was his familiarity with the Hebrew and Greek original documents of the Bible (so far as we can be said to have access to the original documents) that convinced him that it would be impossible for him to teach that an infallible Church was the true interpreter of the infallible Word of God. The verbal inspiration of the Bible is, of course, a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, and this he had become convinced that he could not accept. And so regretfully, but confident that he was right, he left those scenes in which he had so long found himself truly at home. His secession was at the time only known to a small circle of friends, but it was none the less profoundly significant of the wave of Liberalism that was then gathering strength ; and, though M. Renan is not now regarded as one of the best of critics, still his light touch was at least as effective in his own country as were the heavier guns of the German critics in theirs ; and in France practically the whole edifice of religion needs now to be rebuilt on surer foundations.

Three days later, at Littlemore, just outside Oxford, was witnessed a very different scene, though one not less noteworthy in its way. This second scene illustrates with astonishing force the attraction to Rome which was so keenly felt thirty to seventy years ago, and is still felt, in a wider circle, though of later years its power seems to be less intense. In this second scene the leading part is played by the eldest son of a London banker, now forty-four years of age. His early training had been Protestant and Evangelical, but yet, with some perversity, the boy had read Tom Paine, Voltaire, and Hume's "Essay on Miracles," at an age when other boys would have cared more for cricket and football. Now he had been for over fifteen years the most distinguished clergyman and the most persuasive preacher in Oxford. He was the acknowledged leader of a great movement, which, at first unconsciously, and later consciously, looked to Rome as its goal. And now, in the austere little chapel of the semi-monastic buildings, to which Newman and his friends had retired as to a refuge during their period of transition, there is seated a half-educated Italian monk, Father Dominic, Passionist, and before him kneels the former Vicar of St. Mary's, the brilliant Fellow of Oriel, craving for admission into the holy Roman Church, and hearing with joy and gratitude the words of absolution pronounced by the uncouth foreigner. It was a strange scene, and its influence is still felt at this day in the Church of England, though it is less felt now than formerly. I myself came under the influence of it, twenty years later, when Newman published his "Apologia," which I read with feverish interest when a boy at school. Two years later (in 1867) I went to Oxford, and, by means of introductions that were given me, was associated at once with the High Church leaders—Pusey, Bright, and Liddon. Nine years later I was received by Newman into the Roman Church; I lived under the same roof with him for more than seven years; and when I came out from the Oratory and from the Roman Church in 1883, I came out, I must confess, more as Renan came out than as our Reformers came out in the sixteenth century; and

then, for about fifteen years, I belonged to no organized Church at all. But I was not out of God's sight ; and, about 1898, I slowly saw my way to resumé clerical work in the Church of England. All this I state in outline, by way of explaining myself. Now I must deal more particularly with what (so far as I can judge) is the attractive power which leads others, as more than thirty-three years ago it led me, to Rome.

This power is, I think, less concerned with the externals of public worship than most people imagine. No doubt ceremonial has something to do with it. Mankind, all the world over, and in all ages, takes pleasure in an ordered ritual and in æsthetic surroundings. The worship of the Hebrews (at any rate during the last 500 years before Christ) seems to have been on a magnificent scale, and I may note in passing that one of the earliest converts to Rome, the Rev. Richard Waldo Sibthorp (whom I knew in the later years of his life), justified his secession on the ground that only Rome preserved the tradition of a splendid ceremonial, such as God Himself is (in the Old Testament) said to have taught, even in minute detail, to the Hebrews, during their wanderings in the desert. If God is unchanged, then the kind of worship that He authorized and delighted in when Moses led the people He must still delight in now, and it is a part of the duty of the Church to authorize and arrange for such worship. Mr. Sibthorp was, however, never a very ardent Roman Catholic. He had been a much-loved, popular Evangelical clergyman at Ryde, and in the main he was an Evangelical even in his Roman days. For some years he returned to the Church of England, and officiated in the chapel of St. Anne's Bede Houses, which he had built at Lincoln. Later he reverted to the Roman Church, and became a Canon of St. Barnabas Cathedral, Nottingham. There a solemn requiem was celebrated at his death ; but at the close of the service his body was removed to Lincoln, and was buried in the cemetery there with the service of the Church of England. This was in accordance with his own directions.

But to return to the main subject, Puritanism has only been

an incident in the history of Christianity. The Apostolic Church was simple enough in its observances, certainly ; but by the year 500, ceremonies, many of them pagan in origin, were adopted by the Christian Church, and have prevailed in it for 1,500 years ; only in Northern Europe, and that only for less than 400 years, has a bareness of ritual observance been the rule. So that most men have inherited a taste for ceremonial from Catholic and pagan ancestors, and this counts for something as one of Rome's attractions. But, so far as my experience goes, I should say it is not the ritual itself, but the fact of the ritual being duly authorized that is attractive. In the worship of the Roman Catholic Church every action of everyone who takes part in it is duly prescribed, and so a grand ceremony can be performed with ease, and even seems natural—very different this from the amateurish rites in which High Churchmen often take part. But this orderliness in ceremonial is little more than illustrative of the orderliness in Church government, which is, of course, the great strength and the great attraction of Roman Catholicism. The simplicity and the completeness of the organization counts for a great deal—the laymen subject to their priests ; the priests to their Bishops ; and the Bishops to the Pope. This subordination, accepted and acted upon as if it were not open to question, means strength and (generally speaking) permanence. It is on the Pope that all depends, and, though it may sound strange to some, it is largely from the Bible that men are brought to the Pope—from the Bible, I mean, when read with certain prepossessions. I well remember how, in the five or six years preceding 1876, certain texts from the Bible were constantly in my mind, as finding their proper illustration only in Rome. There are many that inculcate unity : “ One fold, one Shepherd,” and so forth. And there are times when the texts about St. Peter seem to have a marvellous force on the Roman side. When I was at school, in 1865, one of the masters insisted that the doctrine of the Real Presence was taught by Christ, in the sixth chapter of St. John, for (as he said) that is the interpreta-

tion that has been given to His words by the Church, and He must have foreseen this interpretation, so that He either meant it to be given, or He meant to deceive, the latter alternative being, of course, unthinkable. Well, a little later I applied the same method to the words addressed to St. Peter: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church." They have, almost from the first, been interpreted as authorizing the Primacy of St. Peter, and so of the Popes, who claimed to be his successors. This must have been foreseen by Christ—even the modern dome of St. Peter's, with these words emblazoned round it, must have been foreseen by Him—so that, unless we take the impossible alternative of an intention to deceive, we must confess that Christ meant to teach the Primacy of the Pope.

I am not now stopping to consider what is the reply to this dilemma. I do not, of course, admit it as an argument now, but I refer to it as an illustration of the attractive power that Rome seems to possess in the settlement of controversies, as by Divine right. And, beyond all question, it is the fear of religious Liberalism that sends men over to Rome, in order to escape from the dangers to which that form of freedom seems to them to expose religion. Even the "sacrifice of the intellect," which Roman Catholicism demands, insisting on a man, by an act of the will, setting aside his doubts, and even what seems to him pretty clear evidence to the contrary, and making an act of complete submission to the teaching of the Roman Church—even this may seem to a man, in times of difficulty or of enthusiasm, to be warranted by such texts in the Bible as—"Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," it being assumed, of course, that only through the Church do we know what the obedience is that Christ demands of us. Such were some of the thoughts that passed through my mind, and I have in manuscript many pages, written in the years 1875 and 1876, just before and after my being received into the Roman Church, and from these I will quote a few sentences, and then leave the consideration of the other side of

the question until later. After mentioning various clergymen whom I consulted (but not to any purpose), I continued as follows: "I felt at this time that the controversy about Rome was a fundamental one. If it was merely a question of raising difficulties, as several of my friends had done, it would not be hard, from science, history, and philosophy, to raise a host of difficulties against the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the fact of a revelation, and so forth; and these difficulties would be very hard to meet, if I were seeking to convince a man prejudiced against these truths. It seemed to me at this time that, given the Apostle's Creed, the Creed of Pope Pius followed. I was not attracted by the practical system of Rome, nor by her ceremonial, for which my experience of ritualism had inspired me with a certain dislike. But what I felt was that religious truth, if discoverable at all, must be one and invariable, everywhere, always, and for all, though not excluding deductive development; and to secure this I felt that any other theory than that of Rome was hopeless. I was also convinced that, given historical tradition, and the Bible as part of it, no living and working system answered to it more accurately than that of Rome; though perhaps a more ideal system might be set down on paper. And then, assuming the Divine authority of the Bible, what was the meaning of the Old Testament prophecies as to the future Church? What was the true interpretation of a hundred passages in the Gospels and Epistles, if Rome's was not the right one? The Papacy must somehow be accounted for. Could I be sure that it was only a parasitic growth of human engrafting on the Church? Was there not really more Scriptural traditional testimony to its being, in its origin, a Divine institution than there was for episcopacy? And what more was there to be said if that were so?

"And then, what a high ideal of life did Catholicism assert, and, on the whole, assert successfully. Whereas, when I looked round on the Anglican communion, what signs of a Divine authority could it show? It had been my good fortune to have been associated with some of the best of its Bishops and clergy.

Both the Bishops I had served under were very good men, and High Churchmen, but how dependent they were on the State! how sensitive of public opinion was even Dr. Wordsworth, who had the reputation of being the most courageous of all! At Oxford I had known all the pillars of the High Church party, and I could not but admit and admire their great natural gifts and their undoubted goodness. But they also had each of them 'views,' and these views were continually in a state of transition. Latterly, as a country clergyman, I had been thrown among men of the most divergent opinions, and of very varying abilities. . . . There were a few ritualistic clergy within reach, but, of all my brethren, they seemed the least worthy of admiration. They were narrow-minded and crotchety, unpractical, and unattractive. . . . I was not, indeed, without a certain admiration for the country clergyman of the old school such as my father had been, to whose benefice I had succeeded. It was true that his teaching made little or no permanent impression on his parishioners, who, if religious, were pretty sure to be Wesleyans. The good that he did he did chiefly by the example of his life, his refinement, his charity in word and deed, by his transparent honesty and simplicity. But he was gone, and could not now be recalled, while the younger generation of the clergy imitated him only in his geniality."

Here I must conclude my quotation, and leave for a second paper a consideration of the other side of the picture, Of course I can see now that my feet went astray, when, as an Oxford undergraduate, I adopted the High Church position, partly, I think, from mere perversity, but partly, also, on account of the good fellowship of the High Churchmen with whom I was brought into contact. But I might have known, and I think I really must have known, that the position was itself a false one, historically untenable; while it led straight to Rome, as a mere matter of logic and consistency. That point I now had reached, and, on the whole, it satisfied me for the time. But my "conversion," if such it can be called, was

really more an experiment than a conviction. It was impossible for me to cease criticizing, even after I had gone inside. But

“God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform,”

and, looking back on it all now, after an interval of over thirty years, I feel sure that though “perverse and foolish oft I strayed, still in love He sought me,” as, indeed, He continues to search for each one of us.

(To be continued.)



Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

I.—THE SOURCES; HISTORIANS.

THE very earliest date at which we can place the birth of the English Church is the landing of Augustine, A.D. 597. There had, of course, been Christians in Britain long before that, but they were not English Christians. When the Gospel was preached first in these islands we do not know, but Bishops went from Britain to the Council of Arles in 314, and to the Council of Rimini in 359. These Bishops, however, were not English, but British; not Teutons, but Kelts. The Teutonic English had not yet reached these shores. The ancestors of English Churchmen were at that time heathen tribes on the Continent. When they did come and settle in Britain, the British Christians made no attempt to convert them, and the heathen invaders almost destroyed Christianity in the eastern half of the island. Bede tells us that down to his own day (673-735) British Christians still treated English Christians as pagans, so strong was the race-hatred towards them.

We omit all mention of the writers from whom we derive information respecting the history of Christianity in the British

Isles prior to the coming of Augustine, and begin at once with the "Ecclesiastical History" of the Venerable Bede. It is the earliest that we possess of really first-rate importance for our national history, and it is not easy to overestimate its value. It was finished in the year 731, just four years before Bede's death; and it was written when he was in his prime—not yet sixty years of age. It consists of five books, of which the first takes us from the landing of Julius Cæsar, 55 B.C., to the landing of Augustine, A.D. 597. The opening portion is mainly a compilation from Orosius, Eutropius, Gildas, and others, although Bede, according to the custom of his time, does not, as a rule, mention the name of the writer whose words he is adopting. The second book takes us from the arrival of Augustine in 597 to the arrival of Paulinus in 633. This brings us within forty years of Bede's own time, and it is the three remaining books, treating of the century between the coming of Paulinus and the completion of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History" (633-731), which are of such priceless value. These three books tell us of what rests upon Bede's own personal knowledge, or on that of the previous generation with which he conversed. It is in the fullest sense contemporary history, and contemporary history written with great care by a conscientious and competent scholar.

Let us see what this means; and probably many of those who read this paper could illustrate it out of their own experience or that of their friends.

There are plenty of people still living, of whom the present writer is one, who have talked with people that had taken part in the French Revolution of 1789.

In his interesting recollections, J. G. Keene, C.I.E., who is still living to give pleasure to his friends, tells us that in 1846 he sat at luncheon next to an old lady who told him that he reminded her of Goldsmith, the author of "The Vicar of Wakefield," who died April 4, 1774. This lady was Mrs. Gwatin, better known to students of the eighteenth century as Offy Palmer, the younger niece of Sir Joshua Reynolds. She kept house for the famous portrait-painter after he moved to the house in Leicester Fields,

and has been immortalized in his picture of "The Strawberry Girl." Sir Joshua's house was the rendezvous of many of the literary lights of the eighteenth century, and Mrs. Gwatkin could give personal recollections of a number of them.

