

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1900.

ART. I.—THE BIRTH FROM ABOVE.

HOLINESS is a living element, a living power, a living growth. In holiness nothing is mechanical; everything is functional. No rules, no ordinances, no observances, no self-denials, nothing indeed of any kind which we do of ourselves, and by ourselves, can create in us the life of holiness. These things strengthen and chasten the holy life when once it has been imparted; but they cannot impart, or convey, or create it. The holy life is a divinely created, a divinely conveyed, a divinely imparted life. God alone is Self-Existent. All other life owes its being to some prior life. Science has abandoned the theory of spontaneous generation. It is high time that religion abandoned it also. Till we realize that we cannot begin the good work of religion of ourselves, that God only can begin it,¹ we cannot make even a beginning in holiness. The first clear conviction we need in reference to the life of holiness is that it must spring from a living source; and that source outside itself. The life of holiness is neither self-existent or self-begotten in man. Its fountain is in the living well of God's fatherhood, its root is in Christ the Living Vine, its seed is from God the Holy Ghost.

This law, that life proceeds only from life, is a law pervading every part of the living universe. Everyone knows the difference between a living organism and a dead machine, between a seed and a rule. No number of rules, however excellent in themselves, or excellently observed, can engender life. The preventient necessity of life is seed. Where there is no seed there can be no life. No skill in mechanical arts, no extent of perseverance in mechanical industry, no amount

¹ Phil. i. 6.

of strictness in the observance of mechanical rules, can engender life. Life can only flow from some living source, or spring from some living root, or grow from some living seed. It cannot spring from a dry fountain, or a dead root, or a sterile germ. Only by the living God, the God of living holiness, can the holy seed-life be implanted in man.

All holy persons are twice-born persons. They are born, first, in the common way of nature. They are born again, from above, by water and the Holy Ghost.¹ Without this birth from above no one can see the kingdom of God, which is the kingdom of holiness.

It is not our physical, but our spiritual, birth which is the beginning of our spiritual life. It is our spiritual birth which originates in us the faculties of spiritual vision and spiritual discernment. Until we are spiritually born from above, we are spiritually blind and spiritually imperceptive. Seeing physically, yet spiritually we see not; and hearing physically, yet spiritually we understand not.² It is the spiritual birth which gives the spiritual eye, the spiritual ear, the spiritual mind to man. As every kind of life must spring from a living source, so life of the spiritual and holy kind must spring from a spiritual and holy source.

The spiritual life is a distinct, generic form of life. And it is a universal law that each generic form of life can only spring from its own proper genus. Birds cannot be hatched from fishes, nor trees grow from birds. Grapes cannot be gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles. We must have vines to grow grapes, and fig-trees for figs. From thistles nothing but thistles can grow; from thorns nothing but thorns. In like manner the spiritual life cannot be born of carnal parentage; that which is born of the flesh is flesh; "that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit."³ The spiritual life must spring from spiritual seed. The holy life must have a holy beginning. This holy beginning is the birth again from above.

When our Lord made to Nicodemus His great announcement of the heavenly origin of the holy life, we are told that Nicodemus was greatly perplexed. He marvelled. But our Lord bade him "Marvel not." And why, indeed, should he have marvelled? For, as our Lord gently reminded him, the law of the spiritual origin of the spiritual life is only part of the grand creational law from which no manner of life can possibly be exempt. According to the primary and fundamental law written everywhere throughout the universe, one form of life cannot spring indiscriminately from another. Over and over again it is repeated in the first chapter of

¹ John iii. 5.² Matt. xiii. 13.³ John iii. 6.

Genesis that it was part of the creational code that each several genus of life can come into being only "according to its kind"—trees after their kind, birds after their kind, creeping things after their kind, fishes after their kind, beasts after their kind. It is to this creational law that St. Paul makes striking reference in his grand thesis of the Resurrection: "There is a natural body and a spiritual body, and to every seed its own body."¹

Modern science has promulged no suggestion adverse to this great generic, creational law. For whatever may have been God's original method of bringing into being the first forms of life, whether by separate independent creations or by successive developments from a single primordial germ, all the world knows that after the various kingdoms of life were once established within their present limits, not a single instance of any generic form of life being produced from another and different genus has ever occurred. One species may run very near another, may even intermingle with it and produce specific modifications and novelties; but one distinctive genus of life has never been known in the entire course of biological history to produce life of another distinctive genus. Since the Creation the law has been unchangeable that every generic order of life must have an origin according to its kind.

When our Lord, then, enunciated the law of the spiritual origin of the spiritual life, He was not enunciating any new law, but only attesting and re-enforcing a law which had been in operation from the beginning. The law of generic origins is a law as old as the cosmical universe. In no department of the universe of life can any exception be found. It works everywhere unfailingly among trees and birds and fishes and mammals and man. It works also in each department of man's triune being, alike in his body, and his soul, and his spirit.² That which is born of the flesh is carnal, that which is born of the soul is psychical, that which is born of the spirit is spiritual. The psychical cannot be born of the carnal, nor the spiritual of the psychical. The carnal is carnally born, the psychical is psychically born, the spiritual is born spiritually. The soul works through the body as its instrument, but is not born of the body as its origin, although, as far as can be discerned, it is born with the body. The spirit works both through the body and the soul as its instruments, exalting and hallowing both alike. Yet is it born from neither; nor is it born at the same time with the other two. It is born afterwards; it is separately, distinctly, generically

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 44, 38.

² 1 Thess. v. 23.

born, born from above, of water and of the Spirit, as our Lord sublimely announced to Nicodemus.

Nicodemus had already passed through his physical and psychical birth. He had entered into physical life, with its physical senses and physical perceptions; and as far as we can see he had entered upon his psychical life when he entered upon his physical life. The birth of his soul had synchronized with the birth of his body. For although the psychical development in man is, as we know, slower and later than the physical—although the moral and intellectual germ lies in the embryonic state longer than the carnal—yet no sign has been given to us that they do not begin their existence together. At any rate, at the time of his conversation with our Lord, Nicodemus had already entered into the fulness of his psychical life. He had attained a high mental and moral standard. He was a master in Israel and a seeker after truth. He had a psychical and rational belief in God. He also perceived the superhuman beauty and power of the teachings of Jesus. He recognised Him as a Heaven-sent worker of rational and moral miracles. “No man,” he confessed to Jesus, “can do the miracles that Thou doest except God be with him.”¹

But beyond this Nicodemus had neither the vision nor the faculty to go. And why? Because one thing was still lacking to the completion of his knowledge and understanding of the Christ. Already he understood the Christ rationally, even affectionately. But he could not discern Him spiritually because as yet he was, in the Christian sense, spiritually unborn. The trinity of his existence was not yet Christianly perfected; he was still without the Christian birth from above. And until he was Christianly born—Christianly quickened and vivified and enlightened and endowed—he could neither spiritually discern, nor spiritually know, nor spiritually understand the Christ. Even our Lord Himself could not give to Nicodemus the knowledge which Nicodemus desired to possess until Nicodemus had the faculty to receive it, and this faculty he could only obtain through the process of being born from above of water and the Holy Ghost. Hence the simple and majestic announcement of the Lord Jesus, “Ye must be born again.”

In making this great proclamation to Nicodemus, our Lord was not, let me repeat, unfolding any new fact or any new law. From the beginning it had been a law that all generic life must have its own proper generic source. All that our Lord did was to project this law into the world of spiritual

¹ John iii. 2.

life, and to foreshadow its operation in the Christian Church. As in His parables, our Lord frequently drew a parallel between physical and spiritual things—saying, for instance, that the kingdom of heaven was as leaven, or as seed growing secretly, and the like,¹ so in His conversation with Nicodemus the main gist is the parallelism between the physical and spiritual life of man. Neither life can be produced mechanically. Each life proceeds by the way of birth. Also in both lives alike the creational law of genus reigns supreme. That which is born of man is human; only that which is born from above is divine.

Great care, however, must be taken lest this simple and luminous spiritual law enunciated by Christ gets confused in our minds with any dark and intricate problems of eschatology. Here no question is raised as to whether that which is born of the flesh is mortal, and only that which is born of the Spirit is undying. Here no question is raised concerning universal redemption, or the duration of Divine punishments, or of salvation and eternal hope out of Christ. It was not our Lord's way to raise such questions as these. His teachings for the most part were of a direct, plain, practical kind. It was Nicodemus who raised speculative difficulties about the new birth. "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Nicodemus's notion of the new birth was not that of a new birth at all, but of an old birth over again. He thought it was being born twice over in the same way to the same kind of life. No wonder that so thinking he marvelled. But our Lord immediately showed him, as we have already said, that all such marvelling was out of place. Here was no dark speculative saying—no bewildering practical difficulty. Here was only a clear restatement of a great creational law, and its Divine application to the kingdom of the spirit and the Church of Christ. The new birth was like every other birth in that it was a birth of life from life, and a birth of life according to its kind. In so far as it was a new birth, its newness consisted mainly in the Divine directness of its origin, and in the fact that it was subsequent to the physical birth. Our Lord Himself did not call it a new birth; he called it a birth from above. The spiritual birth in man is not a new birth in the sense of not conforming to the laws which govern all births. It closely conforms to those laws. It is a birth of life from life. It is a birth answering in kind to its origin. Its origin being spiritual, it is a

¹ Matt. xiii. 31; Mark iv. 26-32.

spiritual birth. Its origin being holy, it is a holy birth—the first beginning of the life of holiness.

It is in this sense, the sense of conforming to the laws of earthly births, that, in the end of His conversation with Nicodemus, our Lord refers to the birth from above as an "earthly" thing. "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not," he asks, "how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?"¹ These heavenly things, as the context shows, were things pertaining to the ineffable nature and attributes of God—things such as the presence of the Son of Man in heaven while He was yet also sojourning on earth; things such as the unspeakable love of God in giving His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. These, in their sublime wonder, are indeed heavenly things. They are things transcending all earthly experience, all earthly parallels. There is nothing on earth to which we can liken them, no comparison with which we can compare them. It is not so with the spiritual birth. This birth is a heavenly birth, inasmuch as it is a birth from above. But it is an earthly thing in its conformity with the laws of ordinary births. True, we cannot see its origin. Its whence is invisible to us. But so also is that of the wind. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit."² The wind is a natural and earthly phenomenon, notwithstanding the invisibility of its origin and destiny. So also the unseen origin and issue of the birth from above does not prevent its being an earthly and natural thing. This birth takes place in us while we are upon earth, therefore it is an earthly thing. It takes place according to the well-known laws of birth, therefore it is a natural thing. The directness of its descent from God does not make it a supernatural, far less a contra-natural birth. We greatly err when we speak of the direct and immediate workings of God as supernatural. Of all works, those of the Author of Nature are the most natural.

The birth from above, then, is a perfectly natural birth, or, as our Lord denominated it, "an earthly thing." But though an earthly thing, it is not of the earth, earthy. Its origin, not less than its destiny, is the world above—the world unseen. The operation of the spiritual birth is an operation wrought, not by ourselves, but of God. As well might a non-existent child attempt to bring itself into being without the instrumentality of parents as the carnal man to begin in himself

¹ John iii. 12.

² John iii. 13, 16.

the holy life without the interposition of the holy God. No form of life can proceed from not-life, no order of life from an order diverse from itself; and so the holy life can only proceed from the living holy God!

