

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

September, 1910.

The Month.

WE quoted last month the Bishop of Durham's words in a letter to the *Times* that "In the Declaration, whatever may be altered, the critical word 'Protestant' must be jealously retained." We are glad and thankful to know that this has been done in the amended form which received Royal Assent on August 3, and is now the law of the land. The King solemnly and sincerely professes, testifies, and declares, in the presence of God, that he is "a faithful Protestant," and will, according to the intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant succession to the throne, uphold and maintain these enactments to the best of his power. While a large number of Protestants inside and outside the Church of England would have welcomed a more explicit Declaration, including the repudiation of certain distinctive Roman Catholic doctrines, we are quite ready to accept the new form as giving to us substantially all that we need, without anything that can be regarded as insulting to Roman Catholics. It is unnecessary to recall in detail the proceedings in Parliament on the subject beyond one or two references. Mr. Birrell, as one able Liberal writer said, contributed "an amazing speech—one of those speeches which make his friends wonder occasionally whether they have ever understood the man, or rightly fixed his place." How so jocose and even rollicking a speech could have been made under these circumstances is probably only explicable by Mr. Birrell himself, for the main

The King's
Declaration.

substance was altogether unworthy of so serious and momentous an occasion. The chief point of importance in the debate was the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, in accepting the new version, expressed the opinion that under the conditions of to-day the King will be as clearly bound by the Declaration in its new form as he would have been by the Declaration in its old form. Then the Archbishop said :

“Reduced to its simplest terms, the Declaration supplies the specific purpose for which it is wanted, and sets it out in a way that everybody can understand, and which cannot hurt the most sensitive member of the Roman Catholic Church. I believe we have need of a Declaration of this sort. I believe so, not because I think that the Protestant succession is not adequately secured under the Bill, because I think it is under the Bill of Rights, the Act of Settlement, the Coronation Oath, and other Acts. It is needed because to abolish that Declaration altogether would inevitably be misunderstood as indicating some new departure.”

The matter will not have been raised in vain if it enables Roman Catholics and others to see that the country is determined to maintain inviolate the Protestant succession. Even the opposition to the new form will have done service in reminding all whom it concerns that there is a very strong Protestant feeling in the country which is ready to express itself and maintain its essential position whenever required.

In the course of the debate in the House of
The Word
“Protestant.” Commons the Prime Minister naturally referred to the way in which extreme Anglicans have been taking exception to the use of the word “Protestant” as a prefix to the Church of England :

“The truth is that this sensitiveness as to the use of the word ‘Protestant’ shown in some quarters in these days is of undoubtedly modern growth. The great Anglican divines of the seventeenth century—people like Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and Archbishop Laud himself—gloried in the name of Protestant, and were not ashamed or reluctant to use the term ‘Protestant’ as a term descriptive of the Church of England. I believe it would not be proper on this occasion to go into any antiquarian discussion, but as a matter of history I believe that the objection to the use of the word ‘Protestant’ is as late as the Tractarian Movement, and, if not invented, it was fostered and fomented by the promoters of that movement. It is no part, and never was a part, of what I may call the tradition even of the High Church party in the great Anglican community. I therefore find it

very difficult—and I am satisfied that the great majority of English Churchmen would agree with me—to understand why there should be any resentment, or even any reluctance, in connection with the application of the word ‘Protestant’ to the Church.”

The vast majority of English Churchmen will heartily endorse these forcible words of Mr. Asquith, and, indeed, will find it difficult to understand why there should be any question on the subject. It is of course quite true that the word “Protestant” is not found in the Prayer-Book and Articles; but it is not the word, it is the thing, that matters; and no one can seriously question the essential Protestantism of the teaching of those Articles which are directed against Roman Catholic doctrine. When we observe the plain references in such Articles as VI., XIII., XIV., XX., XXII., XXV., XXVIII., XXXI., XXXIV., XXXVII., to the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Church, it is almost incredible that anyone should think it necessary to raise what must be regarded as a quibble about the absence of the *word* “Protestant.” The Bishop of Durham, Dean Wace, and Canon Hensley Henson, have shown in their recent letters to the *Times* that in the history of our Church from the sixteenth century to the rise of the Tractarian Movement, all English Churchmen regarded our Church as essentially Protestant, and, as Mr. Asquith says, the “sensitivity” to the word is undoubtedly to be connected with the Tractarian Movement, which aimed at assimilating the Church of England to that of Rome. But, as Lord Hatherley remarked on one occasion in the House of Lords, in words that are often quoted, “I am a Protestant because I am a Catholic.”

The Bishop of Birmingham is always refreshingly candid, whether we agree with him or not.

“The Stupid Party.”

In his *Diocesan Magazine* he has some interesting notes of his experiences at the recent World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, and he tells us that the dominant feeling with which he came away from Edinburgh was—

“That those who are not interested in Missions to-day are nothing else than the stupid party.”

This is plain speaking, and as welcome as it is plain. If only the idea could be impressed on all congregations during the next few months, in the light of what happened at Edinburgh, it would perhaps do more for Missions than anything else. There are many in our congregations who are almost supercilious in their indifference to world-wide evangelization, and yet when the subject is viewed from the standpoint of genuine spiritual religion, as recorded in the New Testament, and expressed in the lives of the noblest and best Christians in all ages, Bishop Gore's view of Missions is undoubtedly the true one when he says that—

“The Conference itself, in which I took part, left in my mind a profound impression of the supreme value and importance of the work of Missions among the non-Christian peoples of the world as it is going forward to-day.”

Another of the Bishop of Birmingham's im-
pressions is worthy of special notice :

Anglicans
and
Missions.

“It was especially good for us Anglicans to have to do with the Conference. We are insular. We like to ignore both Rome and the Protestant bodies. It is good for us to feel how small a proportion of what is being done in the name of Christ all the world over is being done by the Anglican Communion; and then also to be made to realize how indisputably important is the special witness of our Communion, standing as it does between Rome and Protestantism. Just that witness which we are commissioned to bear for a Catholicism which is Scriptural and liberal is the witness which is needed to-day in the nations which are awakening to the Christian claim. Every missionary knows that the new Churches will not perpetuate our old divisions. The nearer the day comes when indigenous Churches shall arise in the East and in Africa, the more important does the mediating position of our Communion appear.”

We are afraid that we cannot endorse the Bishop's view as to the mediating position of the Anglican Communion in relation either to Rome or to Protestant Churches. Rome simply ignores Anglicanism, and regards even the Bishop of Birmingham himself as a layman. And Evangelical Nonconformity will never accept that view of Reunion which involves absorption, and reordination by Bishops, and which is generally associated with Bishop Gore's school of thought. We have only to read the words of great scholars like Dr. Fair-

bairn, Principal Lindsay, and Professor Stalker to see that Presbyterians have no intention whatever of accepting "the mediating position of our Communion." Meanwhile, therefore, the Anglican Church remains in its isolation and insularity. On the one hand, neither the Roman nor the Greek Church will accept our Orders, and on the other hand, extreme Anglicanism holds itself aloof from Evangelical Nonconformity because of its supposed defect and invalidity in regard to Ministry and Sacraments. And this is the present position, after three centuries of Christian life and service. We are thankful, however, to realize that Evangelical Churchmanship, as associated with the C.M.S., has much more hope of helping forward the cause of reunion, for one of the laws and regulations of the C.M.S. which has been in existence for a century is that—

"A friendly intercourse shall be maintained with other Protestant Societies engaged in the same benevolent design of propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

It is along this line, as ably suggested in the *August Church Missionary Review* by a contributor (p. 454), and also by the editor (p. 504), that Anglicanism will do most to bring about Reunion. Unity can only come from New Testament truth, and this is essentially Evangelical.

At the great Convention of the Student Volunteer
Missions and Unity. Movement held in Rochester, New York, last year, a dignitary of the American Protestant Episcopal Church made the following suggestive remarks :

"We have for long years been trying to find a basis of unity for the Christian Church along theological lines, and our efforts seem only to have added fuel to the fire. We have tried to unite under some form of Church government, and have failed. I verily believe that unity is coming in our common obedience to our Lord's command: 'Go ye into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.'"

There is much food for thought here, and it is in this direction that we believe the recent Edinburgh Conference is likely to prove exceedingly fruitful. Those who have read Principal Lindsay's great work, "The Church and Ministry in the Early

Centuries," will remember how often he is able to illustrate principles of Church life in the early ages from what is going on to-day in the mission-field. We at home, with our cast-iron methods of government and work, are not likely to make any very serious changes, at any rate, at present; but missionary organization is necessarily in a much more fluid condition, and we believe it is in the mission-field that some of our greatest problems will be solved. Indeed, next to the primary work of world-wide evangelization, missions will pretty certainly make their greatest contribution to Christianity in their influence on the cause of unity.

Home and
Foreign
Missions.

At the C.M.S. Summer School in June, the Archbishop of York referred to the oft-used argument against Foreign Missions based on home claims :

"We are surrounded by a great argument that it is necessary to convert the heathen at home before we go abroad. I will repeat what I have said before—that, knowing as much as anyone does about the need for the conversion of the East End of London, I unhesitatingly say that the Church which has not the faith and courage and heroism to take its own share in the task of converting the whole world is not the Church which has the slightest chance of making any headway in the East End of London."

These words should be repeated on every hand by workers for missions, for, as the Archbishop also said: "There can be no life in a Church which is not primarily missionary." We do not believe it is true, except in the very smallest degree, that zeal on behalf of missions has ever tended to the neglect of home evangelization, even in the poorest parish. On the contrary, proof after proof can be adduced to show that wherever the missionary cause has been strongly emphasized in the poorest parishes, the work of evangelizing the parish itself has gone forward with earnestness and vigour.

Roman
Catholic
Missions.

In one way or another during the last few weeks the question of Roman Catholic Missions has been brought to the front, and as there seems to be not a little ignorance as to what the Roman Church is doing in regard

to Foreign Missions, it seems worth while to call attention to a valuable article on this subject by Dr. Eugene Stock, which appears in the "Protestant Dictionary." The following words of Dr. Stock seem particularly important just now :

"The Roman missions of the past eighty years have to a large extent been directed to those fields which Protestant missionaries had already entered. Church of England Societies and Nonconformist Societies alike have suffered from this cause. The S.P.G. history contains many illustrations. . . . While, therefore, we are bound to acknowledge the self-denial and devotion of many of the Roman missionaries, and not to doubt that there have been among them not a few who, knowing Christ as their own Saviour, have earnestly preached him to the heathen, it is impossible to shut our eyes to the plain facts of history as recorded by themselves, or to the actual circumstances of the mission-field at the present time. With every desire to show large-mindedness and charity, no well-instructed Christian can suppose that, as regards a very large portion of Roman missionary work, both in the past and in the present, its character could command the Divine blessing."

Facts like these should be carefully borne in mind when we endeavour to appraise, at its proper value, the work of the Roman Catholic Church on behalf of world-wide evangelization.

In the forthcoming Convention in October of
A Change
of Name. the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, a great effort is once more to be made to change the title, in order to get rid of the word "Protestant." It is thought to be narrow and unnecessary, as well as inadequate as a description of our Episcopal brethren in America. In a recent number of the *New York Churchman* Archdeacon Davis of Rochester thus refers to the subject :

"We may claim to be the Church in America or the Church of America, but we can set it down as a fact that the Church for America will be, not the one which assumes the title, but the one which does the work. Our pedigree is all right, and can take care of itself, but unless Apostolic succession is backed up by missionary progression it will not cut much of a figure in the evangelization of the world. We of this branch of the great Church Catholic have been unduly impressed with the *symmetry of our figure*, and the time has come when, figuratively speaking, we must break our ecclesiastical looking-glasses, pull off our cloak of self-righteousness, and go to work. Like the Chinese nation, we have been too much given to the worship of ancestors."

His words are not only applicable to his own Church, but to ours also. We might almost say, "What's in a name?" Men judge

a Church not by its past, but by its present, and if we follow the Jews in merely claiming Abraham for our father, we must not be surprised if God raises up children unto Abraham in other Christian Churches who will put us, with all our ancestry, to utter shame. Is it not sad for us Churchpeople to realize that at the recent Edinburgh Conference the missionary work of Anglicanism only represented one-seventh of the whole gathering ?

This subject of present-day reality as the greatest proof of true Churchmanship is very ably and forcibly stated in a new book which deserves the careful attention of all Churchmen—"Studies in Apostolic Christianity," by the Rev. A. F. W. Blunt (J. M. Dent and Co.). After pointing out our Lord's great principle, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and showing that this was St. Paul's final test of his own ministry, Mr. Blunt proceeds as follows :

The
Supreme
Test.

"And, surely, this is ultimately the only worthy theory of Sacerdotalism, the only worthy conception of a Divinely ordained ministry. A Divine society can live neither upon its past history, nor upon its present externals. A Christian Church cannot safely base its claims upon any unspiritual hypothesis of mechanically transmitted grace, especially when those hypotheses are artificial and destitute of proper historical foundation. . . . The test of 'results,' in the widest sense of the word, is the final test whether a system shall continue to be regarded as Divinely ordained, or whether we must infer that the Providence which established it is also superseding it. The real grace of a ministerial system is the grace of useful Christian leadership and service" (pp. 119, 120).

This is only another way of saying what needs to be said often—that the final and crowning test of Apostolic succession is Apostolic success.

More
Conflicts of
Ideals.

The controversy between the Bishop of Chichester and the Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Brighton, has provided another illustration of the fundamental difference between the two ideals of Anglicanism represented

respectively by the Ritualists and by all other Churchmen. The letters of Mr. Cocks, in which in the most unequivocal terms he speaks of the reservation of the Sacrament and its exposition and adoration, together with the insistence upon the observance of such festivals as Corpus Christi, the Assumption, and All Souls' Day, clearly indicate, not merely the extent to which St. Bartholomew's, Brighton, has gone, but also and chiefly the absolute impossibility of reconciling these doctrines and practices with any teaching or regulations to be found in the authorized formularies of the Church of England. All loyal Churchmen will feel grateful for the way in which the Bishop of Chichester has exercised his authority, and we shall all look forward to further developments in view of the fact that such doctrines and practices are to be found in other churches in Brighton, and also elsewhere in the Chichester Diocese. Meanwhile we commend to the attention of all our readers the striking comment of the *Guardian* on Mr. Cocks's action :

“ His resignation leaves the impression that he retires to his tent because he cannot have his own way. He has acted from no intelligible principle . . . He simply does not like the directions he has received . . . Many good Churchmen, when they read the correspondence on the subject . . . will anxiously ask themselves, What is the kind of authority which the 'extremist' is prepared to obey? He repudiates the jurisdiction of secular Courts, and in doing so he carries with him the sympathies of many who have no great liking for the course of action which has brought him under review in those Courts. He asks for a tribunal of spiritual origin, presided over by a spiritual Judge, and the great majority of Churchpeople are satisfied of the complete legitimacy of the demand. The case of Mr. Cocks has been before just such a Judge, yet he is still disinclined to obey the judgment. He is not prepared to defy it, as he might perhaps defy that of a secular Court, but he will not bow to it—that must be for his successor.”

We entirely agree with the writer that this attitude of mind is deplorable, and will tend to justify the complaint that extreme men are prepared to obey only when they agree with the authority which commands. It is a long time ago since the days of Sydney Smith, and yet his cynical words about the Ritualist of that day seem to be equally applicable now. “ He is only for the Bishop when the Bishop is for him.”

What is the Explanation? We wonder how it is that Romanism and Ritualism are associated from time to time with practices which cannot on any fair interpretation be regarded as coming within the limits of honesty. We take two recent examples. In the *Spectator* for July 16 the following remarks occur in the course of an able review of Cardinal Vaughan's life :

“The question of Anglican Orders is gone into at some length, and with considerable frankness; and, again, we must point out a revelation which is worth noting. Manning's ‘Life’ showed us that the oath of secrecy imposed on the Council was dispensed by Pius IX. for purposes of intrigue. This ‘Life’ tells us that ‘absolute secrecy was imposed on all members of the Commission appointed’ (to examine Anglican Orders), ‘and an armed sentry stood before the doors’ (vol. ii., p. 202); ‘yet Vaughan was kept informed by letter of everything that went on.’”

And in connection with the controversy between the Bishop of Chichester and Mr. Cocks of Brighton, the Bishop feels compelled to call attention to the fact that on August 9, 1895, Mr. Cocks wrote to Bishop Durnford, stating that the Sacrament reserved for the sick was used for no other service, and yet that Mr. Cocks thought it right in November, 1895, shortly after the Bishop's death and during the vacancy of the see, to alter the existing state of things and to introduce the service of Exposition of the Reserved Sacrament. Mr. Cocks considered that when Bishop Durnford died the particular issue was over, and then commenced Exposition and encouraged people to come to chapel for the adoration of the Sacrament, and he has continued the practice for fourteen years. It is difficult to reconcile this with the ordinary laws of honour, for we should have thought that the Bishop's death, especially as Bishop Durnford wrote just before leaving home that he would go into the matter on his return, would have made it impossible for Mr. Cocks to do other than continue the practice which he assured the Bishop was in vogue in August, 1895. While we would not for a moment generalize from particulars, it is impossible to resist the uncomfortable impression made by these two instances, that there would seem to be some connection between Roman doctrines and practices and the absence of straight-

forwardness. But whether this be so or not, one thing is perfectly clear : whatever we are, Evangelicals, or High Churchmen, or extreme Anglicans, if our doctrines and practices do not at all points square with righteousness, truth, honesty, straightforwardness, they stand condemned as essentially unchristian.

In the report of a recent address on the subject of Biblical Criticism, the writer made the following comment :

**Extremes
Meet.**

“ The theories enunciated were popular a generation ago . . . before the Higher Critics had paved the way for a return of Catholic views.”

This is a very significant comment. If through an acceptance of the higher critical position we are compelled to alter our view of the authority of the Bible, and to believe that it is untrustworthy in its history, uncertain in its facts, and not always clear in its doctrine, we must needs have some infallible guide to point out the errors and to support the soul with the assurance of a Divine revelation. When the higher critical position on the Bible is accepted, we are left either to the uncertainties of reason, or to the fact of an external authority. Such an authority is necessarily found in what is claimed to be the historical Church, and thus once again Rationalism may be said to play direct into the hands of Rome. Renan once expressed the opinion that the Church of Rome had done wisely in withholding the Bible from the laity, and said that it was—

“ The most magnificent stroke of policy on the part of that grand institution to have substituted herself . . . living and acting, for a mute authority” (Bernard, “ The Word and Sacrament,” p. 158).

