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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1894.

ART. I.—MODERN PREACHING.—PART II.

"I AM convinced," writes one of my lay correspondents, "that the bulk of our weekly sermons are not really studied and properly prepared, either by the competent or the semi-competent preachers. The absorption of time in other pursuits is doubtless one great reason for this, but it is not the only reason. Self-sufficiency and the disinclination to take great trouble, especially among those who have the dangerous gift of fluent, *ex tempore*, preaching, are also partly responsible for the uninterestingness of ordinary sermons. How different is the preparation of the young preacher from that of the young barrister! It would surprise the clergy if they could hear the opinions commonly expressed by the laity, among themselves, of the ordinary Sunday sermon. Really great preachers may be few, but if only the *one* talent were made the most of, what a change would take place in the opinion of the laity concerning sermons, and what an immensely powerful engine for good the pulpit would very speedily become!"

There can, I am afraid, be little doubt that, as my correspondent says, the self-sufficiency of the preacher is sometimes fatal both to the preparation and the power of the sermon: for preaching is a dangerous privilege. As admission to the priesthood leads men into the temptation to hierarchical autocracy, so the commission to preach is beset with the peril of display. The wasp distils its deadliest venom from the sweetest and most fragrant flowers, and it is out of the very beauty and gloriousness of the ministerial office that those poisons of vanity which inflame the preacher and injure his preaching are sometimes distilled. Vanity is destructive of persuasiveness. It gives an appearance of hollowness to the speaker, and arouses a sense of antagonism in the listeners. Humility is the best advocate of every high and sacred cause. It is absolutely essential to deep and strong preaching. For

the pulpit is the platform of God, and when man stands on God's platform, in what other vesture can he be fitly clothed except the vesture of humility? A vain man, full of himself, never appears such a monstrous spectacle as when standing and speaking from the platform of God.

On the other hand, no man will preach well who, while abasing himself, does not highly exalt his office; for the office of preaching is indeed a great and splendid office. "What occupation," asks a quaint writer, "could be nobler than that of teaching? that is, feeding hungry minds, clothing naked understandings, visiting and enlightening with the torch of knowledge those who are in prisons of ignorance, not only showing them what to see, but also giving them eyes to see with." To do any duty well, it is necessary to be convinced of the importance of that duty, and no preacher who undervalues the duty of preaching will make his pulpit either a fruitful source of power or a radiant source of light. The true preacher both minimizes himself and magnifies his office.

Within recent years, and particularly within the pale of the English Church, there has grown up a fashion of depreciating not only ordinary sermons, but the very office of preaching itself. This fashion has run even to the length of inducing persons to leave church—not occasionally, but regularly—at the close of the prayers and at the commencement of the sermon. Several reasons have been assigned for the growth of this fashion. It is said to be a protest against the length and feebleness of sermons. It is regarded as a way of emphasizing the importance of prayer and praise. It affords great conspicuousness of contrast to the Nonconformist habit of considering that preaching is the principal element in the public worship of the Sanctuary. And in cases where persons do not come to church till the sermon is ended and the celebration of the Eucharist has begun, the intention evidently is to exalt the value of the Eucharist by depreciating the value of preaching. No doubt, also, there are numbers of persons not unwilling to make manifest their own self-importance by habitually marching out of church at the commencement of the sermon. Their exit is the sign of their opinion, either that they do not care to know anything which the preacher has to say, or else that they already know everything which the preacher can communicate. Indifference and vanity are probably large elements in the maintenance of the fashion of leaving church at the opening of the sermon. Moreover, as the collection comes after the sermon, it is to be noticed that in escaping the sermon, the collection is also escaped. Vanity is thus often allied in this instance, as in so many others, with want of generosity and with selfishness.

The fashion, therefore, of habitually leaving church before the sermon is a fashion partly founded on respectable reasons, and partly on reasons unworthy of respect. When the sermon is regularly forsaken either out of indifference, or vanity, or selfishness, then the habit is not worthy of respect. But when persons regularly leave church before the sermon in order to magnify the great importance in worship of the elements of prayer and praise and Sacrament, then, although the habit is erroneous, yet the motive is not wrong. It is a reaction and rebound from the former miserable condition of things, according to which a big, ugly pulpit obscured the Lord's Table from view, and preaching usurped the throne of worship, to the great depreciation of prayer and the Holy Communion.

Still, after making every allowance for the just influence of reaction, it is yet difficult to understand how churchmen can under-estimate the importance of preaching, without disloyalty both to the Bible and to their own Book of Common Prayer. The teaching of the Prayer-Book upon the importance of sermons is most explicit. It is also noteworthy that in emphasizing this importance the Prayer-Book makes particular mention of children. Those who leave church before the sermon sometimes justify the habit upon the plea that they omit the sermon, not so much for their own sakes as for the sake of their children. Sermons, they say, are a weariness to children. Sermons give children a distaste for church-going, and engender a reluctance towards all manner of worship. Nor is this plea entirely baseless. For sermons suited for adults are seldom suited for children. The preaching which interests and edifies the mature, rarely interests or edifies the young. It far more often utterly wearies them. Great strength of patience—enduring patience, which is one of the rarest virtues of the modern age—is, indeed, sometimes produced by the severe discipline of weariness. Yet, seeing that weariness often produces disgust rather than patience, it would seem to be a justifiable habit to withdraw children from sermons principally intended for persons of stronger minds and riper years.

But if it be wise to withdraw children from sermons intended for adults, it is, according to the Prayer-Book, a plain duty for the clergy to provide, and for parents to cause their children to attend, sermons especially adapted for the young. In the exhortation addressed to God-parents, at the close of the Baptismal Office, it is very distinctly laid down as the part and duty of those entrusted with the religious training of children to call upon them to "hear sermons." The Church of England, therefore, in one of her Sacramental Offices, enumerates the hearing of sermons among the main elements

in the right up-bringing of children. Whether sermons to children should be chiefly catechetical in their form is not the question now under discussion, but merely the simple fact that loyalty to the express ordering of the Church plainly and imperatively requires that sermons be provided for children, and that children be called upon to hear sermons. The neglect of this duty, either on the part of clergy or parents, is the neglect of an obvious injunction of the Church of England—a neglect from which true Churchmen should most carefully shrink.

Nor is it in reference to children alone that the Church of England, in the pages of the Prayer-Book, insists upon the sacred importance of the office of preaching, and upon the enormous issues dependent on the right discharge of this sacred office.

At his ordination, every deacon, kneeling before the bishop, receives, under circumstances of the utmost solemnity, a commission to read and preach the Gospel in the Church of God. And nothing is more pre-eminent in the office for the Ordering of Priests than the great importance attached by the Church of England to the duty of preaching. The priest is "a messenger of the Gospel," no less than a watchman over souls and a steward of the mysteries of Christ. It is "his weighty charge to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family." He is, moreover, admonished that his most excellent and difficult office—an office pertaining to the salvation of man—cannot be discharged, "but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the Holy Scripture." Among the solemn promises and vows to which every priest pledges himself is the teaching of the people with all diligence—the determination to instruct them in the way of eternal salvation. Into the hands of each newly-ordained priest is delivered a copy of the Bible; and, as the Bible is delivered, the Bishop imparts the responsible commission: "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments." The Church's conception of the ministry of Christ, therefore, is that it is the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments. Not a ministry of the Word without the Sacraments: nor a ministry of the Sacraments without the Word; but a ministry of both Sacraments and Word. Indeed, it would appear from the arrangement of the Communion Office that, according to the original design of the Reformed Church of England, there may be in public ministrations a sermon without a communion, but not a communion without a sermon. The modern fashion, therefore, of exalting the communion at the expense of the sermon is not a fashion grounded upon loyalty to the Prayer-Book. For both in the office for the administration of

the Sacrament of Baptism, and of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as well as in the Ordering of Deacons and Priests, the ministering of God's Word is regarded as a duty co-equal and co-essential with the ministering of the Sacraments of Christ. And in the Form for the Consecration of Bishops and Archbishops, the Church still further emphasizes the great importance of spreading abroad the Gospel—the glad tidings of "reconciliation"—to the edifying and making perfect the whole body of Christ. The Church of England's own definition of the visible Church of Christ is "a congregation of faithful men in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered." "No sacraments, no Church; no preaching, no Church" would thus seem to be a kind of definitive formula of the Church of England. All undervaluing of the ordinance of preaching is in effect, therefore, whether on the part of clergy or laity, disloyalty to the authority of the Church, and a plain contradiction of the Church's mind as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

And when we pass from the teachings of the Church to the teachings of Scripture, we find it altogether impossible to recapitulate, within our available space, the numerous declarations which Scripture makes, concerning the value and the necessity of preaching. Indeed, as in other matters, so also in its estimate of the importance of preaching, the Prayer-Book is but the mirror and the echo of Holy Scripture. Nowhere in the Bible can any word be found depreciatory of preaching. All through the Bible preaching is exalted as one of the great instruments and powers of God for the salvation of men. The feet of the preacher are said to be beautiful. One of the principal testimonies of his Messiahship enumerated by Christ for the assurance of St. John the Baptist—a testimony co-ordinated with the cleansing of the lepers and the raising of the dead—was the testimony of the preaching of the Gospel to the poor. Both in the temple and from house to house the Apostles ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ daily. St. Paul declares that God had separated him from his mother's womb to preach the revelation of Jesus Christ. How can men believe, he asks, without a preacher? He reminds Titus that it is through preaching that God manifests the hope of eternal life to men. He tells the Corinthians that both Christ and the preaching of Christ are, to them that perish, foolishness; but to them which are saved, both Christ and the preaching of Christ are the power of God. That Jews and Greeks should despise the preaching of Christ seemed natural to St. Paul; but that Christians should undervalue the ordinance of preaching would have seemed to him worse than unintelligible. To the glowing hearts of the primitive

Christians no words were so sweet, so vital, as the words which told them of their crucified and ascended Saviour. To be cold towards the preaching of Christ would, to them, have appeared the same thing as coldness and deadness towards Christ Himself.

And, indeed, the witness of all ages of Christian history confirms the testimony of the Bible and the Church both to the importance of preaching, and to its value as an unerring measure of the vitality and affection of Christian disciples to their Master, Christ. The ages of the exaltation of preaching have been ages of spiritual progress and religious reform. The ages of the depreciation of preaching have been ages of religious apathy and spiritual decadence.

The chief Apostles were great preachers. St. Peter and St. Paul and St. John never ceased to teach and to preach "Jesus and the resurrection." They were instant in season and out of season in heralding the things which they had seen and tasted and handled of the good Word of God. The torch of the primitive Church was carried into the dark places of the earth by the hands of illuminated preachers. The primitive Church owed its erection and expansion to the Divine influence manifested through preaching. The sub-Apostolic age was an age of earnest preachers. Not a few of the primitive bishops were chosen to their office because of their signal power to preach. In the Apostolical Constitutions we are told that "the office of preaching was, in the first place, the Bishops' office." It was a necessity of the bishop's qualifications, in each Christian age, that he "must be apt to teach." St. Chrysostom calls the Bishop's throne "the preaching throne," because "preaching was so necessary a part of the bishop's office that he could not be without it."

The great Fathers of the Church were all incessant preachers. From St. Clement in the second century to St. Bernard in the twelfth century, the greatest Fathers of the Church were the Church's greatest preachers—men mighty in speech and power. The power of preaching is an essential, and very extensive element both in the conception of the individuality, and the measurement of the influence, of such conspicuous leaders as Athanasius and Ambrose, Basil and the two Gregories, Jerome and Chrysostom, Augustine and Bernard. And although Sozomen relates of the Church of Rome in his time "that they had no sermons either by the Bishop or any other," yet this must have been an exceptional experience even for the Church of Rome in her pure and palmy days, for some of the greatest popes have also been the greatest preachers.

And from the earliest to the most recent Christian ages the periods of great preaching have also been periods of great

awakening. Or to put the fact in its converse aspect—periods of great awakening have also been periods of great preaching. The Crusades owed much of their fervour to the fiery eloquence of crusading preachers. No institution of St. Dominic was more potent and far-reaching than the institution of the Order of Preaching Friars. The precursors of the Reformation —John Wycliffe, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague—were powerful preachers. It is difficult to understand by what means the Reformation could have been accomplished, if from its resources the factor of preaching had been eliminated. And within the last hundred years the names of men like Whitefield, Wesley, Chalmers, Guthrie, Robertson, and Newman furnish of themselves abundant evidence that the influence of preaching (wherever preaching is clear, and able, and deep) is in no wise diminished, but probably increased, by the spread of education and the ubiquity of the press. No pulpit in the world has ever had such an audience as the audience that now listens to the printed words of Robertson and Newman, Liddon and Westcott, Lightfoot and Maclaren, Brooks and Church. Though dead, these preachers wield an ever-increasing power.