It should also be observed, in connection with the birth from above, that a fundamental distinction exists between the beginning of a life and the consciousness of its beginning. The beginnings of life are unconscious beginnings. No child knows, or can remember, when first it physically began to be. Few persons, if any, can remember the beginnings either of their moral or intellectual life. Many can, of course, vividly remember the first great pulse of consciousness in their moral and intellectual life. They can vividly remember the first time they realized to themselves the wondrous motions of the mind, the first time the marvel burst on them that they were thinking, willing, reflecting beings. They can remember, too, the first strange hour in which right presented itself to them as right, wrong as wrong, shame as shame, duty as duty. Such an hour is a grand, light-bringing, revolutionizing hour in the moral life of man. But, as a rule, long before intellect becomes self-conscious, or the moral faculty realizes to itself the splendour of its existence, there has been a considerable duration of preparatory, unconscious, intellectual and moral life. The hidden seed has been living and growing beneath the surface of the soil. It is indeed a great and glorious moment for the intellectual and moral germ when it first breaks through the surface, and first freely breathes the air, and first warmly feels the sun. But even in the womb of imprisoned darkness the intellectual and moral seed was not dead. It was invisibly and unconsciously alive long before it sprang forth into the seen and fuller life of consciousness.

So is it also with the spiritual birth unto the holy life. Its beginning is generally an unconscious beginning. To use again our Lord's own figure, we find from experience that the birth from above is as the blowing of the wind. The wind often begins to blow very softly. Its first waftings are almost imperceptible. So gentle are they that we can scarcely tell whence they come or whither they go. Thus is it often with the first breathings of the Holy Ghost upon the spirits of men. Multitudes of God's holy ones have been utterly unable to tell when their first faint pulse of spiritual life began to beat, when the first unfoldings of the spiritual seed took place beneath the soil, when the first slow risings of the spiritual dawn began to appear in the darkness of their spiritual night.

Sometimes, indeed, the beginnings of the holy life seem as if they were sudden, abrupt, more in the nature of a volcano than a birth. We often meet persons who can remember—

yea, they can never forget—the exact place and hour of the first revelation of the Lord Jesus to their quickened spirit. It was thus, we know, with Saul of Tarsus. Years after the event he remembered distinctly both the hour and the spot at which the dazzling light from heaven shone round about him; and for the first time he consciously heard the voice of the ascended, yet still persecuted, Jesus appealing to his heart. It was nigh unto Damascus, he tells us, and about noon.¹ So likewise has it happened to great numbers of the saints. Their birth from above has seemed to have a clear, conscious, well-remembered beginning. They appear to themselves able distinctly to recall its time and place, its where and when.

Yet upon examination these changes seldom prove to be as sudden in reality as they seem in appearance. The aged Simeon, for example, had long been waiting for the consolation of Israel before he recognised its advent in the infant child Jesus. The three thousand who were pricked to the heart by St. Peter's pentecostal sermon, were, the narrative tells us, just and devout men. They, therefore, doubtless had also been waiting for the Messiah, and had heard the things which had come to pass concerning the crucified and risen Jesus. Being serious persons, they would for weeks have been seriously pondering these things. Saul of Tarsus, too, had not only been blameless as touching his hereditary religion, but he had also been an eye-witness of the blessed martyrdom of St. Stephen, and had consented unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. St. Stephen's great Messianic apology on the eve of his martyrdom must have sunk deeply into the mind of the young and ardent Saul. So, too, must the heavenly look on St. Stephen's angel-face, and the wonderfully Christ-like petitions: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."² As the zealous enthusiast went about making havoc of the Church and haling to prison Christian men and Christian women, the memory of that angel-face and the echoes of those dying prayers must often have haunted him. When therefore Saul the persecutor was arrested by Jesus the persecuted, the name of Jesus was no new name to him. The change from hatred to love, from death-spreading persecution to death-defying devotion, seems at first sight an instantaneous change; yet it would be a superficial study of the phenomenon which neglected to take account of all the

¹ Acts xxii. 6.

² Luke ii. 25; Luke xxiv. 18; Phil. iii. 6; Acts ii. 5; viii. 59, 60; xxii. 20.

preceding incidents which heralded it. In a very real sense, of course, all births are sudden. The bursting of the husk, the breaking of the shell, the escape from the womb are comparatively brief operations, but the preparation for them is of much longer duration. So is it, I believe, as a rule, with the birth from above. The heavenly gestation has been proceeding long before we are conscious of it. The escape from darkness into light, from spiritual imprisonment to spiritual liberty, seems a sudden escape. But in reality it has been slow, not sudden. The preparation has been long, although the event appears instantaneous. I doubt if in the whole course of Christian biology a single instance has occurred of the Christian birth from above taking place suddenly, without preparation, without gestation. If any such instances can be adduced, they are analogous to the turning of water into wine without the intervention of grapes, or to the multiplication of the loaves without the prior multiplication of the wheat. They are instances out of the regular course of earthly things. And we cannot too insistently recall and ponder over the fact that our Lord has told us that the birth from above is an "earthly thing" in the sense that it conforms to the regular laws governing births; and one of these laws is that a dark, still, silent, unconscious period goes before the escape into voiceful light, and free motion and glad consciousness. St. Paul himself, in his riper years, dated back the beginning of his Christ-life, not to his blinding arrest near Damascus, but to the period of unconsciousness in his mother's womb."¹

But whether man's birth from above proceeds in the normal manner and begins in a condition of embryonic unconsciousness, or whether it takes place exceptionally and is conscious from the first, there can be no question that in all instances alike its beginning must be a spiritual beginning—a beginning wholly distinct from that of our physical and psychical life. All truly spiritual persons must, as I have said, be twice-born persons. First, they must be born in the natural way of all mankind; secondly, they must be born from above, in a heavenly and spiritual manner—directly from God Himself. All spiritual life must have a spiritual origin—an origin entirely unconditioned by matter. Material water may be the divinely-ordained vehicle by which this spiritual life is conveyed, as bread and wine may be the divinely-ordained channels through which strength and refreshment flow into it, but its birth is from above and of the Holy Ghost. "All physical and psychical life," says St. Paul, "has its origin from God through the first man, Adam, who became a living soul;

¹ Gal. i. 15.

all Christian life through the second, or last Adam, who became a quickening or life-giving spirit."¹ Spirit cannot be born of flesh and blood, neither can flesh and blood inherit the kingdom of the Spirit. As the origin of our spiritual life is divine and spiritual, so will its destiny in the end be divine and spiritual also. Every seed has a body of its own. Terrestrial seeds have terrestrial bodies, celestial seeds have bodies celestial, and spiritual seeds will likewise in the end have spiritual bodies. We see not yet, nor shall we ever see in this our mortal state, the full development of the spiritual body born in us from above of water and the Holy Ghost. But constant experience works in us the sure and certain hope of the ultimate development of the spiritual body which was implanted in us at our spiritual birth. For on every hand we see tokens that the spiritual life in man does not grow old with his earthly years. Nay, as the physical bodies of the saints gradually wax feeble and decay their spiritual life gradually waxes stronger and more perceptive. As the outward man day by day perishes, the inward man is day by day renewed.² The nearer God's holy ones draw to the gates of physical death, ever stronger grows the strength and brighter shines the light of their spiritual life. This liveliness of man's spiritual powers, up to the very hour of his physical decease, is of itself an intimation of their immortality. Yea, it is immeasurably more than an intimation. It is the expression, the evidence of the working of the immutable law both of the origin and the destiny of every manner of generic life, including the spiritual life of the twice-born man. For as the body which is born of the earth is earthy, and returns to the earth, so the spirit which is born from above is heavenly, and returns to God, who gave it.³

JOHN W. DIGGLE.



ART. II.—THE WITNESS OF THE HISTORICAL SCRIPTURES TO THE ACCURACY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. V.

IT is worth noting that the *Times* review of Professor Cheyne's "Biblical Cyclopædia" contains some caustic remarks on the arbitrariness of the methods by which conclusions are arrived at, and the confidence with which those conclusions are pronounced to be final. The *Times* observes that it seems scarcely worth while to embody such conclu-

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 45, 46.

² 2 Cor. 16.

³ Eccles. xii. 7.

sions in a Cyclopædia with a practical certainty that in ten years they will be out of date. Such is the unbiassed judgment of English common-sense. It is, unfortunately, only too certain that the unlucky wight who invests in a Cyclopædia, a Bible Dictionary, or a Hebrew Lexicon at the present moment, will find himself compelled to realize at a loss in a very short time. The Wellhausen school has certainly held the field for an unusually long period. This has been largely due to the hold which it has gained at our two ancient Universities, where its conclusions are apparently regarded as final and complete. But its dominion is drawing to a close, in spite of the unwillingness of Professors to admit that they have been mistaken. After long delay, Professor Margoliouth has entered the field against it, and it has already had enough to do to withstand the assaults of Professors Sayce and Hommel. Professor Margoliouth is a vehement assailant who does not scruple to charge his opponents with a profound ignorance of the language of the knowledge of which they have claimed almost a monopoly. Without going so far as this, one may be allowed to express the suspicion one has long felt that their knowledge of Hebrew is far surpassed by their knowledge of the latest fashions in German criticism.¹

“Mais revenons à nos moutons.” In the history of the altar Ed, in Josh. xxii., Professor Driver seems fairly non-plussed by the phenomena before him. Neither from a linguistic or from a historical point of view can he make anything of it.² He very wisely, therefore, slurs over the whole matter. This does not seem an altogether ingenuous method of proceeding. If ever there were a difficulty which ought to be boldly faced and disposed of, it is the narrative in this chapter. For, if genuine, it disposes of the whole theory that worship at the one sanctuary was an after-development, and therefore of the theory that Deuteronomy was compiled in the days of the later Jewish kings. And if not genuine, it can have been nothing else but deliberate and audacious fabrication by the priestly party. The question, therefore, is one for close reasoning and carefully elaborated proof. Yet Professor Driver is not only unable to tell us when this

¹ The other day I came across a work entitled “Studies in Biblical Archæology,” by Jacobs, which rejects the conclusions of Wellhausen and his school on the same ground that I have done, namely, that the methods adopted are too arbitrary. The writer approaches the question, not from the orthodox standpoint, but from that of Herbert Spencer and Tylor.

² “Introduction,” pp. 105, 106. The most cursory glance at his analysis betrays the fact that it needs considerable external support in the way of argument.

chapter was written or who wrote it—he confesses that he cannot assign it authoritatively to P—but he makes not the slightest allusion to the very obvious fact that unless the narrative can be *proved* to be a fabrication, we have here a complete refutation of the whole theory on which Professor Driver's critical analysis of the Pentateuch is based. The story of the altar Ed, in fact, is a crucial test of the soundness of the whole critical position. It is here, therefore, more than anywhere else, that Professor Driver's critical analysis should be at once definite and incontrovertible.¹ Nothing can be more emphatic than the contradiction given by the narrative to the German theory of the Pentateuch. Nothing, therefore, ought to be more conclusive than the demonstration that it has been fabricated at a later date. The very fact that the trans-Jordanic tribes have erected an altar other than that contained in the tabernacle, even while as yet no burnt-offering or sacrifice was ever reported to have been offered on it, is regarded by the tribes on the hither side of the Jordan as a *casus belli*; while the particularly solemn form in which the denials of the two and a half tribes is couched is sufficient to show how grave an offence the setting up of another altar is universally considered to have been. There is nothing whatever, it may be added, in the details of the passage before us to suggest a suspicion of its genuineness. It bears upon the face of it the stamp of verisimilitude. It is set aside by German critics in their usual reckless, off-hand fashion, not because there are any inconsistencies in it, but simply because it completely disposes of their fundamental principle. Professor Driver, apparently, cannot venture to follow them; so he skates over a dangerous place as lightly as he can. I doubt if any other instance can be given in which an historical expert with any claims to attention has dealt in such a manner with the materials before him.