We have been recently reminded in the *Times* of the way in which Romanism in Spain is causing the reaction of godless Rationalism, and so it must always be if the Bible is not allowed its place and part in the human life as the Divine authority in things spiritual. Men who are shaken by criticism can hardly help crossing over to the authority of the Church. But those who know of a surety that the Bible is indeed the Word of God will be preserved from the errors of Rationalism and Romanism,

and find certitude in fellowship with Christ, through the Word, by the Spirit.

Comparative Religion. The study of Comparative Religion is occupying a very prominent place in the thought of to-day. Christianity is being compared with other religious systems in order to discover if possible the grounds on which uniqueness is claimed for it, and at the same time, many scholars are endeavouring to show that Christianity can be accounted for like any other religion on the basis of a natural evolution through centuries of history. A recent letter on this subject in the *Nation* makes an important point in saying that an impartial investigation into the evidence of Christianity is humanly impossible, because no theologian can really expound Christian doctrine without treating the Resurrection as a fact :

“ Facts upon which the whole fabric of Christianity depends cannot be investigated as if they were a mere antiquarian curiosity, such as the exact site of King Charles I.'s execution. The truth is that the study of comparative religion can never be a science, because the essential conditions of scientific research are lacking. Science seeks the ascertainment and application of calculable laws in a definite subject-matter. In religion the subject-matter is *ex-hypothesi* infinite, and the establishment of absolute rules is incompatible with the postulate of free will. All study of religion is bound to be dogmatic, since the assumption that there can be a religion without dogma is itself a dogma.”

These words call attention to a truth that is only too apt to be overlooked. The experience of the heart is as essential as the consideration of the mind when we are discussing the nature of Christianity and its relation to other religions, and this being the case, absolute impartiality—as impartiality is regarded in physical science—is naturally and necessarily impossible. Christianity takes every faculty of human nature into consideration, and before we can compare the Gospel with other religions we must find out what it and they can do for human nature in every part. If, as Luther says, “it is the heart that makes the theologian,” it is equally true that the heart makes the true Christian student of comparative religion.

Civil Marriages. With a large number of Churchmen of various schools of thought we cannot help expressing our regret that the Bishops of St. Albans and Birmingham seem to have given their approval to the old suggestion of a complete separation of Church and State in the matter of marriage. Lord John Russell, in 1836, recommended the policy of universal civil marriage, "leaving the parties concerned to add any religious ceremony or ceremonies they may think proper." Canon Hensley Henson has very forcibly pointed out that this arrangement would not touch the core of the difficulty so long as the Church of England is an Established Church. It would be intolerable that citizens who contracted marriages permitted by the law should be excluded from communion in the national Church as "open and notorious evil livers." This is a point of the greatest importance, and needs much more consideration than has at present been given to it. In addition to this, there are many and grave reasons why the Church should be the last to suggest the policy of universal civil marriage, for it is pretty certain that many parties would not add any religious ceremony whatever. For the purity of our home life, which King George V. has truly said is at the foundation of our national welfare, we must continue to do our utmost to associate marriage with religious ceremony.

Personal. This number is the last under the present editor. He desires to express his most grateful thanks to the numerous readers who have written such warm letters of appreciation from time to time, and who have thereby made the editorial work a pleasure and a privilege. The Rev. Professor Dawson Walker, D.D., and the Rev. Principal F. S. Guy Warman, B.D., will take charge of the magazine with the October issue.



Abraham in the Cuneiform Inscriptions.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR SAYCE, D.D., LL.D.

WHILE Old Testament criticism, so-called, has been busy repeating the task of the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, first devising a complicated theory and then forcing the facts into accommodation to it, the excavator and archæologist have been steadily and soberly at work ascertaining what the facts actually are, and restoring to us once more the lost history of the ancient East. In Babylonia the work of discovery has of late been particularly active. Thousands of inscribed clay tablets have been brought to light which acquaint us with the daily life and thoughts, not only of the contemporaries of Abraham, but also of the centuries that preceded his birth. It is hardly too much to say that we now know as much about the social habits and beliefs of the Babylonians in the age of Abraham as we do about those of the Greeks in the age of Pericles.

I propose in the following article to give some account of what the latest results of discovery and research have told us about the Hebrew patriarch Abraham, and in what manner it is now possible to write his history from a Babylonian point of view. In Babylonia he bore the name of Abram, and he was born in "Ur of the Chaldees." In the cuneiform documents of the age to which he belonged the name appears as *Aba-ramu*. It was not a Babylonian name, but was one of those borne by the Western Semites, or "Amorites," as the Babylonians called them, who were settled in Babylonia. Ur, the patriarch's birthplace, the modern Mukaiyyar, was built on the western bank of the Euphrates, not far from Eridu, the ancient seaport of the country. Its name signified "The City," and was given to it by the Semitic population, for whom it was the leading city of the world. It was a great centre of Western Semitic trade. On the one hand, the maritime trade of Eridu was poured into it, "the ships of Ur" having much the same

meaning as "the ships of Tarshish" in the Old Testament; on the other hand, it stood on the edge of the Arabian desert, and was therefore in close touch with the "Amorite" peoples of the West. It was, in fact, a meeting-place of the civilized Babylonian and the less cultured Arab, the spot at which merchants and officials, agriculturists and nomad herdsmen would have gathered together. Its foreign population must have been considerable. Just as in Egypt to-day the wealthier Beduin settle down and become more or less peaceable townsmen and villagers, so in Ur the wealthier Beduin of the desert would have had a tendency to do the same. Here, too, would have come merchants and traders from various parts of the Semitic world. Among them were numbers of "commercial travellers" (*damqari*), who travelled on behalf of their Babylonian employers from one end of Western Asia to the other, and about whom we hear a good deal in the cuneiform texts.

Two or three centuries before Abraham a dynasty of Kings ruled over Babylonia for 117 years who made Ur their capital. Wherever their traders had gone, the soldiers of Ur followed. We hear of campaigns in the Lebanon, and the last King of the dynasty fell while endeavouring to suppress a revolt in Elam. Babylonia was already an Imperial power, and claimed to be mistress of Western Asia. Its rulers regarded the Tigris and Euphrates as belonging to them; from their sources to the sea the two great rivers seemed to be of right the possession of the Babylonian Kings. Along their banks the agents of the Babylonian commercial firms made their way; silver and copper were brought from the mines of Cappadocia, the cedars of Amanus were floated down the Euphrates, and the pine-logs of Armenia down the Tigris, while the alluvial plain of Babylonia received its stone from the quarries of the Lebanon.

Between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean lived the Semitic tribes, whom the Babylonians called Amorites. They were not Beduin, who were known as the Sutu, and they were divided into a number of small principalities who acknowledged the supremacy of "the King of the Amorites." The King of

the Amorites paid tribute to Babylonia whenever the Babylonian Government was strong enough to enforce it, but there were also times when the Amorites successfully raided Babylonia and carried away its spoil. One of the Amorite principalities was Khana on the Euphrates, not far from the mouth of the Khabur.

In the age of the Dynasty of Ur, the Amorites were content to live on terms of peace and submission to their more powerful neighbours. "Governors" of the land of the Amorites were appointed by the Babylonian Government, and the fragment of a cadastral survey made by one of them for the purpose of taxation is now in the Louvre. Large numbers of Amorites settled in Babylonia for the sake of trade, and apparently were allowed equal rights and privileges there with the native inhabitants. Ur was naturally one of their chief places of resort. It was the capital of the Empire, it was built on the western side of the Euphrates, and it was a great centre of trade.

The Amorite language differed from that of the Semitic Babylonians as one Italian dialect differs from another. The Semitic language spoken in Babylonia had been profoundly modified by contact with the agglutinative Sumerian; the language of the Amorites, on the other hand, was comparatively pure. The Aramaic dialects had not as yet assumed a separate existence, and little difference could be detected between the Amorite language that was spoken in Canaan and that which was used in South-Eastern Arabia. The Amorite tribes of Canaan and South-Eastern Arabia alike looked to Samu or Shem as their common forefather or ancestral god; they revered the same deities and called their children by the same names.

With the death in battle of the last King of the Dynasty of Ur troublous times set in for Babylonia. How long they lasted is uncertain. When the curtain is again lifted, Northern Babylonia has been successfully invaded and occupied by an Amorite Prince. Sumu-abi, "Shem is my father," was his

name. But he had many rivals to contend against, and it was only gradually that they were slain or enslaved; and Southern Babylonia remained outside his authority. Eventually it was overrun by the Elamites, who established a dynasty of their own at Larsa. Meanwhile the Amorite King in the North had obtained possession of Babylon, which he proceeded to fortify and make the seat of his Government. For the first time Babylon became a capital.

The fifth King of the Amorite Dynasty, founded by Sumu-abi, was Sin-muballid. The Elamites were now more menacing than ever, and Sin-muballid struggled against them in vain. At his death his son, a mere boy, was placed on the throne of Babylon as a vassal-subject of the Elamite King.

The boy-King, however, was destined eventually to drive the Elamite back to his own land, to re-establish the Babylonian Empire in Western Asia, and to become one of the most famous of Babylonian Kings. To the Babylonians he was known as Khammu-rabi, to the Assyrians as Ammu-rapi, to readers of the Old Testament as Amraphel. While still a vassal of the Elamites he followed his sovereign-lord, Chedorlaomer, when he marched into Palestine to suppress a revolt of the Canaanite Princes on the shores of the Dead Sea. The district in which they lived was especially valuable in Babylonian eyes. It was a land of naphtha, and naphtha was as commercially important in the Babylonia of the Abrahamic age as petroleum is among us of to-day. It was used not only as mortar, but above all for heating and lighting purposes. The Babylonian lamp, of which the Greek lamp was the descendant, differed in shape from the lamps employed elsewhere in the Oriental world, and the shape was due to the fact that the lighting material was petroleum. Hence the naphtha district of Southern Palestine was a portion of the Empire which the Babylonian and his Elamite suzerain could ill afford to lose. The trade-route which led from it was protected by the hill-fortress of Uru-salim, the Jerusalem of the Israelites, the name of which, as written in the cuneiform texts, indicates that it had been founded by the Babylonians. The

name, in fact, is Babylonian, and means "the City of Salim," the first element in it being the same word as the name of Ur.

The campaign brought Khammu-rabi, the Amorite King of Babylon, into contact with another Amorite, Abram the Hebrew. Abram had come, indeed, not from Babylon, but from Southern Babylonia, where the Elamite Prince Eri-Aku, or Arioch, reigned in his capital of Larsa.¹ His migration to Canaan was no unusual event. He simply traversed the roads repeatedly trodden by the traders, the soldiers, and the officials of the day. Wherever he went there was the same official language, the same government, the same laws, and the same form of religion. As an Amorite, the Amorite language would have been that of his own home; as a native of Babylonia, the language spoken there would also have been familiar to him. The agents of the great firms were constantly passing to and from the West, and we hear of cases in which business obliged the heads of the firms themselves to be absent from home for several years. Between Ur and Harran, the first resting-place of the patriarch, the relations were particularly close, and in both cities the moon-god was the presiding deity. In the near neighbourhood of Harran was the town of Serug, and Serug, it will be remembered, was one of the ancestors of Abram.

In Babylonia Abram was known as an Amorite. Among his own people he had another designation. He was a member of the Amorite tribe of Hebrews who traced their descent from a certain Eber. The Babylonian form of Eber would be Ibirum, and this very name is met with in the cuneiform documents as that of an Amorite. On a stela dedicated to the goddess Asherah, which has been found near Diarbekir, Khammu-rabi is entitled, not King of Babylonia, but simply "King of the land of the Amorites," and this stela was erected by a governor of the province whose name was Ibirum.

That Eber, the Hebrew, should thus prove to be a personal

¹ The Ellasar of Gen. xiv. 1 represents the cuneiform Al Larsa, "the city of Larsa."

name may, perhaps, appear surprising to scholars who have been trained in Greek and Latin learning, and who naturally transfer the ideas acquired from classical mythology to the Semitic world. But the Semitic world differed from the Greek and Latin world just as it differs from the European world of to-day. The Semitic tribe goes back to an individual, and the name it bears is consequently a personal name. Cities and countries are personified, but not tribes or families. The eponymous hero was unknown to the Semite; in his place stood the individual ancestor from whom the tribe or family obtained its name.

The cuneiform documents have shown that what holds true of Eber holds true also of Israel. Israel also was the name of an individual, and it was borne by Western Semites in the Abrahamic age. One of the cuneiform tablets of that period from the Amorite State of Khana is dated in the reign of Isarlim, the Babylonian form of Israel, while another refers to a canal which started from the city of Zakku-Isarlim. Israel, therefore, is no ethnic title coined from the name of the Israelites. It was a personal name already borne by those Western Semites to whom Abraham belonged long before the time when the sons of the Biblical Israel descended into Egypt.

The name of Jacob, shortened from Jacob-el, is equally a personal name, and was still more common among the Amorites of the Abrahamic age. We meet with it, both in its full and in its abbreviated forms, among the Amorites mentioned in the legal and commercial tablets of that period. It was also the name of a Hyksos King of Egypt, and the Hyksos, or at all events their leaders, as we now know, were Canaanites in origin.

A large proportion of Amorite proper names, it may be observed, are compounded with *el*, "god." It took the place of the name of the specific deity to whom the child was dedicated at birth, and generally appears instead of it at the end of a compound. Each tribe, perhaps each family, had its own special god. The Hebrew tribe could not have been an exception; it, too, must have had its own peculiar deity. The

Old Testament tells us what it was, and the statement of the Old Testament is confirmed by the cuneiform texts. Already in the days before the Deluge we hear that "men began to call upon the name of Yahveh."

Several years ago I drew attention to the name of an Amorite mentioned in the cuneiform texts of the Khammu-rabi period which is written Yaum-ilu. This would correspond with the Jehiel of the Old Testament, the later Joel. Since then other Assyriologists have pointed out other Amorite names which also seem to be compounded with that of Yahu or Yahveh. Some of these, however, are of doubtful etymology. But we now know that in certain of them the name of the national God of Israel really appears. In legal documents of the Kassite period, which followed the fall of the Khammu-rabi Dynasty, Professor Clay has found names like Yau-bani, "Yahu is my creator"; Yaua, the Biblical Jehu; and the abbreviated Yâû, as well as the feminine Yautum.

How old the name of Yahu, generally written Yau, was among the dwellers in Babylonia, and how familiar they must have been with it, is shown by the lexical tablets in which Yahu is stated to be the equivalent of *ilu*, "god," and an attempt is made to explain it through a native Babylonian etymology. Before it could have been regarded as the equivalent of *ilu*, it must have been known for so long a period as to have become a general term for the deity. That it should have continued in use in Babylonia after the migration of Abraham and his family is only natural. The family of Abraham was but one among the many of Amorite ancestry which resided there; even the ruling dynasty, like the Hebrew patriarch, traced its descent from Shem. We have no reason for thinking that none of the Hebrew tribe itself was left behind in Ur. Nor have we any reason for believing that Yahu was worshipped only by the Hebrew tribe; other tribes as well may have participated in the cult.

From Babylonia the family to whom Abraham belonged would have brought the cult to the West along with the

civilization and traditions of the Babylonians. Terah, the father of Abraham, may have been compelled to leave Ur in the fourth year of Sin-muballid when a massacre of its citizens took place. The Amorite merchants are not likely to have been desirous of remaining in a place where massacres like that of our own time at Adana were being perpetrated; or the requirements of trade may have led him to take up his residence in a city which commanded the high road of commerce between East and West, and was, I believe, the capital of the Amorite Kings. From hence the journey to Canaan was easy and natural.

Already in the age of the Dynasty of Ur, as I have stated, there had been Babylonian governors of Syria and Palestine, one of whom is shown by his name, Urimelech, to have been a native of the country. In Canaan the governor represented the King, and as the Babylonian King was deified like the Roman Emperors, he received a title which originally denoted the viceroy or high-priest of a god. Now, it is remarkable that in the twenty-third chapter of Genesis, in which the purchase of the cave of Machpelah is described, Abram is addressed by the Hittites of Hebron by a title which is a literal translation of the Babylonian title, "Viceroy of the deified King." In Babylonia itself the King was called *ilu*, "god," in the singular, but we learn from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets that this was replaced in Canaan by the plural *ilâni* "gods," and in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, accordingly, the plural *elohim* is used instead of the singular *el*. Thus in the old law recorded in Exod. xxii. 28, we read: "Thou shalt not revile the *elohim* (or Babylonian King), nor curse his viceroy among thy people." Hence it is that in the account of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah the Babylonian *issak ili*, "viceroy of the deified King" appears under the form of "viceroy of *elohim*," with the plural "gods" substituted for the singular "god." Does the title thus given to the Hebrew patriarch mean that he, too, like Urimelech, exercised the functions of a Babylonian governor in the south of Canaan? This, at any rate, would explain the references to the troops which served under him and acted as

his bodyguard—the word used to describe them being a Babylonian term which on one of the Taanach tablets is applied to the “bodyguard” of the local sheikh,—to his alliance with the Amorite Princes, to his successful night attack on the Elamite army, and to his respectful treatment by the King of Jerusalem. His position would have been similar to that of the Egyptian governors and native Princes of Canaan about whom we hear so much in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets.

However this may be, the history of the patriarchal age and of the Hebrew patriarchs has now happily passed out of the region of subjective criticism into the domain of archæological fact. Even in Great Britain and America, the last refuge of obsolete German theories, there is beginning to be some glimmering of knowledge as to the results of scientific research in the field of Oriental archæology. For the archæologist and Assyriologist the question has long since been settled. In 1869 an eminent German philologist could prove to the satisfaction of himself and his disciples that “the fourteenth chapter of Genesis,” to use Professor Hommel’s words, was “the biassed invention of a later date”; to-day we have found the names of the Princes and cities mentioned in it on the Babylonian monuments, and have learned that the political situation described in it is historically true. To quote Professor Hommel once more, the verification of the story of Chedor-laomer’s campaign “will for ever remain a stumbling-block in the path of those who refuse to recognize a single line of the Pentateuch as genuine, and, try how they may to remove it, it will continue to defy their persistent efforts.” For the archæologist, at any rate, the fantastic theories of subjective criticism are as dead as the Ptolemaic theory of the universe.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.—My attention has been called to the following words of Professor Driver in his “Additions and Corrections in the Seventh Edition of the Book of Genesis”: “It is stated by Professor Sayce expressly, and by Dr. Orr and Professor A. T. Clay by implication, that Nöldeke’s arguments against the historical character of the narrative of Gen. xiv.

have been refuted by archæology. . . . It will probably surprise the reader to be told that, of the series of arguments thus attributed to Professor Nöldeke, while the one about the names is attributed to him with *partial* correctness (though, in so far as it is stated correctly, it has not been refuted by archæology), the other arguments were *never used by him at all!* Professor Nöldeke, in the articles referred to, does not say a single word about the political situation presupposed in Gen. xiv. being incredible and impossible, or about the impossibility of Babylonian armies at such a distant date marching to Canaan, or of Canaan being subject to Babylonia. . . . So far from denying the wide dominion of the Eastern power, Professor Nöldeke thus expressly declares that there are no reasons for questioning it! . . . The one grain of truth in Professor Sayce's long indictment is that of the names of the five *Canaanite Kings* [two at least] are formed artificially." A reference in support of this is given to Nöldeke's article in *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. T.'s*.