Thus the teachings of all ages of Christian history conspire with the teachings of the Bible and the Church to magnify the office of preaching as a powerful instrument in controlling the destinies of mankind. And it is one of the first duties of every true preacher to endue himself, by an earnest study of these teachings, with high conceptions both of the nature of his office and of the responsibilities belonging to it. No man will ever preach well who is not deeply convinced of the importance of his preaching. The ambitious man will preach ambitiously, the vainglorious man will preach vaingloriously, the indifferent man will preach indifferently, the learned man learnedly, and the ignorant man ignorantly. It is only the man of apostolic mind and heart—the man exalted by the height of his calling and debased by the sense of his own insufficiency—who will preach really well. However chill may be the atmosphere in which such a man lives, however deterrent may be the influences by which he is surrounded, and in despite of all fashionable inuendoes and habits intended to depreciate the value of preaching, he will yet strive and toil to make his preaching a living reality. Abasing himself, he will magnify his office. He will summon to his aid every art which can make his preaching tell. Beauty and force of diction, copiousness of illustration gathered from every department of knowledge, pathos, logic, declamation, appeal—all these he will press by devoted zeal and unwearying work into the service of his preaching; for all these things will help him to cast a glow of modern interest around the old, unchanging truths of

religion. They will enable him to invest the topics of common life and the duties of daily toil with the apparel of an uncommon, a heavenly radiance.

But who is able and sufficient thus to preach? Ordinary men have not the gifts, and busy parish priests have not the leisure which such ideal preaching imperatively and continuously requires.

An order of preachers should, therefore, be dedicated to the office of preaching; not, indeed, that the regular minister should be stripped of his ministry of preaching. To do this would be to ignore an essential characteristic of the office to which he has been ordained, and to imperil one of his greatest opportunities for usefulness. No minister can be loyal to the commission he has received, or true to the obligations into which he has entered, who does not use all diligence both to teach and to preach to the utmost of his power. Careless and infrequent sermons are a violation of his ordination vows. Moreover, who is so well fitted to speak to the people on Sunday as the pastor who has been moving in and out among them during the workdays of the week, holding their hands in sorrow, listening to the tale of their trials, their difficulties, their wants, rejoicing with their joys, weeping with their tears? A house-going preacher will have a sermon-hearing people. "Let the very same speech or sentiment come from two persons, and it has quite a different meaning according to the speaker, and takes a different form in our minds. We always judge of what meets us by what we know already. There is no such thing in nature as a naked text without note or comment."[1] "Words which will go clean over the heads of strangers will pierce the hearts of friends."[2] Well-tended sheep do not yearn for the voice of a stranger. Well-nurtured children love their father better than an alien.

The weakness of the modern pulpit is in no wise due to over-much diligence in pastoral visitation. Multitudinous committees, the keeping of innumerable accounts, the getting up of bazaars, "the serving of tables," may weaken a pulpit; but daily personal intercourse with the people upon spiritual things strengthens it. A pastor need never be afraid of damaging his preaching by the ceaseless house-to-house visitation of his flock. Only let such a pastor be careful to limit his preaching to the topics which he thoroughly understands. If his pastoral charge is too heavy to leave him time for extending his researches to the realms of literature and science, and obliges him to limit them to "the reading of Holy Scripture and such subjects as help to the knowledge of the same," let

[1] Newman's Essays, vol. ii., p. 252. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

him not be vainly ambitious to dilate upon literary or scientific topics, but humbly confine himself to terse expositions of Scripture, illuminated by illustrations from experience. Congregations will gratefully accept such expositions, if so be they do not attempt to compensate their obvious deficiency in learning by an equally obvious development in length. A preacher is feeble in so far as he discourses upon things of which he is ignorant, and powerful in proportion to his knowledge of the subjects with which he deals. The weakness of the modern pulpit has partly sprung from its discussion of secular subjects concerning which it knew nothing, and its dumbness upon spiritual subjects concerning which it is the accredited organ of public utterance.

At the same time, a reading and well-informed age may reasonably require a supply of sermons dealing ably and exhaustively with the social questions, the intellectual doubts, the political interests proper and peculiar to itself. Such an enterprise lies beyond both the scope and the power of the ordinary preacher. Who can expect an ordinary minister, with the limited leisure, the limited library, the limited talents at his command to prepare and preach two notable sermons every Sunday throughout the year? It is beyond the range of human possibility to accomplish such a task. No politician could deliver a hundred great speeches in the year, no scientist compose a hundred great lectures, no philosopher evolve a hundred great speculations. And although the ordinary minister is strictly and sacredly bound by consecrating some portion of every day to reading and composition, by preparing his sermon early in the week and thinking it well over after it is prepared, to make each one of his yearly hundred of sermons as good as it lies in his power to make it; yet, except in rare instances, great sermons can proceed only from special preachers—preachers elaborately trained for their work (and even ordinary preachers need far more training, both in knowledge and utterance, than they receive), preachers gifted with faculties of eloquent speaking and original thinking, preachers secluded from the distracting bustle of a many-sided life, preachers abreast with the most recent literature and researches of the day, preachers with a profound and long-studied acquaintance with things human and divine, preachers whose brain is steam, whose tongue is fire, whose soul is magnetism. In every great town there should be at least one such preacher—either stationary or itinerant—able to wield his sceptre over the intellect and hearts of the most highly cultured of its inhabitants. The Temple Church, St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, are proofs of the power which a pulpit thus replenished would assuredly exercise. The day of the

pulpit is not yet gone by, but what is wanted is to make the pulpit equal to its day. The weakness of the modern pulpit will be transfigured into strength directly its special sermons are so multiplied as to become co-ordinate with the special requirements of the modern age.

What is needed, above all things besides, to strengthen the modern pulpit's weakness and enlarge the modern pulpit's power is more hopeful faith and more living prayer. The current of the hour is setting against prayer; but if the modern preacher is borne away by this current, his preaching will drift into mere brilliant show—the show of self, with an absence of spiritual power. Of course, prayer of itself will achieve nothing without work. Indeed, prayer without work is not truly prayer. He who most earnestly prays over his sermons must also most earnestly work at their preparation, else his prayers will be little else than idle hypocrisy. It is one of the many beautiful sayings of St. Augustine: "Sit orator antequam dictor"—Let a man first pray, then preach. And the saying is just as true to-day as it was fourteen centuries ago. None but those who live within the veil can go forth with lips anointed from the altar of God. The primary, and most pre-eminent, requirement of the modern pulpit is a greater plenitude of effectual prayer — prayer both by clergy and people. Without incessant prayer its ashes will never be converted into beauty or its weakness into power. Let congregations and preachers combine together in prayer, and the one will speak, and the other will hear, with a quite new and resistless grace. And in praying, their first plea should be for a self-renouncing simplicity, because in every age, whether primitive or modern, the simplicity of the preacher has proved to be the power of God.

JOHN WILLIAM DIGGLE.

ART. II.—THE OLDEST COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.

STUDIES IN THE "MIDRASH TEHILLIM."—No. III.

ONE very serious difficulty which confronts the Christian reader in his attempt to become acquainted with the literature of Israel lies in the highly technical character of the phraseology which is adopted in it. He needs an acquaintance, not only with the two or three languages employed, and with their respective grammars and dictionaries, but also with some of the peculiarities of Jewish thought and life. This

requirement is abundantly illustrated in the "Midrash." One story of Rabbi Akiva will sufficiently exhibit it. His son had married a wife; and the night of his marriage he sat up all night to study the Law of Moses. He begs his bride to give him her assistance, which she accordingly does until the morning came. In the morning Rabbi Akiva wanted to know his son's opinion whether he had reason to be satisfied with his choice of a wife or not. But he makes the inquiry in this strange and technical way: "Is it 'findeth' or 'found'?" What could the ordinary English reader make of such a question if he did not know something of the usage of the speaker? In point of fact, Rabbi Akiva was simply making an allusion to two texts of Scripture: "Whoso findeth a wife, findeth a good thing" (Prov. xviii. 22); and "I find the woman to be more bitter than death" (Eccles. vii. 26); and he asked his son under which head, the good wife or the bitter one, his one case was to be placed.

Though the "Midrash" is not much occupied with Lexical considerations, yet it sometimes throws indirectly a certain light even upon these.

In approaching the "Midrash" on Ps. ciii., the first point to which a reader would perhaps direct his attention is to see what help it gives upon the vexed question of the Lexicons in the clause, "Who filleth thy mouth with good things." Did the Hebrews of old time understand the word to be *mouth*, as the English Bible? or *adornment*, as Mendelssohn understands it? or *time*, as Gesenius? or which of the various conflicting senses that have been suggested? There is no distinct pronunciation upon the subject in the "Midrash," though from one of its tales about R. Johanan wearing his phylacteries every day, and from a technical reference of the entire clause to the supernatural girding of the Israelites at Sinai with weapons inscribed with the incommunicable name of Jehovah, it may be gathered that the leaning was to take the word, as Mendelssohn does, in the sense of adornment.

This part of the "Midrash," however, affords us a glimpse into the curiosities of Rabbinic physiology. The Psalm begins, "Bless the Lord, O my soul." The mention of the soul at once makes an opening for the introduction of the subject. This part of the book is full of curious physiological ideas. It will be enough to cite one passage as a specimen of the whole.

R. Abdimi said in (the name of) R. Nechunja, "Some things are bad for the liver and good for the throat; and some things are bad for the throat and good for the liver. There are ten things in man: the windpipe, for voice; the gullet, for food; the liver, for anger; the lung, for drinking; the gall, for jealousy; the maw, for hatred; the intestine, for digestion; the

spleen, for laughter; the veins give counsel; the heart concludes."

One more extract may be made from this part of the work, because it illustrates the practice to which our Lord resorted when He said, "I also will ask you one question"—the practice, that is to say, of meeting a difficult question by another still more difficult. The reference is to the mention of the human soul in "Bless the Lord, O my soul."

"As in the case of this soul, no man knows what its place is, or in what place it is put; so with respect to the Almighty, no creature knows what His place is; for even the holy living creatures on whom the Throne of Glory is supported do not know what is His place, or in what place He is put. For what do they say in Ezekiel (iii. 12), 'Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place.' It is related of a certain man that he said to Rabban Gamaliel, In what place is He set? But he replied, I do not know. He rejoined, Why, is this your prayer and your wisdom that ye pray before Him every day, yet do not know what His place is? He said to him, Thou hast asked a thing which is far beyond me by the space of five hundred years' journey. Behold! I will ask thee one thing, which is set by thy side day and night: tell me, then, in what place it is set. He said to him, What is it? He replied, It is the soul, which is set beside thee; tell me in what place it is set? He said to him, I do not know. He said to him, May your breath vanish.[1] What is that which hath been put beside thee? Thou knowest not its place, yet thou sayest to me a thing which is beyond me by the space of five hundred years' journey. He said to him, If so, they do well who worship the work of their own hands, for they look thereupon at all times. He said to him, The work of your hands—ye see them, but they do not see you; but the Almighty sees the works of His hands, but they do not see Him."

In Psalm civ. the student would at once desire to know the view of the "Midrash" upon the clause which has so troubled both the expositor and the translator: "He maketh His angels spirits." The Hebrew words both for "angels" and for "spirits" present an ambiguity. The one might with equal propriety be rendered either "messengers" or "angels," and the other, either "spirits" or "winds"; while the clause has been variously held to admit of all possible combinations of these senses. There is, moreover, the further question as to which of the two words is to have the position of predicate. Thus we are pushed into a multitude of questions—as to whether it means, "He maketh His messengers to be winds"—

[1] Lit.: "May that man's breath be breathed out."

that is, in swiftness—just as the subsequent figure of the flame of fire is meant to ascribe to them the attribute of irresistible strength; or whether it means, "He maketh winds to be His messengers"—*i.e.*, He useth the powers of Nature to execute His will. The "Midrash" is not the field to which we can go for the final solution of nice questions such as these; but, *pro tanto*, it may be of some service in narrowing the field of inquiry, if it shows us how the language has been understood when uninfluenced by any of our Western ideas. On the question of "spirits" or "winds" it is absolutely silent; but indirectly we can see that the doctors of Palestine in the early days of the Christian era understood the other word in the sense of "angels." We can discern that from the fact that the "Midrash" here takes occasion to digress into one of those curious discussions about the place of the angels in the days of creation, which are so common in the earlier Hebrew literature.

WHO MAKETH HIS ANGELS SPIRITS. R. Johanan said, The angels were created on the second day.

In another part of "Midrash Tehillim" the same view is affirmed. At Psalm xxiv., upon the words, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof," the question is asked at once, "When were the angels created?" R. Johanan said, "On the second day"; as it is said (Ps. civ. 3), "Who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters"; and it is written, "He maketh His angels spirits."

The exposition of this Psalm in the "Midrash" is particularly rich in that class of application of Scripture, which in Christian theology has been called the Moral Interpretation. Its remarks under this head do not present anything of especial interest for us, but a few lines may be quoted as a sample of the method. The Christian theologian will be reminded of much that is to be met with in the work of Gregory the Great on the Book of Job; and the extract from the "Midrash" will serve to show how the same processes of thought have been at work during the ages of the past in schools so widely sundered as Judaism and Latin Christianity.

ANOTHER EXPOSITION, says the "Midrash." "So is this great and wide sea also." This speaks of the fourth kingdom, which was to rule over the earth.

"Wherein are things creeping innumerable." The innumerable edicts which they write down against us.

"Both small and great beasts." Generals, officers and captains.

"There go the ships." These are the promissory notes—properly redemption notes: sc. notes issued by Roman authorities, which the Jews had to redeem; it was a way of

getting money out of them—which they form against Israel; which they write against them every day.

"That Leviathan whom thou hast made." For whoever is associated with them will be made a laughing-stock with them in the world to come.