The last two chapters of this book afford additional instances of the superficial character of the criticism now in vogue. It assigns chap. xxiii. to D₂ and chap. xxiv. to E, with the exception of vers. 13 and 31, which are also assigned to D₂. That the speeches attributed to Joshua in these two chapters are homogeneous in character scarcely even a German critic would be hardy enough to deny. But minute

¹ "Either a narrative of P has been combined with elements from another source, in a manner which makes it difficult to effect a satisfactory analysis, or the whole is the work of a distinct writer, whose phraseology is in part that of P, but not entirely" ("Introduction," p. 106). The italics are mine. But the Professor himself confesses that he cannot make a "satisfactory analysis" of one of the most crucial passages—whether it contain facts or forgeries—in the whole course of Hebrew history.

as our critics are, and exact as they pretend to be, they have not discovered that the man who made or wrote them was acquainted with the *whole Pentateuch as we now have it*. In chap. xxiii., beside many quotations from Deuteronomy, we have phrases from Exod. xxiii. 13, 27, 30, 33, attributed to the "Book of the Covenant," affirmed to be the earliest Hebrew writing, from Exod. xiv. 14, xxxiii. 2, xxxiv. 11, attributed to JE (vers. 15, 23, 26 of chap. xiv., we may remark, are attributed without any very definite reason to P), and Num. xxxiii. 53, 56 attributed to P. In ver. 4 we have an allusion to the division of the land by lot (see chapters xiv.-xix.). But in the account of this division we learn that the compiler "has followed P."¹ And certainly Num. xxvi. 53, xxxiii. 54, xxxiv. 13, 17, 18, in which the division by lot is prescribed, are all assigned to P. The phrase does not appear in Deuteronomy. D₂, apparently, therefore, must have borrowed the phrase here from the as yet unwritten P.² Ver. 13 seems to have been compounded of Exod. xxiii. 33, Num. xxxiii. 53, and Deut. vii. 16, another minute, but not altogether to be neglected, indication that the author of this speech, be he D₂ or whoever he be, was familiar with the *whole Pentateuch*. He not only uses JE and Deuteronomy in verses which are not assigned to D₂, but he consistently quotes the presumed post-Exilic narrative throughout. Again, we not only have possible allusions in chap. xxiv. to Gen. xi. 26, xxi. 2, occurring in the supposed post-Exilic P, but Joshua in his speech here follows the story of the Exodus as we have it now in Exod. xiv., quoting JE and P indiscriminately, as anyone may see who has the critical divisions before him. Exod. xiv. 2, 9, are quoted in ver. 6, Exod. xiv. 28 in ver. 7. These passages are assigned to the post-Exilic P. Deut. xxix. 2 is also quoted in ver. 7. So that here again the speaker or writer in the Book of Joshua appears to have been familiar with the *whole Pentateuch*. P only, too, it may be noticed, in spite of the ingenious division which the critics have made of Exod. xiv., separating verses and half verses at pleasure, so as to fall in with their theory—P only mentions the "chariots and horsemen," and speaks of Pharaoh as having "pursued" (פָּרָס) the Israelites, and the waters as having "covered" (כִּסָּה) Pharaoh's troops. Once more, therefore, the writer quotes a book which, *ex hypothesi*, was not in existence when he wrote. The division of Exod. xiv., ingenious as it is, will have to be a little more ingenious still

¹ "Introduction," p. 102.

² If Josh. xiii. 6 be, as it is suggested, from D₂, the critics have still to explain why the phrase does not appear anywhere in Deuteronomy.

if it is quite to dispel the impression that the speaker in chap. xxiv. is quoting the Pentateuchal narrative *in its present shape*.¹

I may add, before leaving this chapter, the remark that it displays no traces whatever of having been fabricated at a later date. There are no fabulous amplifications in it. On the contrary, the miraculous details which occur in J, E, D, and P are frequently omitted here. So much is this the case that we may expect a new school to arise which will contend that in this speech of Joshua we have an earlier and more authentic fragment dealing with Hebrew history than any other which has come down to us. And yet, as we have seen, it follows the Pentateuch as we have it, and uses indiscriminately the narratives of J, E, D, and P.²

Before we leave the question of the authenticity of the history handed down in the Book of Joshua, there is another point of view from which the question must be considered. The critics, it appears, are teaching their pupils that the religious and moral code under which the Israelites were living down to the "eighth or ninth century B.C.," was Exod. xx.-xxiii. It could not be otherwise, for if we accept the critical verdict, no other portion of what is now known as the Mosaic Code was in existence up to that period. Be it so. Let us try the Book of Joshua by this test. It is an acknowledged principle of the new criticism that the absence of any reference to special provisions of the Jewish law is a proof that such provisions were not in existence. Now, it cannot be proved that the Book of Joshua *ever makes the slightest reference to Exod. xx.-xxiii.*, regarded as distinct from other portions of the Pentateuch. True, one God, Jehovah, only is worshipped,

¹ See note p. 338, on the substitution of Shiloh, here. It will be seen presently that on important occasions the tabernacle and no doubt the whole sanctuary was moved. Shechem was probably chosen for this meeting in consequence of the writing on Ebal and Gerizim, chap. viii. 30-35. See my note *in loc.* in the "Pulpit Commentary."

² One or two minor points ought not to be passed over. The word **דִּינָה**, as referring to a tribe, occurs twenty-three times in the Old Testament. Of these, eleven are in the Pentateuch and Joshua, and the rest in Samuel and Chronicles. In Genesis one passage is in chap. xiv., the chapter to which the critics have been unable to assign a date or an author. The other, *though a genealogy*, is assigned to JE. Why? The remainder of cases in which it occurs in the Pentateuch are in Deuteronomy. Of the four times in which the word occurs in Joshua, two are assigned to D₂, and two to P. Another very singular fact is that in Josh. xxii. 6, ascribed to D₂, and therefore presumably written to support priestly, or at the least Levitical authority, it is Joshua, *the Ephraimite* (!) who is represented as having blessed the tribes before sending them away. Was this likely to be a fabrication of the later Jewish kingdom? Or if found in earlier histories, would it not have been considered by the priestly party wise to exclude it?

and the Israelites admit the obligation of an oath. But there is no reference whatever to Exod. xx. as the ground of these convictions. To the first commandment, as such, no reference is made. There is a possible allusion to the second.¹ As other nations have equally acknowledged the obligation of an oath, we cannot fairly draw from the fact that the Book of Joshua acknowledges this obligation the conclusion that the third commandment was already given. The only portion of what the critics call the "Book of the Covenant" which is definitely quoted in the Book of Joshua is Exod. xxiii. 20-33. But as this passage is to be found in substance in other parts of the Pentateuch—notably in Deuteronomy, in Exod. xxxiii., xxxiv., in Lev. xxvi., in Num. xxxiii., often in almost identical language—it is impossible to prove that the author here is making use of the "Book of the Covenant" at all. There is a quotation, no doubt, of Exod. xx. 24-26 in Josh. viii. 31. But here the author has evidently taken his words, not from Exod. xx., but from Deut. xxvii. And he also, as we have seen, makes use of the whole Pentateuch. Consequently, by the argument *e silentio* which is so triumphantly used by the Germanizing critics, we are entitled to conclude that the author of Joshua, though well acquainted with the rest of the Pentateuch, "knows nothing" whatever of the "Book of the Covenant," and that therefore this portion of the Mosaic law, instead of being the earliest, is in fact the latest portion of the Pentateuch, since it is altogether unknown to an author or redactor who has made plentiful use even of the post-Exilic P.

Thus the methods employed in the new criticism, it may be useful to notice, may be used to establish a good many conclusions of which their authors never dreamed. But we have not done with the subject. We have seen that there is no definite evidence whatever in the Book of Joshua as it stands of the existence of the "Book of the Covenant" apart from the rest of the Pentateuch. But not only does the Book of Joshua ignore what we are told are the only actual institutions of Moses, but it describes a host of other institutions as in existence which, on the critical hypothesis, were utterly unknown in those days. In fact, if the Anglo-German view be true, the Book of Joshua is either an extremely ignorant or an extremely mendacious book. It assumes throughout the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy. It sometimes, with Deuteronomy, speaks of the Levites as priests, and then, within the compass of three verses, it speaks of the priests as they were never spoken of until after the evolution of the

¹ Josh. xxiv. 19.

post-Exilic Priestly Code. It represents the Ark as the object of a superstitious veneration which German criticism has "proved," in its usual fashion, to be altogether a post-Exilic Jewish conception. It relates with apparent satisfaction the erection of the *matzeboth*, which Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code had so stringently forbidden—a curious piece of imbecility on the author's or redactor's part, since the authorities he desires to follow are certainly definite enough.¹ In an age in which the rigid, not to say superstitious, observance of the law had become a passion the redactor commits himself to the utterly unsupported statement that the rite of circumcision, commanded by God under such terrible penalties, was actually set at naught during the whole of the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness. His statement is equally unintelligible whether we regard him as transcribing in this place the writings of an ancient author whose statements he felt himself at liberty to suppress or revise whenever he thought it desirable to do so, or whether we suppose that he is here giving the rein to his own imagination. He introduces references to the post-Exilic law of Jubilee, as well as of the priesthood, into his account of the fall of Jericho. Repeatedly does he represent his hero as observing scrupulously the command in Deuteronomy not to leave a body hanging all night upon a tree. He pretends that the custom of asking counsel of God, presumably by Urim and Thummim, since the Old Testament "knows nothing" of any other, was in existence in Joshua's day, and charges his hero, whom he has written to glorify, with having on one occasion shamefully neglected it. He combines with the most exact knowledge of the topography of Palestine a singular lack of acquaintance with her history and her most elementary religious institutions. For he insists frequently (and, strange to say, the silence as well as the unvarying statements of the remaining books of the Old Testament confirm his assertions) that the segregation of the tribe of Levi to the service of the sanctuary took place from the very moment of the settlement in Palestine, and among the cities assigned to the Levites for a dwelling-place he strangely enough mentions some which, so far as we can gather from the subsequent books of the Old Testament, never belonged to Israel at all, but to Moab. He invents the institution of the cities of refuge for no obvious reason, and places some of them where they could not be of the least use to Jews of his day. He represents the tabernacle of the

¹ It may be necessary to caution the simple-minded reader that neither Deuteronomy nor the "Priestly Code" prohibit any but *idolatrous matzeboth*, though the Germanizing criticism has tried to persuade us otherwise.

congregation as having been set up at Shiloh, and would persuade his readers that it was the centre of the Israelite polity, religious and secular, in Joshua's time. He supports his theory of the religious pre-eminence of the Tabernacle by a wild and remarkable fiction concerning the origin of which we have had a good many unproved statements, but nothing which can be called an explanation—the story of the altar of witness. And yet he balances these with the record of an episode which, were he writing, as is asserted, for a purpose, he would have done far better to have left out. That Joshua, under the hypothesis that the principle of the Central Sanctuary was well understood and incontrovertibly established, should have repaired to Shechem, in order to knit together the past and present history of Israel, cannot be regarded as surprising. But if the object of the historian were to prop up a new institution by daring inventions of the fancy, and if, in the pursuit of this object, he allowed himself a free hand in the selection—or manufacture—of his historical materials, it is inconceivable why he should here have introduced an incident so likely to defeat his purpose as that of Joshua repairing to Shechem, recorded in chap. xxiv., and still more inconceivable that he should have derived his account of this incident from D and P, as well as from older sources. Altogether the author of Joshua, regarded from the point of view of German criticism, presents a remarkable psychological phenomenon. German criticism has elaborated this psychological phenomenon with infinite ingenuity and pains. But it is perhaps not too much to say that so far the discovery has hardly been adequately explained.