In my book ("Monument Facts," p. 54) I have given *two* references, not only one to the *Untersuchungen*, but also another to Nöldeke's article (written the next year) in the *Zeitschrift* (misprinted *Jahrbücher*) *für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1870) pp. 213 *et seq.* All mention of this latter reference is suppressed by Professor Driver, doubtless discreetly from the point of view of the negative critic, as will be seen from the following quotations, which I give, in order to avoid any semblance of partiality, in the translations of Dr. Orr :

Z. f. w. Theol., pp. 213 *et seq.*

"(1) I sum up once more the general points. Of the names in Gen. xiv. several are unhistorical. . . . (2) The expedition of the Kings cannot have taken place as narrated. . . . We have here to do with a romantic expedition, the direction of which is determined by the aim of sharper effect, and has in itself no historical probability. (3) The small number of the host whose complete victory over the four Kings is the climax of the story is contrary to sense, while nevertheless that number designates the maximum which a private person could possess of fighting men. Who now in all this will hold fast to a historical kernel may do so; he must then admit that at some perfectly uncertain time in great antiquity a King of Elam ruled over the land of the Jordan and made a military expedition to it. That would be the utmost concession I could make. . . . To myself it appears much more probable, in view of the consistent, and, for the aim of the narrator, exceedingly well-arranged, but still in reality impossible, course of the narrative that we

have here a deliberate fiction into which only one or two historical names have been introduced.”

This article was written in answer to the Assyriologist Schrader, but the article in the *Untersuchungen*, to which Professor Driver does refer, gives very little more support to the Oxford Professor's allegations. Here are some quotations from it :

“The unhistoricity of the narrative in Gen. xiv. . . . The ‘High Father’ of so many settled and nomadic peoples cannot easily be a historical person. . . . The dating is superfluous, and tells us nothing. . . . [Bera and Birsha are] quite decidedly unhistorical . . . [they are Kings of] the two mythical chief cities of the ‘Circle.’ . . . The alliterative pairing of the names of the other two Kings speaks more for their fictitious than for their historical origin. . . . The artificial chronology of Genesis is for us no rule. . . . The utmost we can admit is that the narrator has employed a few real names intermingled with false or invented ones, and that the appearance of historicity thus produced can as little permanently deceive us as the proper names in the Book of Esther. . . . This whole expedition is historically improbable, as it is adopted for the production of a striking effect : a sure sign that it is fictitious. . . . Does there not lie precisely in the minute details which give the appearance of historicity to the narrative a manifest improbability? . . . (As to Abram's pursuit) if that is possible, then nothing is impossible. . . . It is very improbable that the story rests on a real tradition. . . . The appearance of precision which the names and date impart vanishes entirely on closer examination.”

Comment is needless.

Professor Driver further assures his readers that Nöldeke “expressly rejects the explanation of Amraphel from Sanskrit,” leading them to infer that I have ascribed to him the explanation in question. So far from doing so, I have stated as plainly as English allows me to do that the attempts to derive the names Amraphel and his allies from Sanskrit had been made by other scholars, not by Nöldeke, and have even given a reference on the subject to Renan. It is not the first time, however, that I have found the “higher critics” unable to interpret correctly the meaning of an ordinary English sentence : it is, perhaps, not so strange, therefore, that the Old Testament writers should fare badly at their hands. The method of interpretation resembles the logic which fails to discover how the fact that the agreement of the pre-Mosaic Babylonian version of the story of the Deluge

with both the so-called Elohist and Yahvist narratives in Genesis can "impugn the critical conclusion that the Biblical narrative is composite." It is obvious that, if the latter is composite, the two authors must first have made a compact that the one should omit what the other inserted.



Spain and the Vatican.

BY THE REV. THOMAS J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.,
Secretary of the Spanish and Portuguese Church Society.

IT is almost impossible for the ordinary Englishman to understand the close relation that existed in Spain between Roman Catholicism and national policy. The task becomes harder viewed in the light of history, for in no country is there a greater readiness to absorb Roman dogma and a greater unwillingness, when the life of the nation is vigorous, to accept ultramontane dictation. Before the Spanish Church in the eleventh century became subject to Rome its policy towards non-Catholics was tolerant, for it held it to be lawful to attack Mahomedans with spiritual, not with temporal, arms. As Christians they might, at the peril of their lives, introduce the Gospel among those who followed the teaching of the Koran. This should be done with the tongue, which is the sword of Jesus Christ. Even in the thirteenth century the tradition of tolerance had not died out, and a verse of "Roncesvalles" says :

" Porta patet omnibus, infirmis et sanis
Non solum catholicis, verum et paganis,
Judæis, hereticis, ociosis, vanis ;
Et, ut dicam breviter, bonis et profanis."

When Rome became mistress of Spain, and the might of the Inquisition was established, Spain became proverbial for her ruthless persecution, and "The holiest Land of the Virgin" was the pitiless exterminator of all who differed from the orthodoxy of Rome. "Catholic unity" had to be preserved at all costs, and, as Ulick Burke concludes, "The Holy Office has done its work in Spain. A rapacious Government, an enslaved

people, a hollow religion, a corrupt Church, a century of blood, three centuries of shame—all these things followed in its wake. And the country of Viriatus and Seneca, of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, where Ruy Diaz fought and Alfonso studied, and where two warrior Kings in two successive centuries defied Rome temporal and Rome spiritual, and all the crusaders of Europe—Spain, hardly conquered by Scipio or by Cæsar, was enslaved by the dead hand of Dominic.”

A new Spain is arising from the ashes of the old. The French Revolution found the country unprepared for its influence; the Revolution of Prim in 1868 drove a dissolute Queen and her priestly Court from the land; but the nation was not ready for freedom. It needed the loss of her colonies and the defeat by the great Republic in the continent discovered and exploited by her sons to make her face facts and see the source of her downfall. In every corner of Spain fresh life is pulsating; her sons feel that they have a motherland to redeem from the influences that have strangled prosperity and blocked the course of freedom, and in the reaction they throw off the truth that Romanism teaches, as well as the error that has made Christianity abhorrent in their eyes. No longer is Roman dogma meekly accepted. Since the Council of Trent and the Syllabus it is no longer possible to differentiate between Roman doctrine and Roman rule in a land where the decrees of the Council have legal force and the teaching of the Syllabus has authority. The clash between medievalism and modern thought is violent, and, as a result, the dogmas of Nietzsche are the favourite beliefs of the young men in the Universities. Rome still is able to cause disturbance, but it can no longer give rise to civil war, for the manhood of the country refuses to enlist under the Papal banner. The Spanish people have at last learnt the lessons of history, and even Conservative leaders have to bow before the will of the people.

The Spanish Episcopate is no longer drawn from the parochial clergy. The great majority of the Bishops are members of the religious Orders, and the religious Orders are

not loved in Spain. By the Concordat of 1851 only three religious congregations can be domiciled in Spain. The Roman Church maintains that, as only two Orders are named, the third is to be "one for every diocese," and, as there are nine Archbishops and forty-eight Bishops in Spain, the three Orders may develop into fifty-seven! In order that the Queen Regent might have a strong religious party on her side against the parish priests, who were largely Carlists when Alfonso XII. died in 1885, the founding of religious houses was encouraged by her, and as a result the number of monks and nuns greatly increased. They grew from 21,200 in 1884 to 51,000 in 1902. The immigration from Cuba, the Philippine Islands, and France since that date has largely added to their ranks. No one now knows their exact number. In addition to "giving missions, helping the parish priests, tending the sick, and devoting themselves to works of charity and public utility," as prescribed by the Concordat, they have founded industries. Being exempt from rates and taxes, they are able to undersell lay manufacturers, whose employees, discharged from the closed factories, are naturally angry with those who have deprived them of their means of support.

Several successive Governments have carried on negotiations with the Vatican in order to secure a reduction of their numbers, and to bring their industries under the laws to which lay manufacturers are subject. Decrees of the Executive could not be put in force without breaking off negotiations, and the nation groaned under the burden. Last June the Government issued a circular to local civil authorities, stating that the number of the religious houses is excessive, and the people demanded their reduction. The local authorities were directed to send in returns detailing the number of the religious communities, and particulars as to their authorization, membership, and purpose. The houses received at the same time a demand to send in their returns within twenty-four hours. The authorized congregations were required to produce their deeds of authorization, and those not authorized were commanded to apply forth-

with for authorization. In the King's Speech of June 15 the royal message said: "The Government, in order to meet the aspirations of the nation, will subject the congregations to the civil rules regulating the right of association, but without touching their spiritual independence." It also referred to the negotiations with the Vatican for their reduction, and promised to introduce a Bill to prevent the establishment of new Orders without "civil authorization." The Cardinal Primate at once presented a protest, signed by fifty-six other Bishops, asserting the necessity and utility of all the existing Orders, and declaring that the approval of the Church was alone needed to secure the establishment of any Order in Spain. An agitation was set on foot against the Government, and the Catholic ladies did not hesitate to present petitions with the names of the female relatives of Ministers—proved to be forgeries—attached to them. Rome, too, protested, and angry letters passed between the Vatican and Madrid. Feeling ran high, and a great anti-clerical agitation replied to the action of the supporters of the Church.

Before the excitement of the Circular on the religious Orders had reached its height, the Government took another step. This spring the Protestant young men of Madrid determined to undertake a campaign in favour of religious freedom. They asked Bishop Cabrera and Señor Tornos—the trusted leaders of Spanish Evangelicals—to act as their advisers, and the two veterans thought that the young men should be encouraged in their work for Christ and freedom. Meetings were organized, and the adhesion of leaders in political and literary life was sought. Many flocked to the standard, and no one was more surprised than the enthusiastic young people by the readiness on all sides to stand by their side in the campaign. Orators of unsuspected power were found among the men who had only been accustomed to address small audiences in half-concealed meetings; public men were willing to stand by their side, and the civil authorities everywhere furthered their plans. In the large cities great crowds attended and cheered loudly the

demand for freedom, and a fire was set alight that seemed likely to spread throughout the land. No political party purpose was advanced, the speeches all had pointed reference to the right of all Spaniards to hold and propagate religious convictions, and men little suspected of sympathy with Bible reading proved that they were students of the Gospel. From small beginnings a great movement was seen to be probable, and the Press took notice of the gatherings. The Roman Church looked on in moody silence. It knew that any attempt to crush the spirit that had been roused would end in failure, and might add to its strength. It dreamed that it would come to nothing, for the Canovas decree was still in force, making it illegal for Evangelicals to show their existence in any public manner.

It is necessary to state clearly the law with reference to religious tolerance. In the Concordat of 1851, Article I. says: "The Catholic religion, Apostolic and Roman, shall, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship, continue to be that of the Spanish nation, and shall be always maintained in the dominions of her Catholic Majesty." In 1868 religious liberty was granted under the provisional Government of General Prim, and this was in force until the Restoration, when, much against the wishes of the Pope and the Bishops, Article II. of the new Constitution (1876) was carried by a majority of 221 over 33.

"The Roman Catholic Apostolic religion is the religion of the State. The nation takes the obligation to maintain the cult and its ministers. No one shall be hindered by reason of his religious opinions nor in the exercise of his cult, except with regard to the respect due to Christian morals. Nevertheless, no other manifestations or public ceremonies will be permitted than those of the religion of the State."

The Pope, in an energetic protest, called this tolerance "an innovation offensive to the sacred rights of the Church." In a letter to the Archbishop of Toledo he said it violated every obligation of truth and of the Catholic faith. "It annuls illegally the Concordat between the Holy See and the Spanish nation, exposes the State to the charge of wrong, and opens a door to

error—error which is but the precursor to a long succession of ruinous evils to the nation so long and true a lover of Catholic unity.” Señor Pidal, the leader of the Roman party in the Senate, called it “A crime against the nation, morality, and religion.”

Señor Canovas, on the morrow of its promulgation, interpreted, in a Royal Order tolerance, in the narrowest sense, and in his Order forbade “All acts performed in the public highways, or on the outer walls of a church or cemetery, making the announcement of ceremonies, rites, or practices of dissident religions, whether in the form of processions or by that of posters, symbols, bills, etc.” Semi-concealment was henceforward to be the fate of Evangelicals. Even the English Churches could not have a notice of their existence placed on the walls in English! No advertisement of services was allowed. No Evangelical school was permitted to proclaim its site. Changes in the method of entrance had to be made, so that no passer-by could by any means see the interior of a church.

Under the Queen Regent the front door of Bishop Cabrera’s church was kept closed, and an inscription in Latin, “Christus Redemptor Eternus,” had to be erased. Under her son the crosses had to be removed from outside the English Church in Barcelona, and unfortunate Colporteurs and Evangelicals, by straining the letter of the Order, were frequently imprisoned on charges of making public manifestations. One man has been seventeen times in gaol by the caprice of mayors acting under the influence of local priests; his imprisonments were illegal, but he had no redress. In recent years the enlightened government of King Alfonso has put an end to persecution of this description, and the civil authorities have protected, on several occasions, the Evangelicals attacked by priestly venom. Hard indeed was the lot of a Spanish Bible reader; under the Royal Order he was considered to be a leper to be shunned, or a mischievous kind of vermin that had to be endured because he could not be exterminated.

The King’s Speech declared the policy of his Ministers to

be the amplification of the interpretation of the Article in the sense of "liberty of conscience." The Prime Minister issued a Royal Order declaring that public manifestations do not include "inscriptions, symbols, bills, etc., on buildings and in cemeteries belonging to non-Roman Catholic bodies." These are henceforth to be regarded as legal, and Evangelicals are allowed to creep out of their semi-concealment and live in the open. The Bishops are angry, and their language shows that they are less sure of their ground than they were in 1876, for they say "that the change is less a privilege accorded to the infinitesimal, the insignificant minority that does not belong to the State religion, than a humiliation inflicted on nearly the whole of the Spanish people." Surely the Government is a better judge of what the people wish, when they applaud their action and the leaders of the Opposition do not attack them, than the Bishops who consider "nearly the whole of the Spanish people," their adherents, even when—as is the case—their churches are attended and religious duties are only performed by a small minority!

The Government has acted with great firmness and skill. The Pope denounces the action against the religious Orders as well as that in favour of tolerance as breaches of the Concordat. Whatever may be said as regards the former, there can be no doubt as to the exemption of the interpretation of the Royal Order from the Concordat. Modern States are accustomed to be master in their own dominions and interpret their Constitutions without regard to external influences. Monsignor Moyes asserts for English readers that "The accessory medieval overlordship, with which the Papacy was clothed in other days, in so far as it was political or temporal, is something which is no more likely to return than the galleons or bows and arrows of the Middle Ages." In Spain the attempt is being made to assert this overlordship by pretending that a particular interpretation of the Constitution is a breach of the Concordat. No Spanish political party will now admit the right of the Papacy to do this. Spain is the last refuge of the Vatican's temporal

claims, but Spanish statesmen are too modern and too enlightened to admit its demands. The attempt to force Spain to accept the Papal view of its Constitution has raised a spirit of revolt that is bearing everything before it, and no step back is possible for any Cabinet that wishes to remain in office. The King has boldly thrown his influence on the side of freedom. The great demonstrations in public have shown the world what Spain thinks. Party differences have disappeared in the national assertion of its right to govern as it desires, in a purely domestic matter, without regard to the interference of the Pope. The beginning of the end is in sight, and the national will is finding expression, not in the policy "a free Church in a free State," but in the more drastic movement in favour of "a free Church in a Sovereign State." The pity of it is that there is the gravest danger of the Sovereign State being a godless and non-Christian State. Such is the nemesis of history. Christianity killed by the unchristian policy of those who arrogate to themselves the right to be intolerant in forcing on others medieval accretions to the faith and the dogma and discipline of infallibility.



Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

IV. WILFRID AND THEODORE.

IT is an historical fact of great importance, which still, however, needs to be often repeated, that the English Church was not created by the State. On the contrary, the English State was created by the English Church. There was a united Church of England before there was a united Kingdom of England; and it was the union of the dioceses of England under one Archbishop which was the main cause of the union of the kingdoms of England under one King. But we have not yet

reached the time when this important fact can be regarded as a truism which everyone knows and no one would dispute.

But if the new-born Church of the English was to become a model of unity to the English nation, it must first become united in itself, and when Aidan died in 651 this was far from being the case. Two influences had been at work in converting the English, one issuing from Rome and one from Iona; and, although these two were in agreement as to the essentials of the Christian faith, yet they differed considerably in externals—in liturgy, in the time for keeping Easter, and in the form of the tonsure. Some of these differences, and especially the last, seem to us to be very trivial, and to belong to those things which Gregory had told Augustine need not be in all Churches the same. But all experience shows that great religious bitterness may be generated by differences about usages which in themselves are unimportant; and there was real inconvenience when Christians of the same locality differed about some of these things. It was destructive of Christian sympathy and decency that, at the same Court, the King (Oswy) and his followers should be keeping Easter according to the Iona system, while the Queen (Eanfled), who had lived in Kent under the Roman system, was still keeping the fast of Holy Week. The differences throughout the English nation ran somewhat as follows. Kent and East Anglia followed Rome. Wessex, which had been largely converted by the Roman missionary Birinus, for the most part did the same. The two Northumbrian kingdoms were decidedly Scottish, although, owing to the earlier influence of Paulinus, which had been kept alive since his departure by James the Deacon, the Roman system was not unknown there. Mercia and Essex, owing to the work of Northumbrian missionaries, was to some extent Keltic in its Christianity.

King Oswy could not fail to be impressed by the divergence between his Queen and himself as to the time for keeping Easter. Both could not be right, and the question ought to be settled. So in 664 he summoned a synod to meet at Whitby, where the Abbess Hilda presided over a religious house for both monks

and nuns. She had been baptized at York by Paulinus in 627, but had come under the influence of Aidan, and at Whitby she gave her support to the Keltic side of the controversy. The leading advocate on that side in pleading before King Oswy was Colman, third Bishop of Lindisfarne. The leading advocate on the other side was the presbyter Wilfrid. Like Hilda, he had been under both influences, but in the reverse order. He had been a novice at Lindisfarne, and had gone to Rome with Benedict Biscop in 653, and had returned to England in 658. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the Roman system. Bishop Agilbert of Dorchester was present on the same side. But he was a Frank, and could not easily make himself understood to the English, so greatly had the two languages diverged since Augustine had used Franks as interpreters about seventy years earlier. So the conducting of the Roman case was left to the presbyter Wilfrid.