Another instance is still more remarkable. A Mr. Fraser, who was alive in January, 1907 (letter in *The Times*, January 11, 1907), and may be living still, had as a boy known a Mrs. Butler in Edinburgh who had witnessed the entry of Prince Charles Edward into Holyrood after the Battle of Prestonpans, September 21, 1745, and had afterwards seen him ride up and down the Canongate. And yet another person (letter in *The Times*, January 26, 1907) had known a lady at Redbourne, near St. Albans, who had seen the Duke of Cumberland marching with the Foot Guards through Redbourne, in November, 1745, to fight the Pretender. So that well within the twentieth century we have two persons who had heard from eyewitnesses what took place in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Let us apply these illustrations to the case of Bede. He was born in 672 or 673. As a boy he may easily have talked to people who were born before 600. It would have been just possible for him to have known a person who had seen St. Columba, who died in 597, and very easy for him to have known one that had talked with St. Columban, who died in 615. Bede probably had seen Adamnan, Abbot of Iona, who wrote the "Life of St. Columba" ("H., E." iii. 4; v. 15). He may have talked to persons who had seen Pope Gregory the Great, and, still more possibly, to persons who had seen some of Gregory's successors—Boniface IV., Boniface V., Honorius I. In short, Bede and the generation which he knew cover the whole of the seventh century and the first third of the eighth. The three last books, therefore, of his chief work are history at first hand.

We must not suppose from its title of "*Historia Ecclesiastica*" that it is what we should call *Church* history nowadays. It contains a great deal of purely secular history as well as information respecting ecclesiastical matters. In those days the Church was the centre of history. Very often the ministers

and rulers of the Church were the ablest men of affairs, as well as the most learned scholars. The chief statesmen and the chief legislators were frequently ecclesiastics. Hence the history of any period was of necessity (to a large extent) ecclesiastical history—not merely because the persons who had culture enough to *write* history were monks or clerics, but because so many of the people who *made* history were ecclesiastics. When Bede calls his History of the English Nation “Ecclesiastical History,” he does not so much mean that the field which he is going to describe is limited in any particular way as assure us that what he has to tell is of supreme interest. He is going to work at the centre of things, and explain the chief influences and their working. “Ecclesiastical” is opposed, not to “secular,” but to “trivial.” He desires to tell us all that is best worth remembering about the land which was his birth-place and his home, down to his own day.

We cannot many of us study original sources of history. Most of us must be content to take our history at second or third hand. This is specially the case in the later periods, about which the sources are so bewilderingly abundant. But every educated English person who aspires to a knowledge of the early history of England and of the English Church might endeavour not only to know something of Bede, but to read him for themselves. In these days, of popular editions of classical authors, a shilling edition of one of the translations of Bede’s “Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation” is a thing very much to be desired, and such a venture would probably be a financial success.

Next to Bede in importance must be placed what is sometimes called the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, but should rather be called the Saxon or the English Chronicles, for there are several of them. We probably owe them to the wise patriotism of Alfred the Great. There had been local chronicles before his time, but he seems to have had the grand idea of a National Chronicle, and to have caused it to be executed. He himself may have contributed some of the entries respecting his

own wars. And, just as he sent copies of his own translation of Gregory's "Pastoral Care" to all the Bishops, to assist them in what Pope Gregory himself called "the art of arts, the care of souls," so he appears to have sent copies of his National Chronicle to different religious houses, to be preserved and kept up to date. The chief home of the Chronicle was Winchester, but there were other places, and at each the Chronicle would be likely to develop in a different way.

These English Chronicles have no equal in literature. Great as is their value as sources of historical information, they are perhaps even more valuable as a unique monument of our language, exhibiting the changes through which it passed from what is called Anglo-Saxon to what is known as Early English. Their general truthfulness is proved by the evidence of names and of archæological remains, and they represent the varying tastes of many generations, from the crudest ideas of history to something which, if still simple in form and expression, is nevertheless worthy of the name of literature.

With the exception of the Chronicles, we have not much that can be called historical literature respecting the Church of England for nearly four centuries after the death of Bede. This long interval is somewhat sparsely filled with the productions of inferior writers, mostly biographies of eminent persons, especially saints, some of which will be noticed in another paper. Passing over Henry of Huntingdon, who is remarkable as a secular cleric compiling history at a time when such writing was almost entirely the work of monks, and Simeon of Durham, who is valuable chiefly for what he can tell about Northumbria in the tenth century, and also the writer who is never tired of letting us know that his full name is Radulfus de Diceto (the meaning of which we can still only guess), we come at last to a writer who may be regarded as a genuine historian and a worthy successor of Bede. William of Malmesbury was born 1095 and died 1148: he was therefore contemporary with the writers just mentioned, outliving Henry of Huntingdon and outlived by Simeon of Durham. William was Norman on his father's side and English on his mother's.

He seems to have thought that this would make him impartial in criticizing the ruling race, but his sympathies are plainly with the Normans. Both in his "Gesta Regum Anglorum" (A.D. 449-1128) and in his "Gesta Pontificum Anglorum" (a history of English Bishops and monasteries from Augustine to A.D. 1123) he relies upon writers most of whom are known to us, Bede and the Chronicles being the chief. Alcuin, Ethelwerd, Eadmer, and William of Poitiers were also used, with others, both English and foreign. "In short, there was no available source of information of which he did not make ample use" (James Gairdner, "Early Chroniclers," p. 80). He was no mere chronicler, but, like Bede, an historian. He groups events, and tries to account for them.

All these authorities, whether histories, or chronicles, or biographies, show us by direct quotations and in other ways that there was a great deal of material which was known to the producers of these writings, but which has not come down to us. And while we rejoice at having received so much, and in a few cases so much that is excellent, it is impossible not to lament that so much has perished. And perhaps it may have been the case that the popularity of some of the writings which have been named caused other writings, which were more valuable though less popular, to fall into neglect, and then to perish. Popularity does not always depend upon excellence, still less upon historical accuracy, as is shown by the writings of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was contemporary with William of Malmesbury, and whose audacious romances spread all over Europe, and came to be accepted as history. But in one case, at any rate, popularity and historical excellence did go hand in hand—viz., in that of the "Ecclesiastical History" of Bede; and it is possible that, by its conspicuous superiority, it may have driven other writings of inferior but real merit out of the field. If this surmise is correct, the case is very similar to that of the Canonical Gospels. What would we not give now for a few of those many narratives of doings of our Lord which were known to St. Luke as existing in his time? (Luke i. 1, 2). It is,

perhaps, not impossible that a few fragments of them may still survive, buried in the literature-saving sands of Egypt; but, so far as our present possessions go, they have long since been driven into oblivion by the excellence of the Canonical Gospels, acting through the inexorable law of the survival of the fittest.

In marked contrast to Bede and the English Chronicles may be mentioned the writings of Nennius and of Geoffrey of Monmouth. The "Historia Britonum" of Nennius seems to have existed in several editions, the chief of which was written about A.D. 796. Nothing is known of the writer—and, indeed, we are not certain that his name was Nennius, but (for convenience) we continue to call him Nennius. His "History of the Britons" is mainly confined to Wales, and, though it was written after Bede, it does not reach even to A.D. 700. It contains some valuable quotations from a much earlier writer, who described the struggles between the English and the Britons in Wales between A.D. 547 and 679 (Nennius lvii.-lxv., "The Genealogies of the Kings"). It is in this portion that the name of King Arthur is found: "Then did Arthur fight against the Saxons along with the chiefs of the Britons, but he himself was leader of the wars." This may be a quotation from "The Genealogies of the Kings," or it may be the remark of Nennius himself. In Nennius's own work tales about enchanters and dragons are given as serious history, and the chronology is absurd. The birth of our Lord is placed at A.D. 183. Is King Arthur to be swept into the region of fable, along with the dragons and enchanters and the impossible chronology? You must settle that question with Nennius, for there is no earlier authority for Arthur's existence. The later writers who tell us so much about Arthur had no other source of information than Nennius, and they enlarged and embellished what he states about the King just as they pleased. On the whole, it is probable that there was such a King as Arthur, and that he was a brave and able leader in war.

It is to Geoffrey of Monmouth that the popularity of the legends about King Arthur and of many other legends is mainly due. He lived between A.D. 1100 and 1154, and was

probably a Benedictine monk. A Benedictine would be likely to possess his love of literature and his literary skill. He was over fifty years of age when he was ordained priest (February 16, 1152). Eight days later he was consecrated Bishop of St. Asaph, but he died in 1154, without having visited his diocese. His influence as a writer has been immense, but his "Historia Britonum" is important not so much as a source of historical truth as one of historical romance. It consists mainly of fiction, and is based upon Nennius and a book of Breton legends which is no longer extant; and it has had two great results—one literary, and the other political and (perhaps we may add) religious. The literary result was that in less than fifty years the romances of King Arthur and the Round Table, the Holy Grail, Sir Lancelot, etc., partly based upon Geoffrey, became current; and Geoffrey's stories of Merlin and King Arthur spread, not only to England and France, but to Germany and Italy. His writings had an enormous circulation, and the later chroniclers, down to Holinshed, treated Geoffrey as an historical authority. From him the medieval *poets* also drew very much of their material.

The political result of his romances was a very happy one. Fictions in our own time have sometimes done much towards exciting race-hatred and class-hatred in various quarters. The fictions of Geoffrey of Monmouth did a great deal towards softening the bitterness of race-hatred between the British, English, and Norman elements in the population of this island. All three of them, according to Geoffrey's stories, had a common ancestry: they were descended from Trojan fugitives, who had taken refuge in Britain after the destruction of Troy by the Greeks. There was not one word of truth in this legend, but, thanks to Geoffrey, the legend became widely known, and was accepted as history; and political events, as we all know, depend, not upon what is true, but upon what is believed. Who would wish to quarrel with a romantic tale which did much to hasten the unification of the people of England, and thereby to help the consolidation of the English Church?

Some Advantages of Establishment.¹

BY THE REV. F. H. L. MILLARD, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Aidan's, Carlisle.

I WILL confine myself strictly to the title of this paper—"Advantages of Establishment"—and endeavour to show that those advantages are of such a nature as to put all question of disestablishment out of the minds of reasonable men.

I propose to clear the ground first of all by answering two questions: (1) What is the meaning of Establishment? and (2) What are the incidents of Establishment?

We need to understand very clearly what we mean by Establishment, for it seems to imply one thing to one man and another to another, and the confusion thus produced is responsible for much heat in controversy and much misrepresentation. Not a few people are under the impression that the Church of England is called the Established Church because at some time or other it was created or founded by an act of the Legislature; that the State did something in the way of choosing it, in preference to any other form of religion, as the expression of the national faith. Nothing could be more erroneous or misleading. There never was a moment in the history of England when the Church of England was chosen as the peculiar expression of Christianity which the nation was by law to adopt. "There was no one moment, no one Act of Parliament, when and by which the Church was 'established'; still less was there any Act by which one Church was 'disestablished,' and another Church 'established' in its place" (Freeman).

There are only three periods in the history of this country when such suggested Establishment could possibly have taken place: (1) On the formation of the single kingdom of England from the kingdoms of the Heptarchy; (2) at the Reformation; (3) at the Restoration.

With regard to the first of these periods, it is well known

¹ Being a paper read at the Church House, Carlisle.

that the formation of the kingdoms of England into one nation was preceded by the Christianization of the country and the recognition of Christianity within the kingdoms as the true religion. There was no question of choice. The Church was in possession; the victory over paganism had been won; and the formation of the single kingdom involved no change, no choice of religion, and no formal establishment by law of the religion already existing in the country. In the case of the second period I may content myself by again quoting the historian Freeman that "in all they did Henry VIII. and Elizabeth had no more thought of establishing a new Church than they had of founding a new nation, for in their eyes the nation and Church were the same thing." In the third possible period it is true that the Church had been disestablished by the Commonwealth, but it is equally true that at the Restoration there was no re-establishing her; she simply returned to her own, which had been taken away from her, just as the King returned to his throne and the nation to monarchical government. There was, as a matter of fact, at each of these great historical crises, no question of establishing at all. "The relations between the ecclesiastical and civil powers were not then or at any other time settled by any one formal enactment. They grew up and shaped themselves according to the circumstances of one age or another." The Church Establishment has just the same history as the House of Commons or the Trial by Jury. It is the creation of law; but it is not the creation of any particular law, but of the general course of English law, written and unwritten. The Church was never established; it grew up simply because it was the nation in one of its aspects.

What, then, do we mean by an Established Church? It is obvious from the foregoing that we can only mean the accepted and adopted national expression of religion. In our own case it is that organization of religion which has grown up with the nation and embedded its fibres into the very centre and heart of the national constitution. We find that with the brief interlude of the Commonwealth, a period whose termination was

hailed with wilder joy than the relief of Mafeking, there has been but one religious organization whose law has been incorporated into the law of the realm, as a branch of the general law of the country, under the shadow of whose moral protection, and by the inspiration of whose life, the nation has risen from the tiniest beginnings to become the mightiest power in the world.

We now pass to our second question, What are the incidents of Establishment? That is to say, In what respect does the Church of England differ in its relation to the State from the Nonconformist bodies? It is well to remember that until the sixteenth century the identity of the Church and nation was an accepted fact, which needed no more discussion than the succession of the seasons. It is well to remember this, because the incidents of the Establishment are not the result of conflict between rival religious organizations, but the natural result of the joint life of Church and State. "Stated briefly," says Mr. Eldon Banks, in one of his clever pamphlets, "the chief incidents of the Establishment are as follows :

"1. That the King is the supreme head of the Church and the ultimate Court of Appeal in matters Ecclesiastical (the appeal now being to the Privy Council).

2. The summoning of the Convocations by Royal writ.

3. The part taken by Parliament in Ecclesiastical Legislation.

4. The restrictions placed by the State upon the enactment of Church laws.

5. The authority of the Church Courts.

6. The fact that certain of the Bishops sit in the House of Lords.

7. The fact that the right of nominating the Bishops rests with the Crown.

"It is easy to trace what led up to these incidents. For instance, the Royal Supremacy is due to the determination on the part of King Henry VIII. to exclude the Papal power, and to establish the supremacy of the British Crown over the Church of England. It was during the primacy of Archbishop

Warham in 1530 and 1531 that the Convocations of both provinces of Canterbury and York formally acknowledged the King's supreme headship of the Church of England. It was three years later—in 1534—that the Act of Parliament was passed which added to the King's style the title of the 'only Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England.'