It will be unnecessary to deal with the remaining history in equally minute detail. It has been already treated in "Lex Mosaica." To that "monumental mass" of irrelevancies I am not afraid to refer the reader who desires to study both sides of the question. It will be found (1) that in "Lex Mosaica" a good many pertinent questions are asked which have not yet been answered, and (2) that the authors of that volume have not, as a rule, concerned themselves with questions of authorship, but have simply asked whether the history we have is, in its main features, worthy of credit or no. It is further to be remembered that "Lex Mosaica" does not deal with Professor Driver alone, but with the critics from whom, in the main, he himself admits that he has borrowed his conclusions. If in any particular he should happen to shrink, as he often does without avowing it, from going all lengths with them, the replies contained in "Lex Mosaica" may be "irrelevant" as far as Professor Driver is concerned, but they are by no means irrelevant to the general

question which has been raised as to the authenticity of Hebrew history. In fact, as so much is built in Professor Driver's book on the agreement of the critics, it would be well if he were to tell us more definitely where he feels it his duty to *disagree* with them, and his reasons for doing so. The extent of the disagreement between him and the authorities on which he professes to rely is, as the reader will already have perceived, really far greater and more serious than he has given us the least reason to suspect.¹

J. J. LIAS.

(*To be continued.*)



ART. III.—THE PROTESTANTISM OF OUR GREAT ENGLISH DIVINES.

III. ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

THERE is no man who is regarded both by themselves and by others as so much in accord with the modern medieval school as Archbishop Laud. The following passages will show how entirely unfounded is the belief that Laud looked with any tenderness on the Roman Church, and how little support can be derived from him for any preference of unreformed to reformed doctrines.

The Roman Church.

“The Church of Rome neither is nor was ‘the right Church.’ A particular Church it is and was, and in some *times* right and in some *times* wrong, and then in some *things* right and in some *things* wrong; but ‘the right Church’ or ‘the Holy Catholic Church’ it never was, nor ever can be, and, therefore, was not such before Luther and others left it or were thrust from it. A particular Church it was. The Church of Rome both was, and was not, a ‘right’ or orthodox Church *before* Luther made a breach in it. For the word *before* may look upon Rome and that Church a great way off or *long* before; and then, in the prime times of it, it was a most right and orthodox Church. But it may look also nearer home and upon the immediate times before Luther, or some ages before that; and then in those times Rome was a corrupt and a tainted Church, far from being right. The word *before* includes the whole time before Luther, in part of which time that Church of Rome was right and in other part it was

¹ As Professor James Robertson has pointed out in his “Early History of Israel.”

wrong. It is no news that any particular Church, Roman as well as another, may once have been right and afterwards wrong and in far worse case. And so it was in Rome after the enemy had sown tares among the wheat. So, though it was once right, yet the tares, which grow thick in it, are the cause why it is not so now. And then though that Church did not depart from the Protestants' Church, yet if it gave great and just cause for the Protestant Church to depart from the errors of it, while it in some particulars departed from the truth of Christ, it comes all to one for this particular, that the Roman Church, which was once right, is now become wrong by embracing superstition and error. . . . I never granted that the Roman Church either is or was 'the right Church.' It is too true that there is a miserable rent in the Church, and I make no question but the best men do most bemoan it. But I never said nor thought that the Protestants made this rent. The cause of the schism is yours; for you thrust us from you, because we called for truth and redress of abuses. For a schism must needs be theirs, whose the cause of it is" ("Conference with Fisher," § 21).

"That there are errors in doctrine, and some of them such as most manifestly endanger salvation in the Church of Rome, is evident to them that will not shut their eyes" (*ibid.*, § 24).

"The Church of Rome hath in all ages maintained the faith unchanged in the expression of the Articles themselves; but it hath in the exposition both of the Creeds and Councils quite changed and lost the sense and the meaning of some of them. So the faith is in many things changed both for life and belief, and yet seems the same. Now that which deceives the world is, that because the bark is the same, men think this old decayed tree is as sound as it was at first, and not weather-beaten in any age. But when they make me believe that painting is true beauty, I will believe too that Rome is not only sound but beautiful" (*ibid.*, § 37).

"The Romanists dare not believe but as the Roman Church believes; and the Roman Church at this day doth not believe the Scripture and the Creeds in the sense in which the ancient primitive Church received them. For the primitive Church did not acknowledge a purgatory in a side part of hell; nor did it ever interpret away half the sacrament from Christ's own institution (which to break Stapleton confesses expressly is a damnable error); nor make the intention of the priest of the essence of baptism; nor believe worship due to images; nor dream of a Transubstantiation, which at this day is a scandal to both Jew and Gentile and the Church of God. I have mentioned here more instances than one, in some of which they have erred in the foundation or very near it.

But for the Church of England, let A. C. instance, if he can, in any one point in which she hath departed from the foundation" (*ibid.*, § 38).

"The truth is, you do hold new devices of your own, which the Primitive Church was never acquainted with; and some of them, so far from being conformable, as that they are little less than contradictory to Scripture; in which particulars and divers others the Scriptures are not interpreted by 'unanime consent of Fathers' or 'definitions of Councils,' unless perhaps by some late Councils packed on purpose to do that ill service. I pray, whose device was Transubstantiation, and whose, Communion under one kind, and whose, deposition and unthroning, nay killing, of princes, and the like, if they were not yours? Neither is any Jesuit able to show any Scripture, interpreted by 'unanime consent of Fathers of the Primitive Church,' to prove any of these, nor any 'definition of Councils,' but only Lateran for Transubstantiation, and that of Constance for the Eucharist in one kind, which two are modern, at least far downwards from the Primitive Church, and have done more mischief to the Church by those determinations than will be cured, I fear, in many generations" (*ibid.*, § 38).

"Titles enough are given to the Roman Church, and I wish she deserved them all, for then we should have peace. But it is far otherwise. 'One' she is, as a particular Church, but not 'the one.' 'Holy' she would be counted; but the world may see, if it will not blind itself, of what value holiness is in that court and country. 'Catholic' she is not in any sense of the word, for she is not the universal, and so not catholic in extent; nor is she sound in doctrine, and in things which come near upon the foundation too; so not catholic in belief; nor is she the 'prime mother Church' of Christianity; Jerusalem was that, and so not catholic as a fountain or original or as the head or root of the Catholic" (*ibid.*).

"Is there no superstition in adoration of images? None in invocation of saints? None in the adoration of the sacrament? Is there no error in breaking Christ's own institution of the sacrament, by giving it but in one kind? None about purgatory? About common prayer in an unknown tongue, none? These and many more are in the Roman religion. And it is no hard work to prove every one of them to be error or superstition or both. But these things which the Church of England charges upon the Roman party to be superstitious and erroneous, are not held or practised in or by the Universal Church generally either for time or place. The Bishop and Church of Rome have in this particular of judging controversies taken that authority to themselves which neither

Christ nor His Church Catholic did ever give them" (*ibid.*, § 39).

"While they seek to tie all Christians to Rome by a divine precept, their ambition of sovereignty is one main cause that Jerusalem, even the whole Church of Christ, is not at unity in itself this day" (Sermon III.).

Infallibility.

"Rome hath not that gift, nor her bishop neither" ("Conference," § 3).

"If this company of men be infallibly assisted, whence is it that this very company have erred so dangerously as they have, not only in some other things, but even in this particular, by equalling the tradition of the present Church to the written Word of God? Which is a doctrine unknown to the primitive Church, and which frets upon the very foundation itself by jostling with it. So belike, he that hath but half an indifferent eye may see this assisted company have erred, and yet we must wink in obedience and think them infallible" (*ibid.*, § 16).

"For my own part I am clear of Jacobus Almain's opinion: 'And a great wonder it is to me, that they which affirm the Pope cannot err, do not affirm likewise that he cannot sin. And I verily believe they would be bold enough to affirm it, did not the daily works of the Popes compel them to believe the contrary.' For very many of them have led lives quite contrary to the gospel of Christ; nay, such lives as no Epicurean monster, storied out to the world, hath outgone them in sensuality or other gross impiety, if their own historians be true. Take your choice of John XIII. about the year 966, or of Sylvester II. about the year 999, or John XVIII. about the year 1003, or Benedict IX. about the year 1033, or Boniface VIII. about the year 1294, or Alexander VI. about the year 1492. And yet these and their like must be infallible in their dictates and conclusions of faith. Do your own believe it? Surely no. Lyra says expressly that many Popes, as well as other inferiors, have not only erred but even quite apostatized from the faith. And yet now nothing but infallibility will serve their turns. . . . I would fain know, since this had been so easy a way either to prevent all divisions about the faith, or to end all controversies did they arise, why this brief but most necessary proposition, 'The Bishop of Rome cannot err in his judicial determinations concerning the faith,' is not found either in letter or in sense, in any Scripture, in any Council, or in any Father of the Church for the full space of a thousand years and more after Christ? But certainly, as

no divine of worth did then dream of any such infallibility in him, so is it a mere dream, or worse, of those modern divines who affirm it now. Most certain it is that the Pope hath no infallibility to attend his cathedral judgments in things belonging to the faith" (*ibid.*, § 33).

Supremacy.

"The Popes grew under the Emperors till they had overgrown them" (*ibid.*, § 25).

"The pope in ancient Councils never had more power than any the other patriarchs; precedency perhaps for order's sake and other respects he had. Nor had the Pope any negative voice against the rest in point of differences. No, nor was he held superior to the Council; therefore, the ancient Church never accounted or admitted him a judge; no, not with a Council, much less without it" (*ibid.*, § 39).

The Catholic Church.

"The Catholic Church of Christ is neither Rome nor a conventicle. Out of that, there is no salvation. I easily admit it. But out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too; salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave" ("Epist. Dedic." xvii.).

"In all the primitive times of the Church, a man or a family or a national Church were accounted right and orthodox as they agreed with the Catholic Church, but the Catholic was never then measured or judged by man, family or nation. But now in the Jesuits' new school, the one holy Catholic Church must be measured by that which is in the city or diocese of Rome, or of those which agreed with it, and not Rome by the Catholic" ("Conference," § 20).

"We confess as well as you that out of the Catholic Church of Christ there is no salvation. But what do you mean by 'out of the Church'? Sure, out of the Roman Church. Why, but the Roman Church and the Church of England are but two distinct members of that Catholic Church which is spread over the face of the earth. Therefore Rome is not the house where the Church dwells, but Rome itself, as well as other particular Churches, dwells in this great universal house, unless you will shut up the Church in Rome, as the Donatists did in Africa. When did Christ give that power to an elder sister, that she and her steward the bishop there should thrust out what child she pleased, especially when she herself is justly accused to have given the offence that is taken in the house? Salvation need not be feared of any dutiful child,

nor outing from the Church, because this elder sister's faults are discovered in the house, and she grown froward for it against them that complained" (*ibid.*, § 36).

The Catholic Faith.

"A man may believe the whole and entire Catholic Faith, even as St. Athanasius requires, and yet justly refuse for dross a great part of that which is now the Roman faith. And Athanasius himself, as if he meant to arm the Catholic Faith against all corrupting additions, hath in the beginning of his Creed these words, 'This is the Catholic Faith,' this, and no other; this and no other than here follows. And again at the end of the Creed, 'This is the Catholic Faith,' this and no more than is here delivered (always presupposing the Apostles' Creed, as Athanasius did), and this is the largest of all Creeds" (*ibid.*, § 38).

The Protestant Reformation.

"There is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, will we nill we, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs: 'Where was your Church before Luther?' For it was just there where theirs is now—one and the same Church still; no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity, their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still, but leprous with them and cleansed with us, the same man still" ("Epist. Dedic.," xv.).