The "Midrash" on Psalm cv. furnishes a specimen of a class of learning which properly belongs to the "Massorah." The "Massorah," it may be explained, has for its object the protection of the text of Scripture, both against loss and against the intrusion of extraneous matter. With this end in view, it systematically enumerates the observable peculiarities of the written text. How many times, for example, it happens that words begin and end with the same pair of letters; how many times each letter of the alphabet occurs.[1] For instance, that in the twenty-four books of Scripture the first letter of the alphabet occurs 42,377 times; that there are five words with the letter H (ה) in the middle in the textual reading, but without it in the margin; and so on.

The "Midrash" adduces an example of this kind of lore, which, from its character, might have been included in the columns of the "Massorah," though it actually is not to be found there. It comments on the words, "Remember His marvellous works that He hath done, His wonders and the judgments of His mouth,"

"O ye seed of Abraham His servant: ye children of Jacob, His chosen."

"He is the Lord our God; His judgments are in all the world."

The point of its observation is that in the Hebrew text the word for "He" is prominent and associated with the name Jehovah.[2] And it says that in the Scripture this word for "He" is five times joined with a man's name for good, and five times for evil; the five evil men being Nimrod, Esau, Dathan, Ahaz and Ahasuerus; and the five good men being Abraham, Moses, Ezra, Hezekiah and David. R. Berechiah said in the name of our Rabbies, "The blessed God is (here) counted with the righteous; as it is said, '*He* is the Lord our God; His judgments are in all the world.'"

It may be observed that the personal pronoun certainly does

---

[1] Buxtorf (Comment. Masoret, Cap. 18) says that this was part of the Masoretic work, and that it is contained in the enigmatic Hebrew poem of Elia Raf Saadia Gaon, head of the Babylonish School of Sora about A.D. 927.

[2] Hoo (the Hebrew word for "he") has been thought to be one of the names of God in some forms of religion. So in Ps. cii. 28, "Thou art the same." The word, however, is not Hebrew for "the same." It might be rendered, "Thou art Hoo, and Thy years shall not fail."

so occur in the several passages cited by the "Midrash"; but there is no ready way of verifying the statement that there are no other similar occurrences of the word, because the pronoun is not given in the concordances of the Hebrew Bible. There is, however, only one circumstance which might reasonably cause any suspicion of it; and that is because we detect amongst the Hebrew expositors an especial fondness for developing the number five whenever it is possible, so as to point a mystic allusion to the five Books of the Law. Thus, there are five letters in the Hebrew alphabet which have a different form when they are at the end of a word; there are five Books in the Psalter corresponding to the five Books of the Law, as the "Midrash" says,[1] as justifying the phrase of the Greek Father[2] who said that the Psalter was "another Pentateuch": the letter H which God put in to change the name of "Abram" into "Abraham" stands in the Hebrew numeration for five, and many other such. But whatever we may think of the critical value of observations of this kind when taken one by one, there can be no doubt that such labours taken as a whole have exercised at least *some* influence upon the preservation of the text. There is probably no ancient book of wide circulation in the world which presents so few conflicting readings as the Hebrew Bible. Elias Levita, who wrote in Hebrew in the fifteenth century, contrasts the Bible with the state of the text in the "Chaldee Targum" of Onkelos, very much to the disadvantage of the latter; and he says[3] that though a Massorah was made upon it, yet it has allowed so many variations and changes to slip into the text, because it did not follow the way of the Massorah on the Bible in numbering the words, the letters and the like. We, perhaps, can hardly avoid the reflection that, if only the Christians of antiquity had bestowed any similar care upon the New Testament, a vast number of those textual questions, which are now perhaps insoluble to us, might never have arisen: and when it is remembered that all this learning of the sages of the "Midrash" and "Massorah" was accumulated before the days of concordances, then, to do them justice, it must be admitted that it all represents a grasp of the whole body of the Sacred Text, and a prodigious acquaintance with its minutest features which we Christians may perhaps sometimes envy, but have scarcely tried to imitate.

In the exposition of the Psalm, it is satisfactory to find that some of the expressions which perplex the *modern* commentator were also a difficulty to the *ancient* authorities of Israel. The

[1] "Midrash" on Ps. i. [2] Hippolytus, qu. Delitzsch, p. 11.
[3] Massoreth Hammassoreth, ed. Ginsburg, p. 134.

Psalm speaks of God's deliverance of Israel in the early period of its history. In the midst of the reference to Joseph, we have this verse:

"Until the time that his word came, the word of the Lord tried him."

Whose word? God's word, or Joseph's, in the interpretation of the dreams in the prison? The ancient authorities, it seems, were no nearer agreement than the moderns:

"R. Chaya bar Abba and our Rabbies (declared): one said, "[This means] until the word of Joseph came." And another said, "[It means] until the word of the Almighty came."

In the same part of the Psalm, legend comes in to fill up the outlines of the Old Testament history of Joseph. Pharaoh's treatment of him is described in the Psalm in these terms:

"He made him lord of his house and ruler of all his substance."

"To bind his princes at his pleasure."[1]

What was this binding of the princes of Pharaoh? There is nothing about it in the history in Genesis. The phrase has always been more or less troublesome to Christian expositors. The doctors of the "Midrash" find no trouble whatever with it. They have a legend which admits of the words being taken in their most literal sense.

"When Pharaoh sought to make Joseph king, his counsellors said to him, So then a slave is to be king! (But) he took them and bound them until Joseph's brethren came to show that he was of noble birth."

There is not a trace of such action on the part of Pharaoh in the authentic history of Joseph. The story represents, indeed, what is quite likely to have been the jealous policy of a party in the state on the occasion of Joseph's advancement; but there is not the slightest evidence that it is anything else than one of those legends which, in so many ages of the past, men have had a tendency to invent so as to fill up the outlines of some particular phrase.

There is one habit of the "Midrash" at large which is worthy of specific notice—the habit, that is to say, of leaving the particular verse of the Psalm which is before the reader and going off at a tangent to discourse upon some other text of Scripture which it happens to have cited. This habit is often a source of disappointment to the student; but it has incidentally this result, that in the comments of the "Midrash" upon these few Psalms we meet with specimens of the curious way

[1] There is a trace in the "Midrash" (and also in the Commentary of Rashi) of there having once been a different reading here. The "Midrash" says, The Chethib is "his prince," which refers to Potiphar. Our printed text presents no trace of such a reading.

in which the Hebrew nation has understood certain other features of the Scriptures. Thus, in reference to David's Psalm, "Lord, how are they increased that trouble me! many are they that rise up against me!" we have an example of that species of explanation which is called *Notarikon*, and which consists in taking each letter of a word as the initial of some fresh word, very much as in Greek Christian Theology the word $I\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ became adopted as a name of Christ. The present instance arises thus: the insults of Shimei are enumerated by the "Midrash" amongst the prominent troubles that David had to undergo, and reference is made to the terms in which David spoke of his insults in his last charge to Solomon his son: "And behold, thou hast with thee Shimei, the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, which cursed me with a grievous curse in the day when I went to Mahanaim" (1 Kings ii. 8). The Hebrew word for "grievous" is understood in the "Midrash" to be symbolic of the opprobrious names with which Shimei assailed David: its five letters are the initials of the Hebrew words for Adulterer, Moabite (in reference to David's descent from Ruth, the Moabitess), Wicked Man, Adversary, Abomination.

There is a further point in the account of Shimei in the "Midrash" which, perhaps, may command more sympathy from us. On the first introduction of Shimei upon the page of Scripture, he is described in these terms: "And when king David came to Bahurim, behold, thence came out a man of the family of the house of Saul, whose name was Shimei, the son of Gera" (2 Sam. xvi. 5). When upon a subsequent occasion he comes before the victorious king to implore pardon for his insults, the sacred historian still describes him in similar terms: "And Shimei the son of Gera, a Benjamite, which was of Bahurim, hasted and came down with the men of Judah to meet king David" (2 Sam. xix. 16). Those, however, are not the terms in which Shimei describes himself: "Thy servant," he says, "doth know that I have sinned: therefore, behold, I am come the first this day of all the house of Joseph to meet my lord the king" (*ibid.* 20). Why this intrusion of "the house of Joseph" at this critical moment when Shimei felt that his fate was hanging in the balance? Perhaps he felt it politic not to put forward any mention of the house of Saul; but, then, he might have been silent upon his extraction—perhaps, as Stanley suggested, it is an indication of "the close political alliance between Benjamin and Ephraim";[1] the obvious rejoinder is that the moment of an impending sentence of death is hardly the moment when he would have cared to insist

[1] Dic. Bib., s.v. Shimei.

upon that. The "Midrash" on the Psalms[1] sees in the phrase a delicate touch of rhetoric. It is an appeal to David by one of the most sacred memories of the nation: that as Joseph rewarded his brethren good for the evil which they had done him, so David of his clemency would act now. That, says R. Samuel to R. Jonathan, was the view of the schools in Babylon. "You say beautifully," said R. Jonathan when he heard it; and we, it will be thought, may not improperly say the same.

And once again, in the description of David's bodyguard as "the Cherethites and Pelethites," the "Midrash" furnishes[2] a glimpse of a view which more than one Hebrew expositor adopts,[3] and which is admitted to be arguable by the moderns. Gesenius even adopts the view in question, which is that the names Cherethites and Pelethites are not geographical names at all, describing a nation or a tribe, but that they are official terms derived from the functions which the corps discharged. The names might be referred to two Hebrew words which mean respectively to *cut* and to *wonder*. And so we find in the "Midrash," "R. Ibbo says, They decided legal questions, and were the distinguished presidents of the courts of justice."

The leading characters in Scripture, too, sometimes assume a novel attitude in Hebrew tradition. Doeg, for example, is president of the Sanhedrim, because the Scripture describes him as "chiefest of the herdmen belonging to Saul"—"herdmen" being apparently understood in the sense of pastors, guides and leaders. And in the case of Ahithophel we are offered an explanation of one of those mysterious gaps which are retained even in our own copies of the Hebrew Scripture, where a word is ordered in the margin to be read, but its place has always been left vacant in the text. With reference to Ahithophel it is said, "And the counsel of Ahithophel, which he counselled in those days, was as if a man had enquired of the oracle of God" (2 Sam. xvi. 23). The word for "man" has never been written, but a space has been left for it in the text. The omission, says the "Midrash," was meant to imply that Ahithophel was not really a man, but an angel.

The tradition of Israel attempts to supply the detail of many a Scriptural picture of which the sacred narrative itself gives little more than an outline. Thus, in reference to the first days of man's life upon earth, the "Midrash" is rich in many a speculation upon points about which modern curiosity has not been altogether silent—the gates of the garden of Eden.

---

[1] "Midrash" on Ps. iii. [2] On Ps. iii.
[3] So Talmud Babli (Ber. 4a). See also Levy, s.v.

were close to Mount Moriah (on Ps. xcii.); the skins of which the Lord God made coats of skins unto Adam and his wife were skins which the serpent had shed (*ibid.*).

There is many a story preserved in the "Midrash" which probably has not survived elsewhere. As a specimen, one may be cited in reference to the Emperor Adrian, whose name is often mentioned in Hebrew literature. It occurs in the exposition of the words, "The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters." And it shows how the ancients were no strangers to that curiosity about the secrets of the deep which in our own day we have endeavoured to satisfy by the soundings and dredgings of scientific expeditions. It happened, says the "Midrash," to Adrian, that he sought to study what was at the bottom of the ocean; so he took cords and lowered them for three years, when he heard a mysterious echo, saying, Stop, Adrian! He sought again to know what the waters were saying in praise of the Creator, so he made chests of glass, and, having put men inside them, he lowered them into the ocean. And when they came up, they said, We heard the ocean uttering praise, and saying, "The Lord on high is mightier."

Occasionally we meet with some legend or usage in the "Midrash" which serves to elucidate an expression of the New Testament. For example, on the question of angelic ministration at the giving of the Law on Sinai, there is no direct statement of it in the narration of the scene in Exodus; there is a dim allusion to it in the last blessings of Moses at the end of Deuteronomy; but in the New Testament it is freely affirmed without apology or explanation: "If the word spoken by angels was stedfast" in the Epistle to the Hebrews; by St. Paul in the Galatians, "it was ordained by angels in the hand of a Mediator," and by St. Stephen "Who have received the Law by the disposition of angels and have not kept it." It is at least curious that in the "Midrash Tehillim" we have evidence of a tradition which is dated in the times of the Apostles themselves, and which shows that St. Paul and St. Stephen were but affirming a view which was common property in their day. It may be translated as follows:[1]

"R. Johanan expounded the Sacred Text thus: On Sinai at the time when Samuel received the Law, there came down sixty myriads of ministering angels and put crowns on the heads of every Israelite. Rabbi Abba bar Cahana in the name of R. Johanan said, There came down one hundred and twenty myriads, and while one put a crown upon the head of each Israelite, another girt him with a weapon."

[1] On Ps. ciii. Ed. Warsaw, p. 148, foot.