“Take other incidents—for instance, the summoning of Convocation by Royal writ, and the summoning of the Bishops to the House of Lords. How came these about? Again it is easy to trace. The eleventh constitution of the Council of Clarendon declared that the Archbishops and Bishops, and all other persons of the realm who hold in chief of the Crown, are to have their possessions of the King by the title of barony, and, like the other Barons of the kingdom, they are to have places with the Barons in the King's Court, except in cases of life and limb. King John, by his Charter, promised to summon the Archbishops, Bishops, and Abbots, as well as the Earls and greater Barons, to his great Council, whenever a grant or subsidy might be required. Here we find the origin of the Bishops sitting in the House of Lords, and learn that it was simply by reason of the fact that, like other great landowners of the time, they held their lands as tenants-in-chief by barony from the Crown, and as such they received their writs of summons.

“The origin of Convocation is also interesting and instructive. King Edward I. wished that representatives of the clergy as well as the Archbishops and Bishops should attend in Parliament, and he issued his writs accordingly. But the clergy objected on the ground that it was uncanonical to summon them to the King's Parliament—a secular Court. This dispute was finally adjusted in the time of King Edward II., when the Provincial Convocations were established upon the system which has ever since been continued, being summoned, pursuant to Royal writ, by the Archbishops simultaneously with every Parliament.

“I mention these matters as illustrations to show how these chief incidents of the Establishment have come about, and to

illustrate what I have said about recognition by the State constituting Establishment ; and that these acts of recognition were not steps in the building up or creating of a Church, but natural incidents, as it were, having regard to the circumstances of the time, and the relative positions which Church and State then occupied in this country.

“ If it is desired to make any alterations in any of these matters which I have mentioned, it is possible to do it by Act of Parliament. It is not necessary to disestablish the Church in order to secure any needed alteration.”

We thus arrive, without any difficulty, at the conclusion that the Church has grown side by side with the State, and that Establishment does not rest on any one act done at a particular time from definitive motives. It has come to be what it is through the circumstances of our history. The Church was once the nation, looked at in reference to religion, just as the Army was the nation looked at in reference to warfare, or the Parliament the nation looked at in reference to legislation.

At this point the inquiry may be made as to what are the advantages of Establishment and of the connection with the State which it is proposed to destroy. Let us remind ourselves in passing that so far as protection and recognition by the State is concerned, the Nonconformist bodies are all equally recognized and protected with the Church. A moment's consideration proves this. Take the position to-day of the relation of the State to the Church of England and to any one of the great Nonconformist parties. Each is recognized by the State as a lawful institution or community ; each is allowed to conduct its services according to its constitution ; each is allowed to possess and hold property ; each appeals to the State for protection, in the event of its property being taken from it, or its rights infringed ; each has received from the State the same exemption from State obligations, as, for instance, the exemption of churches on the one hand and chapels on the other from the obligation to pay rates. These are instances where the extent of the recognition of the State is substantially the same. And these considerations prove,

I think, that the word "Established," when used in connection with the Church of England, means considerably more than merely recognition by the State. How much more it is not easy to define. The answer is to be found in considering the incidents of the Establishment to which I have already made reference.

The advantages of Establishment, succinctly put, may be stated as follows :

1. *National Recognition of God.*—This is no small advantage ; so long as the Church is established the nation is openly and avowedly Christian. She can appeal to the sentiment and fact of religion, and take her position as a definite religious force in the world. Admit Disestablishment, and no other form of religion can possibly be placed in the position which the Church holds. The nation must in her worldly aspect be non-Christian. A State without a creed is a miserable object, but the maintenance of the Church of England as the National Church saves the nation from the intolerance of sectarianism, and from being torn in pieces by the struggles of fanatical opinions. Divine institutions cannot be discarded without affecting the welfare of Society. Further, the State which has once receded from the strict externally established form of religion, and has framed or tolerated a new form of Church government upon the ground of opinion, cannot take its stand upon doctrine or defend any truth whatever, even the vital fact of Revelation itself. For if opinion be valid against one positive institution, it is valid against all. Let me here quote a valuable extract from a little-read book by a once-famous Professor, the Rev. William Sewell, D.D. He says :

"If the Church of England be, as it is supposed, a sect—that is, if, in either of the senses of the word sect, it be either a self-formed Society, following a human leader of its own choice, or a section of Christians which has severed itself, or has been rightfully severed, from the body of the Catholic Church ; if its creeds are either imagined by itself, or deduced by its own interpretation from the Scriptures, without authority from a higher source ; if its commission to teach and to administer sacraments be a human expedient, not a Divine appointment ; or if its claim to support be the accordance of its system with the opinions and interests of man, not the authority externally conferred on it by Heaven ; if, in one word, it rests its strength on anything

but external historical testimony to the reality and the maintenance of its externally revealed and externally transmitted truth—then the foundation of the Church rests upon opinion, the opinion of fallible men; and for opinion there is no available criterion but numbers. And a Government derives no right to pronounce judgment from its possession of power, since power is no test of truth; nor from its alleged superiority of wisdom, since this also must be reduced to a question of opinion. And neither has it any right to draw a line of distinction by itself between essential doctrines of Christianity, which it resolves to retain, and supposed non-essential forms, which it is willing to abandon. No one, in a matter of Revelation, may presume to say what is important, and what is unimportant, where all alike is enforced by a positive institution of the Almighty. If, on the other hand, external Revelation and appointment be binding for an article of faith, it is binding for episcopacy. And thus, step by step, from outward form to inward principle, from the outskirts, as it were, of Christianity and of all religion to its inmost heart and citadel, a State which has once abandoned its adherence to Apostolical tradition must be necessarily driven back—compelled to cast away, fragment by fragment, whatever offends any considerable number of its subjects—not logically justified in retaining anything—and, at last, stripped of all its truth, its arms bound down, its tongue paralyzed, and all its influence, if influence it can possess, turned in the defence and propagation of falsehood, blasphemy, and unbelief.”

From such a disaster as this Establishment saves the nation, since by virtue of the maintenance of the National Church the nation, as such, accepts Christian Revelation and recognizes the Law of God.

2. *The Maintenance of Religious Sanction for our Acts of Government.*—As I have already said, if you admit Disestablishment you make it impossible for the State ever to recognize religion in her public acts and functions, for to do so would be to establish one form or other of Christianity or of some other religion, and this would be to return, in a baser form, to the principle which you repudiated. But surely it must be wholly to the advantage of any State to maintain a due and proper recognition of the Almighty, at least in its public ceremonies. That recognition can only be made in outward form of ritual and of creed which are the appurtenances of some accepted form of religion. Do away with such recognition, deprive the nation of religious sanction for its acts of government, and you reduce it to a nation of fools, for it is the fool who says in his heart, “There s no God.” The first and the second Table of Commandments

are closely bound together, as closely as truth and right, the head and the heart of man, his thoughts and his feelings, his feelings and his actions, and to allow the State to imagine that it is possible for it to do its duty towards its neighbour while ignoring its duty towards God is to court national disaster. The nation which casts off faith in God will soon lose its sense of duty towards man, and the Socialism that follows will be blood-red Anarchy. From all this the Establishment saves us, and I venture to claim this salvation as an advantage which cannot be overestimated.

3. The third point I would make is that *without Establishment our Sovereigns would be free to be of any or no religion*. Disestablish the Church in England, and you cannot impose any obligation on the Sovereign to observe any form of religion. You have reduced creed to a mere matter of opinion, and the Church to a sect. You could not compel the Sovereign to swear to maintain throughout his realm the doctrines and integrity of a sect. In fact, if you abolish the Establishment, you could place no obstacle in the way of our Sovereign being a Mohammedan, a Buddhist, a Jew, an atheist, or anything he pleases. Religion would be degraded from the level of Revelation to that of mere opinion. Now, the Establishment prevents the possibility of all this, and I ask, Is not this a very great advantage?

4. The fourth advantage is one which perhaps touches us more nearly than the others—namely, *the relation of the parish priest to the people*. Any person who recognizes the value of religion in educating the moral sense of the people must admit that it is an inestimable boon to have our parish churches served by earnest men, whose duty it is to preach the Gospel, and teach religion and minister to the spiritual needs of the people. By our present system provision is made that everyone may be within reach, free of charge, of the spiritual ministrations of a parish priest. Disendow the Church—for Disestablishment is not contemplated, and could not be accomplished without Disendowment—and your parish priest becomes merely a congregational minister. No longer can the

people claim his ministrations as theirs by right. He will be able, like the Nonconformist of to-day, to minister only to those who can afford to pay for his ministrations. The possession of a spiritual birthright, as well as of a national birthright, is no small matter, and is no little advantage to the development of character. Deprive the nation of the national religion and you take away the inestimable boon of spiritual birthright. There can then, of course, be no more chaplains of prisons, reformatories, ships, or armies, recognized by the State. No man, when serving his country, can expect his country to consider his spiritual welfare. So far as that country is concerned his eyes will close in death with his soul unaided, save by the futile efforts of his own darkened imagination. But if it would be impossible to attend to the spiritual needs of those who were fighting their country's battles, it would be certainly impossible to supply the spiritual needs of many thousands at home. Unable to pay for spiritual ministration, the poor would for many years at least go neglected and unattended, to live without hope, and to die without God. By the maintenance of the Establishment we avoid all this. May I not justly claim that this is an advantage we dare not lightly pass by, and one which must counterbalance many a disadvantage, for what could compensate the nation for such a loss as that of the work and influence of the parish priest?

5. Our fifth advantage resides in the fact that the *union of Christendom can the better be accomplished by its maintenance*. Establishment is and must be a bond of union, not a ground of separation. But allow Nonconformity to tear asunder the lifelong union of Church and State, a union which has grown through centuries of English history, and you make a chasm deep, wide, and almost impassable, between English dissent and the English Church, which will take longer to bridge over than it has taken to build up Church and State. It will postpone indefinitely any chance of reunion. As it is at present, the Church of England occupies a unique position in Christendom. No Church has a similar history; no Church has

built up national life in the same way. No Church is so national, so broad, so comprehensive, so capable of becoming the meeting-place of all sects, the basis of union for all Christendom. But destroy her national character, her representative character, reduce her to the level of a sect, and you deprive Christendom at once of one of the most, if not the most, important element in the problem of reunion, while postponing indefinitely the chance of religious peace at home. The bond of union lost in the parish will not be rediscovered in the babel of sectarian strife.

6. The sixth advantage *is the independence of the clergy*. We know how debasing to all that is noblest and best in the teacher it is to be in the power of the purse-holders. To preach and teach without let or hindrance the glorious Gospel entrusted to our charge is the privilege and prerogative of the clergy of the Church of England, but to be responsible for these things to the Vestry is to lose that independence of spirit, the loss of which must hinder the free course of the Spirit of God.

These are a few out of the many advantages which this country reaps by having an Established Church. There may be disadvantages when compared with the imagined freedom of the Church in the Colonies, or of the Nonconformist Churches at home. We are not, however, considering the disadvantages of Establishment, and I would only add in conclusion that whatever and however great those disadvantages may be, there are none of them which cannot be got over by reformation, instead of deformation. Disestablish the Church, and you can never re-establish, nor can you ever compensate for the loss that is bound to ensue.

I hope I have, in this brief space, said enough to show that the advantages of Establishment are so great that he would indeed be a misguided person who, seeing what these advantages are, would lightly throw them on one side, for the somewhat chimerical advantages of a Church severed from its lifelong partner, the sharer of its joys and sorrows, whose separation would leave it lacerated and bleeding. "Take the Church of England,"

said Mr. Gladstone, "out of the history of England, and the history of England becomes a chaos without order, without life, without meaning." Leave the Church of England where she is, support her, enrich her, enable her to reform, to carry on her noble work, unhindered and unimpeded, and you will retain the history of England an intelligent whole, and keep the nation alive to its spiritual birthright, with its face set towards the golden spot in the distance, and its heart atuned to that

"One far-off Divine event
Towards which the whole Creation moves."



Anglo- and Roman Catholic Responsibility for Truth.

BY G. G. COULTON, M.A.

THE popular conception of extreme High Churchmen as crypto-Romanists, however unjust, is really fostered by many of those who are loudest in their complaints. The attachment of certain ritualists to Roman uses, as such (including certain customs which have neither antiquity nor piety to recommend them), revolts even the majority of their own party. These extremists, moreover, as their principles draw them necessarily far closer to the Romanist than to the Nonconformist, are likewise tempted to follow the Romanist policy of setting "authority" above facts, which is simply the frank medieval preference of "edification" to veracity. Canon Rashdall's scathing phrase, "their appalling indifference to truth," will not seem too strong to any unprejudiced reader who labours to track the "Church Times" through some of its devious ways. With all its ability and fairness in many cases, that journal frequently commissions, and shields from open criticism, articles of startling unveracity. It hesitates no more than the "Tablet" to burke the plainest documentary evidence; while an article may appear to-day in the Anglican organ, and to-morrow as a

“Catholic Truth Society” pamphlet.¹ Moreover, both parties make the same unfair use of the anonymous press. The editor of the “Tablet” quotes from the “Saturday Review” as from the impartial judgment of an outsider, though he knows all the time that the unsigned article conceals a bitter Romanist controversialist. And an attentive reader can scarcely avoid the conviction that the anonymous F.S.A. of the “Church Times” and the Catholic Truth Society is identical with a critic who carries the same views and the same style into the pages of the “Athenæum.” Nor is he the only critic who is allowed to carry on a similar campaign under the shelter of that journal, the secular character of which ought to guarantee its impartiality. Nearly all its reviews of Church history are characterized by great unfairness. The advantage of anonymity is exploited to the utmost, facts and references are seldom given, nor does the editor admit even a few lines of protest when these are falsely given. Moreover, such references are not usually to contemporary documents, but to modern authorities, some of whom have little claim to distinction beyond the fact that they are also favourites with the “Church Times” and “Tablet.” One of these, however, is a writer of real eminence, Dr. James Gairdner; and, if here again I discuss one of his conclusions, it is only because these anonymous reviewers persist in confounding their own cause with his.