"Is it, then, such a strange thing that a particular Church may reform itself, if the general will not? I had thought, and do so still, that in point of reformation of either manners or doctrine, it is lawful for the Church since Christ to do as the Church before Christ did, and might do. Was it not lawful for Judah to reform herself when Israel would not join? To reform what is amiss in doctrine or manners is as lawful for a particular Church as it is to publish and promulgate anything that is Catholic. What, should we have suffered this gangrene to endanger life and all rather than be cured in time by a physician of a weaker knowledge and a less able hand? If this were practised so often and in so many places, why may not a national council of the Church of England do the like as she did? For she cast off the Pope's usurpation, and, as

much as in her lay, restored the King to his right. That appears by a book subscribed by the Bishops in Henry VIII.'s time, and by the records in the Archbishop's office, orderly kept and to be seen. In the reformation which came after, our Princes had their parts and the clergy theirs, and to these two principally the power and direction for reformation belonged. That our Princes had their parts is manifest by their calling together of the Bishops and other of the clergy to consider of that which might seem worthy reformation. And the clergy did their part, for, being thus called together by regal power, they met in the national Synod of 1562, and the Articles there agreed on were afterwards confirmed by Acts of State and the royal assent. In this Synod the positive truths which are delivered are more than the polemics; so that a mere calumny it is, that we profess only a negative religion. True it is, and we must thank Rome for it, our confession must needs contain some negatives; for we cannot but deny that images are to be adored, nor can we admit maimed sacraments, nor grant prayers in an unknown tongue; and in a corrupt time or place it is as necessary for a religion to deny falsehood as to assert and vindicate truth. Indeed this latter can hardly be well and sufficiently done but by the former, an affirmative verity being ever included in the negative to a falsehood. I make no doubt but that as the universal Catholic Church would have reformed herself had she been in all parts free of the Roman yoke, so while she was, for the most, in these western parts, under that yoke, the Church of Rome was, if not the only, yet the chief hindrance of reformation. And then, in this sense, it is more than clear that if the Roman Church will neither reform nor suffer reformation, it is lawful for any other particular Church to reform itself so long as it does it peaceably and orderly, and keeps itself to the foundation and free from sacrilege" ("Conference," § 24).

"The Protestants charge upon the Pope that he hath governed, if not the whole yet so much of the Church as he has been able to bring under his power, so as that he hath given too just cause of the present continued separation, and as the corruptions in the doctrine of faith in the Church of Rome were the cause of the first separation, so are they at this present day the cause why the separation continues. And further, I for my part am clear of opinion that the errors in the doctrine of faith which are charged upon the whole Church, at least, so much of the whole as in these parts of Europe have been kept under the Roman jurisdiction, have had their original and continuance from this; that so much of the universal Church (which indeed they account all) hath forgotten her own liberty and submitted to the Roman

Church and Bishop; and so is in a manner forced to embrace all the corruptions which the particular Church of Rome hath contracted upon itself; and being now not able to free herself from the Roman jurisdiction, is made to continue also in all her corruptions. And for the Protestants, they have made no separation from the general Church, properly so called, but their separation is only from the Church of Rome and such other Churches as by adhering to her have hazarded themselves, and do now miscall themselves the whole Catholic Church. Nay, even here the Protestants have not left the Church of Rome in her essence but in her errors; not in the things which constitute a Church but only in such abuses and corruptions as work toward the dissolution of a Church" (*ibid.*, § 25).

Romish Superstitions.

"There is peril, great peril, of damnable both schism and heresy and other sins by living and dying in the Roman Faith, tainted with so many superstitions, as at this day it is, and their tyranny to boot. I do indeed for my part, leaving other men free to their own judgment, acknowledge a possibility of salvation in the Roman Church; but so as that which I grant to Romanists is not as they are Romanists, but as they are Christians; that is, as they believe the Creed and hold the foundation Christ Himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross superstitions of the Romish Church. And I am willing to hope there are many among them which keep within that Church and yet wish the superstitions abolished which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their errors in what they know not, and which hold the foundation firm, and live accordingly, and which would have all things amended that are amiss, were it in their power. And to such I dare not deny a possibility of salvation for that which is Christ's in them, though they hazard themselves extremely by keeping so close to that which is superstition, and in the case of images comes too near idolatry" (*ibid.*, § 35).

Transubstantiation.

"That was never heard of in the primitive Church, nor till the Council of Lateran (1215), nor can it be proved out of Scripture, and taken properly cannot stand with the grounds of Christian religion" (*ibid.*, § 33).

Communion in One Kind.

"Christ's institution is clear against that; and not only the primitive Church, but the whole Church of Christ kept it

so till within less than 400 years, for Aquinas confesses that it was so in use even to his times, and he was both born and dead during the reign of Henry III. of England" (*ibid.*).

"Here their building with untempered mortar appears most manifestly, for they have no show to maintain this but the fiction of Thomas of Aquin that he which receives the Body of Christ receives also His Blood by concomitancy, because the blood goes always with the body; of which term Thomas was the first author I can yet find" (*ibid.*, § 35).

Invocation of Saints.

"Though some of the ancient fathers have some rhetorical flourishes about it for the stirring up of devotion as they thought, yet the Church then admitted not of the invocation of them, but only of the commemoration of the martyrs, as appears clearly in St. Augustine, and when the Church prayed to God for anything, she desired to be heard for the mercies and the merits of Christ, not for the merits of any saints whatsoever" (*ibid.*, § 33).

Adoration of Images.

"The ancient Church knew it not, and the modern Church of Rome is too like to Paganism in the practice of it, and driven to scarce intelligible subtleties in her servants' writings that defend it, and this without any care had of millions of souls unable to understand her subtleties or shun her practices. I heartily wish it were not, and that men of learning would not strain their wits to spoil the truth and rend the peace of the Church of Christ by such dangerous, such superstitious vanities. For better they are not, but they may be worse" (*ibid.*).

Purgatory.

"The Council of Florence first defined purgatory, to be believed as a divine truth and matter of faith. The doctrine of Purgatory was not held ever in the whole Catholic Church of Christ, therefore purgatory is no matter of faith. Alphonsus a Castro deals honestly and plainly, and tells us that the mention of purgatory in ancient writers is almost none at all, especially in the Greeks, and he adds that hereupon purgatory is not believed by the Grecians to this very day" (*ibid.*).

The Council of Trent.

"Is that Council legal where the Pope, the chief person to be reformed, shall sit President in it, and be chief judge in his own cause against all law divine, natural and human? In a

place not free but in or too near his own dominion? To which all were not called that had deliberative or consultative voice? In which none have suffrage but such as were sworn to the Pope and the Church of Rome and professed enemies to all that called for reformation or a free council? And the Pope himself, to show his charity, had declared and pronounced the appellants heretics before they were condemned by the Council?" (*ibid.*, § 27).

The Eucharist.

"As Christ offered Himself up once for all a full and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sin of the whole world, so did He institute and command a memory of the sacrifice in a sacrament even till His coming again. Thus far these dissenting (differing) Churches agree that in the Eucharist there is a sacrifice of duty, and a sacrifice of praise and a sacrifice of commemoration of Christ. Therefore according to the former rule, and here in truth too, it is safest for a man to believe the commemorative, the praising, and the performing sacrifice and to offer them duly to God, and leave the Church of Rome in this particular to her superstitions, that I may say no more" (*ibid.*, § 35).

We shall conclude by quoting some of Laud's declarations in respect to his personal faith:

"I have lived, and shall, God willing, die, in the faith of Christ as it was professed in the ancient primitive Church, and as it is professed in the present Church of England; and for the rule which governs me herein, if I cannot be confident for my soul upon the Scripture, and the primitive Church expounding and declaring it, I will be confident upon no other. This can never deceive me; another, namely, the faith of the Roman Church, may. Therefore I will venture my salvation upon the rule aforesaid, and not trouble myself to seek another of man's making, to the forsaking or weakening of this which God hath given me; for I know they committed two evils which forsook the fountain of living waters to hew out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water" (*ibid.*, § 38).

"I did never desire that England and Rome should meet together, but with forsaking of error and superstition, especially such as grate upon and fret the foundations of religion. That I should practise with Rome as now it stands, and to that end should confederate with priests and Jesuits, or hold secret intelligence with the Pope, or treat with him or by any agents is utterly untrue. I do here make my solemn protestation in the presence of God and this great Court that I am

innocent of anything, greater or less, in this Article or any part of it" ("Troubles and Trial," p. 413).

"I have hindered as many from going to the Roman party and have reduced as many from it, and some of great quality and some of great learning and judgment, as, I believe, any divine in England hath done" (*ibid.*).

"I am as innocent in this business of religion, as free from all practice or so much as thought of practice for any alteration to Popery or any way blemishing the true Protestant religion established in the Church of England, as I was when my mother first bare me into the world" (*ibid.*).

"For my faith; I die as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, foreshadowed by the prophets and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles, and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, as it stands established by law" ("Last Will and Testament").

We may add that in Laud's Visitation Articles there is no encouragement of vestments, but there is a strict inquiry as to the zeal of the minister in converting Popish recusants.

If even Archbishop Laud had such a firm hold of Protestantism as is exhibited in the above extracts, can those who look back with desire to the doctrines and practices of the unreformed Church be regarded as legitimate successors of the seventeenth-century divines? Can even the Laudian school be appealed to in justification of their present claims? And if not in the Laudian school, where else can they find a sanction in the history of the Church of England since the Reformation?

F. MEYRICK.



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

VI. THOMAS TENISON (*continued*).

THE eighteenth century opened ominously for the peace of Europe. Charles II. of Spain was nearing his end; he had no children. By the secret treaty of partition between Great Britain, France, and Holland, it had been agreed that the Electoral Prince of Bavaria should succeed to the greatest part of the Spanish monarchy, *i.e.*, to Spain and the Indies. The Netherlands and the dominions in Italy were to be divided between Germany and France. It now became necessary to make a fresh arrangement, and accordingly it

was agreed that the portion which had been allotted to the Electoral Prince should be transferred to the Archduke Charles of Austria. Archbishop Tenison wrote to King William protesting against this arrangement, which he declared most seriously threatened the peace of Europe; the Emperor of Austria, he said, would be furious when the treaty was made known, and the French king was playing him false, his object being to draw on the Spaniards to resist the dismemberment of their monarchy. His anticipation was well founded. Charles II. died November 1, 1700, and it was then found that Louis XIV. had obtained a will making the Duke of Anjou heir to the whole. King William immediately began to take steps not only to break the intended union of France and Spain as fatal to the balance of power, but also to secure the Protestant succession in England. For this year the Duke of Gloucester, the Princess Anne's only child, had died. Parliament, though it was angry at the Treaty of Partition, which had been kept a secret between the powers till now, recognised the wisdom of the King's present proposals by voting supplies for the defence of the liberties of Europe, and also by settling the succession on the house of Hanover. Momentous consequences followed, which, though they do not belong to these pages, cannot be ignored hereafter as we pass along.