It is worth while to understand the question at issue. Both sides agreed that Easter Day must be kept on a Sunday, and that the Sunday must be so many days after a particular new moon. The Keltic usage was to take the first Sunday on or after the fourteenth day of the moon. The Roman usage was to take the first Sunday on or after the fifteenth day. Thus the Keltic usage allowed Easter Day to fall on the fourteenth day, and excluded the twenty-first day; while the Roman excluded the fourteenth day and admitted the twenty-first.

Colman appealed to St. John and the Quarto-decimans, who were supposed to have had his authority. But the Quarto-decimans' practice was really quite different from the Keltic. They had kept the fourteenth day, whether it was a Sunday or not, and this had been universally condemned. Wilfrid appealed to St. Peter, from whom, he said, Rome had received its custom, which had never varied. This plea was as futile as the other. It is not very probable that St. Peter ever laid down any rule about Easter, and it is quite certain that the Roman usage had changed. Experience had proved that the Roman cycle was a vicious one, and a better one had been adopted. The one solid

argument that was used was on Wilfrid's side—viz., that it was unreasonable that two tiny islands like Iona and Lindisfarne should set up customs at variance with the rest of Christendom. But it was not this argument which decided the case. What proved decisive with Oswy was that both advocates admitted that Christ had given the keys of the kingdom to Peter. "Then," said the King, "I cannot have him against me who is admitted to have the keys." The majority agreed with the King, and the Roman rule was adopted. Hilda loyally accepted the decision, and her influence smoothed the general adoption of the rule; but Colman and the clergy who held to his view returned to Iona. The decision respecting Easter carried with it a similar decision respecting the tonsure and other matters, and in a comparatively short time conformity with the Whitby decision was established in all English dioceses, although a few even of the English clergy preferred to migrate to Iona. In 710 the northern Picts conformed, and Iona itself in 716. The Britons in Wales, with characteristic unwillingness to agree with the English, were the last to give way; but they yielded in 768. Meanwhile an important development in the history of the English Church had taken place some years before the synod at Whitby. Paulinus, who had left Northumbria in 633, and had been made Bishop of Dorchester, died in 644, and was succeeded in that See by Ithamar. Hitherto all the Bishops of the English nation had been outsiders, either from the Continent or from Scotland. Ithamar was an Englishman, and the English now began to have Bishops of their own race.

When Colman resigned the See of Lindisfarne after his defeat at Whitby, Tuda, an Irishman, who accepted the Roman Easter, was consecrated as his successor. Tuda was soon carried off by the yellow pest; and then the Northumbrian Kings, with their council of wise men, chose Wilfrid, the victor at Whitby, to succeed him. Wilfrid begged to be allowed to go to Gaul for consecration, in order that none of his consecrators should have any of the taint of Iona. He was consecrated, with the magnificent ceremonial that was so dear to him, at

Compiègne. Twelve Bishops were present, among them Agilbert, formerly of Dorchester, who had allowed Wilfrid to take the lead at Whitby, and who was now Bishop of Paris. Wilfrid made the grave mistake of lingering for many months in Gaul, perhaps attracted by fine churches, vestments, and music, and did not start for England till the spring of 666. He had to contend with wreckers on the coast of heathen Sussex, and when he at last reached Northumbria he found troubles of another kind awaiting him. Although the party whom he had defeated at Whitby had accepted the Roman Easter, they had not been eager to accept as Bishop the man who had deprived them of their old usages. His long absence gave them an opportunity of getting rid of them, and Wilfrid found that another man had been elected and consecrated. This was Chad, one of the most beautiful characters in early English history. The see had been moved from Lindisfarne to York, and Chad, consecrated by Wini of Winchester and two British Bishops, was established as Bishop of York. Wilfrid went off to Ripon, and both there and at Hexham he spent much time in building a fine basilica. At both places crypts, which may be his, remain, but nothing of his work survives above the ground.

We have now reached the spring of 668. On the Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 26, Pope Vitalian consecrated Theodore of Tarsus to be Archbishop of Canterbury. Both Deusdedit, the late Archbishop, and Earconbert, the Kentish King, had been carried off by the yellow pest on the same day (July 14, 664), and the man elected to succeed Deusdedit had also succumbed to the plague. But at last, on the Second Sunday after Pentecost, 669, this very capable Oriental, brought from the Eastern Church to Rome, and sent from Rome to the extreme limits of Western Christendom, was enthroned on the seat of Augustine. It was a momentous day for England. Tarsus had produced a St. Paul to found Churches at the extreme East of Europe, and it produced a Theodore to consolidate newly-founded Churches at the extreme West. The Apostle of the Gentiles and the organizer of the English were

very unlike one another in many things, but both of them were alike in this—they were both endowed with great gifts for the work which God required them to do, and they both used the gifts with which they were endowed.

Theodore was sixty-six, and he knew that, in the rough climate to which he was so unused, the night in which no man can work might come very soon. If he was to accomplish the great commission which had been entrusted to him, he must work strenuously; and he began his labours at once. As it proved, he had a Primacy of twenty-one years before him, but no one could have expected that when he arrived.

It was an excellent omen that, in spite of his foreign origin, he was heartily welcomed by both the people and their rulers. It may have increased their interest in him that he came from the East. It was certainly an advantage in their eyes that he had been consecrated by the Bishop of Rome himself. But the greatest advantage of all had to be discovered by experience, for it lay in his own strong personal character. He was masterful and determined, perhaps we may say despotic; he had a clear head and a strong will—and these were just the qualities which were needed for the work which he had to do, for he came to regulate a Church which, to a disastrous extent, lacked unity, organization, and culture.

The English nation had been converted piecemeal from a variety of centres, and by missionaries whose ecclesiastical systems did not agree. Five years had elapsed since the Roman system had been preferred to the Keltic system in the Synod at Whitby in 664, but general uniformity had not been reached. With just one Bishop to each kingdom, the dioceses were far too large, and the work could not be efficiently done. There were still heathen scattered up and down the kingdoms; and Sussex and the Isle of Wight, separated from the rest of England, the one by its belt of forests and the other by its belt of sea, were still mainly heathen. Moreover, in spite of the learning which some missionaries had brought from Iona, or Ireland, or Rome, there was a very low condition of education

among the clergy. Many were too busy to study, and very few had opportunities of obtaining instruction. This great need appealed to Theodore at once.

After going through the dioceses and regulating what called for immediate attention, he developed a great school at Canterbury, where Latin and Greek were taught to such purpose that, as Bede says, some came to know these languages as well as their native tongue. Not only theology and other ecclesiastical subjects were taught, but astronomy, music, and medicine. Theodore was himself a teacher, and was aided by Hadrian, whom Vitalian had at first selected as Archbishop, but who had begged that Theodore might be chosen instead. He did not want to shirk; he was quite willing to go to England and work, but he did not feel equal to going as Archbishop. He was Theodore's very competent helper in many things.

Then came the question of unity and organization, and Theodore made a great advance towards this in summoning a Synod to meet at Hertford in 673. Of his six suffragans, four came; and Wilfrid, who was now established as Bishop of York, Chad having retired to Lichfield, sent persons to represent him. Many teachers came with the Bishops, but only the Bishops were regarded as members of the Synod. It was a notable assembly. The English Parliament is often called "the mother of Parliaments," other nations having copied us in having such. But the Synod at Hertford was the mother of the English Parliament. In it the English Church met for the first time as a single body, and at that time the English Church was the only representative of the English nation. The Synod at Hertford, therefore, was the first of our national assemblies, and it decreed that a Synod should be held annually at Clovesho. Theodore proposed that the unwieldy dioceses should be divided, but there was so much opposition to this that he did not insist upon it. He was able, however, to bring this about in particular cases, first in East Anglia and then in Mercia.

Then, in a high-handed way, without consulting Wilfrid, he divided Northumbria into four dioceses, leaving Wilfrid at

York, but taking Bernicia, Deira, and Lindsey from that see. Wilfrid protested; Theodore persisted; and then Wilfrid appealed to Rome, and left the country to plead his own cause there—the first instance of an appeal to Rome in the history of the English Church. In his absence Theodore, without assistant Bishops, consecrated three Bishops for the three new sees. Pope Agatho called a council to consider the matter. Fifty Bishops assembled in the great basilica of the Lateran, and their decision was a wise one. Wilfrid had been irregularly deprived of the greater part of his diocese, and the Bishops who had been intruded must retire. But the division of the huge diocese was necessary. Wilfrid must hold a council at York, and, with the council's concurrence, must select Bishops to assist him. He must choose men with whom he could work peaceably, and then present them to Theodore to be consecrated. Thus each side got what was essential—Wilfrid that his rights as Bishop of York should be respected, and Theodore that so large a diocese should have more than one Bishop.

Wilfrid regarded the decision as a triumph, and he found Rome so attractive that he repeated his error of 665, and stayed away from his diocese for months. He remained in Rome till the next Easter (680), and was delighted at being asked to take part in a council to consider the case of the Monothelites. But his satisfaction received a rude shock when at last he did reach home. He had forgotten that not only Theodore, his Metropolitan, but Egfrid, his King, had been committed to the arrangement which Rome had condemned. And he had, perhaps, never known that by no means all Englishmen had the love for Roman decrees that he had. They revered the Bishop of Rome, and regarded him as the leader of the Church. But they had the dislike, which Englishmen have shown all through history, of having the affairs of the nation settled by a power outside the nation by "outlandish" jurisdiction. It did not matter whether the outside power was a Pope, or a King of Denmark, or a Duke of Normandy, or a King of Spain, or a King of Hanover. What they thought fair and fitting was

that English affairs should be determined by English rulers in Church and State. And when Wilfrid waved in their faces the decree of a Roman Bishop, upsetting the arrangements of their own Archbishop and King, they concluded that such a decree must have been either forged or obtained by bribery. Unless swayed by evil influences, the Bishop of Rome would never have issued such a decision. The question of his right to decide the case seems not to have been raised. Wilfrid was put in prison as an impostor.

When at last he was released he went off to convert his old assailants, the heathen savages of Sussex. As Bede says, though Wilfrid's own diocese was closed to him, "he could not be restrained from the ministry of preaching the Gospel." There was a famine in Sussex, and Wilfrid taught the people to catch fish, before himself becoming a fisher of men. The King gave him two hundred and fifty slaves. He taught them, baptized them, and set them free. This is the most beautiful part of Wilfrid's work, and we will leave him at it. He lived to be restored to Northumbria, to be again expelled, to appeal again to Rome, and to walk across Europe at the age of seventy in order to plead once more in person. The result was a compromise. He lived five years longer, and in the autumn of 709 he passed peacefully away, just as the monks in the choir of his minster of St. Andrew, at Oundle, were chanting the 104th Psalm. He ceased to breathe when they reached the verses: "When Thou hidest Thy face, they shall be troubled; Thou shalt take away their spirit, and they shall die, and shall return again to their dust. Thou shalt send forth Thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth."



Evangelical Religion at Oxford in the Later Sixties.

BY THE REV. A. C. DOWNER, D.D.

IN the later years of the seventh decade of the nineteenth century Evangelical religion had no easy task to maintain itself in Oxford. It was then only some thirty years since the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," and the "Essays and Reviews" were still recent. These had almost divided Oxford religious life between them, and there was a strong anti-religious movement. The works of John Stuart Mill were the centre round which unbelieving speculative thought chiefly moved.

At that time none of the senior members of the University came forward as leaders of Evangelical Churchmanship. There were, indeed, men of this type who exerted an influence on University life, such as the saintly Cotton, Provost of Worcester, and Symons, Warden of Wadham. Dr. Payne Smith was the Regius Professor of Divinity, and Dr. Heurtley the Margaret Professor. C. P. Golightly was residing in Holywell Street, and doing good in his own quaint way; and there were other men with similar sympathies. But though their example told powerfully, none of these could be described as a leader. On the other hand, there were Dr. Liddon and Dr. Pusey, Dr. Bright and Dr. King, all of whom were keen leaders on a different side of Church thought. Dr. Burgon was a power for good in a place of his own apart from these, but he could not be ranked among Evangelical men.

Nor were there any institutions to which the Evangelical feeling of Oxford might attach itself. There was no Wycliffe Hall, nor Hannington Hall; no Oxford Pastorate, nor even the Inter-Collegiate Christian Union. It seemed that Evangelical religion was destined to be crowded out of the University.

Under these circumstances the men who saved the situation were parochial clergy. In the absence of those who could have brought the weight of University dignity and position to the

cause, a few men, diverse in gifts, and acting for the most part individually, but strong in faith and in devotion to Christ, set up a banner in Oxford, which rallied many and kept them true to the principles they had received elsewhere, and carried an influence into the very heart of the University, especially among the undergraduates, that is being felt to-day. How splendidly they came to the rescue, and how great the effect of their work was, my best endeavours will fail to convey. These clergymen were the Rev. Henry Linton, Rector of St. Peter-le-Bailey, and formerly Fellow of Magdalen; the Rev. Alfred M. W. Christopher, Rector of St. Aldate's; and the Rev. Edward Penrose Hathaway, Rector of St. Ebbe's; ably assisted by their curates, especially the Rev. George Tonge at St. Peter's, and the Rev. T. A. Nash at St. Aldate's. Later, the Rev. Sydney Linton, son of Henry Linton, became Vicar of Holy Trinity; while Dr. French and Dr. Barlow successively took up the work at St. Ebbe's. Apart from all these, but exercising an influence of his own, was the Rev. Joseph West, Vicar of Holy Trinity, and Chaplain of New College—a most singular preacher, of the old Puritan type. I must not omit to mention the strong individuality of H. C. B. Bazely, of Brasenose, who at the time of which I write was a young B.A., not yet ordained.

It was round these men that the Evangelical feeling of the undergraduates gathered; and as, after the manner of Evangelicals, they acted together only to a very limited extent, each of them had a separate following of his own of those who, from temperament, training, or accident, found themselves attached to one leader or the other.

These clergy were not authors, but men of prayer and action. They live for us, not in their written works, which were few and of little weight, but in their saintly lives, their spirit of prayer, their constant zeal, their untiring efforts for the spiritual welfare of the undergraduates, their generous hospitality, their fervent support of foreign missions, their constant maintenance of the simplicity of worship, and the brightness and

loving warmth of their teaching and of the Gospel which they proclaimed. Beside their efforts, there were movements indigenous to the undergraduate life. One of these had arisen some few years before the period of which I write. It began in Wadham through the efforts of W. Hay M. H. Aitken, and another undergraduate named Freeman. During one of their vacations they had taken part in some revival work, in which the father of the former, the Evangelist, Robert Aitken, of Pendeen, had, I believe, been the leader. On returning to Oxford they resolved to speak to every man in the College about his soul. This effort met with extraordinary success. A number of Wadham men dated the beginning of their conscious religious life from that time. Prayer-meetings were held in the College, Evangelistic effort was set on foot, and a movement began which vibrated throughout the University.

At the time of which I write, this movement, though still remembered, had spent its force. There were only two agencies left representing the independent Evangelical energy of the undergraduates. One was a prayer-meeting, held twice a week, in the afternoon, in the famous "Upper Chamber" of the old Rectory House of St. Aldate's, No. 40, Pembroke Street; and the other, which found a home in the same room, the Oxford University Tract Distribution Society, the members of which visited defined districts in the villages around Oxford, with the consent of the parochial clergy, lending and exchanging tracts amongst the parishioners. There is not much to be said about these two institutions, except that, while undoubtedly of good tendency, they were somewhat dry and formal. I remember seeing the conductor of the prayer-meeting go round the room inviting each of the few men present to offer prayer, and being refused by all of them in turn. In the Tract Distribution Society there was a fair amount of activity, but a morbid fear seemed to obsess some of the members lest their tracts should be of too Evangelistic and stimulating a character. A strong element in it voted consistently at the general meeting for confining the tracts circulated to the publications of the

S.P.C.K., at that date less lively and telling than they have since become.

Another institution, chiefly, though not exclusively, worked by Evangelical men, mostly of graduate standing, was the Oxford Union for Private Prayer—a most excellent organization, which still survives, though, unfortunately, in a languishing condition. Many saintly names are recorded in its list of members.

The institutions set on foot by the parochial clergy were the Saturday Evening Meeting for Prayer and Exposition of the Scriptures, by the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, in the old Rectory “Upper Room,” undoubtedly the most powerful Evangelical influence in Oxford at the time; the Friday Afternoon Meeting for Missionary Intercession at the house of the Rev. Henry Linton; and a useful Greek Testament Class on Sunday evenings, conducted by the Rev. George Tonge, Curate of St. Peter-le-Bailey, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle. Of each of these I shall speak in its order.

Such was the condition of Evangelical religion and effort in the University as I remember it when I went into residence as a freshman in October, 1866. Brought up in the old High Church school of thought, I had later received a strong impulse of an Evangelistic rather than Evangelical nature, and, beyond a few occasions on which I had listened to well-known men like Goodhart and Molyneux, I was unaccustomed to Evangelical sermons. Probably one of the first I ever heard was from the Rev. T. A. Nash, at St. Aldate’s Church, when I went up to try for a scholarship in 1866. Of Evangelical Churchmanship I knew very little, and was inclined to be critical.

In our first term, my schoolfellow C. S. Bontein, of Oriel, and I called upon Mr. Christopher at his house, Richmond Lodge, and received a cordial welcome. He invited us to his Saturday evening meetings, which we promised to attend. We went to the University prayer-meeting, of which I have spoken. I was also made a member of the Tract Distribution Society, and joined Mr. Tonge’s Greek Testament class.

In Lent term, 1867, the same two began some Evangelistic meetings at Sutton Courtney, which brought us into connection with two senior men, H. C. B. Bazely, of B.N.C., and C. H. C. Ward, of Exeter. At our second meeting these two joined us. This was the beginning of Bazely's Evangelistic work, which largely developed in after-days. Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, prohibited Bontein from taking an active part at any such gatherings, which led to his migrating to a Hall, and subsequently to his seceding to Plymouth Brethrenism. The Principal of my own College did not interfere. He said that there was free trade in religion nowadays.

I now go back to describe the work and influence of Mr. Christopher. He was a Cambridge man, an M.A. of Jesus College, and had been a University "Blue," playing in the cricket eleven of his year as one of the winning team against Oxford. Mr. Christopher, now an Honorary Canon of Oxford, happily still survives at the age of ninety to greet the old friends who visit him with the same cheerful smile and hearty welcome that they remember so vividly from olden days. It was his practice in term-time to remain at home all day in order to receive visits from undergraduates, to each of whom he addressed words of warm sympathy and counsel, frequently inviting them to join with him in prayer; and he used to furnish his young friends with a good supply of books and tracts of an earnest Evangelical tone. He was especially fond of Caroline Fry's "Christ our Example," Scott's "Force of Truth," and Brownlow North's books, as well as those of the Rev. J. C. Ryle.