Let me give two specimens from the “Athenæum”; not as the worst—far from it—but as the most recent. On December 11 appeared a review of Mr. M. W. Patterson’s “History of the Church of England.” The reviewer’s main gravamen against the author is this: that he treats again, on the same scale, a subject already treated thirteen years ago by Wakeman; and that the present book, though written “carefully, judiciously,

¹ “The Suppression of the Monasteries” (Catholic Truth Society; one penny). The preface says: “The author is a well-known antiquary, who writes under the initials F.S.A., and it is thought that an estimate of the work of Henry VIII., coming as it does from an Anglican source, may carry weight with some who are unwilling to accept the testimony of Roman Catholics.” This pamphlet began life in the columns of the “Church Times.”

accurately," is less vigorous and enthusiastic than its predecessor. Wakeman was a very strong and extreme High Churchman, and vigour comes easily to a declared partisan. But to imply that the past thirteen years have disclosed no fresh facts of importance in Church history, and left no excuse for an impartial writer to cover the same ground again, is to betray either great ignorance or great prejudice. And when, after a paragraph of generalities, the reviewer descends for once to particulars, he is still more unfortunate. Tyndale's translation of the Bible restored to their literal sense certain words which had been mistranslated in the Vulgate. To choose, perhaps, the most flagrant instance: the Vulgate had altered the Greek *μετανοεῖν* into *pœnitentiam agere*, and thus perverted an inward change of mind into an outward doing of penance. Mr. Patterson naturally regrets that a scholar like Dr. Gairdner should condemn Tyndale for a change so imperative in itself, and so unreservedly approved by modern scholarship. This regret the "Athenæum" reviewer loftily condemns as a "temerarious assault," in which Mr. Patterson has only shown his own ignorance. No details or vouchers are given; if the readers had been allowed a glimpse of the facts, they would simply have laughed the reviewer out of court. "Catholic Truth" no more admits of historical argument in the pages of the "Athenæum" than in the "Tale of a Tub." A certain historian disagrees with Mr. Patterson. That historian "is a good man; he is a safe man; he is one of Us!" therefore Mr. Patterson is temerarious and ignorant. Yet Dr. Gairdner would be the last man to claim or enjoy this role of infallibility; he always thinks and writes with the modesty of a true scholar. Even in his latest publication, after admitting in the face of criticism that "there are faults all through the book," he makes very important retractations, which the "Athenæum" characteristically ignores. This brings me to my second point.

Having had for many years a strong interest in the monastic question, further quickened by the discovery in 1901 that Abbot Gasquet had no references to give for some of his most

important statements, and had given misleading references for others, I have been specially interested in the attitude of the "Athenæum" on this question. For some years it has gone strangely out of its way, not only to bolster up the monastic legend, but to vituperate those students who are trying to thresh out the real contemporary evidence and get at the facts. There was once a long disquisition on the subject, full of gross and easily verifiable misstatements, under the heading of "Fine Arts." This time I sent a brief protest, which, of course, was ignored. Another time a reviewer appealed to a MS. document among the Canterbury archives. I wrote asking him to give me, without prejudice to his anonymity, the briefest reference enabling me to look this document up: here again I got no answer. Meanwhile the same tirades, bolstered up with the same falsehoods and often bearing internal evidence of their connection with the "Church Times," appear regularly three or four times a year in the "Athenæum." The latest of these (would that it might be the last!) appeared on December 25, in a review of Mr. Jennings's "The Medieval Church and the Papacy." "Nor is there" (writes the critic) "any known evidence, beyond the vague generalities constantly reiterated, and once again enunciated by Mr. Jennings, to support the view that there was *a general decadence of the monastic standard towards the end of their days in England.*"¹ On the contrary, a distinctly opposite opinion is maintained by such competent students as Dr. Gairdner and Dr. Jessopp, as the result of their wide researches." It would be possible, I think, to find at least half a dozen parallels to this sentence, almost in the same words, within the last three or four volumes of the "Athenæum"; and it is really worth while at last to carry the case into a court where the real evidence may be discussed. With regard to Dr. Jessopp, the reviewer evidently refers only to his inaccurate edition of the Norwich Visitations, and knows nothing of his "Penny History" (S.P.C.K.), on p. 54

¹ Throughout this article, the italics by which contradictory statements are emphasized are my own.

of which Dr. Jessopp writes of the fifteenth century : " Among all classes the conviction was growing silently, but surely, that during the centuries that had passed since the Norman Conquest the monastic system had developed as a parasitic growth upon the Church, and that the Church could do without the monasteries." Again, he has not even read with care Dr. Gairdner's histories, which do not bear out his appeal. And, thirdly, he entirely ignores the article in the " Nineteenth Century and After " for July, 1909, in which Dr. Gairdner confesses to a significant change of views in the face of documentary evidence. " I fear," he writes, " that there is much to be said about the state of matters in a considerable number of monasteries, to show that they were no good schools of delicacy or chastity ;" and again, as if to give the lie direct to these parasites who would fain find a refuge in him from the verdict of medieval documents : " I must confess that my treatment of monasticism is exceedingly defective. . . . First, I feel that I should have said something about *such a well-known fact as the decline of monasticism before Henry VIII.'s time.*" It is not likely that the " Athenæum " reviewer, even if he should discover Dr. Gairdner's true views, would desist from his steady ignoring of the truth. In a journal which admits no protest on the point, he can safely go on quoting Dr. Gairdner as chief authority for statements which Dr. Gairdner himself would reprobate. The most successful policy for a controversialist who writes from an established position is to retract nothing. In this, the reviewer need only follow the steps of the master at whose feet he has evidently learned the monastic legend—Dr. Gasquet, Abbot President of the English Benedictines.

Space would fail me to enumerate even briefly one quarter of the patent misstatements, exploded by plain documentary evidence, which have been, not only not retracted, but even boldly republished without justification or apology by this Romanist champion, " our only historian," to quote a phrase from the " Manchester Guardian." I have already exposed

several of these in the first, sixth, and seventh of my "Medieval Studies."¹ Let me here quote two from a quite different field. In the "Dublin Review" of 1894 he printed an article designed to prove that the so-called Wycliffite translation of the Bible was really an ancient Catholic version, the credit for which had been usurped by Protestantism. This essay was answered by Dr. F. G. Kenyon, Mr. F. D. Matthew, and the "Church Quarterly" (October, 1900, and January, 1901). Apart from many other errors sufficiently serious to shake any author's credit, it was shown that the Abbot had based his case upon three separate misstatements of fact very startling in themselves, quite indefensible when once pointed out, and yet almost essential to his argument. I need only quote the last of these; the others may be found in the "Church Quarterly."

Richard Hun was condemned for heresy in 1514, and a Bible taken from him which, as both Sir Thomas More and the Bishop of London testified, contained in its Prologue at least thirteen heretical articles. On this case Abbot Gasquet lays great stress. If the so-called "Wycliffite Bible" lacks these heretical articles, then there is at any rate some small presumption that it may be an orthodox pre-Wycliffite production—a presumption small enough in itself, but of desperate importance in default of better evidence. He therefore declares roundly: "We shall look in vain, in the edition of Wycliffite scriptures published by Forshall and Madden, for *any trace* of these errors." Yet, incredible as it may seem, the first of these articles stares us in the face at the very beginning of the Prologue, and the other twelve, one after the other, in the succeeding pages of that document. Nor are they difficult of recognition; they occur often in the very words in which the condemning Bishop summarized them! It is only necessary here to give the first article, from the very books to which the Abbot himself appeals; the rest are equally plain.

¹ Simpkin, Marshall and Co. No. 1, "The Monastic Legend," is published separately.

Article condemned in Hun's Heretical Bible (Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," ed. Townsend, iv. 186).

"First, The said book damneth all holy canons, calling them *ceremonies and statutes of sinful men and uncunning*, and calleth the pope *Satan*, and *Antichrist*."

The same article on p. 3 of the book in which Abbot Gasquet declares it is *not* to be found. (Forshall and Madden, "Wycliffite Versions," vol. i.).

"It semith opyn heresie to seie, that the gospel with his treuthe and fredom suffisith not to salvacioun of cristen men without keyping of *ceremonyes and statutis of sinful men and unkunmynge, that ben maad in the tyme of Sathanas and of Antecrist*."

After an exposure like this, men wondered what Abbot Gasquet would do. Would he continue to sell an essay which so plainly said the thing that is not? Would he not publicly admit that he had rested his case on a series of very strange blunders? On the contrary, he has not only continued to sell these unabashed misstatements, but has deliberately reprinted his essay twice since, down to the very last falsehood. In the preface to the last edition he regrets that he has had no time to write more on this subject, though he has discovered fresh (but unspecified) evidence in his own favour! Was it not Newman who complained that, after a discussion with Cardinal Manning, he scarcely knew whether he stood on his head or his heels?

The personal aspects of a case like this are inconsiderable; the real significance lies in its public aspect, and its bearing on the prospects of religion in general. For Abbot Gasquet has many accomplices in his own Church. Having frequently drawn public attention to other Roman Catholic controversialists who permit statements to go under their names which they must know to be false, I will give only one more example here.

Alzog, a distinguished German Catholic, wrote a Church history which was translated by two Catholic dignitaries, Pabisch and Byrne, and warmly recommended to the faithful by two Archbishops. The translators, in their preface, protest with perhaps suspicious emphasis that they have made every effort to render the original faithfully. Yet, in fact, they have not only permitted themselves numerous falsifications throughout the book, but at the end, when we come to the Vatican Council, they have perpetrated a deliberate literary fraud.

The German Catholic's frankness had often been inconvenient in former cases: here it was simply impossible. Alzog had tried to write, not Catholic truth, but the truth; and here the translators were compelled to cast aside all reserve. Quite apart from added footnotes (in which they might fairly have expressed their dissidence), they have interpolated into the actual text, without the least warning to the reader, pages and pages of their own writing, in a sense directly contrary to that of Alzog.¹ This would naturally result in a series of obvious discrepancies, which they have carefully removed by suppressing large quantities of the original text.² By dint of these wholesale interpolations, falsifications, and omissions, they produce the desired effect. Alzog had summed up dead against the Papal policy, and his translators turn him into an approver. The original and the translation might be printed separately as controversial pamphlets on opposite sides. It was a bold stroke. But "Catholic Truth" required it, the Archbishops of Cincinnati and Baltimore approved it, and the faithful have now got a Church history after their own heart. The Pope, if he had time to look into these things, might cry with Jeremiah: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so."

Yet the Pope himself is not altogether guiltless in the matter. However vicious the system, he might break through it if he turned his full energies that way. His present efforts, however well-meant, simply tend to foster the evil. If President Pabisch or Abbot Gasquet had supported pertinaciously the

¹ Alzog's own text contains roughly 11,000 words; the "translation" contains 18,000.

² Here is a specimen of these omissions (Alzog, 9th edit., vol. ii., p. 529: it is part of the formal and official declaration of the German Bishops to pacify those who were disquieted by the rumour that Infallibility was about to be proclaimed). "Never and never will even an Ecumenical Council proclaim doctrines which stand in contradiction with the first principles of justice, with the rights of the State and her authorities, with civilization, and with the true interests of science"! and so on for ten lines more. The omitted passages, quite apart from others which are deliberately garbled, number at least eleven, and would probably fill more than four pages of the *CHURCHMAN*.

modern critical view of the Pentateuch, for example, then they would certainly have been severely punished ; and the Pope's undoubted right by Canon Law to burn them would have been tempered only by mercy and expediency. Yet the one may publicly state that he has been conscientiously faithful to an author whom he has in fact deliberately falsified ; the other may in cold blood assure the public that they will vainly search the Wycliffite Bible for sentences which, in fact, he knows to be there. And their reward is not only popularity with the multitude, but the highest official recognition. So long as these things are written and approved under the Pope's eyes—if only he had eyes for them—so long will partisans like the "Church Times" and "Athenæum" critics continue to circulate this base historical coin.



Bishop Gore on the Ministry.¹

BY THE EDITOR.

AT the present day there is no Bishop, perhaps no Churchman, whose words are more generally and more carefully heeded than those of the Bishop of Birmingham, whether by men who agree with him or by men who do not. And when he tells us that his motive in writing the present book has been the frequency of the assertion that recent criticism "has weakened and rendered untenable the position that the episcopate is the necessary and divinely given link of continuity and cohesion in the Church universal," we give all the more earnest attention to what he writes because of the vital importance of the subject. This must be the justification, if any be needed, of another article in our pages after the two that appeared in the last number. It seemed necessary, in view of the general attention given to the Bishop's book, to endeavour to convey some impressions of one who earnestly desired to see and to face the latest and best that

¹ "Orders and Unity." By Charles Gore, D.D. London: *John Murray*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

could be said for the school that Bishop Gore represents. It is, of course, impossible to touch on every point raised in this most interesting book, but an endeavour will be made to deal with the more important lines of thought discussed in its pages.

1. Almost the first point that strikes the reader is the difficulty of obtaining a clear idea of the Bishop's real attitude to the New Testament. There are statements that seem inconsistent and even contradictory. Thus, on page 4, we have the following striking testimony to the value and importance of the New Testament :

“The Anglican communion has a distinctive duty or opportunity, which is to realize and express a catholicism which is scriptural; which will admit nothing as essential in doctrine or order which is not verified on appeal to the documents of the New Testament. This is our charter of freedom. We cannot be content merely to appeal to the teaching of the Church, without reference to the supreme standard.”

This is an encouraging start, for it indicates a position which, if only it could be regarded as common to all Churchmen, would go far to resolve our difficulties. In the same way we read :

“There is not found in the New Testament any basis for the idea of a priestly class in the Church occupying any nearer position to God than the rest of their brethren, or brought into any more intimate relations to Him” (p. 65).

So, also, we have the following frank admission :

“Practically we must recognize that the presbyters and the bishops of the local church are the same persons” (p. 117).

And we are also told that the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century were vindicating certain Divine principles, “especially the principle of the supremacy of Scripture in the Church against the corruption of tradition, and the principle of human liberty against spiritual tyranny” (p. 185).

“It is upon their vindication of true principles—upon their passionate love of Scripture and their strong claim for spiritual liberty—that I seem to see the Divine blessing resting” (p. 185).

Yet suddenly the reader is arrested by observing certain statements that apparently run quite counter to these very frank and unqualified utterances :

"It must be admitted that if the documents of the New Testament stood alone . . . we should feel that various tendencies towards different kinds of organization were at work in the Christian Church, that the picture presented was confused, and that no decisive conclusion as to the form of the Christian ministry could be reached. But, in fact, the documents of the New Testament are only some of the documents which belong to a great historical movement" (p. 83).