The "Midrash" naturally acquaints the reader with many of the leading ideas in ancient Jewish cosmogony. Thus, God is declared to have created seven heavens. "I created seven heavens, but of them all I chose only the ethereal plains" (A.V., Ps. lxviii. 4, heavens) "for the habitation of my dwelling," a conception possibly which lies at the base of our English phrase of "being in the seventh heaven." There is a void between the firmament and the waters that are below the firmament, and a similar void between the firmament and the waters that are above the firmament; the upper heavens are suspended in the air, and rain is caused by the descent of the upper waters (on Ps. xix.). The earth is supported in a manner which may remind us of the legend of the still more distant East, which says that the earth is poised upon an elephant, and the elephant upon a tortoise, though the account in the "Midrash" is philosophically far more complete, inasmuch as it traces the ultimate support to God Himself. "The earth," it says, "is supported on the pillars" (*i.e.*, the ones mentioned in the Scripture), "the pillars upon the waters, the waters upon the mountains, the mountains upon the winds, the wind upon the whirlwind, and the whirlwind depends upon the arm of the Almighty" (on Ps. cxxxvi.). The question is touched from which modern impatience is sometimes not altogether free: Why the things were created which seem to have no use or seem to exist only for the purpose of inflicting discomfort and annoyance; and the answer which the "Midrash" gives is that when His creatures sin God may look upon such useless members of His creation, and reason that if He preserves those for which there is no necessity, much more may He preserve those for whom there is a necessity (on Ps. xviii.).

And before closing the subject, there is one other feature of the New Testament which receives abundant illustration from the pages of the "Midrash," and that is the prevalence of parable. That description which the Gospel gives of our Lord's teaching is entirely true to the usual methods of these doctors of Israel, "Without a parable spake He not unto them." In the "Midrash" parable is everywhere. It must suffice to quote one specimen. It is attached to the text, "Thou hast put gladness in my heart since the time that their corn and wine and oil increased." The aim of it is to show how Israel in depression could be glad on seeing the prosperity of the nations of the world. R. Joshua, the son of Levi, said, It is a parable of a king who made a feast and invites the wayfarers, and sets them by the door of the palace, where they see the dogs going out with pheasants in their mouths and heads of fatlings and of calves, they begin to say, If the dogs have

such good things, how much better will the feast be which is prepared for us? Now, the idolatrous nations are compared to dogs, as it said in Isaiah (lvi. 11), "Yea, they are greedy dogs." They are in prosperity in this world: and will not Israel be much more in prosperity in the world to come? This is the meaning of the text, "Thou hast put gladness in my heart." One reflection will probably be suggested to the reader of the New Testament: that the parables of the "Midrash," of which that is a more than average specimen, are vastly inferior in dignity, in aptness, and in all the elements of literary merit, to the earlier parables with which our Lord has made us familiar.

From what has been said it will have been gathered that in this field of the older Hebrew literature, much ground has to be broken before anything of real value can be found. The explorer is indeed at times rewarded by the discovery of something which serves to illuminate some feature of the New Testament with not a little of the brilliancy which it naturally bore to the oriental eye of old time, but which it has almost lost to our changed perceptions and habits in the west. That perhaps, imparts to the literature of the "Midrash" a value which it will never lose; but, as students of Scripture, if we want a caution that we are not to be misled by its vagaries, its extravagances, its triviality, we have it in that Hebrew saying of these very Rabbies themselves—

הדרשה תדרוש אבל אין המקרא יוצא מדי פשוטו.

You may expound your "Midrash," almost as we should say, You may preach your sermon; but the Scripture does not leave its simple and literal sense.

H. T. ARMFIELD, F.S.A.

ART. III.—FASTING.

FASTING was an institution of the Old Covenant, as it is of the New. Our Lord scarcely alludes to it: as St. Chrysostom hath it, His direct command is rather "eat" than "fast": His apparent recommendation of it as a source of spiritual strength is, like St. Paul's in 1 Cor. vii. 5, of dubious textual authority: yet His non-ascetic ministry was preceded by the great fast of forty days. It is an observance ordered in our English Church.

What is fasting? What is the final cause of fasting? Familiar as is the well-known word, it may be that since both

our teaching and our practice in this matter show differences and divergences indicative of confusion of thought, some endeavour to answer these inquiries may not only give an opportunity for that discussion, that "shaking about," or worrying of a topic (though *discutio* in this sense is hardly classical), which brings us together here,[1] but also threw some light on a question where light seems to be needed.

But what is fasting?

The former of our homilies on fasting, which we all believe contains doctrine profitable for the year 1571, argues that, because our Saviour agreed that His disciples, inasmuch as they ate and drank, fasted not, fasting is a "withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting." The same homily quotes a canon of Chalcedon to the same effect.

But less simple authorities distinguish (*e.g.* Bellarmine) *jejunium spirituale, i.e.*, fasting from *vice; morale,* which equals temperance; *naturale,* unqualified abstinence; and *ecclesiasticum,* which we see may allow vice, and is neither starvation nor temperance. Erasmus ("Pietas Puerilis") distinguishes *naturale "ad tuendam valetudinem,"* and *civile ad obeunda promptius negotia,* from *religiosum,* of which more hereafter. In attempting a definition we shall be helped, as we are always helped, by the history of the words which we use; for how would both the sweetness and light of conversation and controversy be increased if no bit of their currency were ever issued or passed without knowledge of their image, superscription and value?

In the Old Law the meaning of the technical term for fasting is *afflicting the soul.* Whether the Aramaic word used by our Lord was the equivalent of this affliction of the soul or of the more vernacular word *tsom,* used by prophets and the psalmist, must be, more or less, matter of conjecture. The evangelist's word *νηστεία* and its correlatives is, of course, formed from the privative *νὴ* and *ἐσθίω*, and means not eating.

The Latin words *jejunus* and *jejunium,* which have been so widely circulated in the Church, and appear in the modern *déjeuner,* are traced to a root, which has much the same connotation as the almost synonymous *abstinentia,* and express the idea of self-restraint and holding aloof. The same force is latent in our English "fast," which is an early offshoot of the Teutonic "fast" in the sense of firm, strong, strict; fast, equalling firm, being kindred with *πούς—pes,* foot. To fast, therefore, is to exercise a strong moral restraint, like that of a man who makes a firm stand, puts his foot down, and says "no" when

[1] This paper was written to open a discussion at a Clerical Society.

needed. Our vocabulary leads us to define fasting as affliction of the soul, coupled with marked moral and physical self-restraint. It reminds us further, through its Greek words, that this self-restraint has very commonly expressed itself in curtailment or temporary refusal of the commonest of animal pleasures—the satisfaction of hunger. I say "curtailment" because, just as the Greeks said γυμνός of a man in only his under-garment; just as St. Paul's storm-tossed shipmates were ἄσιτοι for fourteen days, not in the sense of taking no food, but of taking no regular meals, and barely keeping body and soul together in the face of their apparently imminent disjunction; so νηστεία is said of eating very little, or of not eating and drinking certain viands and beverages, as meat and wine. I therefore define fasting, viewed as a Christian custom, to be *sorrowful self-restraint, most frequently shown in eating and drinking.*

We ask next, What is the final cause of fasting? This I apprehend to be twofold, regarding both the past and the future, or, rather, a future so immediate that in most analogous cases it is better to regard it as the present. In answer, then, to the question, "Why fast?" we may say partly for the past, partly for the present. Why for the past? Because there is so much in our past as a race, as a people, as families, as individuals, of sorrow, that, assuming the propriety of marking anniversaries at all, we may well mark sorrowful anniversaries by sorrowful curtailment of pleasure. For all "the souls" that "were perfect once" it seems well to exercise sorrowful self-restraint on the day kept in memory of the supreme agony of Him who "found out the remedy." Again, our land has not recently seen many shameful or crushing disasters; but, had our Miletus been taken, we should probably not care to see any play at all as the year brought round the day. Again, a David would hardly feast his chief estates on the anniversary of his Absalom's death. A thoughtful and penitent soul will instinctively turn away from many pleasures, quite lawful in themselves, when the date on the calendar summons black memories from the past, and will feel "to-day these things are not only not expedient for me, they are not possible."

But the Church is the happy hill-country where the climbing Christian may forget the mud and mist which lie behind, and reach forward to the white slopes of high enterprise which rise before. Wholesome fasting has less to do with the past than with the immediate present. What is the good of fasting? We perhaps cannot get a better reply than by referring to the two collects which we use on the first and second Sundays of the penitential season of Lent, and which are at least as old as the Sacramentary of Gregory. In the

first we pray to the great Faster of the Wilderness of Paradise regained to "give us grace to use such abstinence that, our flesh being subdued to the spirit, we may obey His godly motions in righteousness and true holiness." In the second we are opportunely reminded that the most pious and healthy abstinence can have no power of itself to help us, and further that the Divine defence is desirable not only against "adversities which may happen to the body," but also against "all evil thoughts which may assault and hurt the soul." In short, we ask for such abstinence as may from time to time conduce to the preservation of the Christian *Mens Sana* in the Christian *Corpus Sanum*, and make us at once more vigilant and more vigorous, manfully fighting our ceaseless fight against sin, the world and the devil. If the true end of sorrowful self-restraint is, for the past, such godly sorrow as works repentance, it is for the present the readiness of the happy warrior to do his duty in the battle of life.

Having thus cleared the ground by defining fasting and its objects, we may do well to note some of the misconceptions and exaggerations which stand in the way of obedience to a discipline recommended on high authority. On the whole, there is perhaps less need now and in England to insist on the narrower fasting of *νηστεία*—mere abstention from food—than there was in the grosser times of imperial banquets. We look from a distance at the Roman vulgarity of costly piles of fantastic meats, and the filthinesses (which it were a slur on God's beasts to call beastly) of the vomitoria and the secunda fames. We see afar off stout Scandinavian princes qualifying for heaven by gorging themselves to stupor on earth. And, of course, all questions of diet are largely questions of race and climate. The kind and amount of food conducive to a beatific spirit and bodily and mental activity in an oriental Euphrates valley may mean peevish incapacity in the valley of the Thames. Still, the Protestant Reformation has something to answer for in its discountenance of a diminished diet, and its association of high principles of politics and Catholicity with butcher's meat. I am not at all sure that Archbishop Cranmer was really advancing the best interests of this realm when in March, 1547, he did what Mr. Froude tells us was "to four-fifths of the English world as agitating as if among ourselves the opera house was to be opened on a Sunday, and the Bishop of London to appear in a private box," *i.e.*, "did eat meat openly in Lent, in the Hall of Lambeth, the like of which was never seen since England was a Christian country." All well-to-do people, as a rule, eat too much. Everybody who can get it—barring a handful of modern Priscillianists—eats too much

meat. Fish on Wednesday and Friday, or Tuesday and Thursday if you will, might possibly conduce to wider obedience to Christ's godly motions. And, if our gluttons and gourmets are less fit than Vitellius, or Ciotto the Florentine, for the mire of that special circle of Dante's Hall, where Cerberus, prolonging for ever the pangs of indigestion, "tears the spirits, flays them, and their limbs piecemeal disparts," what shall we say of intemperance in intoxicating drinks? We want fasting here. We shall probably be agreed that the best hope of the growing temperance of England lies in the extent to which all of every rank and age can be brought to recognise that the worst damnation incurred by either fury or coma of drunkenness is the unfitting of soul and body to obey a loving Master's godly motions.

Failure to fast, as exemplified in a general lust for amusement, is another prevalent evil of our age. "Whatever you do, amuse yourself," is a *vox populi*, and would be recognised as a *vox Dei* if only those who say so loudest recognised a *Deus* to have a *vox*. Amusement is the work of the idle, and some of the best of them originate societies for providing amusement for the unamused. Here there seems ample room for recommending a sorrowful self-restraint, with a view to obeying holy influences. On the whole, we should be a merrier England, in the best sense, if we had more godly fasting.