Mr. Christopher frequently invited us to breakfast at his house, and it was in this way that I became acquainted with Mrs. Christopher, one of the most gracious and amiable ladies I have ever been privileged to meet. On Saturday evenings I went regularly to the Rectory meetings, and there for the first time found myself amid a circle of Evangelical friends. Mr. Christopher used to expound the Scriptures, especially Rom. v., and to offer up earnest extempore prayer. Very many times

have I sat listening to his simple fervent words with intense feeling. The "Upper Room" was usually crowded. From time to time Mr. Christopher would invite leading clergy to address this meeting, and to preach in St. Aldate's the following day. Among these I remember C. J. Goodhart, James Bardsley of Manchester, J. C. Miller, Wilkinson of Birmingham, W. Cadman of Marylebone, and W. Haslam. Mr. Christopher's method was simple. His first and dearest effort was to induce men to receive the truth of the Gospel of Christ, and he would tell many anecdotes of the conversion of well-known men, both clerical and lay. Next to this he sought to show the reformed character of the Church of England, and to guard us, always most charitably, against contrary errors. Thirdly, he was ever stirring up the more earnest men to speak to their College friends about the things of God. And, lastly, he put before us the great ideals of service in the mission-field abroad and the great parishes of our large towns. Every effort for good found him a sympathizer and helper. He lent his Rectory room for the University prayer-meeting and the Tract Distribution Society. The useful schemes of others were as welcome to him as his own.

In the summer term, 1867, H. C. B. Bazely went to Mr. Christopher and proposed that Evangelistic meetings should be held in the Town Hall, St. Aldate's. Bazely was a man of a remarkable kind. He was the son of an old High Churchman, who had been a Fellow of Brasenose, and a Proctor of the University. As a schoolboy at Radley, his mind turned against the system in which he had been brought up and which he considered the discipline of the school to foster. He had taken a Classical Scholarship at Brasenose, a First Class in Moderations, and a Second in Greats, and was now a Hulmeian Exhibitioner of his College. Later, he took the Denyer and Johnson Theological Scholarship, in 1868, and proceeded to the B.C.L. degree. He would not take the M.A., as he thought he should be required to sign the Articles of Religion. His ecclesiastical position was undetermined when I first knew him, but afterwards

settled into Presbyterianism. His theology was Calvinistic, but with large-hearted appreciation of the views of others. At this time, he was in communion with the Church of England and he always continued in regular attendance at Mr. Christopher's Saturday Evening and other meetings. The "Life of Bazely," by Canon (now Bishop) Hicks (Macmillan, 1886), gives an account of many events in his life and many features in his character. Somehow, however, it fails to present the man as we knew him, and the author seems to have missed the peculiar aroma of his personality, with its quaintness, which had assimilated a strong Scotch quality, and its dry and biting, but not unkindly, humour.

The meetings in the Town Hall were duly arranged and issued in great success. Various well-known Evangelistic speakers were obtained to address them, amongst whom were Lord Radstock, the Earl of Cavan, Robert Baxter, Stevenson Blackwood, Admiral Fishbourne, William Taylor the navy, Joseph Samme the costermonger, and the Rev. W. Haslam. Some fifteen hundred townspeople gathered at each meeting; vast numbers of tracts were distributed, including "A Saviour for You," "The Sinner's Friend," and others; and many undergraduates took part as mission-workers. Some of the speakers, especially those of good social position, used the opportunity to influence the undergraduates. Chief among these was Lord Radstock, who would breakfast with us in our rooms and there meet many of our friends.

While this work was at its height and was creating no little stir and even excitement amongst us, one morning, in the Summer Term of 1867, I was walking with C. H. C. Ward round the Schools, near Broad Street, while he, in his enthusiastic way, was expatiating on the need of constant prayer for such an important movement. Brasenose being in a central position, it was agreed to invite our friends to a short prayer-meeting every evening; and, although the "Eights" were then in full course, we had twelve or fourteen men every evening, with a great spirit of prayer, in what was then the back "Quad" of Brasenose,

now pulled down. The following term, F. J. Chavasse, of Corpus, proposed that this meeting should be removed, with Mr. Christopher's permission, to St. Aldate's Rectory, in place of the meeting previously held twice a week. In this way originated the University Daily Prayer-meeting.

Open-air, cottage, and other meetings were organized to influence people for good, both in Oxford and in the villages. The clergy of St. Aldate's, St. Ebbe's, St. Peter-le-Bailey, and Holy Trinity, welcomed help from the University men, thus providing an outlet for their new zeal. F. J. Chavasse instituted a Sunday-school in a cottage at New Hinksey, at that time without church or school. Amongst his helpers were W. Sinclair, scholar of Balliol, W. B. Brown of B.N.C., and others. Bazely started an outdoor service on Sunday evenings, at the Martyrs' Memorial. These special efforts impressed many townspeople with greater respect for junior members of the University than they had felt before.

Once a year, Mr. Christopher gave a great Church Missionary breakfast, inviting senior, as well as junior, men. Some well-known speaker was obtained and a strong missionary feeling was kindled. On one occasion, at Mr. Christopher's house, I listened to an evening address from Sir Bartle Frere, the tenor of which I well remember. The rooms were crowded, and men were sitting on the staircase.

I must now turn to speak of the work of the Rev. H. Linton, of St. Peter-le-Bailey. The Friday afternoon meeting for missionary intercession at his house, Northbourne, was very different from those of which I have spoken above. Mr. Linton's deep sense of reverence disinclined him for extemporaneous prayer in public. The prayers at this meeting were from a Missionary Liturgy drawn up by Dean Goulburn and others, and were read by Mr. Linton himself. They were very beautiful, and I have continued to use them, with my curates, for a great part of my life. Mr. Linton made us many gifts of books, such as the works of Dean Vaughan, Mr. Bourdillon, Dean Goulburn, Dr. Heurtley, and others. Here I first saw the

Rev. C. P. Golightly, who, I believe, regularly attended these meetings.

The Oxford Union for Private Prayer was at this time closely connected with this meeting. On Trinity Tuesday a social meeting and luncheon for the members was held at Islip Rectory, but was afterwards transferred to Mr. Fremantle's, at Claydon.

Mr. Linton was an assiduous distributor of tracts. One of his own on "Assurance" I remember well, and still have a copy. He kindly gave me a class in his Sunday school. Mr. Linton, probably more than any other clergyman named, visited undergraduates known to him in their rooms; and he used to invite us about once a term to an evening party at his house.

The Rev. E. P. Hathaway, Rector of St. Ebbe's, was a man of burning zeal and acute, far-seeing intelligence. His health was infirm, and he suffered from sleeplessness. Mr. Hathaway had been a barrister, and his legal knowledge was of essential service to him in the important enterprises which he undertook. By his efforts, I believe, an Evangelical ministry was obtained for St. Aldate's, St. Peter-le-Bailey, St. Ebbe's, Holy Trinity, and St. Clement's, the advowsons being secured and suitable appointments made. He had two excellent curates, H. E. Fox, a Cambridge man, since Hon. Secretary of the C.M.S., and W. B. Brown, whose mission-work is known all over the country. Mr. Hathaway devoted his efforts largely to the interests of the five parishes named, and every year raised a large sum to supplement the inadequate endowments. He also cared for the parochial schools, and concerned himself in finding curates for the parishes. In this way a great force was brought to bear both upon the city and the University.

The sphere in which Bazely moved was altogether his own, though he was in constant touch with the older men, especially Mr. Christopher, and with great modesty and loyalty attended their meetings. He had not yet seceded to Presbyterianism, and probably at no time was he more useful. As a theological "coach" he was in contact with many undergraduates. To me,

as a junior man, he gave much valuable advice and assistance in my reading, lending me his marked editions of the classics. He gave me many publications by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, which helped to clear up my views on various subjects. I was with him constantly, both in term-time and vacation, for about eighteen months, in 1867-68, and took a long tour with him in Scotland and the Shetlands in my first long vacation, beside uniting with him in various Evangelistic enterprises in Oxford and elsewhere. After that he drew off, not from any coolness, but, I believe, because he thought I was now able to stand alone, and other men needed his care more. He was a diligent visitor amongst the poor, and generous in his gifts to them. As a tract-distributor he was indefatigable. In his outdoor preaching he greatly excelled his efforts indoors, which were often rather dry. Canon Hicks has included in his "Life" a description, contributed by me, of Bazely preaching at the Martyrs' Memorial—a unique and remarkable figure.

One of the most striking events I remember during my undergraduate life was the famous meeting in Brasenose Hall, held by Bishop T. V. French, of Lahore, and John William Knott, formerly Fellow of Brasenose, previous to their going out together to India. Many of the leading personages of the University were present; and, though I cannot remember much of what was said, I can never forget the figures of those two devoted men as they stood up and simply told of Christ and His cause in heathen India, where the latter was destined to fall within a year and a half, and the other was permitted to labour for many years more before yielding up his own life in the midst of his work.

These reminiscences may seem to disclose no large or connected movement, nor do they tell of any comprehensive organization, and still less of any influential patronage secured for the Evangelical cause. But the power of God was in and with these simple-hearted men. They lived and prayed, and laboured and suffered. Some smiled; others disapproved; most held aloof. "Of the rest durst no man join himself to them."

But God was with them, and let none of their words fall to the ground. They spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance, and their influence was more direct and effective, in all likelihood, than could have been exerted by any diplomacy or any patronage. The Oxford of to-day has more organized effort and more prominent names to back it. It will be well if it can wield the same power and achieve as great results.



When the Foot Drags.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.,

Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells.

THIS is a contribution to the study of the inner life of the minister of Christ; an attempt to clear and invigorate that inner being when the foot drags. To put a new spring into that dragging foot, or even to show the way to lift it, is worth attempting, even if the venture be not wholly successful.

I. Let us first ponder carefully *the complaint*.

It is easily identified, for all my ministerial readers will have traversed that very dark subway of life which I have ventured to describe by the dragging foot. The mood comes on with more or less suddenness, and, when it comes, plunges us into the worst of life's morasses. The old buoyancy which has hitherto kept us afloat in God's free air disappears, and the strangest of changes takes place in the inner spirit. The joy of work evaporates, the sense of hopefulness disappears, the love of our fellows suffers an eclipse, the delight in rapid movement ceases, our songs are dirges, and then, well—the foot drags.

The distressing part of the complaint is that, in spite of it, we have to keep moving, the foot has to be kept "on the go." Visits must still be paid to souls hungering for some buoyant message of life, sermons must still be preached to congregations who are more or less dependent on our life and brightness,

classes must still be conducted, whether the foot drags or not. If only we might go away somewhere, far from the madding crowd, and conceal that dragging foot where no one might see the poor paralyzed thing, we could better tolerate it. But this cannot be. It has to be dragged in the face of the sun and the world.

Of course, there are various degrees of intensity in the malady, but in whatever measure it appears it is eminently distressing. Sometimes we detect it in the feeble response within us to God and truth. Sometimes it comes in the form of strain; work, which before we did with alacrity, changing into a burden now. Sometimes we feel wooden, so that we can scarcely arrive at a single worthy thought to pass on to our flock. We do not doubt our creeds, or lose a general kind of faith in the powers of God, but faith takes less and less the living form of personal trust and assurance. Formalism stretches its chill hands over us and our work. We cease to have visions of the Holy One, cease to run to meet Him, cease to leap in the ways of service and duty. In a word, the foot drags.

Truly, of all the many complaints which afflict the poor parson this is the very worst, the one we dread most, the one which strikes the hardest. It almost seems as if all the mischiefs of life find their king and chief in it.

II. We will now dwell for a little on *the curse of the dragging foot*.

Naturally, under the circumstances, there is *an arrest of usefulness*, for our moods are a part of our message and ministry, and our depressions and exaltations being more or less contagious, there is nothing more certain than the stoppage of blessing. A doleful mood is not a worthy setting for our bright Gospel, and a minor key cannot properly represent the truth as it is Jesus. It is very much as if we draped a white marble statue with crape, or sang a bright song in a tearful voice, or played the Dead March at a wedding. We get over but little ground when the foot drags. We are like a broken-

down motor-car drawn along by horses; but ministers and motors are intended to run more easily than that.

And does there not seem to be *a sort of scandal* in the dragging foot? A religion which has broken down is not the nicest spectacle for our people, and a joyless religion is not the best of advertisements for so gladsome a faith. The consciousness of this does not tend to make our foot drag the less. And, of course, the more the foot drags, the more the dust rises, and the deeper the roadway is scored. It is a sad pity.

Yes, and we know that *one dragging foot means others* before long, by sheer contagion. For if we expect our people to imitate our good features, they are not likely to stop there. They will certainly go on to imitate our bad ones as well. And depression not only drags, but drags down. It puts weights in the place of wings. It lowers, not only our own vitality, but the vitality of the congregation. It is a thought we are not often brave enough to face, but it is one which has to be dealt with. For, just as the soldiers' feet keep pace with the band in front, so do parochial feet have a tendency to keep pace with the swift or dragging foot of the minister. It is a serious matter, this dragging foot.

It seems sometimes a little hard that we ministers should stand so much before the footlights, but is it not a part of the plan? The city set on a hill is the chosen image of the Master for His children's position in life, and evidently they are set there, like the lamp on the stand, to be seen and to be useful. We may, if we choose, place a bushel measure over the light, but we do it at our own peril. No, instead of complaining of the blessed heights to which the grace of God has raised us, let us fall in with the Divine plan and play well the part assigned to us. True, our feet may be more visible as we move about on the high places. Then all the more reason for our acceptance of the promised blessing that He will make our feet like hinds' feet, nimble and springing, and all the less excuse for us if the foot drags. In truth, there can be no more serious accusation against us than this dulness of movement, this

slowness of pace, this want of spring, this absence of heart, this presence of effort and strain, when the foot drags.

III. God forbid that I should make sadder the hearts of any of God's weary servants! And, were it not the fact that we are never nearer a rise than when we are conscious that we have sunk the lowest, I should scarcely have ventured to write so strongly of the curse of the dragging foot. But a sense of inward wrongness is the best of spiritual springboards from which to leap upwards, and so let us treat it, passing on now to the consideration of *the causes of the dragging foot*.

We may look in several directions for the occasion of this sad visitor, and, no doubt, it is from a variety of causes that the depression comes.

Frequently, it is the product of *an overstrained body and mind*. For weal or woe the soul is tied to a weak body, a frail brain, and brittle nerves, and we do well not to forget the frailty of the physical partner. But some intense souls are apt to forget all this, and to hurry heedlessly on to a physical breakdown. The sharp sword wears the scabbard through. The experiment has often been tried, and the results have often been reaped, but in every generation the experiment is tried over again in the hope that bodies and minds are stronger than of old. But they are not. And then the spiritual foot drags too. Under this condition of things the doctor is the best spiritual physician, for the overstrained mind and body have to be dealt with as the procuring cause of the soul's ills.

Not infrequently the foot drags because of *the overstrained soul*, for the soul which tries to do both its own part and the part of God is not unlikely to break down. Surely, the whole art and science of spiritual work is to do *our* best, and leave all else to the Master. To shoulder both burdens is fatal. Probably, it is true that it is not so much work that wears as worry—and worry is not the less worry because the soul is anxious about the results of work. The golden path is the path of energetic work and energetic faith, and then an easy, confident mind that what is out of our hands is now in the

Lord's, and may be happily left there. "Commit thy works unto the Lord, and thy thoughts shall be established." Some may protest at such apparently cold-blooded quietness, but it is in reality a purer spirituality to trust God with the issues than to worry and spoil all with a dragging foot. No doubt, it is better to wear out than to rust out; but why do either? Steady work is better than a rush, and spiritual spasms are not half so reliable as the steady pressure which lasts, because the strain is less tearing. We are apt to think ourselves indispensable. It is well to learn that God has other agents, and still others, and that when the time comes to superannuate His servants He has others just as good, and perhaps better, in reserve. "He that believeth shall not make haste." *Festina lente*. It is scarcely likely that the foot will not drag when we tug about heavy weights which do not rightly belong to the foot.

Now, if the foot drags because we overwork or overstrain body, mind, or spirit, it is also true that the foot drags when *we work too little*. And we may say with some certainty that, as a cause, it is a more disastrous one than doing too much. Neglected duties recoil upon us in just this way, compelling us to stagger with a dragging foot. One feels a great admiration for the worker who from overwork breaks down, but the worker who is prostrated by apathy and laziness and neglect provokes indignation rather. We cannot waste our sympathy upon him.

Apparent failure, also, is apt to breed the dragging foot, for we cannot bear, if we are in earnest, the plodding, cheerless work that seems unproductive. Naturally, we want to see fruit; we should not be human if we did not. But we must learn to draw a distinction between results which we can see for ourselves and results which God sees. Oftentimes "their works do follow them," and these we cannot see just yet. There are disappointments in all work, whatever the character of the work may be. The Lord Jesus Himself had them. But failure, absolute and final, in any work done for God, and done in Him, is not only impossible, but unthinkable.

Want of appreciation has sometimes a hand in the weighting

of the foot, and there are certainly many who feel bitterly that they are undervalued. Bishops know them not. Patrons pass them by. No incense of praise ever greets their nostrils. Newspapers are oblivious of their eloquence and talents. The masses seek out more popular preachers. They are just stranded, and they do not like it. And as they sit and ponder their desolate condition, they feel a paralysis creeping downwards until the spring is gone. Well, human nature is very human, and we can hardly expect perfection in an imperfect world. Still, is there not a little that is rather too human about this cry and longing for appreciation and popularity? We are ministers of Christ, are we not? and we say that our best rewards are inner ones. And may not the spirit of self be a little too much in evidence here? It has sometimes happened that appreciation and incense and adulation, thickly laid on, have acted a worse part in the deterioration of the soul of the minister than the sheerest of neglect. Pedestals are giddy places, and brains are weak and easily turned, and some have become sadly spoiled by position and dignity and elevation. The safest places are lower down. Why court publicity, then, and notice? Why long for human uplifting? Besides, we may be as able and worthy as we think we are, and—we may not be. And the chances are that if we hold so lofty an opinion of ourselves and our deserts, that we are proud and conceited. Surely, the Divine notice is not a trifle, and if He applauds with His "Well done," that surely should outweigh all earthly neglect. No wonder that the foot drags with this overestimate of ourselves hanging on so sadly. Perhaps God is waiting until we discover that we are not worthy, until the spirit of humility comes in, until we are satisfied that, amidst the unnoticed world, He knows and praises and rewards. It is very likely. It is the man in the parable who takes the lowest room to whom the Master says, "Friend, go up higher."