And again :

"It has become evident that the Bible cannot stand alone. The books of the New Testament are products of the Church. . . . Moreover, the documents which are included in the canon are separated by no gulf from those just outside it" (p. 191).

On this latter point it may be worth while to compare the words of that great historical scholar, Professor Gwatkin :

"There is no more striking contrast in the whole range of literature than that between the creative energy of the Apostolic writers and the imitative poverty of the sub-Apostolic" ("Early Church History to A.D. 313," vol. i., p. 98).

And so we have two voices equally clear and distinct. The supremacy of Scripture could not have been more clearly or strikingly stated, and, moreover, certain distinctive Roman doctrines are expressly rejected by the Bishop because they do not and cannot fulfil this requirement (pp. 197 *et seq.*). And yet on those questions which the Bishop himself favours and regards as essential, even though he admits that they are not found in Scripture, he is compelled to bring in the Church and say that "the documents of the New Testament are only some of the documents which belong to a great historical movement." Can this position be regarded as satisfactory? If the documents of the New Testament are, to use the Bishop's own phrase, "the final testing-ground of doctrine," then assuredly they must stand alone, and cannot be simply "merged in a miscellaneous mass of authorities" (Gore, "Body of Christ," p. 223).

2. It is almost equally difficult to appreciate the force of Bishop Gore's argument for episcopacy. He starts by saying that

"the Christian Church, as it appeared in history for 1,500 years, had for its officers bishops, priests, and deacons" (p. 75).

Of course, everything depends upon what is meant by these terms, since, on another page, the Bishop has already admitted (p. 117) that in the New Testament presbyters and Bishops "are the same persons." There is something lacking in the logic here. Then we are told that (p. 76) Christ instituted the ministry in the persons of His Apostles, and that this ministry was transmitted to a succession of persons down the generations. Here, again, we have statements for which no New Testament proof is given. In particular there is one difficult question, which, so far as I know, is not considered by Bishop Gore in this or in his earlier book. Was each of the Twelve competent to ordain and thus transmit an Apostolic ministry? Or could they exercise their authority only as they agreed among themselves? That is to say, if each Apostle could have been the fount of an Apostolic Church, would there not have been twelve Apostolic Churches? The Roman Catholic Church is logical in vesting all authority in St. Peter; but if it should be said that authority was given, not to the Twelve individually, but collectively, we are compelled to ask for the historical evidence that the Twelve ever formed themselves into a body or college to ordain successors. Then, again, does the laying-on of hands involve transmission or commission? Dr. Sanday seems to us decidedly truer to fact when he tells us that the latter, rather than the former, is the correct idea. Indeed, Dr. Sanday says that "it really cannot mean" transmission ("Conception of Priesthood," p. 167).

Another and curious result of Bishop Gore's tendency to raise, as it seems to us, false issues is seen when he speaks of the appointment of Matthias as to an "episcopate," or "office of supervision" (p. 86). Even the quotation from the Psalms does not warrant the use of a term that really begs the question, for the "episcopate" of Judas has no real relation to the question of episcopacy in the Apostolic Church. It would seem to be in every way better to avoid terms which are not necessary and tend to prejudge the issue. Again, we are told that

"only those of the superior or Apostolic order lay on hands to supply the gift of the Holy Spirit" (p. 162).

But we cannot help asking, What was the meaning of the laying-on of hands by Ananias, by which the Holy Spirit was given to Saul of Tarsus?

Of course, Ignatius forms one of the strongest arguments in favour of Bishop Gore's position. But there are two points which are overlooked in the consideration. In all the references of Ignatius to episcopacy there is no suggestion of an episcopal *succession*, and certainly nothing *diocesan*. As Dr. Sanday said many years ago, the earliest *episcopos* was more like the rector of the mother parish of a large town than anything else. We believe it is no anachronism, but true to everything we know of the Ignatian epistles, to say that their testimony to episcopacy would be quite adequately explained on the basis of a purely congregational episcopacy, without any thought of succession.

3. It is also very difficult to follow, and still more to accept, the Bishop of Birmingham's argument for priesthood in the ministry. He starts with the idea of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, and from this argues that the Church as a whole is in some senses prophetic, priestly, and kingly. But when the argument is narrowed down to the officials of the Church, the theory begins to halt very seriously. We are told that "in all its functions the Church acts through and with its appointed officers" (p. 153), though this can hardly be taken literally in the sense that the Church as such cannot perform any functions apart from appointed officers. But what is still more striking is the Bishop's statement (p. 153), couched in these words: "*Therefore we should expect to find the ministers or officers of the Church in some special sense prophets, priests, and kings*" (italics are mine). Is not this a dubious and illogical conclusion? In whatever sense the Church is prophetic and royal, in that sense only can we predicate priestliness of it.

The real question, which does not seem to be clearly answered by the Bishop, is as to the unique sense in which the ministry is a priesthood. He agrees with Dr. Denny that there can be no Christian priest mediating between God and man, and he fully admits that the title "priest" (*ιερεύς, sacerdos*) was

not at first applied to the ministers of the Church. But he does not seem to us to give due attention to the position of Lightfoot, lately confirmed by Gwatkin, that it is to Cyprian that we owe the earliest use of *ιερεὺς* for the Christian ministry. Yet even Cyprian applied it to the Bishops only, and not to the presbyters. The best way of testing whether the Christian ministry is a real priesthood is by the application to it of the classical and Scriptural definition of a priest in Heb. v. 1: "For every high priest taken from among men is *ordained for men in things pertaining to God*, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." A priest represents man to God, just as a prophet represents God to man. Now, in what sense does any Christian minister represent his lay-brethren before God as distinct from their own position as priests? Bishop Gore says: "This is a question of words" (p. 161). True; but, as Lightfoot says:

"Words express things; and the silence of the Apostles still requires an explanation" ("Philippians," p. 264).

One other illustration of the Bishop's treatment of this point must be given. First of all he says that

"it may well have been left for the Church to decide, according to the wisdom given to it, as to the precise allocation of functions. Its decision, as the New Testament would have us believe, would have heavenly sanction" (p. 163).

And then immediately follow these words:

"We must conclude that when once it was established that Christ was a priest—the great High Priest—and His Church a priestly body, it became inevitable and right that the ordained officers of that body should be called priests" (p. 163).

It is difficult to follow this argument, which commences with "It may well have been left for the Church to decide," and then takes it for granted that it *was* the decision of the Church, "early, unanimous, and final," when we know, on the authority of Lightfoot and Gwatkin, that history gives no warrant for such a contention.

4. Not the least interesting and significant part of the Bishop's book is the frequent illustration afforded of the fallacy

of *non sequitur*. Thus, we are told first of all that the Apostles were the centre of unity, and then immediately after the ministry is said to have been derived "from the Apostles and Apostolic men" (p. 145). Indeed, the whole of that passage is almost a succession of instances of *non sequitur*. Again, it is urged that "the fundamental question for us is whether really Christ and His Apostolic interpreters laid down any law or principle of Church organization" (p. 4). Surely this is not the question. The fundamental issue is whether Christ and His Apostles laid down *any particular law* or principle of organization, and especially whether they laid down the law or principle for which the Bishop contends. Again, we are told that, as Jesus Christ was Prophet, Priest, and King, in some sense all the three elements of His pastoral office were to be carried out among men by His disciples (p. 35). But this will not logically carry us to the special priesthood required by Bishop Gore's theory. Of the silence of Ignatius as to episcopacy in writing to Rome, we read that, "though he has no occasion to mention the Church officers, yet it is inconceivable that he could have held the ideas which he did about the episcopate if he had had any doubt that Rome had a Bishop, as well as presbyters and deacons" (p. 125). Yet all history points to the absence of the episcopate so early in Rome. Perhaps the most striking instance of the Bishop's tendency to the fallacy of *non sequitur* is the illustration of physical generation (p. 169) which he uses in opposition to Canon Hay Aitken's contention as to the danger of the mechanical idea in religion. How the Bishop could have employed this illustration is surprising. He says that he confronts his objector with a "staggering problem." The real difficulty, however, is to account for the Bishop's apparent inability to see that the illustration is far from carrying the conclusion that he wishes to draw from it.

5. We are also greatly surprised to observe the Bishop's apparent inability to appreciate the position of his opponents. Thus he believes (p. 16) that the main obstacle which his view of the ministry has to encounter lies in the fact that the

unworthiness of the ministers has so often prejudiced men's minds against the very idea of their office. Will the Bishop allow us to assure him that this is absolutely incorrect? The main obstacle to his theory of the Apostolical succession is the fact that it is both absent from and really opposed to Scripture, to say nothing of history. And the objection to it would be just as valid if all the ministers of the centuries had been personally worthy men. Again, he speaks of

"a cheap philanthropic Gospel, unaccompanied by any careful or exacting doctrine about God and sin and redemption, which plays a great part in popular Protestantism in England and America" (p. 24).

We wonder where the Bishop obtained his information on this point. So far as can be seen it is almost the reverse of true. Like many others of his school, the Bishop confuses between rationalistic Protestantism and Evangelical Protestantism, but he must know that the popular Protestantism of England and America is very largely of the latter rather than of the former kind, whatever may be said of Germany. And of such it is certainly not true to say that it preaches a Gospel without any careful or exacting doctrine about God and sin and redemption.

Popular Protestantism is also charged with laying such emphasis on the allegiance of the individual soul to Christ as to make all corporate fellowship "a subsequent matter of voluntary organization" (p. 40). Yet only a page before he describes Protestantism in these words :

"Those who thus believe and are saved find themselves bound in obedience to Christ to combine—for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments and for mutual assistance" (p. 39).

If, therefore, "they are bound," how can it be a matter of "voluntary organization"?

The Bishop also says that

"where Protestantism is the prevailing influence, people pass from one Church to another, as they are attracted by this preacher or that, this service or that, without any constraining sense of obligation to one body" (p. 189).

We should greatly value proofs of this tendency, for there are certainly very many places in which Evangelical Protestantism

is "the prevailing influence" where there is a devoted attachment to the particular organization with which the people happen to be associated. Then, again, we are told of "the decay of the distinctive forms and barriers of Protestantism" (p. 205), as though Protestantism, as expressive of the cardinal tenets of Evangelical Churchmen, Presbyterians, and Methodists, to say nothing of other bodies, is undergoing a process of disintegration. Perhaps the most surprising statement about Protestantism is the charge that its general tendency

"is to seek refuge from the difficulties of thought in the opportunities of philanthropic or evangelistic action" (p. 220).

Here, again, it is difficult to believe that the Bishop is speaking from first-hand or intimate knowledge. We should have thought that philanthropy, at any rate, was quite as generally associated with members of the Christian Social Union, who are in general sympathy with Bishop Gore's ecclesiastical position. But if the Bishop thinks that Protestant evangelistic and philanthropic work is due to a desire to seek refuge from the difficulties of thought, we believe that he is altogether mistaken. On the contrary, it is simply because Evangelicalism has a gospel of redemption that it is able and anxious to do evangelistic and philanthropic work. Was not the great Lord Shaftesbury a proof of this? And what of Moody, Barnardo, and others?

There are other points of importance in the book which space does not allow us to discuss. We must content ourselves by affirming our strong conviction that the Bishop is endeavouring to maintain an impossible position, and we do so on three grounds.

1. It is not true to the New Testament, and if we accept that as supreme, the Bishop's contentions fail utterly and hopelessly. In a recent review of Professor Gwatkin's book in the *Times*, the writer, while admitting that the argument from silence is not necessarily and always conclusive, yet argues that the High Churchman

"has still to deal with what to the plain man may seem the most formidable silence of all. Is it conceivable that, if such a tremendous obligation had

been laid upon the Church at the outset for all time, it would simply be not disproved by the documents of the earliest age, that the ecclesiastical tradition should not be confirmed by any express declaration in the recorded words of the Founder, or in the writings of His first disciples?"

2. Is the Bishop's position true to history? There is a hiatus between the documents of the New Testament and the Bishop's reading of the history of the second and third centuries. Lightfoot's view is as true to-day as ever :

"The episcopate was formed, not out of the apostolic order, by localization, but out of the presbyteral, by elevation; and the title which originally was common to all came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them" ("Philippians," p. 196).

The words of the *Spectator* in reviewing the Bishop's book are well worthy of attention :

"It strikes us as almost profane to inquire whether such a mechanical theory of the transmission of grace can claim authority from the lips of Christ Himself. Certainly it cannot. Nor has it any support in any Pauline principle. In defending it, the Bishop appeals, not to principles, but to deductions from supposed historical facts. . . . And we may add that a theory supposed to be based upon Scripture which met with no acceptance from Lightfoot, Westcott, or Hort, comes to us already more than half condemned."

3. Not least of all the Bishop's position is not true to life to-day. Quite recently a valuable pamphlet has been issued by a well-known Presbyterian minister in Dublin,¹ which is well worthy of attention by members of the Church of England. Mr. Gardiner speaks with the utmost frankness as to the conditions of reunion, and in so doing he claims the following for his own Church :

"Any proposals for union which have any chance even of being considered must proceed on the assumption that we respect one another's position. Now, I say, from the bottom of my heart, that I do respect yours. I respect the learning, devotion, and earnestness of your Bishops and clergy. I admire the piety of your people. I find myself at one with you in heart and sympathy. But you must remember our position. We are not much inferior to you in point of numbers in Ireland. If you have half of England, we have eight-tenths of Scotland. And we outnumber you in Wales. We have all the Reformed Churches of the Continent, except the Lutherans, who in

¹ Lecture on "Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism." By the Rev. F. Stuart Gardiner, M.A. Dublin: Eason and Son. Price 6d.

some respects are more akin to us. We are much more numerous than you in America, and in the Colonies we are not much behind you. We have successful missions all over the world in no way inferior to yours. Our theologians and scholars are not less distinguished than yours. You have saints. So have we. You have seals to your ministry. So have we. You have evidence of Christ's presence in your Church. Not less have we. You have episodes in your Church history which are heroic and which thrill the blood when they are recalled. So have we. And I beg of you to remember that we are proud of our Churchmanship."