As usual, a new Convocation of the clergy was summoned along with the new Parliament, and here also trouble immediately began. For many years it had never been called to work, but was prorogued by the President at the beginning of each session. This—so said the authorities—“was designed for the ease of the Clergy in not obliging them to a fruitless and expensive attendance, when there was no occasion to justify their absence from the duty of their cures.” Not unnaturally some of them grumbled at being thus muzzled, and debarred of their rights and liberties. The Nonjurors actively fomented the discontent, but it was also strong among the High Church clergy, who were dissatisfied with the Government, though they had given in their allegiance to it. In 1697 “A Letter to a Convocation Man,” published anonymously, gave vigorous utterance to the discontent, maintaining that the clergy should have the right of meeting and debating simultaneously with the sitting of Parliament, and also that the irreligion and immorality which were confessedly so rife must be attributed to this silencing of the clerical voice. Answers to it were published by two or three pamphleteers, but the most learned was by Wake, Rector of St. James's, Westminster, an intimate friend of Tenison, and destined to be his successor. Wake's essay was entitled “The Authority of Christian Princes over

their Ecclesiastical Synods." It brought into the field one of the most remarkable and brilliant men of his time. Francis Atterbury, Student of Christ Church, Oxford, handsome of presence, attractive in manner, eloquent, a fair scholar, but who had an extraordinary power of appearing deep in places where he was only shallow, had already won himself a name as a controversialist. At Christ Church he was quite the right-hand man to the Dean, Henry Aldrich, a man, says Macaulay spitefully, "only known now by his catches."¹ Atterbury had written an able reply to Obadiah Walker, the Papist whom James II. had intruded into the Mastership of University College, and who had published an attack on the Reformation. Atterbury's next controversial essay was on a very different subject. He had the temerity to attack the great Bentley, in defence of his pupil, Charles Boyle, who had edited and annotated a forgery pretending to be the Epistles of Phalaris, tyrant of Agrigentum, B.C. 500. Bentley had declared the work spurious, and Atterbury must needs defend it because it emanated from Christ Church, and Boyle was his pupil. So began a controversy keen and amusing for the time, for Atterbury, though really he had not a leg to stand upon, was so skilful, versatile, and witty, that a great many people, for the time being, were taken in. This controversy is now dead; no one doubts that Bentley was right.

Atterbury had now taken Orders, and at once gained high repute as a preacher, his sparkling style being aided by a very musical voice. Bishop Compton had given him a London lectureship. Whilst the "Phalaris" controversy was still proceeding, Wake's essay appeared, and Atterbury saw his opportunity. He was conscientiously convinced that the clergy were being ill-used, and that Wake's pamphlet was calculated to urge the civil power to strain its prerogative into oppression. So he published a treatise on the "Rights, Powers, and Privileges of our English Convocation." Wake, he wrote, "represents those Clergy who desire a Convocation (that is, by his leave, the far greater part of them) as if they were irregular in their lives, violent in their tempers, and factious in their principles, and the Government is excited to take vengeance upon them, as men embarked in a separate interest." The book was received with a chorus of approbation; it was witty in style and vigorous in its denunciation. The University of Oxford at once voted him an honorary D.D. Wake himself, though he declared that it did not answer him, said it was a pattern of charity and good humour. Certainly,

¹ Some of Aldrich's services and anthems are still deservedly popular in our cathedrals.

whatever might be thought of Wake's book, Atterbury's principles were unsound, as Hallam has shown.¹ He assumed that the Parliamentary writ and summons of the clergy was identical with the Convocation writ and summons of the clergy, whereas they were two distinct things. The former was an invention of Edward I., who wanted to get representatives of the clergy into Parliament because he found them so difficult to manage in the way of supplies. The latter was the ancient ecclesiastical summons to a Church synod issuing from the Archbishop. By confusing the two, Atterbury made out that the clergy were as much entitled to be summoned as the Members of Parliament, and had the same rights. No wonder that the clergy were enthusiastic, and the Ministry was so moved by his pamphlet, that it stipulated with the King that a Convocation should be summoned and allowed to debate. Atterbury had just been made Archdeacon of Totnes, and therefore was summoned among them. Burnet, White Kennett, and Hody, had all written against his historical mistakes, but at present he was regarded as master of the situation.

On Monday, February 10, the new Convocation of Canterbury met in St. Paul's Cathedral. As usual, the Litany was said in Latin, after which Dr. Haley, Dean of Chichester, preached a Latin sermon. Then the Archbishop, according to custom, bade them choose a Prolocutor, which they did, namely, Dr. Hooper, Dean of Canterbury; and so ended the day's proceedings. On the 25th, when they assembled again, the Archbishop's customary schedule of Prorogation was brought down to the Lower House. In reply to this they continued sitting, and after some discussions of no moment, ended by adjourning to Henry VII.'s Chapel, instead of going to the Jerusalem Chamber to complete the prorogation. Here evidently was incipient rebellion, and the Archbishop called them to explain. The Prolocutor, after discussion, returned answer "that the Lower House was preparing somewhat to lay before his Grace and the Upper House concerning the methods of Prorogation and some other things of form." Tenison returned a civil answer, that he was ready to receive what should be offered by them, but in the meanwhile the Upper House would continue its usual practice. The Lower House at once appointed a committee to search the records on the subject of prorogations, and on March 6 delivered their report. It stated first that the common usage had been to continue sitting till the Prolocutor should adjourn them, with their

¹ Hallam's "Constitutional History of England," vol. iii., p. 245.

own consent. And they instanced cases in which they had not been prorogued or adjourned on the same day with the Upper House. Further, that they had always had the privilege of meeting in a separate place, from which they attended their lordships both when they had business of their own motion, and when they were summoned by their lordships by a special messenger. And then, without further discussion, they went back to their chamber ("persisted in their contumacy," says Burnet), and proceeded to examine Toland's book, "Christianity not Mysterious," but found that legally they had not sufficient authority to censure it judicially without the royal license.

Tenison endeavoured to stop the breach by proposing a conference between equal numbers selected from the two Houses, which might settle affairs amicably. It was a fair proposal, but the Lower House rejected it, "did not think fit to appoint such a committee," whereupon the Bishops declared that they would receive nothing more from it until these irregularities were settled. "If you have anything to offer, we cannot receive it till the late irregularity of refusing to meet the committee of Bishops to inspect the books of the Convocation be set right." Open war was now declared, and there is no doubt that Atterbury was the moving spirit. After a short consultation with his brethren, the Prolocutor returned answer that he was ready to wait on their lordships concerning an irregularity which they desired to put right, and thereupon he was requested to return. He did so, and at once informed their lordships that concerning "the supposed irregularity they had thought fit to complain of, they were ready to give their lordships satisfaction when thereunto called," but in the meantime they had another grave irregularity to complain of, namely, the Bishop of Salisbury's book on the Articles. This was, of course, like throwing a shell upon the floor. The paper had been carefully and secretly drawn up, and, no one will question, was disingenuously produced by the Prolocutor. It stated: "(1) That the said book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions as the Articles were framed to avoid; (2) that there are many passages in the exposition of several Articles which appear to us contrary to the true meaning of them and to other received doctrines of our Church; (3) that there are some things in the said book which seem to us to be of dangerous consequences to the Church of England as by law established, and to derogate from the honour of its Reformation. All which particulars we humbly lay before your lordships, praying your opinions herein." Burnet, who felt strong enough to take care of himself, entreated the Archbishop to waive precedent,

and to receive the paper. But Tenison was firm. After a short time of withdrawal the Prolocutor was again called in, and informed that his Grace and his brethren adhered to their resolution not to receive anything from the Lower House until the irregularity of which they had complained had been set right.

At the next session (June 6) the Archbishop again addressed the recalcitrants. "I cannot," he said, "according to the order of the House, receive anything from you until the irregularity complained of be set right. But it appearing from the paper you read on May 30 that you had something to offer relating to the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, I and my brethren, without prejudice to our former order, and at the repeated and earnest request of the Lord Bishop of Sarum, are now willing to receive the said paper." The Prolocutor replied that he had not that paper with him, but had brought one "concerning the irregularity." Whereupon his Grace bade him leave that in his hands and go and fetch the other. Then the Bishops read the answer, which is described as "full of accusations against their lordships, rather than acknowledgments of their misfortune in falling under their lordships' displeasure." It was afterwards answered by Tenison in a very tender and gentle manner.

"The whole Convocation," he said, "is but one body. They meet together first in one place, before the Archbishop as President, sitting *pro tribunali*, as it is always expressed; and though afterwards the lower clergy have, by the appointment of the President, a particular place assigned to them to treat and debate in apart, yet whenever the President pleases they are obliged to return to the Upper House where they first assembled, and both Houses are always continued and prorogued by one instrument and Act." This is the true doctrine of the status of Convocation, and to this day is fully admitted.¹

But now the paper respecting Burnet's book was again brought forward and read, after which the Archbishop replied: "Your paper of complaint contains only generals, and therefore we must require you to bring up particulars of your charge." After an interval the Archbishop sent down a messenger to ask if their charge was ready, and received this short answer in writing: "This House returns their lordships their humble thanks for their message, and is preparing business, but are not yet ready with it."

It was not unnatural if the Bishops were somewhat irritated

¹ See *Church Quarterly*, April, 1882.

by this curt reply. Whether they were or not, they drew up the following declaration: "I. It is our opinion that the Lower House of Convocation has no manner of power judicially to censure any book. II. That the Lower House of Convocation ought not to have entered upon the examination of a book of any Bishop of this Church without first acquainting the President and Bishops. III. That the Lower House of Convocation censuring the book of the Bishop of Sarum in general terms without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded is defamatory and scandalous. IV. That the Bishop of Sarum by his excellent 'History of the Reformation,' approved of by both Houses of Parliament, and other writings, hath done great service to the Church of England, and justly deserves the thanks of this House. V. That though private persons may expound the Articles of the Church, yet it cannot be proper for the Convocation at this time to approve and much less to condemn such private expositions." To this they added that those members of the Lower House who had recognised the President's authority by absenting themselves after his prorogation had acted in a dutiful manner, and that the others, both by their disregard of it, and also by refusing the proposed committee, were guilty of disobedience and contempt. Soon afterwards the Convocation was dissolved together with the Parliament.

Then began a fast and furious war of pamphlets, in which by consent of all calm judges the Bishops' party came off best. Gibson, Kennett, Hody, were all strong and learned men. Atterbury wrote to his Bishop (Trelawny) complaining that he was not properly supported, and was deeply mortified that the new Convocation which met at the close of 1701 was by no means so amenable to his views as the preceding had been. "Our majority," he wrote, "is much sunk to what it was, and there are other discouragements both within and without." One of these "discouragements" was that Hooper refused the prolocutorship, and Atterbury carried his new nominee, Dean Woodward, of Sarum, against Beveridge, by only a majority of eight. Woodward was chosen because he was known to be hostile to his own Bishop, Burnet.