Unkind criticisms can heavily weight the foot, as most men know in the course of their ministry. We cannot please everybody. Somebody is sure to find fault. But, however much

fault-finding is experienced, we do not easily get used to it. We may do our best, but we shall not often get the credit for it. Sometimes criticism is true, and we shall do wisely to welcome the wholesome correction. And if it is not true, we need not mind much, for most likely the critics did the best they knew, and meant it well. And if they meant it maliciously, we must comfort ourselves with the reflection that it will not break any bones. The truth is, that hard words are rarely meant, that unkind words sound worse than they truly are, and that, like sparks recklessly thrown out, they only ignite what is dry and flimsy.

But, probably, the deepest reason for the dragging foot is *the lack of proper nourishment*. If the heart were half as well nourished as the head, we should seldom drag our foot. But alas! how often it is not. When prayer is stinted, and communion with God shelved, when we are more with man than with God, when we read and study other books to the neglect of the Word of God, when we are ever drawing on our own resources and are satisfied with them, when the Holy Spirit is ignored in the inner apprehension, when the Church hides away the real presence of the Head of the Church, it is no wonder that the foot drags. We become faint from starvation. The truth is, it is a hard thing for the ministers of Christ to be always in the very pink of condition as they ought to be. It is only by spiritual exercise, plenty of spiritual nourishment, and that nourishment taken often, that we can keep the spring in the foot, and prevent its dragging. But never has it happened that, given the right attitude, the right energy, the right confidence, and the right expectation, the foot has dragged.

IV. It is of course better to prevent the foot dragging than to cure it after it has lost its spring; but when it is dragging, the first thing is to set it right, and to restore it by a radical cure. So let us deal with *the cure of the dragging foot*.

And, surely, the first duty is *not to acquiesce* in it. One may easily do this, and in sheer despair let things go. It is easy to point out its folly—a folly which men do not perpetrate in

temporal things, in the care of the bodily health, or in the mending of broken fortunes. But we too well understand that with a certain pitch of depression the work of self-recovery is difficult, and the longer it is delayed the more difficult does it become. And this is why that, to insure a real cure, the spirit of hope should be nourished, and the will set to the overcoming of this tyrannous mood.

And, just as surely, the second duty in the interest of a radical cure is to *cut off all occasions* to depression and despair. We must be content, if the root be physical, to go slowly, to moderate our energy, and to keep within bounds. To go on at the highest pressure in the face of these serious warnings is suicide of mind and body, to say nothing of a soul sapped and sacked. Your elastic band will stretch, and stretch, and stretch, and—break. Most broken men might have been saved had they been content to listen to the physical and mental voices and obey. But no, they must go on; the time is short; better, they say, to wear out than to rust out; and then—something snapped, and left them a ruin.

But if the cause be a spiritual one, then the remedies must be spiritual too. So, frequently, the call is to *come back to God*, to mend the broken connections, to drink afresh of the waters of life and healing and strength. Honestly, it is as backsliders we have to return to God, in repentance and faith and renewed self-surrender. Then, when we hear again the welcome of the Lord, and taste afresh of His sweetness, and feel His hand upon our heads and hearts, the depression will vanish, and the old refreshing waters of comfort will be found flowing once again into the deep places of the spirit. But restoration requires, further, the *maintenance of the higher levels* of life, the uplands of God, where we shall walk with Him in communion. Here we shall find the bracing air which is the soul's natural atmosphere; here will sound the voice which, sweet and low, shall encourage and cheer us on our way; here the discords of earth shall be silenced, being too far off to articulate themselves to our hearing; here shall we learn to leave God's part to God,

and be content with doing just our own ; here our powers shall be found at their best and highest ; and here the pull of the world shall be least and weakest.

But all this will not come as a matter of course. Nothing so comes in the spiritual experience. The worker's path is beset with temptations and snares which have to be met and checkmated continually. There will come the intrusion of the self-spirit which literally poisons the very centres of the inner man. The temptation to be somebody important, the temptation to shine, the temptation to achieve glory, will sap the inner purity if not checked by some higher motive. And when self sweeps us off our feet, the fall which ensues is a bitter experience.

There will come, too, the spirit of the world, with its show and materialism, its excitements and its witchery. The world has tremendous sapping power, and, like a stream undermining the bank, and bringing down many a mass of good soil, it undermines the Christian worker off his guard. The world's breath soils all that it touches, and takes the shine out of all the spirit's bright things ; its tentacles, like that of the stinging jelly-fish, benumb progress. This thing and that may look harmless enough, but when the results are totalled up, lo ! we find ourselves like a despoiled Samson with our strength gone.

We cannot, of course, keep ourselves in glass cases, shut off from all harmful things, but we can cushion our spirits by the intervention of that blessed protecting shield which the Divine Spirit introduces.

We must do as we do on wet days—pick our way and choose out the cleanest spots. For earth's mud and clay sticks, and is quite heavy enough to weight the foot and make it drag. We must learn to walk lightly, remembering the old royal saying that the world is a bog, and they go best over it who go quickly. And if the pull of earth be strong, we must hitch our waggon to a star and neutralize its attraction. Our course takes the line of the strongest pull, and if that be Heaven's, we need never fear that the foot will drag. Like the troops who have on

occasions to march lightly, let us be careful not to multiply impediment and to add unnecessarily to our baggage.

But, after all, the main consideration for us who minister in holy things, and who fear the dragging foot, is the inner one, for the foot follows the heart, and where the inner springs are right, the jolting and the jar will be lessened. And for this the upward look and the realized Presence are the main resource. Left to ourselves, we drag: held up by the higher attractions, we soar. There can be no tyranny of moods when the Lord is Master. There can be no dragging foot when the Lord is Lifter.



The Holy Angels.

(ST. MICHAEL AND ALL ANGELS' DAY, SEPTEMBER 29).

BY THE REV. HERBERT A. BIRKS, M.A.,
Vicar of Kingsbridge, Devon.

THIS earth is God's fair dwelling,
Where angels come and go,
Their gracious tidings telling
Of love to man below.

Strong dwellers in the far light
Of God's most holy hill,
Who wander through His starlight
And silent spaces fill—

In tangled wildernesses,
On tiny blades of grass,
Ye print your happy kisses,
And bless them as ye pass.

In unsuspected places,
Mid tenements forlorn,
Ye light on children's faces
The sunny smile of morn.

The wakeful birds that twitter
As earth turns toward the sun,
With peeping eyes that glitter,
Are happy every one.

Their little wings that tremble
In palpitating light
Are swift and strong and nimble
To emulate your flight.

The innumerable humming
Of busy working bees
Reveals your unguessed coming
Amid the moving trees.

The glamour of the morning,
Its tender shining dew,
Or fairy bright adorning
Of frost is brought by you.

There's not a sound in nature,
Of rain or brooks or seas,
But takes some form and feature
From your soft harmonies.

When homes are filled with sorrow,
And hearts are chilled by fear,
Ye whisper of a morrow
Of still abiding cheer :

Nor e'en the deepest sadness
Of earth's most troubled place
Can disenthroned the gladness
That meets you from God's face.

O visitants from heaven,
O lovers of this earth,
To us may grace be given
To share your holy mirth,

Till after this life ended,
 Before the unveiled throne,
 Our songs with yours are blended
 In perfect benison.



The Crisis of Romanism.¹

BY THE REV. ARTHUR GALTON, M.A.,
Edenham, Bourne.

THE volume which is the occasion of the present article is well worth reading for its own sake. M. Houtin is a most accomplished writer, and those who know French best will have the highest appreciation for his work. He is known most widely for his masterly account of Americanism, and for his two admirable volumes on *The Biblical Problem in France* during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Besides these books, he has written on various biographical, historical, and ecclesiastical subjects. He is equally at home in matters of antiquarian research and of contemporary social interest. He has the right as a student to discuss the former, and he knows the latter by experience. He deals with them all by the strictest and most impartial methods of historical investigation. He has a passion for documentary evidence, and he handles all his subjects with a lightness of touch, a wit, an urbanity, and a rigorous logic which are not too common in our English theological discussions.

If M. Houtin's book stood alone, it would be a very grave sign of what is happening in contemporary France with regard to ecclesiastical affairs; but his volume is only one among many scores, written by ecclesiastics, ecclesiastics, and pious laymen, about the present crisis of Romanism. The list of books published by M. Émile Nourry alone would surprise English readers, both by their number and their titles. Every distinctive article and practice of Romanism is challenged by those who have been, or who still describe themselves as, Catholics. Besides these critics, there are many Protestant controversialists, as well as the greater multitude of anti-clerical writers. Many of the latter do not make a clear distinction, even in their own minds, between clericalism and Christianity. When they think they are attacking the latter, they are really dealing only with the former. The worst foes to Christianity in France are the clericals, who assert that the Roman system and Christianity are inseparable. France is not at bottom an irreligious country, but the very opposite. It is the confusing of religion in general and of Christianity in particular with an exceedingly vicious system which makes so many Frenchmen hostile in appearance to much

¹ "The Crisis among the French Clergy," by the Abbé Houtin; translated by F. Thorold Dickson. London: *David Nutt*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

that for us in England is bound up indissolubly with our notions of religion. That system is arbitrary and theocratic, and therefore it is opposed to all the intellectual, social, and political ideals of modern France; it is controlled ultimately, and ever more directly, by a foreign power, and therefore it is anti-national and unpatriotic; it is retrograde and even obsolete in its knowledge, and yet it aims at the exclusive control of education. It is not surprising that the vast majority of the French nation either hate or fear it, and that a growing number of its own adherents are becoming ever more and more uneasy, perplexed, and restive under these galling fetters.

This is the crisis which M. Houtin describes. He calls it the crisis among the clergy because it falls heaviest on the clerical body, from the beginning of their education until the close of their ministry; but it affects the whole French nation indirectly, and more especially that part of it which may still be described as Catholic. What that proportion may be is a disputed question. The present population of France is over 39,000,000. The number of practising Catholics, that is of those who obey the laws of the Church and contribute to their religion, is put by some authorities at about 8,000,000; by others it is reckoned as low as 4,000,000. The latter figure is based on the returns of certain French Bishops, which were presented recently to Pius X., to his grave displeasure and dismay. These numbers do not represent the masses of people who are christened, married, and buried by the Church, but who have no further dealings with the clergy; whose first Communion, if they make it, is also their last; who are not Catholics by conviction or Christians in practice, but who merely accept certain rites through ancestral habit or in deference to social custom. The numbers quoted include those who attend Mass more or less regularly, who do not wholly ignore the regulations of fasting and abstinence, who contribute something to the ecclesiastical finances, especially to Peter's Pence, and some proportion of whom fulfil their annual Easter duties of confession and communion. Only those who perform all these acts are practising Catholics, and strictly "in the Church." Statistics prove that the number of these is exceedingly small; and the clergy list, especially in the big towns, as well as the amount of church accommodation, show that that number cannot be large. Whether the larger number of lax and nominal or conventional Catholics be reckoned at 8,000,000 or at 4,000,000 out of nearly 40,000,000, there is a significant shrinkage compared with the state of things when France could be described truthfully as Catholic, and when the overwhelming majority of the nation was said to profess the Roman Catholic religion. That was the description given by Napoleon's Concordat in 1801, and still more was it true of the older Gallican Church down to the revolution in 1789.

As long as Gallicanism flourished, the nation was the Church and the Church was the nation. The religion may have had its faults, but at any rate it was national and patriotic. It appealed to the vast majority of Frenchmen, and was interwoven with the whole course of their history. With the Concordat all that was altered. The restoration of the Papacy and of the Jesuits in 1814 led to that increase of centralization, obscurantism, and Vaticanism which were flaunted in the Syllabus of 1864, and which culminated by the definition of Papal infallibility in 1870. Since then the

centralizing and arbitrary process has gone on unchecked; and a century of Vaticanism, even under the Concordat, has led to the de-Catholicizing of France, and to the shrinkage, which has been pointed out, in its Catholic population.

Such, on one side of it, is the cause of the crisis with which M. Houtin deals. As has been remarked, M. Houtin is only one among a crowd of similar writers. The most recent, and in some ways the most interesting, of them is the anonymous American author of some "Letters to Pius X.," who points out that "Catholicism and Romanism were not always one"; that "the old Catholic independence is lost, the old episcopal dignity sunk to serfdom"; and, he adds, "weakness, the inevitable consequence of subservience, is the universal result." Bishops are chosen principally for their Papal zeal, that is for their subservience and flattery. Strong men, scholars, and thinkers, are suspected and repressed. Episcopal action is narrowed continually by the Papal administration; Bishops are now little more than consecrators of holy oils, christeners of bells, ministers of Confirmation and Orders. Neither initiation nor administration is left to them. They have no security of tenure, but depend helplessly on the good-will of the Apostolic See. Priests, in like manner, depend absolutely on their Bishops, and are appointed for very similar reasons; submission and abundant contributions are the two chief virtues in favour at Rome. It is not surprising, in these circumstances, that the Church is withering, and that Rome dreaded above all things, at the separation of Church and State in France, the re-establishment of an independent episcopate and clergy. Since 1814 the Papacy has been steadily killing Roman Catholicism. The process has been hastened in France by separation, which has removed the last feeble barriers against the unchecked bureaucracy of the Vatican; but this process is not limited to France: it prevails now throughout the Roman system, and is continually growing. Mr. Gladstone pointed out the dangers of Vaticanism to the State, but he failed to see how utterly destructive it was bound to prove to every Church that was submitted to it. For this reason, the Papacy is not nearly so dangerous to Governments and to society as many people imagine. The system emasculates its supporters, and most of all its chief administrators. The more perfectly it is carried out, the feebler it must become; just as the Roman Catholic system devours every country, intellectually, physically, financially, in proportion to its predominance there, as Spain has shown, as Ireland is now showing.

But the internal or intellectual crisis among the French clergy is no less grave than the disciplinary or administrative crisis. A system which only exists by manipulating history is bound to suffer educationally in two ways. Those who submit to it blindly are educationally weak, and their standard is far below the average acquirements of these times. Those who acquire a better knowledge, who have both the courage and the honesty to use it, rebel sooner or later against the system. Either they go out of it, or they remain only in the hope of working a future and a gradual reformation. The numbers of clergy who go out are large. They are reckoned at 1,000 in the last ten years. The recruiting of the seminaries has become very difficult. In 1888 there were 2,169 vacancies among the parochial clergy, and 1,679

ordinations. In 1903 there were 2,560 vacancies and 1,649 ordinations. The vacancies will certainly increase, and the ordinations diminish, as education extends and the effects of Separation come to be appreciated by Catholic parents. The methods and policy of Pius X. will certainly add enormously to the intellectual difficulties of existing and intending clergy; and besides the difficulty of finding men, there is the ever-growing difficulty of providing money to maintain them. This, again, is due very largely to the aggressive and selfish policy of the present Pontificate. Rome, as has been noted, feared an independent clergy, and it vetoed every law because its jurisdiction was ignored by the State in dealing with what it held firmly and properly to be a domestic question.

Now, it is a mistake to suppose that all the present difficulties in France are produced by what is called Modernism, and it is a further mistake to connect Modernism exclusively with destructive Biblical criticism. All Modernists are not critics, and all critics are not destructive or extremists. Those who are can be dealt with best by the patient methods of scholarship. Truth will always in the end find its level, and it can only be reached through hypotheses and free inquiry. These of themselves imply errors by the way before the goal is reached. In intellectual matters force is no remedy, and is the worst of crimes. Since the thirteenth century Catholicism has been stereotyped, tied to a scholastic method which is dead, crushed under an obsolete philosophy. In the sixteenth century all the medieval errors were re-affirmed in the sole interests of the Papacy, which is founded only on medieval ignorance. The Papal theory was enforced by the crimes, chicanery, and violence of the Catholic reaction. Society, by degrees, has liberated itself from this tyranny, and science has been able to assert those rights which were denied and crushed at the revival of learning. Education and freedom have spread, and are spreading ever more widely, the results of knowledge. Hence the crisis in the Papal Church. The Papacy is striving to keep the men of the twentieth century back in the thirteenth. Difficulties nowadays, as Tyrrell says, "are almost entirely of a positive and historical character," and they are felt more or less by the whole educated population of Europe and North America. As education spreads, they will be felt equally elsewhere. The struggle is sharper in France because she is more logical, more intelligent, and more civilized than any other country. She is the protagonist of science and freedom. The Papacy is the protagonist of reaction and retrogression; first, because its infallibility commits it to all the errors and the evil machinery of its past; and, secondly, because whatever else may go, the Papal authority and claims are both rejected by competent scholarship and free criticism.

It is deeply interesting to see how many of the conclusions reached by the Anglican Reformers are now being repeated within the Papal Church by its own historians and critics. Modernists of this sort are only claiming precisely the same rights which we took in the sixteenth century. We can only deny those rights by destroying our own historical and theological position. Let us, then, be patient where these newer scholars may appear to differ from, or ever to deny, some of the conclusions reached by our predecessors four centuries ago. We cannot see the world altogether as they

did, for very obvious reasons. Mankind will not stand still to please the Anglican Reformers any more than to please the Roman Pontiffs. Let us look forward with courage and good hope, for we may be sure there will be no sound and permanent Christianity again in France until the Papal centralization is utterly destroyed.



The Missionary World.

BY THE REV. A. J. SANTER,

Formerly C.M.S. Missionary in Bengal.

FROM an article entitled "Little India," by the Principal of Trinity College, Kandy, quoted in the *C.M.S. North India Gleaner*, we learn of the awakening activity of the Buddhists. The missionary in charge of the Cotta district says: "Never have I known a year in which the Buddhist opposition to Christian work has been so severe and intense, and our means to combat it so limited." He gives instances of schools almost emptied of the scholars and the Government grant lost when a new Buddhist school is opened; all the influence of the local authorities seems to be used to prevent the children attending Christian schools any longer. Every Sunday Buddhist preachers from Colombo visit the chief centres and attack and revile Christianity.



For the first time in the history of the mission in German East Africa, we are told in the *C.M.S. Gleaner*, the inheritance to a chieftainship has come to a member of a Christian family. Mr. Deekes writes: "The inheritor is a small boy, the son of our teacher Yusuf. The father of the child, being an earnest, conscientious servant of the Master, desirous of having everything above board, objected to any heathen rite or ceremony in the claiming of the inheritance. For this reason he consulted me, and I called all the members of the family together, with the headmen and chiefs of the tribe, and held a council in the compound of the mission. Yusuf's fearless stand and bold testimony to the power of the grace of God in his life before that vast assembly of heathen were cause for great thankfulness. He said that if there were anything incompatible with the Christian religion which he and his son believed, and by which their lives were regulated, he would advise his son to forego the inheritance. . . . I took the opportunity of saying, 'Your heathenism must soon die; it cannot continue for long; it must give way either to Mohammedanism or to the Christian religion.' Here there was an interruption, the whole assembly with one accord declaring no less than three times: 'Then it shall be Christianity. Take our children and teach them, but away with Mohammedanism; we will have nothing to do with it. . . .' Will our friends pray for us, and also help us in every way possible to make good use of this unique opportunity?"