And Dr. Sparrow Simpson, a member of our Church, who quite evidently sympathizes with Bishop Gore's general position, recently spoke in the following candid terms, in a sermon preached at Westminster Abbey :

"We are, perhaps, the most undisciplined Church in Christendom. We have not been able to hold the spiritual movement of our nation together, nor blend in one the varieties of the Christian type. We have seen them part from us, one after another, to their loss and our own, erecting divisions outside our borders, rather than communities within; describing themselves as standing protests against our doctrine or our discipline; weakening the spiritual force of Christianity upon this nation. And then we invite them to reunite with a Church conspicuous for its own divisions and clamorous with discordant gospels."

In the face of these facts, can it be argued that non-episcopal Churches are ever likely to accept the Bishop's view as true to facts? As Dr. Stalker said some months ago in our columns, Presbyterianism can only consider the question of reunion on the basis of absolute equality in regard to ministerial validity.

To conclude. If Bishop Gore's book represents all that can be said for the position he maintains, then we are bound to add that it is far weaker than we had supposed, and we are not at all surprised that the Rev. J. H. Jowett, in referring to it the other day at Hull, should have described it as giving away Bishop Gore's case entirely. His statement of the position will certainly not satisfy the extreme men on his own side, for there are too many significant admissions in it. The fact is, that from the days of the Bishop's Bampton Lectures there have been two very distinct voices in his utterances. One voice bears witness to his early education, training, and influences; the other testifies to the impression made upon him by scholarship,

which, of course, he cannot ignore, and which he finds it very difficult to controvert. When he makes such significant admissions to the scholarship of men like Lightfoot, Hort, Gwatkin, and Lindsay, the admissions go far to destroy the very essence of his position.

We close by saying that, in our judgment, the doctrine of the Apostolical succession is at the basis of all our present-day differences. It was the foundation of the Tractarian Movement, and is still at the root of all ecclesiastical controversies. It behoves us to concentrate on this point and meet it fairly and squarely. Scripture, history, and experience, are undoubtedly on the side of the non-sacerdotal idea of the ministry, and the more thoroughly the Bishop's contentions are tested by this threefold criterion, the more impossible will the position appear. It is in vain that the Bishop endeavours to meet the objection to his theory, which is shown by the fact that the non-episcopal Churches manifest in abundance the fruit of the Spirit. To say that Protestants were rebellious against one Divine law and yet fearless champions of others is utterly illogical in view of his statement that Apostolical succession is "an essential principle of the Church's continuous life." If, therefore, non-episcopal Protestantism is without an *essential* principle, how is it possible to speak of the presence of the fruit of the Spirit in their midst? Those who know their New Testament, who believe both in primitive and post-Reformation Church History, and who rejoice in spiritual life wherever they find it, will endorse the words of the *Spectator* in the review already referred to :

"Although in the sixteenth century men might well have doubted whether the Apostolical succession were not necessary, as an essential principle, to a life of grace, after an experiment of three centuries they can doubt no longer. Churches which have, if any have, an Apostolical succession may give God thanks for it ; if they have it not, they need not repine."



The Missionary World.

BY THE REV. A. J. SANTER,
Formerly C.M.S. Missionary in Bengal.

IN the C.M.S. *Awake* for March is an interesting account of the diligence of the Cree Indians, in the Diocese of Rupert's Land, North-West Canada, in their attendance at the Church services. The Rev. T. J. Dobbs writes: "Men and women, well advanced in years, do not think it any hardship to walk four or five miles over roads which the average person, living in a civilized centre, has no conception of. In many places these 'roads' are calf-deep with water, and often ankle-deep in the 'dry' spot, yet even so long a walk over roads which would make most people shrink from undertaking the journey does not prevent those dear old people from attending at church. In this respect they set an example well worthy of imitation, for they do not deem it a hardship to undergo the journey to hear the Word of the Master whose Name they profess."



A cause for heartfelt thanksgiving is to be found in the awakening of the Syrian Church to a sense of responsibility in the matter of missionary work. From the same source as the above paragraph we learn that "every year a Convention of Syrian Christians is held in Travancore. Last year it was noteworthy for the stress laid on foreign missionary work. A sphere for such work in the Nizam's Dominions has been assigned to the Reformed Syrian Church. Some funds have been contributed, and search is being made for men willing and qualified to go out as missionaries."



Encouraging news comes from the Hill country of South India. The Rev. A. N. C. Storrs says that there are signs of a real movement among the hill tribes of the Wynaad towards Christianity. He writes: "Early in December I visited three Kurumber villages, in each of which the men joined in prayer with us, kneeling down on the ground, and with apparent earnestness repeating every petition. In the first village we visited the headman spontaneously said, before engaging in prayer: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the only God.' To prove their sincerity they broke off the charms which were tied round their children's necks and threw them away, and the headman promised he would build a little prayer-house."



In the extracts from Bishop Ingham's diary, written on his visit to China, and given in the *C.M.S. Gazette* for March, he says that he learnt the following most interesting fact from a number of the directors (both European and Chinese) of the Young Men's Christian Association in Shanghai: "The United States Government has lately returned to the Chinese Government the 11,000,000 dollars in gold that was paid over to them as Boxer indemnity, and the Chinese Government, as an act of appreciation, has decided to spend this money on Chinese students, at the rate of £100 a year, who will be studying at American Colleges and Universities. This is to go on

until 1940. It means that in that time 1,800 Chinese students, destined for important places in China, will have spent four years or more in America under Western and often Christian influence."



From Uganda comes the news that the Kabaka, or King of Uganda, is being prepared for confirmation. The Rev. E. S. Daniell, who has the pleasing task in hand, writes: "I am now going twice a week to his house to teach him, and am taking for the course the Church Catechism and the Life of our Lord. I am using Dr. Eugene Stock's well-known lessons on the latter as a guide. The Bishop hopes to hold the confirmation about Easter. The young Kabaka is a very intelligent, apt, and keen pupil."

Mr. Daniell asks for prayer "that the Kabaka may be so strengthened and taught by the Holy Spirit that as he grows older he may grow deeper in his allegiance to Christ the King."



There are those who would fain sneer at the thought of Christian missionaries ever obtaining converts from Islam. The following news from Old Cairo, Egypt, is a sufficient refutation. The Rev. Canon MacInnes wrote on New Year's Eve: "There has fallen to Mr. Gairdner and myself a greater number than ever before of classes for Moslem inquirers, of whom we have been privileged to baptize eight, all of them grown men, in addition to three young women baptized in connection with the hospital at Old Cairo. We are anxious not to lay undue stress on mere numbers, and it should be borne in mind that at least four of these converts have been in touch with us for two years or more—one of them had been at heart a Christian for considerably longer—but at the same time it is highly encouraging to think that eleven adult Moslems have been admitted into the Church of Christ after long and careful preparation, and that this is nearly twice as many as we have ever before received during the course of a single year."



From Persia also come encouraging reports of work among Moslems. Dr. D. W. Carr writes: "It is quite unusual in Mahomedan lands to find a people *asking* both for a teacher and a doctor, as the Bakhtiaris have been doing. They are a fine race, and they have risen to a position of great power and authority in the country. It is a call which is urgent, *very* urgent, and an opening which, if not entered at once or in the near future, may, and probably will, be permanently closed against us."

Dr. Catherine Ironside, writing from Ispahan, Persia, also says: "Never before has there been such a clear call to 'go forward,' or such an opportunity to do so in Persia." And she continues: "Certainly, whichever way we look, Persia's doors are opening wide for the teaching of the Gospel. A great door and effectual . . . and there are many adversaries. Yes, and if Christ's servants do not soon enter the great open door, the adversaries very quickly will."



Literary Notes.

THE fifth volume of Grove's "Dictionary of Music" is nearly completed. Mr. Fuller Maitland has been devoting all his energies to the volume, so that it may be ready this spring. It is a valuable work, and evidences careful editing. Messrs. Macmillan and Co. are, of course, the publishers. They are also issuing Professor Lowell's new work, "The Evolution of Worlds." This author is making for himself quite a following in England. Certainly he brings into his studies and estimates points of view which are highly original and suggestive. The same house are issuing the Bampton Lectures for 1909; "The Faith and Modern Thought," by Rev. W. Temple, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer, Queen's College, Oxford, to which Professor Sadler writes an Introduction; Canon Henson's volume on "The Liberty of Prophesying"; and "The Working Faith of the Social Reformer," by Dr. Henry Jones. The concluding volumes of "A History of the English Church," edited by the late Dean Stephens and the Rev. Dr. William Hunt, are approaching completion. They cover the nineteenth century, and are written by Mr. F. Warre-Cornish, Vice-Provost of Eton College. The titles of the six lectures contained in the Rev. W. Temple's volume are: "The Ground of Our Belief in God," "Revelation and Faith," "Historical Basis of Christianity," "The Person of Christ," "The Atonement and Problem of Evil," "The Spirit, the Church, and the Life to Come." These lectures were delivered under the auspices of the London Intercollegiate Christian Union. The aim of the lectures is to state in the ordinary language of contemporary thought some of the main doctrines of the Christian faith, and some of the arguments by which they are to be supported.



The Bampton Lectures for 1909 were delivered by the Rev. Walter Hobbhouse, the subject being "The Church and the World in Idea and History." The treatment is historical throughout. The aim of the lectures is not to examine the organization of the Church in detail, but to treat of the Church in its relations to the world, in theory and in experience, from the age of the Apostles to the present day, not merely as a speculative inquiry, but with a view to throwing light upon practical problems.



Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons, whose "Heroes of the Reformation" series—a collection of biographies which might well be placed alongside of that other popular and well-written series, the "Heroes of the Nations"—is having a fresh lease of life since the reduction in price, are issuing at once a volume dealing with Martin Luther's political opinions. Most people, naturally, do not associate the great reformer with many political interests, yet most of his actions in life might be said to have been based upon political beginnings, developing, as they rose into important structures, into pure dogma. Dr. Luther Hess Waring has prepared a volume in which he discusses Luther's attitude in matters political, and he will present a

systematic account of Luther's utterances on the character, origin, function, and responsibilities of the State. The work should find many readers.

There are several other interesting publications coming from the same firm likely to interest CHURCHMAN readers. One is entitled "Above Life's Turmoil," by James Allen, who wrote that thoughtful little book "The Mastery of Destiny." In his new work Mr. Allen shows how, through self-knowledge and self-discipline, we may rise above the turmoil of the world, and how, without shirking the duties of life, we can fortify ourselves against anxiety. "Criminal Man, According to Lombroso," by Gina Lombroso Ferrero (Signora Guglielmo Ferrero), is another, and it should prove a very readable book. The author sums up the ideas of the Modern Penal School, originated by her father, the late Professor Cesare Lombroso. Mr. Stanton Davis Kirkham, author of "The Philosophy of Self-Help," has also written a book for Messrs. Putnam, entitled "Resources: An Interpretation of the Well-founded Life."

The Rev. John P. Peters, D.D., Canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, has prepared for publication a volume entitled "Modern Christianity; or the Plain Gospel Modernly Expounded." Dr. Peters' chapters give his views which are admirably suggested by the title, and among the subjects dealt with are: The Birth of God, The Resurrection of God, The Mystery of Birth, Death, The Real Heaven, The Real Hell, The Judgment, Forgiveness of Sins, Palaces and Slums, Tainted Money, Revolutionary Christianity.

The next few volumes expected in Messrs. Duckworth's "Studies in Theology" are the Rev. William Cunningham's "Christianity and Social Questions," the Rev. George Buchanan Gray's "A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament," and Dr. Fairbairn's "An Encyclopædia of Theology." The volumes in this collection of studies in theology are both critical and constructive. In every instance bibliographies will be provided for the guidance of those who wish to pursue more extended studies in the problems of Faith and Morals dealt with in these manuals. The price is 2s. 6d. net per volume. The same publishers are also issuing a new series entitled "The Readers' Library," a series of copyright volumes of individual merit, and includes only such books as have permanent value—the works of authors of repute, such as Leslie Stephen, Richard Jefferies, Stopford Brooke, W. H. Hudson, and Hilaire Belloc. The volumes selected are those likely to be acceptable to the reader of critical taste, and hitherto only obtainable at prices prohibitive to the book-buyer of moderate means. "Studies in Poetry," by the Rev. Stopford Brooke, is the latest addition. The little volume concerns itself with Blake, Scott, Shelley, and Keats. Probably there is no better critic of poetry living than Mr. Stopford Brooke.

The Rev. Gerald S. Davies has written a book on the "Renaissance Tombs in Rome to the End of the Fifteenth Century." It is designed to supply a need which has been much felt by students and travellers. Up to

the present time no English writer has dealt at all completely with the subject. The author has divided his work into two parts. The first portion is devoted to a sketch of the development of sculpture in Rome from 1100 to 1500. The last part contains a chronological list and an arrangement of tombs under the heading of churches, with short descriptions and biographies. This is being published by Mr. Murray.



Messrs. Longmans have just issued Mr. R. H. Malden's "Foreign Missions: Being a Study of Some Principles and Methods in the Expansion of the Christian Church." Mr. Malden is Classical Lecturer at Selwyn College, Cambridge. Professor John Edward Lloyd, who holds the Chair of History in the University College of North Wales, Bangor, has finished a work of considerable importance. It will also be shortly issued by Messrs. Longmans. It is a two-volume "History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest." Prehistoric Wales, Roman Wales, the early institutions of the Welsh, the political divisions of the country, the Norman invasions and settlements, and the achievements of the more powerful Princes, are successively described. Special sections are devoted to the history of the Welsh Church. The relations between England and Wales are traced at each stage, and the reaction of Welsh upon English history is illustrated.



The fourth and fifth volumes of "The Expositor's Greek Testament," which is being so admirably edited by Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D., are expected shortly. The same editor is also issuing a new series of "Little Books on Religion." The great circulation of these famous little books on religion shows that there is a wide demand for small, well-written, and comprehensive publications among readers within whose reach the larger works do not always come. A new shilling series has just been inaugurated with a number of fresh volumes. Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton—the publishers of these books—are also issuing the fifth edition of Dr. Nicoll's "Seven Words from the Cross," and the seventh edition of the same author's "The Key of the Grave."



Canon Henson has just published a new volume of sermons, entitled "Westminster Sermons," through Messrs. James Clarke and Co. The same publishers have also recently issued "Church Questions of Our Time," by D. J. B. Paton.