Yet no pendulum swing starts from the perpendicular. That the Protestant Reformation should have gone to a needless extreme of depreciation, if not of condemnation, of fasting, is hardly to be wondered at when we recall the opposite extreme of mediæval superstition. No doubt our judicious Anglican is right in regretting the hurt "grown to the Church of God, through a false imagination that fasting standeth men in no stead for any spiritual respect, but only to take down the frankness of nature, and to tame the wildness of flesh."[1] "The world" in Hooker's day, he goes on, "being bold to surfeit, doth now blush to fast, supposing that men when they fast do rather bewray a disease than exercise a virtue." But how could the society that laughed under the lightning satire playing from those thin lips of Erasmus, or heard the thunder peal from Luther's thick ones, discern virtue or manliness in what the Church had come to teach about fasting? It was a patent folly; a great gastronomic farce. Sorrow and humiliation were lost in a frivolous etiquette, and self-restraint in the indulgence of the sillier and blinder self. Mere reference to these absurdities seems unseemly in the discussion of what concerns the faith of the saints; but we cannot measure the

[1] Hooker, v. 72.

healthy mean without taking into our reckoning both kinds of extravagance. Not only was the fasting of the mediævalist an unspiritual form, but it was fatally confused with weightier matters of the law of love. Take, for instance, the story which Jeremy Taylor quotes from Poggio, of the Neapolitan peasant who came in distress to own to his priest that he had eaten animal food in Lent. He was making a cheese, he said, and some of the whey accidentally spurted into his mouth. How purge this heinous sin? "Is that all you can charge your conscience with?" said the priest. "I know that men of your class sometimes waylay, rob, and kill stray travellers: are you guilty of such deeds?" "Rob and kill a traveller!" rejoins the peasant. "I hope you do not call that a deadly sin? We all do it; almost every week. But I never touched animal food in Lent before." Well, it may be said this was the crass stupidity of a hind; his priest would show him better. But what of the clergy? Poggio's facetiæ were published in 1538. The ecclesiastical world had been interested for centuries in nice questions as to what was or was not fasting. Up to the fourth century notions and practices were loose. Rigour began with Leo the Great (A.D. 460) in the fifth century. The eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries seem to have been the period when extremists commanded most obedience. And in the eleventh, according to Baronius, meat-eaters in Lent were liable to forcible extraction of the teeth. Up to the period of the Reformation, as after, the Church was sorely exercised about fasting, quite apart from the question of the sorrow or the moral restraint of the faster. "It is instructive," says Bishop Kingdon, "to watch the gradual advance in the meaning of the word 'fasting,' as applied to those about to communicate. For a long time it was only applied to one kind of fast, which would now be called an ecclesiastical fast. But when reverence and devotion brought in the idea that it was congruous to the dignity of the Sacrament that it should be the first food taken in the day, it was 'probably to be the first food taken after the night's sleep.' But as some persons did not sleep, it was laid down that a man was fasting ready for Communion when digestion was complete." St. Thomas Aquinas was satisfied if a man took no food after the commencement of the day, as the Roman Church computed the day—"a convenient definition," sweeping away "all difficulties about digestion and sleep, and all other such questions." "But"—hitherto I have somewhat abridged, here I quote Bishop Kingdon at length—"there were other doctors in the thirteenth century who still clung to the notion of the ecclesiastical (as distinguished from the so-called natural) fast; and these said that a man might take electuaries, or ginger, or

such like, by way of stay stomach without impediment to reverent Communion." At the period of the Reformation we find Protestants protesting, on the one hand, against the fast that was so easy as to be a feast under another name; on the other, against a vain asceticism. But triflers trifled on. "Sala,[1] in his notes upon Bona,[2] says that any opinion favouring mitigation of the Fast ought to be held an error in faith. 'This is nearly approaching to a heresy, and therefore it is almost as bad as giving the cup to the laity.' Further refinements were soon introduced. The popular Summist, Sylvester of Priesio, says that a man may clean his teeth with salt and vinegar so long as he does not swallow any. Later ritualists forbid this luxury. The question was raised as to whether a man was properly fasting if he said his matins the afternoon before, and took any food afterwards; or whether he had to say matins again the next morning of necessity before communicating. Then came the question of a man going to sleep with a lozenge or sugar-candy in his mouth to prevent coughing in the night: how can he be assured that he had not swallowed some after midnight? Here was a nice question for the casuists, and there are two opinions on the subject: the weight of authority inclines to the determination that such a thing impedes Communion. Then comes the question of tobacco. Here was something that would comfort and prevent wretchedness of hunger without breaking *the fast of nature.* A man, then, may smoke, chew tobacco, or take snuff, though he swallow either smoke, or juice, or snuff, unless he does it *per industriam* of set purpose to eat, or to take it as food. This decision must have been arrived at by devotees to this narcotic leaf; others would perhaps think such a determination the reverse of reverent. Though this, therefore, is the rule of Roman and Continental casuistry, there are canons passed in Mexico which make it a matter of eternal condemnation to take snuff before Mass. What, therefore, is allowed in Italy is mortal sin in America. Then, again, we read that water *attracta per nares,* drawn up through the nostrils, does not break the fast so as to hinder Communion. And so on through many curious scruples (such, again, as swallowing paper or parchment), which seem perhaps to an English mind to show that the chief end in view is not reverence to the Sacrament, but the keeping the rule in the rubric.

* * * * *

"But in England the domestic canons on this head never

---

[1] Robert Sala of Turin, 1749. [2] Cardinal; Res Liturgicæ, 1671.

found their way into the rubrics of the Sarum Missal, hence we find no discussions in Lyndwood as to whether sucking a piece of ivory or bone breaks the fast. It may be that this is owing to what Dr. Newman calls our 'national good sense.'"[1]

These examples of the carnal and unspiritual degradation of a possible aid to good living are cited by Bishop Kingdon with reference to fasting as necessary to due partaking of the holy mysteries of the Eucharist. I have purposely so narrowed the question here from the general to the particular, because what is called "Fasting Communion" affords an instructive illustration of how a practice, in itself innocent, or even, when the circumstances of men and manners are taken into account, desirable, may become, when frozen into a rigid law, recommended and enforced by unintelligent formalists, at once ridiculous and pernicious. And, it may be feared, to judge from some recent utterances, that it has for us a more than antiquarian interest, and is in some quarters so treated as to imperil the high character which the venerable Cardinal is pleased to give to English Catholics for national good sense.

There is no injunction, Divine or apostolic, imposing the duty of Fasting Communion. No law binding in our Church enforces any such observance. We may naturally infer that it was a custom of the first century to celebrate the Eucharist before the first meal of the day, from the fact that the first Christians assembled to worship early in the morning. For their thus assembling early in the morning there may have been many reasons—reasons alike of expediency and reverence will readily suggest themselves; but it is nowhere even hinted that they assembled early that they might assemble fasting. And as the early Church knew no such law, so neither does our own Church so order. We are, therefore, free to consider the question from the point of view of general edification, and may well wish to consider it without detriment to our character for common-sense. We shall all be agreed that it is desirable for the rite of the Holy Communion so to be rendered in all matters of secondary importance as to draw to the sacred board the largest possible number of devout recipients of the mysteries; for them to be in such a condition of mind and body as shall best enable them—with souls strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ, He in them, and they in Him—to join with angels and archangels in lauding and magnifying His Name, and so to go forth, whether to the business of our common life or through the grave and gate of death, as to carry with them the abiding presence of the Eternal.

[1] Bp. Kingdon, "Fasting Communion."

We might ask whether these ends are consistent with anything like sorrowful self-restraint—whether there is not an incongruity approaching to wickedness in the very idea of fasting on the feast, and whether those old worthies were not right who, like St. Epiphanius, taught that it was wrong to fast on the Lord's Day? Of course, the sacred commemoration of the Passion must be safeguarded from any unseemly association with the merriment or the thoughtlessness of a common meal; the proximity of even the Agapæ was dangerous to the infant Church of Corinth, and the awful Presence was not distinguished amid the unsanctified eating and drinking. But the very same peril is risked by long separation from, as from close nearness to, the satisfaction of ordinary hunger. There is an obvious danger lest the thoughts of the hungry communicant should be diverted from the extraordinary to the ordinary bread.

Think of what is wanted in the good communicant—profound reverence; abstraction from distracting thoughts; soul ready to be joined in indescribable communion with the Unseen; body ready to act under the authority of spirit itself; conscience under the authority of the Divine; the happy gratitude of a welcome guest; the genial cheerfulness of a sharer of the best; the sober enthusiasm of a reasonable worshipper. Are these conditions likely to be produced by physically irritating alterations in the ordinary habits of decent simple life? By calculations as to how long since supper, or how long before breakfast? There are many obvious and excellent reasons why early Communions should be held, and why many devout worshippers should prefer them. But I cannot see that the fact of their being in most cases fasting Communions tells necessarily in their favour. There are assuredly not a few obvious and excellent arguments to be adduced in favour of Communions celebrated after morning prayer, and I am equally unable to see why any noon-communicant should be ordered to go without his breakfast, or be unto us as worse than a heathen and a publican if he has breakfasted. Even in the old English breakfast-of-beef-and-beer days, should we be justified in despising the mid-day sacrament? Even if beef and beer might seem an inappropriate preface to an awful service, against the changed conditions of our dietary no such obligation can lie; and as a general rule it would seem that a pious communicant, even early in the morning, might benefit none the less—perhaps the more—from the holiest mysteries of our faith, after modest sustenance from the gentle beverages and viands of our tables. It is a matter to be left to be guided as various needs and circumstances may require. There is that communicateth fasting to the Lord, as there is that

communicateth fasting not to the Lord, and it would be as cruel and stupid to say in all cases you shall not communicate fasting, as to say in all cases you shall not communicate except fasting. The great objects to be sought is that no one at God's table should be thinking of his meaner self and his lower wants at all. His mind should be free, and the more he can forget his body the better. Not a few fasting communicants must be in danger of coming to the Divine entertainment as some folks come to a human entertainment—fidgety about their appetites, or their clothes, or some form of the infinitely little.

So far I have considered this aspect of fasting Communion only in relation to the subject. It is impossible quite to pass over—though I would fain quite pass over, for I hardly know how to find words not indecent and irreverent wherein to touch on—reasons which have been, and, I believe, are, given for fasting Communion, in connection with the state of the consecrated Bread and Wine after their reception and manducation by the communicant. It is only right to note, and I note with thankfulness, that leaflets and manuals which I have seen issued with the cachet of our more materialistic brethren are for the most part free from this curious superstition, but it appears that 11,000 copies of a small tract, edited by a committee of clergy, teach its readers that "When about to celebrate the Divine Mysteries, we do not allow upon the altar anything which has not an immediate connection with the ministration of our Lord's Body and Blood, so when we are about to receive that Body and Blood into our bodies, we should take care that the resting-place of the Sacraments be not preoccupied."

Reverence is so good and so rare a thing that even misdirected reverence seems to claim the kindliest consideration. Yet the ugly results of a misapprehension of the true nature and object of sober and righteous Christian fasting are certainly seen in most distressing forms in the case of fasting before celebration of the Holy Eucharist. I will give three illustrations of what I mean: (i.) The first shows how hardly the rigorists' precept of Fasting Communion may tell against the devout sick. I quote it from Bishop Kingdon. We must remember that the mediæval rule only allows Communion without fasting in *articulo mortis*. A rigorist priest refused to communicate an invalid because the medical man had directed food to be taken every two hours. The invalid, "after refraining from Communion for some time, becoming greatly distressed, persuaded a priest to celebrate at a quarter before one in the morning. Thus the natural fast was observed, though food had been taken within an hour of

the act of Communion. Surely this," adds the Bishop, "could not have been a reasonable service." Reasonable service!

My second illustration I give on the authority of a London clergyman of wide information as to the manners and customs of his brethren: he tells me that among the "advanced" clergy—pardon my condoning popular misuse of a term which properly, of course, connotes rather progress than extravagance—it is not unusual for the priest who is to celebrate at noon to remain away from earlier services, and stave off hunger by smoking, unaware, perhaps, that by several Mexican Councils of equivalent authority to those of which much is made by his authorities, "prohibetur sub reatu pœnæ æternæ damnationis presbyteris celebraturis ne tabaci pulverem naribus etiam prætextu medicinæ ante sacrificium sumant." If there were no *via media* between a priest's coming to officiate at the Eucharist literally without having tasted food, and, as the Second Council of Macon (585) phrases it, "crepulatus vino," the former alternative were preferable. Canon Liddon (on Evening Communions) "is disposed to think that the English habit of lying in bed on Sunday morning is an evil with which the clergy ought to wage unceasing war." What of a clerical habit of lying in bed in order the more easily to celebrate fasting?

The third instance is that of the little daughter of an acquaintance of my own. She was of weak health, and her parents wished her to take some slight nourishment before going out in the morning to Church. A young curate heard of this, and was much shocked at the violation of the Church's rule. His advice to the damsel—that word will hint a contrast which is not uninstructive—his advice to the damsel was, "if you say you are not able to come out to Early Communion fasting, eat a heavy supper as near midnight as you can the night before."

Surely it is not too much to say of the unworthy ["*ἀνάξιον*"] feeling and teaching thus exhibited, that they spring from a failure *διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου* (1 Cor. xi. 29). Yet it is inevitable that injudicious enthusiasm, unaware of the purest Catholic doctrine on the subject, should run into extremes, when we find leaflets issued such as the one which I mention, published with the brand on it of an honoured name. It is edited by the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie.

It states that "the Practice of the Church from early days has been to lay down as a general rule for her children that they should go fasting to receive the Holy Communion." What "early days"? Where is this "Rule"?

"By fasting," he says, "is meant going absolutely without food of any kind, either solid or liquid, from the previous mid-

night. Some people, through ignorance or self-indulgence, take the matter into their own hands."

The Church. *What* Church? when? where? The Church Catholic, *never;* the pure and Apostolic branch of it established in these realms, *never*. The most that can be truly said by advocates of Fasting Communion is that it was in some places a recognised necessity in the fourth century.

To argue that this was one of the rest of the points which St. Paul set in order when he came to Corinth, is an instance of arguments from wishes to facts. Canon Bright cannot controvert the position that "There is no law or canon binding in England now so as to make those that are unable to follow this custom liable to a charge of mortal sin, as having broken a positive precept." It may be a pious custom, recommended to the consciences and hearts of many, into which God forbid that I or anyone should pry, least of all with cold and unkind criticism. But this is a very different thing from a law of Divine or even of high ecclesiastical authority, to be imposed on all.

Fasting Communion, viewed as a matter of moral and spiritual taste, happily illustrates that view of fasting generally which it is the purpose of this short paper to promote. Such affliction of the soul, coupled with marked moral and physical restraint as may help a worthy Communicant to due self-examination, and stimulate to lively faith, thankful remembrance, and universal charity, by all means let him exercise. But as to the details of amount and kind of this abstinence, our Church, while wisely naming appropriate times and seasons, declines to make rules fussy, foolish and irritating, and, like the sensible mother of a household, ready, if need arise, to regulate every jot and tittle of life by the application of sound principles, refuses to make the Divine Letter illegible by magnifying tittles and jots, and bases her parental despotism on broad grounds of reverence and love.