Mrs. H. S. Phillips, of Kien-ning, South China, writes in the *Gleaner*: "One of our new little policemen here was talking to one of our Bible-women, and he said: 'You know, when we first started work this year, the people looked upon us with suspicion, and disliked having us, and thought we were only here to trouble them; now everyone sees we do good, and are here to keep order, and they are pleased to have us. It is the same with you Christians. We all used to hate you, and think you were here to harm us; but now, you know, the whole city believes that Christianity is good, and that you are here to do us good.' It was rather nice testimony from a heathen, and shows the absolute change of opinion."



The call for more workers, especially qualified Indian workers, is emphasized by the following in the *Awake* for August: "The Indian clergyman who is stationed at Montgomerywala, a village in the Chenab Colony, Punjab, estimates that there are 2,000 people in the district, covering seventy square miles, who wish to be accepted for baptism, but through lack of workers no arrangements can be made for teaching them."



"Here is the testimony of a poor widow lately baptized in South India as to the joy which Christ has given her: 'I have been overwhelmed with grief and sorrow, and have known very little happiness, and I thought grief was my lot for life. But ever since I came to understand that my Saviour died for me, my joy has been so immense that I feel as if I am crowned.'"



Pleasing testimony to the power of the Gospel to give light and liberty is given in the extract from a letter in the *C.M.S. Gazette* by Mrs. Skeens, lately working in Busoga: "A bright example is that of L—, living far away from her country with her husband, S—, a teacher right amongst the rude Bakavirondo. L— teaches the women daily on the veranda of her house. One of her converts was baptized the last time we visited them. This good woman and her husband have left all for more than four years, and have been like lights in a dark world. Their little home is as beautiful as any English cottage in its faithful witness for Christ. They are beloved by the people amongst whom they live, and have great influence over them. Their catechumens numbered sixty when we were there last, and they told us that the people gave them no rest, they were so anxious to learn."



Dr. Archer of the Ranaghat Mission, Bengal, reports in *Mercy and Truth* the conversion and subsequent baptism of a young Brahmin from Behar. He is a youth, twenty-two years of age. "He was suffering from chronic Bright's disease, and had been advised to come in for treatment. From the first the truth of the Gospel impressed itself upon him, but he feared to openly tell his brother, and to confess Christ." But ultimately he did so; and then followed persecutions and threats. He was removed to another station where he was taught, and he rapidly advanced in knowledge, winning every

one of the workers by his faith and gentle character. He was baptized by Dr. Monro on August 1, taking the name of Luke. He is now very weak physically, but he is a bright witness in the hospital . . . his knowledge of the Word is splendid. He speaks very freely of his home-going, and always smiles, saying it will be good to go to Jesus. His mother and one elder brother came 500 miles to win him back, but, recognizing how firm he stood in the faith, they have troubled him no more. His brothers now visit him in the hospital frequently, and we pray that they too may come out for Christ.



Literary Notes.

DR. R. A. TORREY has prepared a volume for publication which is likely to secure a wide circulation. It cannot help being of vital interest to readers of *THE CHURCHMAN*. It is called "The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit." A new book by this well-known evangelist is always an event looked forward to with eagerness by his numerous admirers. In this volume they will find that he has in no wise lost the gift, one might almost call it the great gift, of exposition and exhortation. Every point is made and brought home with his characteristic vigour, while at the same time it can be said that seldom has the writer been so inspired with the true spirit of devotional fervour. We feel sure that the book will make a deep and lasting impression on the reader. Messrs. Nisbet and Co. expect to issue it this month at three shillings and sixpence.



From the same firm may be expected next month, "Knowing the Scriptures," by the Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D. The author's expositions on the Bible have always attracted widespread attention, and this new volume will well maintain his reputation as an interpreter of the Scriptures. Messrs. Nisbet are also bringing out Dr. Torrey's "The Gist of the Lessons for 1911." This guide to the International Lessons is now too well known to require any introduction. There seems little doubt that it is now firmly established as an indispensable volume for the Sunday-school teacher. The price will be one shilling net in leather, and ninepence net in limp cloth.



The Rev. P. H. Ditchfield is a busy man, and his books are all attractively written. Moreover, he gives them titles which are excellent in every way, and likely to tempt the casual person to open the book and explore farther. His latest literary effort is "The Parson's Pleasance." It will be recalled that he recently provided us with a very entertaining book, entitled "The Parish Clerk," which, we believe, secured for itself a goodly number of readers. Anyhow, it was well received at the hands of the reviewers. In the new work Mr. Ditchfield discourses upon such topics as the charms of his old rectory—and makes us think that it is indeed a very delightful place—and provides us with many pages of good reading.

“The Elements,” by Sir William A. Tilden, and Professor Ernest Gardner’s “Religion and Art in Ancient Greece,” are the new volumes in Harper’s cheap but valuable series known as “Harper’s Library of Living Thought.”



In the near future, from the house of Longmans, will come “An Excerpt from ‘Reliquiæ Baxterianæ’; or, Mr. Richard Baxter’s Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of his Life and Times.” To this volume the Bishop of Chester is contributing a preface, and in addition to the “Excerpt” it will include Sir James Stephen’s essay on Baxter, reprinted, of course, from “Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography.” Dr. Jayne has annotated both of these works.



Most of our readers are familiar with the valuable writings of Dr. Wace, the Dean of Canterbury, and many will be undoubtedly glad to hear that next month will see the publication of a very important book, which he recently finished, entitled “Principles of the Reformation.” It is appearing at a most opportune time, and should find a large circle of readers awaiting it. Whatever Dr. Wace writes is always sound and earnest; it conveys to the reader not only the important fact that the author is a great authority upon the subject that he is dealing with, but also gives the distinct and emphatic impression that his views are the outcome of a decided and earnest conviction. This particular volume deals very strongly with the historical bases and practical working of the great and lasting principles of the Reformation. Moreover, the whole view of the writer is as comprehensive as it is possible for it to be. In view of the King’s Declaration, which has been exercising the minds of all of us recently, Dr. Wace’s opinions will be most welcome. But, of course, apart from this special interest, the subject-matter of the work is one which is peculiarly the Dean’s own. It will be good news to many who read this paragraph that the price of the volume—it is to be published by the Nisbets—will be within reach of all. It will be issued at five shillings net.



Under the editorship of Professor Joseph Jastrow, of the University of Wisconsin, a series of volumes is in preparation, intended to consider the several aspects of mental life of largest theoretical and practical interest, and to survey the ethical, social, and æsthetic aspects of human nature in relation to their origin, development, and influence. The books, while of a very important character, will be simple in treatment, and will have a direct appeal to the general reader. Among the titles in preparation are “Psychology in Common Life,” “Character and Temperament,” and “The Health of the Mind.”



The Rev. Canon Barnes-Lawrence has written a book, which Mr. Robert Scott is publishing, and which the author hopes will lead many to inquire how far the phrase “the indwelling of Christ” represents a personal experience. The book is a small one, but it is none the less valuable for that, and is of a very devotional character. It is called “Jesus in the House: Practical Suggestions for a Holy Life.”

In addition to "The World of Homer," which Mr. Andrew Lang has prepared for publication, and which Messrs. Longmans will publish, he has also finished a new work on "Sir Walter Scott and the Border Minstrelsy." These books will soon be out. It is also worth bearing in mind that there will be the usual Lang "Annual." This year's volume is to be called "The Lilac Fairy Book."



Dr. Arthur J. Maclean, Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness, has written a volume on "The Ancient Church Orders," which is to be issued by the Cambridge University Press in the series of "Cambridge Handbooks of Liturgical Study."



We may expect, through Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. shortly, an important work by John Edward Lloyd, M.A., Professor of History in the University College of North Wales, Bangor. The work will be called "A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest," two vols. In this book the story of Wales is told in detail down to the struggle in which the country lost its independence. 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 necessarily described. Special sections are devoted to the history of the Welsh Church.



It is close upon seven years since Mr. Canton gave us the first two volumes of his "History of the British and Foreign Bible Society." He has been hard at work for some time now upon two subsequent volumes, and it is expected that they will be ready some time this autumn.



On the 20th inst., Mr. Arthur C. Benson's new book, "The Silent Isle," will be published. It is an attempt to sketch some of the details of life, seen from a simple plane enough, and with no desire to conform it to a theory, or to find anything very definite in it, or to omit anything because it did not fit in with prejudice or predilections. It is just a little piece of life, observed and experienced and written down.



Notices of Books.

LIFE OF LORD KELVIN. By Silvanus P. Thompson. Two volumes. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price £1 10s. net.

In these two handsome volumes the life of one of the greatest scientists of this or any other age is ably told. Professor Silvanus Thompson has had a task of great magnitude, and has performed it exceedingly well. His subject evidently was his hero, and we do not wonder, for the man was as great as the scientist. Much of the material in these volumes will necessarily

be "caviare to the general," and will scarcely be intelligible except to those of scientific bent and attainment. But there is also not a little which will attract and fascinate every reader as he is brought face to face with the greatness and goodness of this remarkable man. The story of William Thomson's childhood and upbringing in Chapter I. shows at once the outstanding power of the boy. He matriculated into Glasgow University at the age of ten, and when he was twelve he received a prize for performing the holiday task of translating Lucian's "Dialogues of the Gods," with full parsing of the first three dialogues (p. 9). And at sixteen he gained the class prize in Astronomy, and was awarded University medal for an essay on "The Figure of the Earth." Professor Love, who examined the text of the essay years afterwards, wrote that it was a truly astonishing performance for a boy of sixteen. From Glasgow Thomson went to Cambridge. The chapter of his life there is one of the most interesting and delightful in the book. Within five days of his arrival it was currently reported in the college that he would be Senior Wrangler. The entire chapter is a revelation of the marvellous powers of the young undergraduate and of the promise of the genius he became. We are here told the familiar story of how he missed his Senior Wranglership, being beaten by a man vastly his inferior in calibre, but with a greater "knack" of answering questions. While his tutor declared that he had in Thomson a candidate whose mathematical abilities would outshine those of any man in England, a tutor of another college was reported to boast that he had a candidate whom he would guarantee to beat any man in Europe; and so, indeed, it happened in regard to the Wranglership. But almost immediately Thomson beat his rival hopelessly in the competition for the Smith Prizes, where brains counted for more than memory. The papers on abstruse mathematical subjects which Thomson contributed to several journals while he was an undergraduate at Cambridge are truly astounding, and it is clear that "devotion to scientific activity of the highest order such as this acted as a hindrance rather than a help to University honours" (p. 96). After Cambridge the biography traces his career step by step through the Glasgow Professorship of Natural Philosophy; the strenuous years of study and research connected, among other things, with Atlantic telegraphy; the epoch-making treatise in which he collaborated with Professor Tait; the various offices which he adorned; the honours which were showered upon him, until at length he became Sir William Thomson, then President of the Royal Society, Lord Kelvin, Chancellor of Glasgow University, and one of the original twenty-four on whom the late King bestowed the new Order of Merit.

Ordinary and non-scientific readers will turn with great interest to the chapter entitled "Views and Opinions," in which they will find much that reveals the real man. It was truly characteristic of him, and speaks volumes for his profound attainments, that he characterizes the most strenuous efforts for the advancement of science during fifty-five years by the word "failure."

"I know no more of electric and magnetic force, or of the relation between ether, electricity, and ponderable matter, than I knew and tried to teach my students of natural philosophy fifty years ago in my first session as Professor" (p. 1072).

We have naturally read with special attention what the biographer has to tell of Lord Kelvin's religious views. He was a man of earnest convictions, quietly but tenaciously sustained, and although brought up in the Church of Scotland, he conformed to the Church of England while at Cambridge, and became a regular and reverent communicant.

"As a young man he had thought things out in his own way, and had come to a faith which, not having been received second-hand, but being of personal conviction, was never afterwards shaken. His faith was always of a very simple and childlike nature, undogmatic, and unblighted by sectarian bitterness. It pained him to hear crudely atheistic views expressed by young men who had never known the deeper side of existence" (p. 1089).

One point in connection with Church affairs is of particular interest:

"Of sacerdotalism and ritualism in all its phases and forms he had an unconcealed detestation. He even went once so far as to write that the only sense in which he could regard the 'High' Church as high was the same as that in which game is said to be 'high'—when it is decomposing" (p. 1087, note 1).

On one occasion he spoke at a meeting of the Ladies' League, and expressed his deep regret that "so much of perversion was allowed to pass unchecked within the Church of England with only too feeble remonstrance on the part of the Bishops." We are particularly glad to have in this permanent form the letter Lord Kelvin sent to the *Times* in 1903.

"Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers which we saw around us grew by mere chemical forces. He answered: 'No; no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them grew by mere chemical forces.' Every action of human free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science" (p. 1099).

That even Homer may nod can be seen from Lord Kelvin's *obiter dicta* on aeroplanes. In 1894 he expressed his disbelief in the aeroplane, and thought that the problem of flight might be better solved with a platform having a vertically working propeller at each corner (p. 937), and in 1902 he spoke of the airship on the plan of those built by Santos-Dumont as "a delusion and a snare." A gas-balloon, paddled around by oars, he thought, could never be of any practical use, and he considered the day was a long way off when we should see human beings soaring around like birds (p. 1168). Considering that he lived until 1907, it would be interesting to know what he would have said if he had survived until 1909. We are also told of his "whole-hearted detestation of spiritualism and all that pertains to it" (p. 1104).

We close these volumes with feelings of deep admiration and thankfulness—admiration for such commanding genius, and thankfulness for his simple goodness. That Lord Kelvin should have been so profound a thinker and so simple-hearted a believer in Christ is one of the finest testimonies to the utter futility of the sceptical assertions so rife to-day, that intellect is incompatible with Christianity. Professor Thompson is to be congratulated on the production of a biography which takes rank with the best of recent years, whether we have regard to the subject or to the treatment. The concluding words in which the biographer pays his last tribute to Lord Kelvin well sum up the whole book:

"Though he was essentially a man of thought, he was also a man of effort to whom came the high privilege of achievement. That laborious humility for which he was conspicuous, that unceasing activity which drove him, as by an internal fire, from success to

success, mark him as a man of purpose. In an age that threatens now to fester into luxury, now to swell into the degenerate lust of bigness, now to drivel into sport, such a strenuous career as his, and such high ideals of intellectual endeavour as illuminated his whole life, are possessions not lightly to be lost" (p. 1213).

STUDIES IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY. By A. M. Fairbairn, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 12s. net.

Dr. Fairbairn's retirement from Mansfield College is fitly associated with the issue of this book, for it represents some of the most characteristic of his teaching during his long and honoured Principalship. He calls his book "Studies," because it is "made up of scientific attempts to conceive and represent formulated ideas." Part I. consists of six separate though connected sections dealing with religion and philosophy. The first two sections represent addresses from the chair of the Congregational Union, and deal respectively with the Church in the first and in the nineteenth century. Other allied subjects are "The Sacerdotal and the Puritan Idea," "Ecclesiastical Polity and the Religion of Christ," "How the Religion of Christ grew into Catholicism," "How Sects have come out of an Attempt to revive the Religion of Christ." Part II. discusses "The Church in Idea and History," and embraces twelve sections, covering the various aspects of the New Testament doctrine of our Lord and His Apostles. It will readily be seen that the book includes an immense amount of material, and it is impossible to say that as a whole it is quite on the very high level of the author's two great earlier works, "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology" and "The Philosophy of the Christian Religion." But its interest and value lie in the fact that it represents the mind of one of the ablest philosophical theologians of the Nonconformist Churches, and it provides an opportunity for Churchmen in particular to see what view of the New Testament Church and religion is held by a scholar who for many years was the peer in learning and ability of any theologian in our own communion. Herein, in our judgment, is the great importance of this book, and it ought to be studied with the closest attention by all who wish to know how Church polity looks from a Congregational standpoint. As Evangelical Churchmen, we feel justified in complaining that Dr. Fairbairn tends to identify the Church of England with the extreme Anglicanism so prevalent to-day. We do not object to his calling extreme Anglicanism the "reigning" tendency, but we do take strong exception to his calling it the "native" tendency of our Church, for he ought to know that, as originally set forth in the Prayer-Book, Articles, and writings of the Reformers, the tendency of Anglicanism was not sacerdotal. The present "reign" of extreme Anglicanism is due to accretions which are no true part of the original deposit, but date almost entirely from Tractarian days. With Dr. Fairbairn's trenchant criticism of sacerdotalism we find ourselves in hearty agreement, and we commend his words to the thoughtful consideration of all Evangelical Churchmen—that is, of all who are at once Evangelical and Churchmen. Although the book is unequal in treatment, it is well worthy of that close study which the author's eminence as a theologian demands, and which his ability as a thinker requires. It must necessarily be referred to in all serious discussions of Church polity and all proposals for Christian reunion. We take leave of Dr. Fairbairn with profound thankfulness and with equally profound regret. Two at least of his works will

long remain as the guide and inspiration of all real students of Christianity, its philosophy and religion. He has passed into an honoured and well-earned retirement, having made many who do not accept his Church polity his debtor for untold help in regard to their Christian faith.

THE IDEA OF THE SOUL. By A. E. Crawley, M.A. London: *A. and C. Black*. Price 6s. net.

The aim of this book is, briefly, to apply the results of psychology to the belief in the soul and the spiritual world. The author, already favourably known to anthropologists by his two previous books—"The Mystic Rose" and "The Tree of Life"—tries in this work to analyze the conception of the soul from a new point of view. Unfortunately, psychology does not seem to be Mr. Crawley's strong point; and, despite the care displayed in "getting up" enough psychology to deal with the problem under review, we cannot think he is successful in making himself really clear on this topic. It is when he gets back to the anthropological side of his subject that the value of the book begins to emerge; and here, indeed, the evidence he has so scrupulously collected is of the highest importance. As far as we can gather, he considers that the "idea" of the soul arose as a mental duplicate of reality—a sort of faded facsimile of the object. Thus the soul itself becomes a memory-image, and its substance a species of attenuated reality. The metaphysical grounds for belief in the existence of the soul are left out of the discussion—no doubt wisely. Mr. Crawley has produced a book of great interest in the anthropological reference, but we do not feel that he has made out his "psychological" case satisfactorily.