From America comes Mr. O. S. Marden's—of "Pushing to the Front" fame—little book entitled "Do It to a Finish." It is based upon the author's idea of a person's duty to his or her work, and of doing it thoroughly and doing it well. The editor of *Success* knows how to make his sermons attractive, and this pamphlet, which appears in a series called "What is Worth While," is no exception to the rule. Another American book, and a very important one, is Mr. S. H. Church's "Religious Progress in America: Progress and Achievement of One Hundred Years," an address delivered before the Centennial Convention of the Christian Church at the Carnegie

Music Hall, Pittsburg. Dr. Church has written several other books, notably a very excellent biography of "Cromwell."



Another item from the other side of the Atlantic is the announcement of Dr. Charles W. Eliot's "The Religion of the Future."



"The Road to Happiness" is a nice title, and a journey we are always trying to make. Miss Constance Williams has translated the book from the French of Yvonne Sarcey. The little volume is made up of a series of delightful letters, in which much wise counsel may be found concerning the way we must comport ourselves on this much-sought-for road. And there are many practical suggestions in it, too. We hear the book has achieved a great success in France, and we are not surprised. The title is inviting, and it seems that the inside of the book is equally attractive.



We are glad to learn that the Book-Room at the National Church League, in consequence of the great success which has attended it, has had to be enlarged. The value of the work which this department has been able to carry out, under the able supervision of Mr. G. C. Parkhurst Baxter, has been of so definite a character that greater space has had to be acquired for the increased stock consequent upon the demand for Evangelical and other literature. The department recently completed arrangements for a Memorial Edition of the late Rev. N. Dimock's works. The first volumes to be issued are: "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," "Christian Unity," and "Our One Priest on High." These are all published at 1s. 6d. net each. Later will be issued "The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium" (2s. net), to which the Bishop of Durham has written a dedicatory notice. From the Book-Room have also been recently issued "Class Notes, for the Use of Candidates for Confirmation" (price 2d.), by the Rev. Henry Edwards, with an introduction by the Bishop of Newcastle, and a small, but very ably written, pamphlet on "Incense," by Mr. W. Guy Johnson.



The Dean of Worcester is publishing a volume of lectures entitled "The Clergy and Social Life."



"The Cell of Self-Knowledge," with introductions and notes by Mr. E. G. Gardner, is shortly appearing. The volume is a reprint of seven English mystical treatises printed originally in 1521.



The Bishop of Chichester has written a preface to a new Lenten work by the Rev. F. L. H. Millard, M.A., entitled "Last Words: An Indication of the Glory of the Cross." Mr. Stock is the publisher. He is also issuing "A Three Hours' Service on the Seven Words from the Cross," by the Rev. J. E. Eckersley, M.A.



Notices of Books.

CONFIRMATION IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By the Right Rev. Bishop Chase.
London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d.

Anything coming from the pen of the Bishop of Ely deserves and demands the most careful consideration, and we therefore took up this little book with no ordinary interest. In discussing the subject of the title the Bishop endeavours to limit his attention to the New Testament in order to review the evidence therein supplied as to the place of Confirmation in the life and thought of the Apostolic Church. He says that the two great *momenta* of the Christian dispensation are the Incarnation and Pentecost, and that these are brought into contact with the individual in Baptism and Confirmation. The Divine side in the Sacraments is the essential thing, and Dr. Chase considers that the ratification of baptismal vows is only an accidental element in our Confirmation Service. He comes to the conclusion that Confirmation had a recognized place in Apostolic Churches, and consisted of two essential elements: prayer for the Holy Spirit, and the outward sign of benediction by the laying-on of hands. This laying-on of hands was the work of Apostles, and led to the Apostolic gift of the Holy Spirit. We naturally turned with particular interest to see how the Bishop would deal with the episode of Ananias and St. Paul, and we find that he hesitates to regard this laying-on of hands as a formal act of Confirmation (p. 30). He can only arrive at his conclusion about this work being limited to Apostles by regarding the case of Ananias as "abnormal," and for the purpose of the argument of this book to be set on one side (p. 109). This is not reassuring, because a principle which admits of such an exception does not strengthen the case for the Bishop's contention, but in reality tends to undermine it. Another consideration which is vital to the author's position is that Confirmation is essentially the same now as in Apostolic days, from which we are to understand that Bishops now represent the Apostles in regard to Confirmation. But this is exactly what one great historical authority, Professor Gwatkin, says is not the case, and, so far as we can discover, there is no adequate and valid historical evidence for so close and essential a connection between Apostles and Bishops. Dr. Chase apparently interprets all instances of the laying-on of hands found in the New Testament of Confirmation, in which way he would also explain the "sealing" of Ephesians i. Indeed, if the exegesis of this book is true, Confirmation was a very much more prominent feature in the Apostolic Church than the vast majority of scholars of all schools have been accustomed hitherto to see. But we cannot for a moment think that the Bishop has made out his case, or that it will commend itself to the judgment of the majority of exegetical and historical scholars. On particular passages there is very much that is suggestive and helpful in comment, and, apart from the main contentions of the book, there is no little spiritual profit in the teaching. But, taking the book as a whole, we are compelled to say that it is not convincing, for it does not accord with the most natural exegesis of the New Testament, and the most obvious interpretation of the history of the Apostolic Church. And, certainly, the view here given of our Church of England rite of

Confirmation, and the criticisms on our Service, would seem to show that the position adopted is not warranted by the best authorities on the history and contents of our Prayer-Book.

THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF MEDIATION. By the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. London: *Sheffington*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

This is another of those scholarly works for which we are so much indebted to Dr. Oesterley. It deals with a subject of no slight interest, and one of which the author has made himself thoroughly master—the doctrine of Mediation in Jewish literature, ancient and modern. Those of us who have made excursions into Rabbinical writings can appreciate the zeal and energy and patience that have led Dr. Oesterley to wade through so much that is certainly not in itself attractive in style, language, or matter, in order to discover what these writers thought on such a momentous subject. After a brief account of the Old Testament teaching regarding Mediation, the author deals ably with what is said about the matter in the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha, the Targums, later Rabbinical literature, and the Jewish Prayer-Book. He then treats of the modern Jewish attitude towards the doctrine, dealing separately with the Orthodox, the Reform, and the semi-Reform parties. He shows that “in respect of the doctrine of Mediation, historic Judaism offers much that tends in the direction of Christianity,” and that only after their rejection of Christ did the Jews develop their thoughts in quite another direction. The teaching of the Pseudepigrapha (Enoch, Testament of Abraham, etc.) is strikingly summed up in pp. 48, 49. Our author deals lucidly with the Metatron (*μετάθροπος*), the *Mémra*-doctrine, the “Paraclete” in Jewish literature. In summing up his conclusions he traces belief in Mediation to man’s conception of God and his sense of sin (p. 187), whence the doctrine must inevitably rise in some form. Regarding modern Judaism Dr. Oesterley’s language is both frank and courteous. We have been struck with the almost Mohammedan character of Rabbinical Judaism. The appendices are very full of information, and there is a good index.

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

LOTUS BUDS. By Amy Wilson-Carmichael. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 14s. 6d. net.

Another missionary book by Miss Carmichael, whose former works have been so fruitful in blessing. This time she depicts the little temple children of India, whom she appropriately calls “Lotus Buds.” In the course of thirty-six fascinating chapters she brings before our minds the sadness and horrors connected with child-life, and at the same time the glorious possibilities of the same childhood when brought under the influence of loving, Christlike missionary effort. Miss Carmichael wields a graphic pen, and all lovers of children, to whom in particular the book is dedicated, will be greatly interested in this account of missionary effort for Christ’s little ones. The sadness of their condition goes right to the heart, while the hopefulness consequent upon missionary effort stirs us to prayer and sympathy. The get-up of the book is very attractive, and fifty finely executed photogravures add immensely to its value and beauty. As a missionary gift-book it stands in the front rank, while for workers it will be

found full of intensely interesting and valuable material. We heartily commend it to our readers as one of the most fascinating missionary books that we have had for some time.

THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. By the Rev. Arthur C. Jennings. London: *Methuen and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This volume forms one of a series of Handbooks of English Church History—under the general editorship of the Rev. J. H. Burn—designed to cover the period of English Church history from its beginning up to the close of the eighteenth century. The present work embraces the years 1135-1485, and forms a useful and reliable guide to the events preceding the Reformation. The interest in these three and a half centuries of Church history really centres on the critical problem respecting the relation between the English Church, King, and Papacy to the English nation. At one moment the struggle between the Church and Crown forces a union between the Crown (John) and the Papacy, and compels the Church to unite with the nation, as in the struggle for Magna Charta. At another time the Church is alienated from both the Crown and Papacy, and assumes the constitutional leadership of the nation as evidenced by the reign of Henry III.; but in the closing years of the thirteenth century both Crown and Church compete for the nation's confidence, which is given to the Crown (1301). It is this which forces the Church into a Papal attitude, compels it to become less national, and consequently leaves it helpless before the Crown at the Reformation. The underlying causes which ultimately produced this result are well worked out in the handbook by Mr. Jennings. He treats his subject in a dispassionate way, but with the sureness of one who has a thorough knowledge of the period. There are a couple of obvious misprints in dates on p. vii, Introduction, and p. 142.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD. By the Rev. Henry Gee, D.D. London: *Methuen and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

In this book we have the succeeding volume to the above, embracing the period from the accession of Henry VII. to the death of Elizabeth. It is needless to state that the name of Dr. Gee is a guarantee for wide knowledge of the original authorities on this important period, and he has here produced a work which will commend itself to a large circle of readers owing to its impartiality. We would not therefore necessarily endorse every conclusion of the learned author. His defence of the monasteries, for instance (pp. 88-89), might be rebutted by the obvious answer that such foundations were out of date from whatever point of view we care to regard them—religious, social, or educational. The fact that the number of monasteries built in the years preceding the sixteenth century had dwindled away practically to nothing is a sufficient guarantee that people had lost faith in them. Nor, again, can we follow him when he declares, in his review of the medieval Church (p. 26), that "the daily and nightly offices of the Church were in like manner acts of praise and prayer to God, and it did not matter much if those present failed to catch the telling force of psalm and hymn and lection in their significant juxtaposition so long as the office was duly sung to the glory of God." Possibly Dr. Gee means us to understand that this was the medieval

conception concerning "the daily and nightly offices of the Church"—for we cannot understand how the office could be sung "to the glory of God" without there being intelligence on the part of those singing or listening. A little more explicitness in wording would doubtless make the author's meaning clearer. Again, on p. 79, Dr. Gee quotes Professor Pollard to the effect that "the submission of the clergy had been effected in the form of a writ in 1532, and this had been signed by Convocation and confirmed in the Commons." He continues: "The Lords threw it out when the Bill then came up to them. The more complaisant Parliament of 1534 passed the Bill at once." We consider that the author should give some detailed proof for the statement of Professor Pollard, because it contravenes the usually accepted course of events, whilst the statement as to the "more complaisant Parliament of 1534" is misleading, since the Reformation Parliament sat from 1529 to 1536. But in spite of these and one or two other places where the writer has laid himself open to criticism by his vague wording, the work of Dr. Gee comes up to the aim of the editor, who conceived the series in "no narrow spirit of partisanship," but with a desire "to do justice to all parties, whether religious or political." We are often asked for a handbook on the English Reformation: here is one which can be recommended for its general accuracy, fairness, and sympathy, which are especially essential in dealing with this important period.

GENESIS UNVEILED: Anonymous. London: *James Nisbet and Co.* Price 3s. net.

This little volume is the work of the author of "God's Week of Creation Work," and "The World's Week of Human History." The author employs Bishop Hellmuth's version of Genesis instead of the Authorized or the Revised Version. The book is written in a very reverent spirit, in which it stands in striking contrast to many modern works on the subject. We confess our inability to agree with many of the author's arguments and conclusions, but we most heartily agree with the following: "The Bible is indeed a Book containing depths as yet unsounded, and indeed unsoundable, but . . . never will those depths be even seen at all by those who approach it in an irreverent . . . spirit" (p. 230).

THE MISSIONARY MANIFESTO. By the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 2s. net.

The six lectures of which this book consists are in Dr. Campbell Morgan's best style. They deal with the Fourfold Commission—the Authority of the King, the Evangel to Creation, the Witnesses, the Remission of Sins—and the Fourfold Resource and Responsibility. After a course of reading many modern theological books imbued with a very different spirit, it is refreshing to come upon a work so full of reverence and spirituality, marked by love for, and knowledge of, a personal, living, loving Saviour. The harmony which pervades the variety in the fourfold Gospel presentation of Christ (pp. 8-12) is clearly pointed out. What is said about the proclamation of the Gospel to the *Kosmos* (pp. 13, 14, 68 *et seq.*) is well worthy of consideration. Those of us who have studied the present condition of the world will agree that Humanity's "first necessity" to-day "is

that of Authority. . . . The supreme need of the world is the enunciation of an ethic which is binding and authoritative, and which gives a clear revelation of what sin is" (p. 17). Dr. Morgan's explanation of "I know Him, whom I have believed," etc., is well worthy of careful consideration, all the more so because it differs from the ordinary view of its meaning (pp. 30, 31). Though we may learn much from the study of Comparative Religion, and this new science may even help in mission-work, yet it needs to be borne in mind that "we are not sent to men to discuss with them the relative value of their religions. . . . Our supreme business is to preach Christ crucified and risen" (p. 123). We have nothing but praise for this scholarly and spiritual little book.

GOD'S EIGHT DAYS OF CREATION. By E. O. James, F.S.Sc., with Introduction by Rev. Chancellor Lias. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The object of this interesting little work is to show how well the Biblical account of creation harmonizes with the facts revealed to us by geological science. In the conviction that this is so, Mr. James agrees with Dana and Sir W. Dawson. At a time when even men occupying high positions in the Church are not ashamed to declare that "the first chapter of Genesis is not science," a handy little volume like this, written by a man of science, will be very useful. Chancellor Lias well says in the Introduction: "It will be found extremely difficult to discover in what way the simple recital of facts with which the Bible commences is inconsistent with the conclusions of science as stated in this work." By a slip of the pen the author (p. 79) speaks of the Fall of Jerusalem as occurring "seventy years" after our Lord's prophecy of that event, instead of "70 A.D."