When the new House met there seemed some hope of peace. Beveridge had solemnly addressed the Prolocutor beforehand: "Mr. Prolocutor, I call upon you in the name of Jesus Christ not to open our first meeting in contempt and disobedience to the Archbishop and Bishops, and in giving offence and scandal to our enemies." This had its effect. The Prolocutor spoke, and the Archbishop replied, in terms of goodwill and conciliation. But the hope of peace was soon seen to be in vain. As soon as they got to their place of meeting, Atterbury

moved that the phrase about prorogation hitherto in use, in which the Prolocutor intimated that this Convocation was continued, should be changed, so as to declare that the Prolocutor, and he only, continued and prorogued the Lower House by his own right. On this an angry debate arose, and a compromise was come to, that the old form should be used, but that the House need not be adjourned until the day's business was ended. It was an abortive *via media*, but both sides for the moment were satisfied. Then the Prolocutor fell ill and asked for a deputy. Atterbury moved that Aldrich should fill the place, and was met by the contention that the Archbishop's consent must be obtained, and this would be admitted now. But at the moment a great tumult followed in Henry VII.'s Chapel. The news of it reached the Archbishop in the Jerusalem Chamber, who summoned the Lower House thither. "An incident of great moment has happened," he said, "we must take time to consider it; the Convocation is prorogued till Saturday, February 14." This was a sudden blow to Atterbury, but his spirit was too intrepid to yield tamely. As his brethren left the chamber he called them to come back to their own House, and even pushed some of them bodily before him. Forty-two went with him, ready to defy the prorogation and to act independently. But a terrible calamity fell upon them the very next day. The Prolocutor died. He had been selected, as we have seen, because he was opposed to his own Bishop, Burnet, and his death prostrated the High Church party. Without a head they were powerless. According to Atterbury's account of the sequel, Tenison was somewhat cynical about it. Instead of issuing his license to them to choose another Prolocutor, he prorogued them, and recommended them sarcastically to go back to their cures, and catechize their people in preparation for Easter. Forty-five of them, headed by Atterbury, went back to Henry VII.'s Chapel, and chose a temporary chairman, though they hesitated to choose a Prolocutor. Atterbury proposed to draw up a protest and publish it, but this again was thought to be raising a standard of revolt. In the midst of the conflicting recommendations, Gardiner, Bishop of Lincoln, the Archbishop's Commissary, came to prorogue them. The debates which arose out of this were in full progress when another event finished the controversy for the time being effectually. William III. died on March 8, 1702, and the Convocation was thereby according to law dissolved. The High Churchmen were filled with hope, for the new monarch, Queen Anne, was known to favour them. Atterbury declared his satisfaction to his clergy on his return to Totnes.

The struggle between High Church¹ and Low Church now assumed a different phase. But we must postpone this to the next chapter. There are other subjects yet to be taken up, and those very important and interesting ones, belonging to William III.'s reign; and they are out of the regions of strife and contention.

The Society for the Reformation of Manners, which came before us in our last chapter, was simply repressive; it aimed at putting down vice by legal procedure, and the members of it, recognising this fact, now determined to go deeper, and to reform practice by the teaching of positive truth. March 8, 1698-99, was a real epoch in the religious history of England, for on that day was founded the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The prime founder was Dr. Thomas Bray, one of the most zealous and able divines of his time. Bishop Compton had sent him across to Maryland to organize the English Church there, and the zeal which he displayed for extending the knowledge of the Gospel both abroad and at home never flagged. His whole biography is a beautiful record of unselfish zeal and Christian love. Having successfully accomplished his American mission, he returned to England, and whilst he was consumed with zeal for giving effect to the resolutions concerning our Colonies which experience had taught him, he also threw himself into this movement for teaching our people at home. He had made marvellous exertions in America for promoting public libraries—in fact, he seems to have stipulated that the English Bishops should help him in this work before he would consent to go to America. The first was founded at Annapolis, the capital of Maryland, so called after the Princess Anne, and she gave him “a noble benefaction” towards the valuable library there. He founded thirty-nine of these libraries in America, besides others in foreign parts. And it was this desire of promoting libraries which led him on to the foundation of the Christian Knowledge Society. He met with difficulties, red-tape and otherwise, of course; but he carried his point. The Society was formed, and the following is the preamble of it, drawn up by Bray: “Whereas the growth of vice and immorality is greatly owing to gross ignorance of the principles of the Christian religion, we whose names are underwritten do agree to meet together as often as we can conveniently to consult, under

¹ The words “High Church” came into use during this controversy. “These men,” says Burnet, “who began now to be called *the High Church* party, had all along expressed a coldness, if not an opposition, to the present settlement. They set up a complaint of the want of Convocations, that they were not allowed to sit nor act with a free liberty, or consider the grievances of the clergy, nor the danger the Church was in.”

the conduct of the Divine Providence and assistance, how we may be able by due and lawful methods to promote Christian knowledge."

There was afterwards a resolution to meet, at all events at first, weekly. And they state that their first objects shall be to propagate Christian knowledge "by encouraging charity schools and distributing good books." Twelve Bishops, or men who afterwards became so, signed the minutes of the first meeting, the most eminent of whom were the saintly Thomas Wilson (Sodor and Man, 1698-1755), Kennett, Patrick and Gibson. Robert Nelson's name also appears among the signatories. The minutes and correspondence of the Society from 1698 to 1704 have been edited by Mr. McClure, and make a volume of very interesting reading. Archbishop Tenison's name appears incidentally three times as approving and furthering its work, but he did not attend any of the meetings. The last mention of him is that Mr. Nelson reported that he had seen the Archbishop, who "did design to give the Society some particular encouragement."

This good work of Dr. Bray was followed by another not less important. He had been hampered in his American mission by legal difficulties. The Governor and Assembly of Maryland had determined to divide the province into parishes, and to appoint a legal maintenance for each minister. Part of Compton's commission to Bray had been to make all needful arrangements for this, but the Act of Establishment had failed because the preamble "wrongly stated that the laws of England were in force in Maryland." This and kindred difficulties caused a delay of eight years. But Bray had, as we have seen, not been idle. He had done a noble work towards educating the clergy who were to be appointed in the Colonies, and when he returned to England he found the library movement which he had set on foot so growing that before his death there were no less than eighty libraries in England, and he now saw his way to another development. He obtained from William III. a charter for the incorporation of the "Society for Propagation of the Gospel throughout our Plantations." This was granted in June, 1701. The Archbishop, as in the case of the "Reformation of Manners," had been urged to remedy this shocking neglect. Dean Prideaux had written him a very earnest letter, pointing out that the Roman Catholics had made a start in the good work, and that the Dutch had also done so in their settlements. When the East India Company had been incorporated, Robert Boyle had in vain endeavoured to get the spiritual provision made part of the charter; he had shown his earnestness for the same object by bequeathing, in 1691, £5,000 to promote it.

When the new Society was launched, the names of the two Archbishops (Tenison and Sharp) appear among the founders, as well as Bishops Wake, Potter, Compton, Patrick, Burnet, Beveridge, Hough, Gibson, Gastrell, Wilson; and Dean Prideaux, Evelyn and Robert Nelson. Burnet gives praise, not undeserved, to the King for the zeal which he displayed on behalf of the new Society. But it must be confessed that the Society bore one sign of its time greatly to be lamented. There was no provision for a Colonial Episcopate, though one of the cries of the Colonists was for supervision and union. For many a long year the American clergy had to come over to England to be ordained.

W. BENHAM.

(To be continued.)



ART. V.—NATIONAL REPENTANCE.

II. MATERIALISM.

THE Bishops of England, in the united call to prayer during the last year of the dying century, to which I drew your attention in the last paper, used the following language :

“The spirit of materialism which has invaded national and social life, the consequent relaxation of the sense of personal responsibility, the power and influence of sins which lower national character, such as intemperance, gambling and self-indulgence, and the thoughtless and indolent acquiescence in grave public evils—these things, which sadly contrast with the blessings and advantages given to us by God, loudly call us to prayer.”

It is to Materialism and its moral consequences that I would address myself in this number.

The Bishops do not mean that a great number of persons have consciously become Materialists. Materialism is so terrible a doctrine, and so few people think things out for themselves, that it is most improbable that many would take such an awful step as that. But there is generally some particular philosophy that prevails in the centres of thought of any particular country, such as the Universities and the scientific schools; and about thirty years ago, when the last generation was flourishing, there was a school of materialistic teaching in England which has greatly affected, and is still greatly affecting, the life of the country. That school has, thank God, given way to a wiser and better school, which does not think that an account of matter and its laws is a

sufficient answer to the puzzle of life. But a very considerable number of our scientific teachers and writers continue to speak as if matter was everything; and this certainly has the effect of seeming to put God away out of the minds of their readers and hearers. So the idea of the present, the material, the visible, the tangible, the sensuous, has taken possession of the minds and hearts of a great many men and women of all ranks and classes, to the exclusion of the future, the spiritual, the invisible, the ideal; and the change in the conduct of people who put aside all thoughts of things higher than the things of earth is very great indeed.

There is another consequence of the materialistic philosophy of thirty years ago, which has the same results. Many people have found that Materialism was too strong in one direction, just as they thought belief in God was too strong in the other, and therefore they have said: "We really cannot be certain about any of these things at all; so we will put both Materialism and belief in God aside, and we will call ourselves Know-nothings and Agnostics. We will investigate every kind of science, but beyond scientific investigation we will make no inquiry whatever." Now, these people have not understood that directly you come to the border of scientific investigation you come to the province of faith. Even science itself requires a great deal of faith behind it, because you can never say why things are, but only that so they come about; and you can never be absolutely certain that things are going to happen as they have always done, but only that there is a strong probability that they will happen. But, at any rate, when you get to the end of the province of science there is the domain of faith. You do not know how life began, or what it is; you do not know whether matter is eternal, or whether space is infinite. Directly you leave the things that you can touch and see you are surrounded with mysteries. And then a strong, manly faith takes you by the hand, and tells you that it is not reasonable for human beings to go through this momentous epoch of their earthly life without forming any suppositions or conclusions which will supply the most satisfactory account available for the riddles of existence, the most trustworthy guide that can be found for their principles and conduct, especially when there is so much real, solid, true ground on which to rest those conclusions. Faith is not demonstration, but faith is just as much a duty of the human intellect as knowledge, and it must always rest on reasonable foundations. Life without some kind of faith is impossible, but life with a poor, shrunken, distorted, misguided, impoverished, unspiritual faith is shipwreck.

I will not trouble you with a very long account of Materialism.

It is the attempt to account for every development of the Creation as we see it, even the mind of man, without God. Even thought itself, even the consciousness of thought, is supposed to be merely the movement of material atoms in the brain. It is an old and clumsy theory, and really accounts for nothing. The first Materialist was an ancient and distinguished Greek philosopher, Democritus, who lived about 460 years before Christ, and was shocked by the polytheism of his countrymen. This theory, therefore, has been before the world for upwards of 2,300 years, and its absurdities have been over and over again pointed out. "Materialism," says the Italian reformer Mazzini, "the philosophy of all expiring epochs and peoples in decay, is, historically speaking, an old phenomenon, inseparable from the death of a religious dogma. It is the reaction of those superficial intellects which, incapable of taking a comprehensive view of the life of humanity, and tracing and deducing its essential characteristics from tradition, deny the religious ideal itself." It is, briefly, that matter existed originally in countless minute particles or atoms all over space; that these touched each other; that thus there grew a wider and wider movement among the whole mass: and that consequently all the complexities of the universe began to grow. The Materialists taught that there was no Mind to guide them, but that all these movements came by Necessity. What Necessity was they cannot say. They really explain nothing at all. Why the atoms moved they cannot say. Where they came from they cannot say. Whether they began to fall down, or fall up, or fall to the side, or whirl round, they cannot say. All they want us to believe is that somehow or other they were there: somehow or other, without a Power to direct them, they fell together and combined, and formed suns and constellations all over the Universe, with all their marvels and glories, both of beauty, grandeur, and variety in nature, and splendour and power in the mind of man—in fact, formed Moses, Socrates, Homer, Shakespeare, Dante, Milton, Bacon, and even Jesus Christ Himself. "The doctrine of the Materialists," said Sir Humphry Davy, the greatest of chemists, "was always, even in my youth, a cold, heavy, dull, and insupportable doctrine to me, and necessarily tending to Atheism."

Such a theory needs only to be stated in order to see that it bristles with difficulties for which it offers no apology.

For instance, some constellations are much older than others. If all the atoms were there, equally governed by necessity, why did some begin earlier than others? Why did they not all begin before, and before, and before, an infinity of before? Some are not yet begun. You can see the

unfinished constellations any clear night in the nebulæ, or masses of stellar vapour which are studded about amongst the completed stars. Why are these not yet begun? Or what gave the atoms their original right to be, or to fall, or to whirl, or to join, or to produce such marvellous results as Light and Heat?