In answer, then, to any inquiry as to what kinds of sorrowful restraint in eating and drinking, or in anything else, best helps us to maintain in soul and body the mastery of the Spirit, we should say that this is best left very much to the consciences of individuals, and must largely vary with the varying needs of the Church. "Every man," as Dr. Johnson says, "is to judge for himself, according to the effects which he experiences. One of the Fathers," he adds—I have not verified the reference—"tells us he found fasting made him so peevish that he did not practise it." No better illustration can be furnished of this wholesome liberty and variety than the want of uniformity about the present penitential season of Lent. The Apostles appointed no days, because, as says John Cassian,

the friend and pupil of Chrysostom, "as long as the perfection of the primitive Church did remain, there was no observation of a Lent Fast." Lent came in with laxity of discipline. The Lent of Irenæus was one of one or two days or more; at Byzantium it has been a week of weeks. So late as the fifth century at Rome it lasted three weeks. Jerome represented Lent as intended for "imperfect and secular persons," who were in an unfit state to make a good Easter Communion. Charlemagne would punish wanton disregard of Lent with death; but as to the length or manner of his godly discipline, the Catholic Church has never pronounced.

But however various the quality and quantity of sorrowful self-restraint which it may be well from time to time to prescribe and to practise, there are certain notes of guidance on the agenda (and negligenda) paper of life's action, which we may safely mark and obey.

There is no good in fasting for the sake of fasting; still less is there any good in fasting, as the prophet says, "for strife and debate." Rather, in these days it might be well for penitential seasons to be appointed and enforced, when, in sorrowful self-restraint, men should be compelled to fast from strife and debate; and in an age that suffers more from surfeits of talk than from surfeits of meat, keep sometimes a Lenten silence even from good words. Such silence might be even more patriotic than the fish diet, which the homily on fasting loyally recommends, on the ground that fisheries are the nurseries of the royal navy.

Many of us are sure to have in mind the hissing scorn and trumpet-blast of encouragement that blend in the prophet's antitheses; vain the head bowed like the bulrush, and the sackcloth and ashes of ceremonial abasement, if for lack of our more righteous self-control bands of wickedness are tight round our brothers' hearts and burdens bow our brothers' backs.

Many of us will remember our quaint "Country Parson's" ingenious conceits:

> Yet Lord instruct us to improve our Fast
> By starving sin, and taking such repast
> As may our faults control;
> That every man may revel at his door,
> Not in his parlour; banquetting the poor,
> And among these his soul.

The "Jejunium religiosum" of Erasmus is "abstinentia non tantum a cibo, sed et omnibus quæ corpus oblectant, ad impetrandum precibus Dei clementiam propter instantes aut prementes calamitates."

Yet to him that thinketh he standeth there is always an

"instans calamitas"; and to the Christian, life and Lent must be, in a sense, conterminous.

"The Shepherd of Hermas" is not now regarded as a work of such high authority as once was accorded to it; but, nevertheless, I will venture to conclude with part of the fifth Similitude of the third book:

"As I was fasting, and sitting down on a certain mountain, and giving thanks unto God for all the things that He had done unto me, behold I saw the shepherd, who was wont to converse with me, sitting by me, and saying unto me: What has brought thee hither thus early in the morning?

"I answered, Sir, to-day I keep a station.

"He answered, What is a station? I replied, It is a fast. He said, What is that fast? I answered, I fast, as I have been wont to do. Ye know not, said he, what it is to fast under God; nor is this a fast which ye fast, profiting nothing with God.

"Sir, said I, what makes you speak thus? He replied, I speak it because this is not the true fast which you think that you fast; but I will show you what that is which is a complete fast, and acceptable unto God.

"Hearken, said he, The Lord does not desire such a needless fast: for by fasting in this manner, thou advancest nothing in righteousness.

"But the true fast is this: Do nothing wickedly in thy life, but serve God with a pure mind; and keep His commandments, and walk according to His precepts, nor suffer any wicked desire to enter into the mind.

"But trust in the Lord, that if thou dost these things, and fearest Him, and abstainest from every evil work, thou shalt live unto God.

"If thou shalt do this, thou shalt perfect a great fast, and an acceptable one unto the Lord."

BLOMFIELD JACKSON.

ART. IV.—DISESTABLISHMENT—WELSH AND IRISH.

THE vicissitudes of political parties have brought it about that the question of the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Welsh Church is again to the front. How, then, is the assault to be repulsed and the fortress rendered impregnable? This is a utilitarian age. Appeals to history or to sentiment, unless backed up by something more practical, will prove of little avail. The average voter does not greatly

concern himself as to whether the title "Welsh Church" be correct, or, rather, that of "Church of England in Wales." The Church of Ireland had and has an acknowledged right to this claim of high descent. It did not, however, avail her much in her hour of need. Around other points the controversy waged. And so the Welsh Church shall most wisely trust, not to the prestige of ancient and independent pedigree, nor, on the other hand, to the claim to be part and parcel of the Church of England, but rather to the work which she is now doing, and on the place which she alone can fill in the nation's life, likely to become, if deprived of her, hard, barren, unspiritual. We do not, be it understood, desire for one moment to minimize the power and the inspiration which flow from the consciousness of a noble ancestry. Such should nerve the arm and fire the courage of all true defenders of the faith. This appeal, however, is confessedly felt by those within, rather than those without, the Church.

The Welsh Church, it must be admitted, had, equally with the Irish Church, for the last one hundred and fifty years failed in its appointed work. But it must also be equally insisted upon that in neither case was the cause of failure solely that these were Established Churches. The outcry in Wales against Establishment—*quâ* Establishment—is quite a modern one, nor is it even now the genuine expression of a majority against grievances at present existing. These are Mr. Gladstone's words in the House of Commons: "It has been no question of National Establishment that has led to the growth of Welsh Dissent. In my opinion it is due to the cruelly anti-national policy that has been pursued. It is a fact of some interest that the people of Wales were the stoutest Churchmen in the country so long as the Church was administered in a spirit of sympathy and in accordance with the national feeling." External influence wrongly applied cramped and stifled the Welsh Church, just as in Ireland it compelled the Church to be the tool of a party, not only failing to encourage, but rather sternly repressing, all symptoms of national life. It seems to be a law of nature that a dominant race should not possess an effective missionary power. The conquered instinctively shrink from adopting the faith of the conqueror. The fact of their national insignificance was surely a prominent factor in the success of the missionary efforts of the Jews. This, however, which largely accounts for the comparative failure of the Church of Ireland in dealing with the Roman Catholic population, cannot be said to apply in the same degree to the history of the Welsh Church. Yet the English Church, in face of the vast forces of Dissent arrayed around herself, cannot surely afford to blame either

of her feebler sisters, but shall rather assure them of her sympathy and her active aid. She was left almost unhampered and free at least from external force, to pursue her path, whilst they were made for long years the tools of political parties, their mother-tongues and their national aspirations alike ignored, ruled by stranger-prelates often non-resident, careless alike of their people's wants and of the feelings of their clergy. Does not this, however, seem to tell against the benefit of State-connection altogether? It does, if the possibility of the abuse of a right is good ground for abolishing that right. If the Church is to be a political tool, and not the spring of the national conscience, better far that such alliance should at once be severed.

The question of Establishment is now one of expediency. If the national life really be the poorer, weaker, and bitterer from its continuance, no true patriot, much less Christian, could seek for one moment to support it. But this is the very question at issue. This, also, is the very point which men fail to sufficiently consider. The "Home Rule" policy promised certain advantages to Ireland. Well and good. But were there no accompanying disadvantages which altogether outweighed the former? Investigation proved that beyond all question the evil far surpassed the good. We have, indeed, heard of someone who, when sentenced to capital punishment, committed suicide *to save his life!* But, then, he was an Irishman.

What are the alleged grievances in the case of the Welsh Church which only Disestablishment and Disendowment can remove—which are so necessary and inveterate that not reformation but destruction alone is the remedy? We confess not to be aware of them.

Will Disestablishment cause that the spiritual wants of the poor shall be better looked after? will it make the tithe-paying Nonconformist a richer man? will it abolish sectarian animosity? will it purify and elevate the spiritual tone of the national life? will it increase the flow of offerings to charity? will it make education more wholesome and more co-extensive with the complex nature of the scholar? will it help to stem the rising tide of anarchy, immorality, godlessness? Such, indeed, would be national benefits of the highest value, and if any barrier exists between these and the nation's life, away with it, it must not stand. But is there the slightest ground for believing that any such results must follow upon the policy of spoliation? The Rev. Stephen Gladstone in his address to his parishioners urges upon Churchmen the duty of removing every ground of irritation, every grievance which Dissenters may feel. Assuredly, when such are not imaginary,

when it can be clearly pointed out that the spiritual gains outweigh the losses. Unless this be done, what right have men to part lightly with the heritage bequeathed to them in trust for the spiritual benefit of future generations? It is true we must not sacrifice the spirit to the letter, and selfishly hoard or squander spiritual resources when there is no accompanying spiritual result. But again we ask, Where is the proof of this? Is not the very opposite acknowledged to be the case in the Church of Wales? We are by some pointed to the so-called advantages which flowed from the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. There is surprising ignorance even among Churchmen on this subject. It cannot be too widely known that the only advantage which the Irish Church directly obtained from Disestablishment was the right to legislate for herself. If Irish Churchmen are pointed to the rising tide of spiritual effort in Ireland during the last quarter of a century as a convincing proof of the great boon which Mr. Gladstone so generously conferred upon them when he stripped their Church naked of her rights and possessions, the apt rejoinder is, "What is *post hoc* is not necessarily *propter hoc*." "What of the very same renewed life in the churches of England and of Wales, and the Episcopal Church of Scotland, where this factor of Disestablishment played no part?" Surely we may rather put this question, "What great spiritual results might not the Church of Ireland have achieved with this new life stirring in her veins, had her rightful inheritance been left to her, or even had the spoiler spared but a small portion thereof?" The religious revival which produced such mighty results in England and in Wales reached Ireland also, and caused the dry bones to live. They stood upon their feet a mighty army, but alas! the weapons of their spiritual warfare were unjustly denied them—no longer theirs to wield.

Must Disendowment alone bring it about that the laity shall take an intelligent interest and an active participation in the affairs of their Church? That clergy and laity shall unite in choosing their bishop—a most primitive and expedient custom? That parishioners shall have some voice in the choice of their minister? In Ireland these concomitants of Disendowment are gladly welcomed; but they would have been much more welcome without it. They had no necessary connection with it. Have, however, any of the supposed advantages of Disestablishment followed as alluded to above? Is Ireland to-day richer, more loyal, more contented? Are opposing sects drawn more closely together? Is spiritual life throughout the whole land deeper and fuller? Is the tone of the national life higher? is popular education more compre-

hensive and more sound? We fear it is not so. The Upas-tree of Protestant ascendancy—which is the rightful order of the realm—has given place to a foreign despotism ten times more galling and enslaving.

"The Welsh Church," it is said, "cannot hope to obtain such good terms as the Church of Ireland." Indeed, the provisions of Mr. Asquith's recent Bill are much more severe than in the case of the latter Church. What, then, were these "good terms"? To the Church of Ireland were left the church fabrics, the life services of the then existing clergy, *and nothing else whatever*, neither parsonage-house, nor rood of land, nor one penny of her inheritance. "Over two thousand burial-grounds, hallowed by the sacred association of centuries, are now in the grasp of Poor Law Guardians and Boards of Health. The very graves of St. Patrick and St. Columkille have been secularized." Even a journal like the *Times* was bold enough to say that the Irish Church was "re-endowed." It is true that about £520,000 was repaid as compensation for private benefactions and endowments, and for proprietary churches of so recent a date that no principle, save that of barefaced and open pillage, applying equally to Nonconformist trusts and meeting-houses, could pretend to lay hands upon them. How, then, does the Irish Church exist? What is its support? Its position to-day is, under God, due to the loving skill, to the open-handed benevolence of impoverished Irish Churchmen. The State, to save itself trouble, handed over to the Church the task of paying the existing clergy who could still draw State-payments for a whole generation. The sum handed over was exactly that amount, plus a small grant for expenses, which would meet these annuities, if it were invested so that every shilling, till it was demanded by the annuitant, should bear interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. The only gain the Church could have in taking this responsibility off the shoulders of her spoilers was that she would have for herself whatever interest over and above this 3½ per cent. she could obtain for the capital while it was in her custody. Upon this and upon the generous contributions of her children the Church of Ireland strives to-day to do her work. She has been of necessity compelled to amalgamate her outlying parishes; she has no longer any positions of ease and competence wherewith to reward her hard-worked clergy. A bare sufficiency is all that can be looked for outside the few large towns. She cannot hope to attract into her ministry the same class of men as formerly; nor is a learned ministry a popular desideratum. In olden days, throughout the length and breadth of the land, in the lonely regions of a few scattered hamlets, the Church parsonage was a centre of culture and all

gentle influences, where no civilized gentleman would consent to bring up a family except for the love of God and His Church. Is the land none the worse for the loss of this—a blank filled by ignorance and grinding superstition? Where is the result of "The Message of Peace"? *Cui bono?* Is the Nonconformist conscience comfortable under the sense of the ever-tightening grasp of the Church of Rome upon over three millions of fellow-subjects? What mockery to "protest" against Ritualism in England while weakening the defences of the Reformed Faith in Ireland!