DEVOTIONAL HOURS WITH THE BIBLE. By J. R. Miller, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

This volume, which begins with the crossing of the Red Sea and closes with David's life, is full of help and suggestion. Leaders of Bible-classes will find many a useful illustration and quotation in these pages, and the spiritual teaching is what we have always been accustomed to expect from Dr. Miller. In an age that multiplies homiletic commentaries, of more or less value, this will take its place as among the most helpful.

HOW TO DEVELOP POWER AND PERSONALITY IN SPEAKING. By G. Kleiser. London: *Funk and Wagnall Company*. Price 5s.

The purpose of this book is to give "practical suggestions and exercises for building the body, the voice, the vocabulary, for training the memory and imagination, and for the general development of power and personality in the speaker." To this end we are reminded of the value of power and personality as the essentials of true success. Then come chapters on "How to Develop Physical Power, the Voice, and the Imagination," "How to Build a Vocabulary," "How to Train the Memory," "Power in English Style," "Extemporaneous Speaking, Conversation, Illustration, and in Holding an Audience." There is a long list of selections from various authors for study and practice. The book comes quite evidently from a teacher of thorough and varied experience, and it seems to us to be one of the very best of its kind. We envy the beginner who can commence his ministry under the

guidance of this able work. A careful attention to the wise and forceful counsels here given would make an immense difference in the quality and attractiveness of preaching. We should like to see it used as a textbook in all theological colleges.

RATIONAL NECESSITY OF THEISM. By the Rev. A. D. Kelly. London: *The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*. Price 2s.

This essay aims at refuting two prevalent antitheistic theories—Naturalism and Agnosticism—and then tries to show the reality of spirit and spontaneity in man and in the universe, and thereby to prove the rational necessity of theism. If it be asked why another book on this subject is needed, the author replies that as the arguments for theism must necessarily be more or less philosophical, and many educated men have very little acquaintance with philosophy, it seemed worth while trying to state the philosophical arguments in a way which an educated man could understand without requiring a previous training in the terminology of metaphysics. The author has achieved his purpose splendidly. Within the compass of 160 small pages he has provided us with one of the clearest and most convincing pieces of argument we have read for a long time. The book ought to be in great request among clergymen and teachers. It will provide them with a perfect arsenal of apt quotation and forcible arguments. We have read it with great interest and profit, and shall constantly use it in our work.

THE COMING OF THE DAY OF GOD. By Rev. Hubert Brooke, M.A. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 1s.

This valuable booklet on the fact, signs, effects, and hastening of the second coming of our Lord should be widely read. It is the work of a deep student of God's Word, and a shrewd observer of events. It is a call to increased prayer and watchfulness.

FOUNDATION TRUTHS. By Rev. Dr. Pierson. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 1s.

No one has a better right or gift for discussing foundation truths than Dr. Pierson. What he has to say on repentance, faith, wisdom, and love is worth reading, marking, and inwardly digesting. To build a holy life we must secure a deep foundation. All that we need for that is to be found here.

CHRIST IN DAILY LIFE. By Adelaide M. Cameron. London: *H. R. Allenson*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

In this tasteful little volume we have a consecutive life of our Lord, so as to get the story of stories in its entirety. Each day has its portion of His life for reading and meditation. In the rush of life a record of the Gospels so arranged cannot but prove good and illuminating.

GOD'S WEEK OF CREATION WORK. By F. W. H. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

The author writes to prove that the idea of this earth having been created and made in six days of twenty-four hours each is not only not Scriptural, but entirely un-Scriptural. Such a view was not held by the early Church, but is rather a product of the Dark Ages when men were without astronomical knowledge. While we may not be able to accept all the arguments adduced in favour of this contention, we believe the writer makes out his case, and for this reason the book is well worthy of careful study.

HAPPY ENGLAND. By William Jack. London: *A. Stockwell*. Price 3d.

This is an open letter written in a free-and-easy style to an agnostic friend. Its burden is that England to be happy needs a new power. There is nothing wrong with Christianity, only with Christians. Repentance, Faith, and Baptism are needed, the last as the expression of the other two. *Christianize the Church* is the sum and substance of all.

THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By Dr. Marcus Dods, Dr. J. Denney, and Dr. J. Moffatt. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s.

These chapters, written by spiritual scholars, were originally published in the *British Weekly*, which opened its columns to correspondence on the subject. They give us the right view-point in the whole matter, and will prove valuable to the sane Christian who observes a proportion in his faith, while the extremist interpretation is shown to fail.

BUILDING THE WALLS. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 2s.

This is a book of prayer and thanksgiving for family and private use. The Archbishop of Canterbury writes an introduction in terms of praise. Many sources are drawn from, and the choice of subjects is of widest range.

A BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE. Compiled by Honoria Galwey. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d.

This is to recall to our minds our dear ones at rest; Scripture, sacred poetry, and suitable quotations are gathered here in helpful and appropriate fashion for each day in the year.

WEEK BY WEEK. By L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d.

This is an MS. book of private prayer to encourage method in prayer, thanksgiving, and the formation of spiritual habits. It is excellent in arrangement and suggestion.

THE LORD'S TREASURES. By Mrs. H. Kelly. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 1s. 6d.

These Bible talks with the children are good. There are nineteen of them, and they will help the Sunday-school teacher as well as the conductor of children's services.

THE SECOND THINGS OF LIFE. By Rev. J. Moffatt, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s.

This is one of "the Little Books of Religion," and is a most delightful companion, full of freshness and suggestion. The Second Chance, the Second Blow, the Second Thought, the Second Wave, the Second Place, and the Second Watch, form its subjects.

ST. JOHN'S PORTRAIT OF CHRIST. By G. Matheson, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s.

This is a precious shilling's worth. It is the work of a seer, and his vision penetrates to the depths. Admittedly the *spiritual* side—what he calls the argument "from photograph rather than fact"—is neglected. Linguistic knowledge and patristic research cannot give a man eyes. Eyes are necessary for the appreciation of this portrait. He revolutionizes current ideas, and makes the Gospel of St. John the bridge to the synoptists. He compares St. Paul and St. John, and finds their main teaching identical. He finds for us in the Fourth Gospel a progress in thought and appeal. He finds in the Evangelist's choice of his materials the marks of his characteristics. In fine, he transforms the arguments against the Fourth Gospel into shining witnesses. In these days of limited vision and restricted specialization, this is just the point of view that needs emphasis.

OUTLOOK OF THE SOUL. By Canon W. J. Knox Little. London: *H. R. Allenson*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

A reprint of a volume of sermons formerly issued by Isbister and Co. under the title "Labour and Sorrow." They are noble and elevating discourses, characterized even in the printed page by the eloquence for which the preacher is famed. An earnest zeal is everywhere apparent to raise the ideals of men and to point them to Christ and to spiritual realities. Hence there is a strong perception of the sins and weaknesses of human life. There is also a tender insight and sympathy with the deeper perplexities of man's experience, as in the sermons "The End of Sorrow," "Love and Sorrow," "The Soul and its Perplexities." The preacher brings frequently into his view the beauty of the natural world, and claims the painter, poet, and musician for religion. The phrase "Catholic" occurs too frequently, and a "Sacramental" sentence or two is characteristic of the Tractarian school of thought.

NOTE.—In our review last month of "The Bible and the British Museum," by Miss Ada R. Habershon, the price should have been stated as 2s. 6d. net.

PERIODICALS, PAMPHLETS, AND REPRINTS.

THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1910. Edited by the Rev. F. H. Burnside. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 3s.

This welcome and indispensable volume again tells its remarkable story of the work and ramifications of the Church of England. It should be in the hands of every Churchman for frequent use. In view of the official character and sanction of the book, we think the Editor's preface could be dispensed with, since it is very largely occupied with personal views alone.

THE IRISH CHURCH QUARTERLY, January, 1910. Edited by the Rev. H. J. Lawlor. Dublin: *The Church of Ireland Printing and Publishing Company.* Price 1s. 6d.

The first article on "Modern Mysticism," by the Bishop of Ossory, is, like everything Dr. D'Arcy writes, illuminating and suggestive. Archdeacon Sherlock commences the story of the Revision of the Irish Prayer-Book. Archdeacon Cunningham propounds the question whether it is possible for a Free Trader to be a good citizen. Dr. T. S. Berry discusses the Atonement, following Westcott's inadequate and unsatisfactory view. We are glad to call attention to this useful Quarterly of the Sister Church.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, March, 1910. London: *Funk and Wagnalls Company.* Price 1s.

This number is naturally occupied very largely with Good Friday and Easter topics, and its various departments of Church thought and life are well maintained. Preachers will find plenty of suggestions in these pages.

WORK AND WITNESS, February, 1910. London: *Protestant Reformation Society.* Price 1d.

The Quarterly Magazine edited by Dr. Willoughby, who invariably provides valuable material for all who are concerned with the progress and reformation of Churchmanship.

THE CHURCHMAN'S PULPIT. Edited by the Rev. J. H. Burn. London: *Francis Griffiths.* Price 1s. 6d. net per part.

This work, which will be published in weekly parts, has been prepared for the use of clergymen in their pulpit work. About thirty sermons are provided for each of the Sundays and for the Holy Days in the calendar, and the editor believes that it will contain all the homiletic material that a preacher is likely to need in a lifetime of ministerial duty. It claims to be the most complete and weighty work of its kind ever offered to the clergy. All sorts and conditions of preachers are laid under contribution, and with equal impartiality the editor has endeavoured to include all legitimate "schools of thought." It is hoped that clergy will find new and suggestive material in these pages to enable them to impart freshness and interest to their sermons. Used with great care and constant discrimination, the work ought to prove serviceable to busy and overworked clergy.

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY. Edited by Ernest Rhys. London: *J. M. Dent and Sons.* Price 1s. net each.

Fifty more volumes of this attractive library have just been published, including such valuable additions as Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" (in two volumes), Spenser's "Faerie Queene," Thackeray's "Pendennis," Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" (first three volumes), Macaulay's "Essays," and volumes by Balzac, Dumas, Victor Hugo, and Hawthorne. To our readers perhaps the most interesting and valuable will be the "First and Second Prayer-Books of Edward the Sixth" in one volume, with a preface by the Bishop of Gloucester, though the concluding words of the Bishop will not be generally acceptable. He remarks that subsequent revisions have done much to stamp our Prayer-Book with a far more Catholic character than it possessed when it left Cranmer's hands. Such great scholars as Dimock and others have proved conclusively the essential doctrinal agreement of Cranmer with our Prayer-Book to-day. Of all the modern reprints, "Everyman's Library" is the best known, and certainly one of the most attractive. Six millions, we are told, have already been sold, and the series is already well on the way to the realization of the publishers' ambitions of one thousand volumes. Whatever we may think of the choice or substance of the books, they are eminently worthy of attention and it is a bare duty to commend them to our readers.

LETTERS AND RECOLLECTIONS OF SIR WALTER SCOTT. By Mrs. Hughes. A SOCIAL DEPARTURE. By S. J. Duncan. Nelson's Shilling Library. BORN IN EXILE. By G. Gissing. SET IN AUTHORITY. By S. J. Duncan. Nelson's Sevenpenny Library. TALES FROM SHAKESPEARE. By Charles Lamb. Nelson's Sixpenny Classics. London: *Nelson and Sons*.

The newest issues of Messrs. Nelson's charming and attractive series. The varied choice and the unflinching regularity of issue make these series of particular interest.

REVISION OF THE LECTIONARY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Very Rev. Vernon Staley. Dumfries: *R. G. Mann*. Price 1s. 6d.

A scholarly and suggestive contribution to one of our modern problems of revision. Provost Staley considers the present Lectionary "thoroughly unsatisfactory."

ST. PAUL. By F. W. H. Myers. London: *H. R. Allenson Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

A reissue of one of the most striking of modern poems. We are exceedingly glad to have it in this dainty form, and we call attention to it with the greatest possible pleasure. In spite of a few jarring notes which are not true to the great Apostle, Myers' interpretation is one of the finest we possess.

WHY DO WE WANT MORE BISHOPS? By the Rev. A. R. Sharp. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 4d.

An earnest and urgent plea for the increase of the Episcopate, which will be welcomed by all who believe in the writer's thesis.

THE CHURCH ARMY BLUE BOOK. London: *Church Army Headquarters*, 55, Bryanston Street, W.

The twenty-eighth Annual Report of the varied and interesting work of the Church Army.

CLASS NOTES FOR THE USE OF CANDIDATES FOR CONFIRMATION. By the Rev. Henry Edwards. London: *National Church League*. Price 2d.

The Bishop of Newcastle writes an introduction to these clear and helpful notes. Each page is to be torn off and given to the candidates before or after each lecture. The teaching is thoroughly true to the Bible and Prayer-Book. Clergy should make a special note of these admirable suggestions.

HYPERDULIA, OR THE WORSHIP OF MARY. By G. C. Parkhurst Baxter. London: *National Church League*. Price ½d.

A useful compendium of facts which should be circulated widely to counteract a serious error.

INCENSE. By W. Guy Johnson. London: *National Church League*. Price ½d.

One of the ablest statements, within a brief compass, of the case against incense in our Church. Nothing could be more convincing.

A SYNOPSIS OF ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY. By Athelstan Riley. Third Edition. Oxford: *James Parter and Co.* Price 2d.

One of the Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association. A useful guide for all who wish to know what Eastern Christianity really is.

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR A WEEK. Arranged by H. S. W. With Preface by the Bishop of Southampton. London: *Hugh Rees*. Price 6d. net.

The prayers are drawn chiefly from the Prayer-Book, and the book is an attempt to make the Prayer-Book prayers applicable for the family and household. The Bishop of Southampton heartily commends it to the notice and consideration of Church-people. A useful little help.

A THREE HOURS' SERVICE ON THE SEVEN WORDS FROM THE CROSS. By the Rev. J. Eckersley. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 3d. net.

This consists of readings from Scripture, prayers from the Prayer-Book, and suggestions for private prayers. A very convenient and appropriate help for those who attend the three hours' service.

RECEIVED.—PLAY THE GAME. A Word to Young Men who have been Confirmed. SOLDIER AND SERVANT. A Word to Girls who have been Confirmed. By the Rev. E. Grose Hodge. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. per 100 each. IN DUE TIME. A Story founded on Fact. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. per 100.