CHRIST AND THE NATIONS. By Rev. A. J. Tait, B.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

"We are coming more and more to understand," says an editorial secretary of one of the great missionary societies, "that the Church of Christ is not an enclosure within which alone truth is to be found, and beyond the limits of which there is nothing but falsehood and error, but rather that it is a focus and centre of attraction, towards which, drawn by its centripetal force, all that is good and helpful in other religions must sooner or later tend." We fear the writer of this sentence has forgotten, or never known, the disastrous history of Gnosticism. Far more than most are aware, the growing peril of all Churches in the Mission-field lies in the absorption, conscious or unconscious, of heathen conceptions and philosophies, springing out of a misplaced and dangerous sympathy with non-Christian religions. "Already in China and Japan," says Lord William Cecil, after personal observation, "the dangers will come from an effort to incorporate Buddhism and Christianity in one religion." The Principal of Ridley has applied, in some measure, a true and timely corrective. The gradual unfolding of the Divine plan, in promise and prophecy, is traced from the earliest ages, culminating in the flood of blessing pouring from a world-wide evangel. The march of a revelation so unique allows of no parallel, and can suffer no compromise. By so tremendous a fact as the Incarnation the attention of the whole world is challenged; by the fact, no less tremendous, that the Son of God is risen, and on the right hand of power, the work of atonement and

redemption is rendered altogether unique. "Whereas in other religions," says Mr. Tait, "the actual or reputed founders are now mere names of history, or memories to be cultivated, the very truth of the Christian religion is bound up with the belief, not merely in the work of its Founder upon earth, but also in His eternal existence and mediatorial reign in glory." Mr. Tait's little work is deserving of attention, in view of the spiritual dangers above alluded to, and we wish it a wide circulation.

MANY MANSIONS. By Rev. J. W. Bardsley, M.A. London: *J. Nisbet and Co.* Price 5s.

A book of twenty-four most fruitful sermons, full of evangelical fervour and no little culture. The quotations and illustrations are such as spring from a well-stored mind. The theology is deep and strong. The writer is a sturdy son of the Church of England, who, while rejoicing in the great work done by his brethren of other denominations, believes that Disestablishment and Disendowment would be a cruel blow to religion in England. Such sermons as these will always secure an attentive and attracted audience, and the congregations privileged to listen to them did not go away unfed. We are grateful to the author for this suggestive contribution to our sermon library.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS CATHOLIC AND REFORMED. By Rev. Canon Paige Cox. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 3s. 6d.

This work is an expansion of the Chester Diocesan Lectures in Divinity for 1907. The writer speaks in moderate terms, and recognizes that each school of thought has made its contribution to the Church's treasury. We are thankful for much we read, and especially for his views on preaching and his guarded words about the priesthood. When he dwells on Apostolic Succession, the Episcopate, Baptismal Regeneration, etc., we cannot go with him, and we question whether the book as a whole makes for Christian unity. No doubt we have here an able book on the Prayer-Book, Articles, and various subjects of recent ecclesiastical controversy, but it has not entered into the heart of Evangelicalism.

GEORGE HERBERT, MELODIST. By E. S. Buchanan. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s.

We are delighted with this illuminating little book on George Herbert, parson and poet. We commend it warmly as an introduction to the study of the man and his poems.

TURNING-POINTS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.A. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 3s.

A most helpful companion in our journey through the Acts of the Apostles. The writer knows Ramsay, Plumptre, Ellicott, and others, and, while making use of all their scholarship, writes from a different point of view. On their foundation he builds a structure that preachers and teachers will do well to examine. He does not give us a detailed exposition, but marks and emphasizes the salient points of departure in this history of the Church's foundation. His purpose has been to trace the Divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and to discover the principles upon which the Church in all ages and places is to be guided. The result is that we have a

book which is full of masterly analysis and spiritual insight, and we are glad to put it with our other works on the Acts. Our readers have made the acquaintance of some of the material found here, and they will welcome it in this permanent form.

THE DECISIVE HOUR OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. By John R. Mott. London: *Church Missionary Society*. Price 2s. net.

This textbook on Missions, intended for study during the coming autumn and winter season is, as in previous years, issued conjointly by several Missionary Societies. We rejoice to observe two Church of England Societies uniting with six other Societies in its production. Coming after the Edinburgh Conference, its author and its subject are peculiarly timely and valuable, and it is likely to prove one of the most useful annual textbooks which the C.M.S. and other Societies have produced during recent years. Dr. Mott's universal knowledge of the Mission-field, his statesmanlike grasp of principles and problems, his keen penetration into the issues of the present position, and his fine powers of writing are here seen to the best possible advantage. The result is a textbook of first-rate importance, which, if used as it is intended to be, must add considerably to the knowledge of modern mission-work. There are eight chapters. The first three discuss certain aspects of the problem, such as "The Non-Christian Nations Plastic and Changing," "Critical Tendencies and Influences in the Non-Christian World," and "The Rising Spiritual Tide in the Non-Christian World." Then follow four chapters emphasizing "The Requirements of the Present Situation," which are shown to include "An Adequate Plan," "An Adequate Home Base," "An Efficient Church on the Mission-Field," and "The Superhuman Factor." A concluding chapter calls attention to the "Possibilities of the Present Situation." Appendices and a Bibliography complete a most valuable handbook. We wish to commend it very specially to clergy for their own use during this coming season. The key to the missionary situation is very largely in their hands, as a former book by Mr. Mott clearly showed. Knowledge is power; power will mean increased effort, and this in turn will affect our congregations and parishes. Under Dr. Mott's guidance the coming winter ought to be abundantly fruitful in missionary results.

THE NICENE CREED. By Rev. J. J. Lias. London: *Swan Sonnenschein and Co., Ltd.* Price 7s. 6d.

The second edition of a work published about thirteen years ago and intended as "a Manual for the Use of Candidates for Holy Orders." Chancellor Lias takes occasion in a new preface to refer to some criticisms of the first edition, especially to one, the animus of which was only too evident. He has no difficulty in dealing with so palpably shallow and prejudiced a reviewer. In the course of eight general sections the book covers the main points of Christian doctrine as set forth in the Creed. The book bears marks on every page of the author's wide reading, genuine scholarship, and sober Churchmanship. We find ourselves unable to endorse some of his views on such subjects as the Sacraments, but this does not prevent us from calling special attention to the work as one that is likely to be of great value to thoughtful and discriminating students. If

read and compared with such a book as Bishop Moule's "Outlines of Christian Doctrine," it will prove of good service to the cause of Christian and Anglican theology.

MIRACLE AND SCIENCE. By Francis J. Lamb. London: *Charles Higham and Son*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

The subtitle precisely explains the purpose of this book—"Bible Miracles examined by the Methods, Rules, and Tests of the Science of Jurisprudence as administered To-day in Courts of Justice." The author is an American lawyer, and he applies to the Bible miracles the laws of evidence. He first examines the verity of miracles by judicial standards; then he shows the function of miracles, and the objectivity of their evidence in revelation. Two chapters discuss the question of "Miracle and Doctrine," with special reference to the Deity of our Lord and the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Miracles are then shown to be constituent parts of God's economy of grace and revelation, and the closing chapters discuss "The Cessation of Miracles," and whether "Moral Imperative is a Function of Evidence." It will be seen from this that the scope is wide and the problems are important. The discussion is ably sustained, and the author's points are made with all the clearness and cogency of the trained legal mind. It is essentially a book for careful study, and well deserves all the attention that can be given to it. To those whose faith in miracles has been shaken, it will prove specially valuable, for it is one of the most convincing discussions of the subject that has appeared of recent years.

STUDIES IN APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. A. F. W. Blunt. London: *J. M. Dent and Co*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The problems of the Church and Ministry are always with us, and every genuine endeavour to discover New Testament teaching concerning them is to be welcomed. It is on this account, as representing such an attempt, that we give this little volume a very hearty welcome. In the course of seven chapters it covers the entire ground of the New Testament and not a little of the sub-Apostolic age, with a description of the growth, organization, and worship of the Christian Church. We have seldom read anything so lucid, so fair, so judicial, and so cogent. The evidence is considered and marshalled in a masterly way, and the very simplicity of the treatment tends to veil the genuine scholarship, spiritual insight, and judicial balance which mark the work. Mr. Blunt has done the cause of sober New Testament truth and Churchmanship a real service, and his little book should be in the hands of all who would know what are the New Testament principles of the Church and Ministry. For students of Christian origins who desire an introduction to and a foundation for further, fuller study, we know of nothing to compare with this little book in freshness, clearness, and force.

"OUR FATHER." By Rev. J. R. Cohu. Oxford: *James Parker and Co*. London: *Simpkin, Marshall and Co*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Cohu is rapidly becoming one of the most prolific of authors. This is, if we mistake not, his seventh book within something like five years. The present work is practical rather than critical, and will therefore appeal to a much wider circle of readers than some of his former books. It is

designed to expound the Lord's Prayer "from the standpoint of its plain teaching and practical morality," and the book very largely realizes its aim. There is a virility and energy about the writing which carries the reader along and gives interest and point to the teaching, and there is very much in the exposition which is aptly and ably stated. We do not agree with several of the author's positions, such as his treatment of the distinction between trial and temptation, the sinfulness of temptation, and especially his belief in a sinful tendency in the nature of Christ. This last point is a very important matter, and involves conclusions that must be repugnant to Mr. Cohu's reverence for our Lord. And a more careful attention to the context of Isa. xlv. 7 should have prevented him from making God the author of moral evil, a subject with which that text has nothing whatever to do. Mr. Cohu is at his best on the practical side, for theological questions, as he himself admits, do not appeal to him so directly. It is on the ethical and practical aspects and applications of the Lord's Prayer that this book will be found useful by the thoughtful reader.

THE HEBREW PROPHETS. Vols. I. and II. Edited by Rev. F. H. Woods and Rev. F. E. Powell. Oxford: *Clarendon Press*. Price 2s. 6d. net each,

An edition of the Hebrew Prophets "intended for the reader rather than the student." The authors think that there are many intelligent people who take an interest in prophetic literature, but have not the time to study it under the guidance of an elaborate commentary. They have therefore provided this book in the hope that it may give a sufficiently clear idea of the Prophets, and may lead to a more complete study of them. The text of the Revised Version is printed in poetical form, with section headings and brief annotations. There is also a sketch of the life and work of each prophet. A general introduction of thirty-two pages is prefixed to the book, in which will be found much useful information, and, we are compelled to add, some which is not useful. The latter is mainly concerned with the predictive, Messianic, and supernatural elements of prophecy, which are reduced almost to a minimum, and give an interpretation which is quite unsatisfactory to those who are content to take the prophetic words and claims as they stand, and as they are interpreted by our Lord and His inspired Apostles. The notes given are brief, pointed, clear, and, apart from their critical standpoint, useful for their purpose. To those who hold the critical position of the authors the volume will be particularly serviceable but those who do not favour this view will need to balance and correct the opinions here stated by reference to more reliable authorities. The theories of late date and interpolations which mar so much modern writing on the Prophets militate seriously against the value of these volumes, and we cannot help feeling sorry that our young people should be introduced to some of the finest parts of the Old Testament along these critical lines.

LETTERS OF A PHYSICIAN TO HIS DAUGHTER. By F. A. Rupp, M.D London: *Vir Publishing Company*. Price 2s. net.

THE SOCIAL DUTY OF OUR DAUGHTERS. By Mrs. Adolphe Hoffmann. London: *Vir Publishing Company*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

BEFORE MARRIAGE. By Mrs. Adolphe Hoffmann. London: *Vir Publishing Company*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

Three books on certain aspects of the purity question, as indicated by their titles. The first contains the earnest advice of a father to his daughters on several vital subjects. The

second is a message to mothers and their daughters on the dignity and responsibility of wifehood and motherhood. The third consists of advice addressed by a mother to her son on the eve of his marriage. The counsels in all three books are admirable in their delicacy, tenderness, and spiritual reality. Mothers and fathers could not do better than read and wisely use these little volumes.

THE BOOK OF THE KINDLY LIGHT. By Dr. J. S. Zelig. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s.

This "little book on religion" takes as its text Newman's well-known hymn, bravely defends every verse, and in beautiful language draws many happy spiritual lessons from it. We can accept the lessons, even if we are not sure that they are derivable from the hymn.

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PRAYER. By Rev. F. R. M. Hitchcock, B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s.

This is an attempt to answer the philosophical, scientific, and experimental objections to prayer. Sound argument and reverent conviction go hand in hand, and we feel the writer makes his points. We welcome this thoughtful little book.

WORDS TO HELP. By Archdeacon G. R. Wynne, D.D. London: *H. R. Allenson*. Price 2s. 6d.

We have readings for Sundays on certain difficulties in faith and practice. We think the title is justified by the contents, and the writer is able to make considerable use of what he has read. An example may be given on the Second Sunday of Advent, which has as its title, "One who can peep and botanize upon his Mother's Grave."

PERIODICALS, REPRINTS, AND PAMPHLETS.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. July, 1910. London: *Spottiswoode and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s.

The opening article is on the late King Edward, and, though brief, is full of suggestion for our national life and duty in the light of our great national loss. The Rev. G. C. Richards, of Oriel, writes ably and well on "Reunion and the Churches of Scandinavia," holding strongly the view that Sweden has retained the Episcopal Succession. The Rev. A. G. B. West discusses "Education in Australia," and the Editor has felt it necessary to point out that the writer is alone responsible for the opinions expressed. An unsigned article on "The Modern Conception of the Kingdom of Heaven" reviews several recent books on the subject; and four College authorities, three High Church and one Evangelical, discuss "The Training and Examination of Candidates for Orders." Other articles are "The Women's Charter," "The Rating of Tithe Rent-Charge attached to a Benefice," "The Novels of Mr. Henry James," and "Pope Gregory VII. and the Hildebrandine Ideal," the last named by Dr. Whitney, of King's College, London. Altogether a useful, average number, with nothing striking or exceptional. The short notices are again disappointing to those who remember their force, substance, and value in this *Review* in former days.

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. July, 1910. London: *Henry Frowde*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Knetes, a clergyman of the Eastern Church, continues his discussion of "Ordination and Matrimony in the Eastern Orthodox Church," and provides some valuable information for English Churchmen. Mr. S. Gaselee calls attention to two Fayoumic Fragments of the Acts, and the section headed "Notes and Studies" is unusually long, varied, and valuable, covering nearly sixty pages. The review section is also full and timely, and provides valuable guidance on several subjects from recognised authorities. This Quarterly well maintains its character as indispensable for all thorough students of theology.

THE IRISH CHURCH QUARTERLY. July, 1910. Dublin: *Hodges, Figgis and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d.

Five articles, with a Symposium on the Atonement, and Notices of Books. The Rev. J. A. F. Gregg discusses "The First and Second Commandments in their Relation to Jewish and Christian Worship" in an able and timely paper which has some very modern bearings. The Rev. R. M. Gwynn gives the first part of an interesting account

of "The Dublin University Mission to Fuh-Kien." Dr. Hackett reviews the recent Archbishopal question in Cyprus, and the Rev. R. F. M. Hitchcock writes on "The Literary Connexions between St. John and St. Peter." The contributions to the discussion on the Atonement are useful, following those in an earlier number.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY REPORT. London: C.M.S. Price 2s. net.

Once again we welcome this truly interesting and valuable volume. Annual Reports, as a rule, are not regarded as attractive, but exception must certainly be made in regard to this of the C.M.S. For general use there are no less than twelve pages of indexes of special topics, providing missionary information for addresses by missionary speakers. This alone warrants our calling the attention of all speakers to this Report as eminently worthy of constant use.

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF APOCRYPHA. July, 1910. London: *International Society of the Apocrypha.* Price 6d. net.

There are several valuable articles in this number dealing with particular aspects of the general subject for which it stands. The Rev. H. F. B. Compston writes on "The Apocrypha in the Greek and Russian Churches"; the Rev. H. St. J. Thackeray reviews Professor Torrey's "Ezra Studies"; the Rev. H. T. Robins writes explanatory notes on "The Book of Baruch"; and a particularly suggestive, brief article by the Rev. H. Bulcock discusses "The Possible Relation between the Pauline 'Christ' and the Figure of Wisdom in the 'Wisdom of Solomon.'"

THE RING AND THE BOOK. By Robert Browning. **THE ALPS FROM END TO END.** By Sir W. Martin Conway. Nelson's Shilling Library.—**THE BLAZED TRAIL.** By S. E. White. **LOVE AND THE SPY.** By C. N. and A. M. Williamson. Nelson's Sevenpenny Library.—**THE BLACK TULIP.** By Alexander Dumas. Nelson's Sixpenny Classics. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons.*

Tastes of all sorts are provided for by these monthly instalments of Messrs. Nelson's admirable enterprise. If we must make any distinction at all, it is to call special attention to the two volumes in the Shilling Library. Browning's great poem and Sir W. M. Conway's account of the Alps will be specially welcome in this most attractive dress. The volumes in the two other series speak for themselves.

THE ORIGINALITY OF THE GOSPEL. By the Rev. G. Hanson, D.D. London: R.T.S. Price 6d. net.

The Murtle Lecture delivered in Aberdeen in January last. Dr. Hanson discusses with great freshness and force the uniqueness of the New Testament Gospel, limiting himself to the doctrine of the Atonement and the doctrine of the conditions of salvation. In both cases he shows the absolute originality of Christianity. This booklet ought to be circulated far and wide. It contains a very appropriate message for to-day.

STENCIL CUTTING AND STENCILLING. By "Jack Plane." London: *Dawbarn and Ward, Ltd.* Price 6d. net.

Second edition, revised, and with additional matter, showing how to design and cut stencil plates and how to use them in various ways. There are several illustrations and full-page plates.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND PENNY MANUALS: No. 18. THE LORD'S DAY. By the Rev. R. C. Burr. **No. 19. THE INCARNATION.** By the Rev. J. Stephenson. London: *Charles J. Thynne.* Useful for general distribution.

ANTI-RITUALISM. By the late Rev. W. Preston, D.D. London: *The Protestant Reformation Society, and Charles J. Thynne.* Price 3d.

A new edition, revised. Contains a great deal of useful information, though its title will probably prevent it from getting circulated outside those "Protestant Communicants" for whom it is primarily intended.

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MINISTRY. By Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln. London: *Henry Frowde.* Price 4d. net.

One of the last messages of the late Bishop of Lincoln, given to the Conference of Principals of Theological Colleges in January of this year. Full of the spiritual aroma which characterized Bishop King.

RECEIVED: THE TREATMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. G. C. Bell. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2d.—**ARE WE MAKING PROGRESS?** By the Rev. A. W. Robinson, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2d.—**THE GREAT MYSTERY.** By the Rev. E. A. Eardley-Wilmot. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1d.—**THE KING'S DECLARATION.** By Henry Varley, sen. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1d.