We could earnestly ask Christian, patriotic men of every class and creed not to inflict a grievous wrong upon their Fatherland, simply because Disestablishment is an item in a political programme. The forces for God and Righteousness in these lands are weak enough without being still further impaired. Undoubtedly all wrongs must be righted, all injustices removed. If such can be clearly shown, no true Churchman, simply from veneration for the existing order, can dare to raise his voice against their abolition. We acknowledge the existence of anomalies, excrescences, weaknesses. We work and pray that such may speedily be taken away, for they only hamper the Church in her duties and bring reproach upon her fair fame. We deplore bitterly the demeanour of some clergy toward Nonconformists—arrogant, discourteous, unchristian. The more men are assured of the goodness of their cause, the less they are inclined to this. How many of the clergy know the Nonconformist minister in their neighbourhood? It has been largely the Church's fault, in England and in Wales, that Nonconformity has grown so powerful. Human nature being what it is, it should be for Churchmen first to extend the friendly hand. The amenities of social life go a wonderful way in smoothing down the rough places in the ecclesiastical and political worlds. Every privilege has its corresponding duty. The Church exists not for a caste nor a community, but for the nation. The individual has no right and no authority by his words and acts to impair and weaken the Church whose commission he has received. "Noblesse oblige" is true of Church as of chivalry. We should labour that the Welsh Church may not be disendowed, for no selfish or class reason, but chiefly and principally because we firmly believe that if this happen the cause of the poor, the cause of religion, and so the cause of the nation, must receive irretrievable injury. Dispassionately and convincingly pleading this alone, we shall find patriotic men more willing to listen to us than we imagine. The aim of all such is the same. When men understand this and one another, the efforts of professional politicians shall not prevent the mutual toleration of even

widely different means. Politics are eating the heart out of Nonconformity. Better Disestablishment a thousand times than that such result should befall the Church. It is always a misfortune for a church to be associated with a political party. Let there be the "priest in politics" only in questions of moral import. The Primate put it that the Church symbolizes the moral life of the nation. Let us strive to make this a reality and not a pretty saying, that clergy and laity with their unrivalled opportunities may really be in the van of every movement for religious and social welfare. The Parish Councils Act will put the clergy on their mettle. It will test their influence and real worth as national servants. Mixing with their fellow citizens, they can now prove that the Church is not a sect, but exists for the good of all, and that they, having no selfish purposes to serve, and not depending for their bread on the favour or the whims of a chance majority, without fear of giving offence, or temptation to show favour, are able to be "daysmen" between the "masses" and the "classes," witnessing for God and for Righteousness in every department of our many-sided life.

RICHARD W. SEAVER.

ART. V.—MR. GLADSTONE ON HERESY AND SCHISM.

"Non fumum ex fulgore sed ex fumo dare lucem."—HOR., *Ars Poet.*

NOTWITHSTANDING his great affection for Horace, as manifested by the new translation of the "Odes" and "Carmen Seculare" which he is said to have in hand, it is clear that Mr. Gladstone has not laid to heart the line with which we have headed this notice of his article in the *Nineteenth Century*. When one comes to consider in detail his speeches and writings, putting aside all the adornment of beautiful language and ingenuity in vocabulary of which he is master, one is generally left very much at a loss as to what he really means. Every paragraph bears traces of that "open mind" from which are evolved theories and assertions which are chiefly remarkable for their plastic nature. The article in which he undertakes to define heresy and schism, and to show how they should be dealt with, is no exception in this respect. This is not only the result of an oracular style in which long practice has made him an adept, but it appears equally due to a confusion of ideas on vital points, and to the free-and-easy use of terms and expressions which have extremely different meanings when used by different people.

Mr. Gladstone may be taken as typical of that school of Churchmen to which at present both the leading ecclesiastical authorities and superior clergy of our Church belong, as well as probably a majority of the aristocracy; so the article gains importance not only from the fact that it is the product of a man whose acknowledged scholarship, zeal and versatile genius have dazzled the civilized world for many a decade, and who now, with indomitable cheerfulness and resourcefulness, which under the circumstances, are almost pathetic, re-enters the arena of theological strife; but its significance is enhanced by the fact that it reveals how, slowly but surely, and with increasing velocity, the rapid change of thought, the facilities for observing and comparing the great movements of the day are acting upon the fossilized theories which have survived the darkness of the Middle Ages and during the present century been galvanized into an artificial vitality in our own country. It calls emphatic attention to the dominant line of thought observable throughout western Christendom especially. As men look upon the wrongs, the sins, the follies, the consequent misery prevailing so largely in the world and feel their impotence in confronting them; as they pause amid the rush and turmoil which prevails in every phase of life, and realize the nervous and mental exhaustion it induces, the deadening, chilling effect it has on spiritual life, like people surrounded by some sudden and pressing danger, they crave for mutual support and sympathy. The question of the reunion of Christendom has become one of the most fashionable and talked of questions of the day. Partly as the outcome of this craving, and partly through the efforts of those who have been seeking for reunion among the Episcopalians, and dreaming of a huge Uniat Church in which all individuality will be curtailed, the spiritual life cramped and stereotyped, the wind of the spirit cease to blow as and where it willeth, settling down into a fixed current like a trade-wind. To the mind of the sacerdotalists the problem presents itself in a twofold aspect. How can we modify the pretensions of the Eastern and Latin Churches so that moderate Anglicans will fraternize with them? How can we level up Nonconformity so that we can incorporate it with us? The study of this problem has had most unlooked-for results on the minds of the ecclesiastical party, who find themselves on the horns of a dilemma which Mr. Gladstone frankly admits, and from which, with that subtle ingenuity for which he is distinguished, he strives to escape.

These good men start with postulating certain theories as to the origin, constitution, and method of maintaining the continuity of the Church, none of which, as has been shown

repeatedly by the most thoughtful and learned High Churchmen, will bear investigation. Mr. Gladstone summarizes these postulates in his opening paragraph. Practically, he says, let it be granted that our Lord founded the Church as a visible and organized society, that He clothed the Apostles with special powers which were to be passed on by them and continue in succession throughout the whole dispensation, so that the Church, as represented by her clergy, and especially the Bishops, is clothed with authority and endowed with special gifts, in fact inspired, "to carry forward the grand work of the Incarnation." In consequence of this authority and power, she may, nay must, develop the organization and teaching initiated by the Apostles. She may alter not only ceremonies and points of discipline, but, if we understand aright, she may modify the original or ordain new doctrines. Only churches which can trace direct descent by unbroken succession of the Episcopate from the Apostles are, properly speaking, branches of this Holy Catholic Church, and "all who rebel against the jurisdiction then solemnly constituted, should sever themselves in doctrine or in communion from His servants"—by which we suppose is meant those possessing Apostolic Succession—are deliberate rebels and guilty of heresy and schism. Heresy and schism are denounced in Scripture as works of the flesh, excluding from salvation. Ergo, those who separate themselves from this Catholic Church, that is, the ecclesiastical body possessing the "Historic Episcopate," are excluded from salvation, and are not members of the body of Christ. The investigation, however, of the teaching, practices and work of non-Episcopal bodies, undertaken with a view to seeing how far they can be brought into the Episcopal fold, has revealed to many sacerdotalists the astonishing fact that among Nonconformist divines are numbers of men of great intellectual power, ripe scholarship, and earnest devotion to Christ, and that they deliberately, and from strong conviction, remain in so-called schism. Still more astonishing, in purity of life, in the manifestation of grace, in unselfish zeal for the conversion of souls, the relief of suffering, the maintenance of justice, the redress of wrong, these heretics and schismatics are far more abundant in the fruits of the Spirit than any Episcopal Church save the Anglican; and, curiously enough, that section of the Anglican Church which is most prolific in its missionary and philanthropic efforts, while loyal to the threefold orders as the natural development of the Apostolic Church, care very little about the question of Apostolic Succession—in fact, in the majority of cases disbelieve it in the sense in which it is accepted by the ardent advocates of the "CATHOLIC" theory. Most astonishing of all, none but the most intensely bigoted,

who absolutely refuse to see and acknowledge patent facts, can deny that the seal of God's approval has rested upon the labours of those who, according to Mr. Gladstone's postulates, are living in deliberate rebellion against the constituted authorities which Christ ordained for the welfare of His Church.

One is amazed that these facts, which Mr. Gladstone frankly admits, have not led to the reconsideration of the assumptions upon which the whole sacerdotal theory of the Church rests, and to the discovery, made long ago for us by the Reformers, that the holy Catholic Church is not a visible and mechanically organized society into which you can be initiated by a certain rite, and of which you continue a full benefiting member so long as you conform to certain by-laws of the particular branch to which you belong, as well as the general constitutions formulated by the Founder, but that it is an invisible body; that the muster-roll is the Lamb's Book of Life, which no creature can read, and from which no roll-call will be made until the number of the elect is complete; that our Lord did not designate the Apostles His successors in "carrying on the great work of the incarnation"; an oracular assertion, by the way, which is difficult to interpret. Surely the incarnation was a complete work; Christ's life was a complete life; Christ's sacrifice was a complete sacrifice, and when He Himself announced "It is finished," He meant it; and the Apostles' office was not to share, much less to complete, the redemption wrought through the eternal Son, but to preach the glad tidings far and wide of a "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Had Mr. Gladstone carried his researches further he might have discovered that the ecclesiastical meaning attached to heresy and schism, especially in the Middle Ages, and by those who would turn back the hands of the clock some three or four centuries in our own Church at present, differs materially from the sense in which it was used in the New Testament, and that it is far from certain that rigid uniformity existed in the earliest days of the Church, in that it is scarcely to be questioned that the greatest liberty prevailed as to the conduct of Christian worship, discipline, and other similar matters so long as there was a strict adherence to the doctrines and morality inculcated by the Gospel; and that unity was considered to consist in the fact that every Christian, by virtue of the new life granted through Christ, by the operation of the indwelling Holy Spirit, was made a member of Christ, and all, therefore, members one of another, and that the highest spiritual power was to be attained, not merely by rigid observance of orthodoxy, but by an immediate, close, personal fellowship with Christ. However, Mr. Gladstone, like so many others of

this school of thought, having adopted an *à priori* theory of the Church, was unable to see this, and therefore he sets himself to work to find a way out of the difficulties of the seeming paradox everywhere confronting him in the evident spiritual vitality and God-honoured activity of non-Episcopalians. His proposed solution of the problem is as remote from the teaching of the Word of God as his views of the foundation and commission of the Church. Building on the theory that the Church is commissioned to develop doctrine and practice, he calmly proposes that it should be declared, we presume by the Church, that God has revoked His decree as to the assumed nature of heresy and schism. He applies to these solemn matters the same method of argument that he used to convert himself to Home Rule. The Irish, he argued, have persistently broken the law, and a majority of them declare that they never will obey that law. It is true that the leaders of the Land League were utterly wrong, and I meant all I said when I denounced them in years gone by; but as they did not care much for my denunciations, the best way out of the difficulty is to modify the law to suit them. In precisely the same way he deals with these grave questions, if we rightly understand him. He says that heresy and schism are sins excluding from salvation, but that millions of good people are heretics and schismatics; the Church has prayed for their conversion and still prays for it; the Episcopate has for centuries denounced their folly, and striven by force and by coaxing to save them from their position; but they have resisted the force, and they have smiled at the blandishments; the Church must therefore fall back upon her inherent powers, and enunciate some fresh definition of heresy and schism which will bring these outsiders within the pale of the true Church. As an aside, he glances at the somewhat awkward point that it is impossible to prove that the succession has been maintained, at any rate in the Roman Church, and passed on to the Anglican without a breach.

But, we must ask, are we to believe that God's solemn decrees, by which He founded His Church and defined her doctrines and discipline, have utterly failed, and that He has so manifestly blessed those that have refused to accept them, that it is necessary for the Church to step in and rescind or modify those decrees? No wonder that the propagation of such views results in the rapid spread of infidelity, which follows (as truly as darkness follows the sunset) the extended spread of sacerdotalism. If we have not the mind of Christ in the New Testament, where shall we find it? Can we hear it in the voice of the Church? A moment's reflection will show that the voice of the Church is nowhere to be heard. Assuming

that all Episcopal Churches are branches of the Holy Catholic Church, and that it were possible to have them fairly represented in a great œcumenical council, would there be any harmony, to say nothing of unity of sound? Would not the voice of the Church thus represented be a Dutch concert, where each performer plays his own tune? According to these theories, no Church by herself can claim to be the Catholic Church; and since it is impossible to get all the branches to unite, is it not absurd to talk about the voice of the Church, the faith of the Church, meaning the universal Church of Christ as authoritatively declared, except we take the Word of God as the ultimate court of appeal to decide what that faith is? Such theories as we are considering do more than all the propaganda of the avowed Secularist to disparage and obscure the Divine revelation and to spread agnosticism, if not downright atheism. True, Mr. Gladstone appeals to Scripture, but only to try to prove that "the Church" has power to adapt God's law to the varying moods of different ages.

In conclusion, we will consider his Scripture references. The first paragraph is supposed to be a summary of Bible teaching, but no direct reference to the Bible is made, for the very sufficient reason that the theories advanced are not to be found in the New Testament in any shape or form. However, in the next paragraph he tells us that Christ dealt in anticipation with those who frustrate His work by severing themselves from His Church, when He said, "If he neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 17). But this text has absolutely nothing to do with heresy. Our Lord was speaking of a cantankerous fellow who had done you a personal injury, and obstinately refused to admit the wrong and give some satisfactory evidence that he had no intention of repeating or continuing it. You are to do your best to bring such a one to his senses, but failing in your efforts you must simply let him alone. What has all this to do with heresy and schism, which are offences against *the Church*, not against *individuals?* Only by detaching them from their context can these words be made to appear to have the remotest connection with the subject.

It is more difficult to deal with Mr. Gladstone's assertion—"With this stringent law the language of the Apostles coincides"—for he does not attempt to support this groundless assumption by quotations. The only definite allusion is to "the language of St. John," and I imagine he refers to 2 John x.—"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house." But the crucial question is, What is the test doctrine referred to here? The context is conclusive on the point. It is the doctrine of Christ

as opposed to Antichrist. What has this to do with breaking from a visible society and resisting the authority of a certain order of men? Throughout the whole article the Bible takes a very secondary place, and clearly Mr. Gladstone thinks the Church has authority to reverse or modify the decrees of God, and that the principle of ruling by the majority holds good in theology, for he declares the second commandment has been repealed, because "by far the largest portion of the Christian Church gives a sanction to the use for religious purposes either of images or pictures." I thought fierce wrath fell upon Israel in the wilderness when they made an image, though the majority in favour of it was eleven to one, only the tribe of Levi turning Protestant.

When Mr. Gladstone turns to the question of proselytizing he is equally unfortunate in his appeal to Scripture. He says: "Our Saviour made a reference to it (proselytism) which cannot be encouraging to its reckless votaries." Our Lord was denouncing the hypocrisy and trifling with God's law which then, as now, marked the party which render God's word of none effect by their traditions, and in scathing language He exposes their transparent hollowness in eight important matters. Among them is this: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves" (Matt. xxiii. 15).

This is surely a most inappropriate text to apply to sincere Christians, who go, Bible in hand, to those whom they believe to be in error and lovingly entreat them to hear what the Word of God says.

The next reference to Scripture is simply unique as an illustration of the confusion into which the writer's mind has fallen in the attempt to harmonize sacerdotal theories with Scripture and patent facts. He declares: "Holy Scripture provides us with instances of *the danger of substituting the witness of another person's spirit for our own*" (1 Kings xiii.) —the italics are mine—and apparently draws from this the moral that "the hot proselytizer ought to learn to pay some of that respect *to the convictions of his neighbours* which he pays so largely to his own." Comment is superfluous. I can only touch upon one more of the strange perversions of Scripture with which this article bristles. He draws a sharp distinction between the founder of a heresy and his followers, and illustrates it by the history of Jeroboam, declaring that the idolatrous kingdom of Israel was not "cast out from the elder covenant and its provisions for Divine guidance," and he sees in the race of prophets God's provision for these "schismatics." Could anything be wider of the truth? The prophets were

sent to call upon them to give up their "heresy and schism," and as they were persistent in their alienation from God, He finally made void the land, "as a man wipeth a dish turning it upside down," and to this day the ten-tribed kingdom is broken and scattered.

ANTIQUUS.

Short Notices.

By-Paths of Bible Knowledge. No. 18.—*Social Life of the Assyrians and Babylonians.* By Professor SAYCE. Pp. 127. R.T.S.

It is enough to mention the name of the writer to indicate the interest and value of his addition to this excellent series.

No. 19.—*Early Spread of Religious Ideas in the Far East.* By JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D. Pp. 142. R.T.S.

Dr. Edkins, as a learned missionary at Shanghai, has written on Chinese Buddhism, Religion in China, China's Place in Philology, and Evolution of Hebrew.

The aim of the book is to prove, mainly from the facts of language, that ages before Abraham there was a revelation, and that this is recoverable. He shows that Moses compiled ancient documents in the Book of Genesis, because Genesis has intimate knowledge of the dispersal of the nations; because its writers used Cuneiform and used the Phœnician alphabet; and because of its genealogies. Writing, he considers, was invented in Babylonia about 4000 B.C.; and he supposes that the materials we find in Genesis were put together for Joseph. His account of the sacred books of the East, containing fragments of the early revelation, is very interesting. In other chapters he deals with Primeval Monotheism in China and Persia, the Philological History of the Names for God, the Spread of Religious Ideas in the Ancient World, the Early Belief in a Future State, and other important topics.

No. 20.—*The Money of the Bible.* By GEORGE C. WILLIAMSON. Pp. 94. R.T.S.

Mr. Williamson has used his knowledge and skill in numismatics for producing a handbook for Biblical students, which will be acceptable to many. The first page has facsimiles of six coins used in the time of our Lord.

The Holy Spirit in Missions. By A. J. GORDON, D.D. Pp. 241. Price 3s. 6d.

Dr. Gordon has taken six points in the work of the Holy Spirit through foreign missions: the Programme, the Preparation, the Administration, the Fruits, the Prophecies, and the Present Help; and he has illustrated them in a large and catholic spirit, from a wide knowledge of the history of missionary efforts amongst Christians, especially Nonconformists. The book will be found full of fertile suggestions.

Memoranda Sacra. By J. RENDELL HARRIS. Pp. 187. Price 3s. 6d. Hodder and Stoughton.

This is a series of thoughtful papers on leading spiritual ideas. The treatment consists of penetrating and far-sighted deductions from Scripture, and is full of variety and spiritual suggestiveness.

Devotional Companion to the Pulpit. Pp. 95. Elliot Stock.

This is a useful handbook of rules and thoughts for ministers as to subject, preparation, church, pulpit, delivery, and the time after delivery; with a collection of striking extracts at the end. The writer has sympathy and experience, and has arranged his matter in the form of apothegms of advice. If all preachers were animated by these true and high ideas, the pulpit of to-day would be far more spiritual and effective than it is.

The Pilgrim's Progress. Pp. 318. Price 2s. and 1s. Sunday School Union.

The type and binding of these two editions is the same, but the better edition is on thicker paper and has a considerable number of illustrations. Both are excellent presentations of the immortal English classic.

Gradual Catechising. By the Rev. J. W. SHEARMAN. Pp. 287. Price 2s. 6d. Griffith and Farran.

A useful and moderate amplification of the Church Catechism, arranged in lessons, each lesson consisting of questions leading on from one to the other.

A Simple History of Ancient Philosophy. Pp. 118. By W. R. SCOTT. Elliot Stock.

Modern philosophy and thought are built up so considerably upon the speculations of the great minds of the ancient world that it is of considerable importance to intelligent people who have not had a classical education to have a guide to these wide and important fields of thought. The writer avoids too much technical language, and explains in a pleasant and attractive manner the views of the Ionians, the Pythagoreans, and Eleatics; the Philosophy of Change, including Heraclitus, Empedocles and the Atomists, and Anaxagoras; the Claims of Man as expressed by the Sophists; the Philosophy of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; the Stoics, Epicurus, and the Sceptics; Eclecticism and Neoplatonism.

Tolstoi's Boyhood. By Himself. Translated by CONSTANTINE POPOFF. Cheaper edition. 480 pp. Price 1s. Elliot Stock.

The autobiography of the great Russian reformer and writer is a striking fragment of a religious history and a charming glimpse of the life and manners of the noble class in Russia. Through the unfortunate and lifeless apathy of a great part of the Greek Church, Tolstoi has been led to undervalue Christian institutions and to think everything out for himself. How this came about is easily seen in these interesting pages. Nothing can be more admirable than his desire to make Christianity a practical force.

Our Secret Friends and Foes. By Professor PERCY FARRADAY FRANKLAND. Pp. 167. S.P.C.K.

This is one of the "Romance of Science" Series, and deals with micro-organisms, and is expanded from lectures delivered before popular audiences in London, Edinburgh, and elsewhere. It gives us a glimpse into one of the most marvellous fields of scientific romance.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (August) magazines:

The Thinker, The Expository Times, The Religious Review of Reviews, The Review of the Churches, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The National Church, The Foreign Church Chronicle, The Evangelical Churchman, The Gospel Magazine, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, Blackwood, The Cornhill, Sunday

Magazine, The Fireside, Cassell's Family Magazine, The Quiver, Good Words, The Leisure Hour, Sunday at Home, The Girl's Own Paper, The Boy's Own Paper, Light and Truth, The Church Worker, The Church Monthly, The Church Missionary Gleaner, The Philanthropist, Light in the Home, Awake, India's Women, Parish Magazine, New and Old, The Dawn of Day, The Bible Society's Gleanings for the Young, The Bible Society's Monthly Reporter, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Little Folks, The Child's Pictorial, The Children's World, Our Little Dots and *The Boy's and Girl's Companion.*

THE MONTH.

THE devilish and abominable slander that the Duke of York committed bigamy in marrying Princess May has been repudiated with a just degree of scorn and indignation by the Prince of Wales and by the Archbishop of Canterbury. This malignant and incredible fiction is understood to have arisen simply and solely from the postcard of a lunatic.

Much sympathy will be felt for Dr. Paton, the zealous and philanthropic founder of the National Home Reading Union, in the death of his gifted and promising son by drowning at the recent summer gathering of the Union at Barmouth, North Wales. It is believed that he sacrificed his life in the attempt to save others. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man give his life for his friends."

To the regret of the whole Church Sunday School Institute, the Rev. T. F. Kitto has found it necessary to retire after holding the chairmanship to the satisfaction of all for more than twenty-one years. He has received a handsome recognition of his great services.

Canon Lloyd, Vicar of Newcastle, has been approved by the Queen as Bishop of Thetford, Suffragan of Norwich, on the nomination of Bishop Sheepshanks. It is well known that Canon Lloyd's services to Bishop Ernest Wilberforce have been incalculable, and a like debt may be looked for with regard to Bishop Sheepshanks. Canon Lloyd is a man of energy and vigour, with a robust voice and person. He took his degree at St. Edmund's Hall in 1868, and in the same year became curate of Cholsey, Berks. After holding the curacy of Watlington, Oxon, he was Vicar of Aylesbury from 1876 to 1882. He then became Vicar of the Pro-Cathedral of Newcastle, Rural Dean, Chaplain to the Bishop, and Proctor in Convocation. In 1887 he was made Hon. D.D. by Durham University. He belongs decidedly to the school of Dr. Pusey, and has friendly relations with Nonconformists.

The Bishop of Nyassaland, Dr. Hornby, who was recently consecrated to the missionary supervision of the Universities Mission to Central Africa, has resigned his office in deference to medical advice. It would be well if the advice could have been given before the consecration. Dr. Hornby, who is a young man, belongs to the extreme side of the followers of Dr. Newman.

St. Peter's, Eaton Square, which has hitherto been considered a fairly moderate church, is to have a lofty rood-screen, and a morning chapel with a second "altar."

The Public-house Reform Association has issued a circular signed by the Duke of Westminster, the Bishops of Durham and Chester, Lords Aberdare and Thring, Mr. Chamberlain, Judge "Tom" Hughes, Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., and Mr. George Wyndham, M.P., urging "the union and organization of those who, recognising that the public-house of entertainment is necessary for the comfort, recreation, and social intercourse of the people, are convinced that reform rather than abolition must be the aim of a sound temperance policy; and the extension to licensed victualling of the familiar English method of placing affairs of exceptional public concern in public hands, giving to their management the character of a public trust, and eliminating from it as far as possible the motive of private gain; and the diffusing of information as to the working and results of the Scandinavian Licensing System, and of the kindred system of military canteens, with a view to securing legal facilities for a fair trial on suitably modified lines in our own country. Subscription, 2s. 6d.; secretary, the Lord Bishop of Chester, the Palace, Chester.

The disused and unnecessary site of the Church of All Hallows, Thames Street, London, E.C., has been sold for £13,000. The net proceeds will be given to the erection of the Church of All Hallows, Hampstead, for the Rev. Charles Mackeson. The beautiful woodwork has gone mainly to the Church of St. Margaret, Lothbury, of which Canon Ingram is the efficient and energetic Rector.

The East London Church Fund shows a decrease of £1,430, as compared with this time last year. At every recent meeting in its support papers have been distributed at the door showing that it supports curacies in churches where the worship of images is inculcated.

A comprehensive report on the subject of divorce has been issued by the Convocation of York. It may be obtained by writing to the Registrar of Convocation, York.

A new Church House for Hendon has been opened by the Marchioness of Salisbury, the foundation of which was prepared by the late learned and lamented Vicar, Prebendary Scrivener.

Mr. Gladstone has lately been writing an interesting article on the place of heresy and schism in the modern Christian Church. He suggests that this is a matter in which the Catholic Church may review and alter its early position. The question is better solved by the Scriptural view that the Catholic Church is rather a principle, or ideal body, to which various Christian communities approach in different degrees of perfection and imperfection.

The Dowager Lady Forester, whose personal property was sworn under £100,000, left the following legacies: To King's College Hospital and to St. George's Hospital, £1,000 each; to the Salop Infirmary and the Trowbridge Dispensary, £1,000 each; to the National Orphan Home, £1,000; to the inmates of the Barrow Almshouses, Salop, £500.

ERRATUM.

In Article V. of the CHURCHMAN for August, page 589, line 2 from top, for "It cannot tell us," read "It *can* tell us."

INDEX TO VOL. VIII.

Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, London.