Another difficulty: How can you think of matter at all without some mind to realize it? Unless you think of mind, witnessing, observing, noticing matter, how are you to know that it is there at all? Or how is matter, evidently unconscious itself, to evolve mind?

There is another difficulty: How can you get life out of matter? Men of science have tried every combination of atoms, under every variety of conditions, and they have manufactured compound substances, but obtained no sign of spontaneous life. The great naturalist Cuvier said that it was quite inconsistent to suppose that life could be produced by atoms, however perfectly arranged according to their relationships. The influence or action which life exercises on the elements composing any organism is exactly contrary to what would happen to them if there were no life. How, then, could life be produced by them? It is something mysterious, higher, of altogether a different kind, breathed into matter by some higher Power. In a word, matter is itself lifeless: life is spirit. "Materialism," said a thoughtful American writer, "teaches in defiance of all reason that Matter is capable of producing Mind. But let us for a moment inquire how. Matter has one set of properties, mind another; they are so entirely different as to have nothing in common between them. To mind we cannot ascribe the properties of solidity, extension, figure, colour. Of matter we cannot predicate understanding, will, affections. How, then, is Matter to produce Mind?"

Once more—and this difficulty is most serious: Materialism of course does away with the immortality of the soul, as well as denying the existence of God. But if there is no God, and if your soul utterly perishes at death, where do you get any sanction for morality? How should we secure any respect for each other's rights and feelings, such as would insure at any rate some amount of happiness? There are, alas! certain sections of society, people that are reckless and unprincipled among the rich, who have no fear of God before their eyes, and others down in the very lowest depths of the social scale who are steeped in vice and every kind of moral squalor. In neither of these sections is there anything that deserves to be called happiness. The one set find their only relief in the excitement of gambling and sin; the other set drown their

misery in the gin-shop. They are an example of the kind of change that would take place if the great truths of the Being of God and the immortality of the soul were hidden from the thoughts of the whole race of men alike. At present the vast majority of mankind believe them in some sort of way and in varying degrees, and the standard of moral conduct is raised in accordance with such deep and far-reaching truths: once take them away and there would be no difference between right and wrong, except merely what was held to be useful, nothing to protect the honour of your wives and daughters, no check on universal selfishness. The whole tone of the moral standard would be altered, and a race of men without hope would lead lives of mere self-pleasing, shadowed throughout by the unhappiness that is inseparable from sensuality and worldliness. St. Paul has summed it all up: "What advantageth me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!"

When the mind of man goes back towards the beginning of things, towards the thought of Creation, it is met by the idea of an Almighty, self-existent Being, the boundary, if we may say so, of human thought and knowledge, without which human thought and knowledge would seem to be impossible. Here we lean on scientific faith in no greater degree than we do when we speak of atoms, of space, and of other scientific ideas, which are necessary, but which we cannot prove. It is only possible for us to form an analogy about God and creation from what we know of our own active and productive powers. We can mould and dispose of matter, and that is what the Self-existent Being did originally in an infinite way, and on a universal scale. God's Divine activity distinguished the ideas He thought of producing from other ideas; then He realized these ideas in Creation. The world is in space, and space is in God. God is the absolute Cause of everything, God is absolute goodness, absolute love, absolute power, absolute wisdom: from Him everything derives its existence, its maintenance, and its purpose. Goodness exists: we know it: from whence did it come? It could only come from absolute eternal goodness, the true goodness, the glorious ideal of perfect goodness; and that is God Himself. So with every other quality and attribute of existence. Creation is not aimless, not merely a wonderful, sublime display of power and force; it is working out its way to perfection as His thought designed. Lower forms of existence lead to higher ones, from mineral to vegetable, from vegetable to animal, from animal to intellectual, from intellectual to spiritual. The community of man's life with God, so far as this can be attained, is the end of all creation. And so the

whole glorious plan and working of the great Self-existent Being is dimly seen in outline; and it is realized that what we can see and understand of it is entirely in harmony with reason where materialism is impossible and absurd. Belief in God and the soul gives an account of the facts which explains them, and which we can receive.

And so the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton concludes his scientific creed: "This admirably beautiful structure of sun, planets, and comets, could not have originated except in the wisdom and sovereignty of an intelligent and powerful Being. He rules all things, not as the soul of the world, but as the Lord of all. He is eternal and infinite, omnipotent and omniscient—that is, His duration is from eternity to eternity, and His presence from infinity to infinity. He governs all things, and has knowledge of all things that are done or can be done. He is not eternity and infinity, but eternal and infinite. He is not duration and space, but He is ever, and is present everywhere. We know Him only by means of His properties and attributes, and by means of the supremely wise and infinite constructions of the world and their final causes; we admire Him for His perfection; we worship and venerate Him for His sovereignty. For we worship Him as His servants; and a God without sovereignty, providence, and final causes, is nothing else than fate and nature. From a blind metaphysical necessity which, of course, is the same always and everywhere, no variety could originate. The whole diversity of created things in regard to places and times could have its origin only in the ideas and the will of a necessarily existing Being."

I have given you a very brief and imperfect sketch of Materialism; but with the wise and, I think, decisive pronouncement of Sir Isaac Newton—one of the very greatest, most independent and least biassed names in the history of Science—we will leave off, because my real purpose in these remarks is not to offer you a philosophical disquisition, but to put before you what the Bishops speak of as the invasion of national and social life by the spirit of Materialism—that is to say, in its moral and religious consequences.

Now, as I said before, a great many easy-going people, inclined to worldliness and to sensualism, are glad enough to borrow the general principles of Materialism, without understanding the absurdity of the premises on which it rests, or the disastrous nature of the results of those premises. They have a sort of vague, hazy, borrowed notion, which suits with their own natural predilections, that an effective belief in God and the soul and revealed religion is obsolete, and set aside by those whom they style thinking, practical, reasonable

men. They pass the conception of God into the region of the unknowable. They treat the idea of the soul as a quantity that may be neglected. If the notion of immortality presents itself to them at all, they think it will be all right with such respectable persons as themselves, or they decline to think about it at all. As to any theory of responsibility, they are entirely the creatures of convention, and are satisfied to do as other people do about them, so long as they do not transgress the artificial social code by which their set is bound.

The result of this unthinking complaisance, so largely prevalent in the world of to-day, is this: The great mass of men and women who are not religious treat material prosperity as the great thing to be aimed at. The ordinary man on the Stock Exchange, the ordinary promoter of companies, the ordinary man of commerce and business, regards the making of a fortune as the chief object in life. I need hardly remind you that this is a most enervating and degrading pursuit. It is well symbolized in the "Pilgrim's Progress" as the occupation of the Man with the Muckrake. It tends to obscure, and finally to exclude, all the ideas that make life noble and truly enjoyable: unselfishness, self-restraint, generosity, kindness, sympathy, idealism, thirst for progress and improvement, and the tender, heartfelt, practical care for all forms of sorrow and suffering. The passion for amassing treasure on the part of those who are working, and the determination to spend treasure on amusement on the part of those who have received fortunes from those who have gone before them, are two of the most marked features of the age.

And the tendency has been helped by the marvels of discovery. Brilliant as they have been, they have tended more to the increase of material prosperity than to the elevation of the mind. Steam travelling by sea and land, the miracles of machinery, the triumphs of electricity, the charms of photography, all the manifold and almost infinite appliances of science to labour, have worked in an absolutely incredible degree to the increase of material comfort, of systematic luxury, to an exaggerated estimate of the value of riches and to the habitual pursuit of pleasure. Now, these are just the very influences which, if not watched and corrected and dominated, tend to create clouds of self-satisfaction and physical exuberance which combine to exclude God, and the higher and noble life, and self-denial, and sympathy, and the spirit of love, and chivalry, and purity, and idealism, and duty, and all that has made our country great.

I would urge all who know what the true life means, that they should not allow it to be obscured by the reflex and unsuspected influence of Materialism. The true life means

trust in the great Creator and Ruler of all things, in whom we live and move and have our being. It means recognition of the truth of the immortality of the soul, and its supreme value as responsible after its earthly time of probation before the judgment-seat of the Most High God. It means the cultivation of high and pure thought on the mysteries of existence, the marvels of the Creation, the possibilities of man. It means an earnest and determined refusal to submit to the general, unthinking tendencies of the world, which end where all unthinking movements must end, in shipwreck and disaster. It means the cultivation of benevolence instead of selfishness; of self-restraint instead of irregular impulse; of self-government instead of yielding to every tide of human passion; of universal love instead of a cold, unsympathetic, exclusive regard for self-interest; of self-sacrifice instead of that unlovely ambition which at every step makes new enemies; of Divine law instead of human conveniences; of hope for the future instead of the dull dismal horizon of finality and extinction which is all he is able to look for who limits his views and principles to Materialism; no reunion with lost friends, no completion of imperfect aspirations, no realization of ideals dreamed of here below, no gathering up of tangled threads, no rationalization of mixed and disappointed earthly existence, no reward for virtue and endurance, no punishment for vice and mischief and ruin.

Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. I believe that for none of my readers has the dreary and hopeless creed of the Materialist any attraction whatever. I am sure that with all their hearts and souls they believe in God, Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, the only Wise, whom no man hath seen or can see, whom no man hath heard or can hear. Such a belief is the only reasonable account of our own existence, and it is supported by universal and most convincing testimony. Then, I ask them not to submit to the influence of the Materialists—to think little of wealth and luxury and comfort and pleasure, and much of duty, responsibility, faith, pure life, high thought, charitable sympathy and benevolence. Here they will find exercise for their noblest faculties. Here they will be co-operating with the Almighty Ruler of all things, and they will be conscious of His approval. Here they will be providing for their own happiness, both in this life and the next, for happiness is the inseparable reward of virtue, both for the life that now is and for the unending hereafter.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.



HYMN FOR THE QUEEN VICTORIA CLERGY FUND.

O LORD our Saviour, high in heaven ascended,
 Thou, our Good Shepherd, going on before;
 For all Thy servants who Thy flock have tended
 We praise Thy holy Name for evermore—

Warders who flee not though the wolves surround them,
 Sentries who keep their watch by night and day,
 Herdmen who seek the lost till they have found them,
 Guides who on bleeding feet search out the way.

Fainting, they speed to succour those who languish;
 Anxious, they turn to calm their people's dread;
 Mourning, they rise to soothe another's anguish;
 Fasting, to others give their children's bread.

Shall he who fights, at his own charge defend us?
 Shall he who keeps the flock not thereby live?
 Teach us to spare of that which Thou dost send us,
 That we of ours, as they of theirs, may give.

Grant them, that free from care, they may deliver
 Unto Thy Church the message Thou dost send;
 Grant us to give, through them, to Thee, the Giver,
 To Whom be praise and glory without end!

AMEN.

H. M. S.

 NOTE.

PROFESSOR CHEYNE, in his note to the *CHURCHMAN* of this month of May regarding my article in the January number of the *CHURCHMAN*, omits to say a single word about any one of my criticisms and corrections of either his treatment of Isaiah's text or his rendering of Isaiah's meaning in the *Polychrome*. He only states that I assume "that the work under review stands alone," etc. But, in the first place, I have alluded to his maintaining that his "variations . . . are the result of the ripest Biblical scholarship of the present generation." This ought to show that I was not guilty of the above assumption. In the next place, if I wanted to look up the origin of mistakes in the *Polychrome*, I should have in some cases to go as far back as the *LXX*; for such are the mistakes of chap. i. 29; ii. 9, 10, which I have noticed. More can be pointed out which I have not noticed in my article. Is it fair, then, to expect a reviewer to make such researches, or even to review only two books at the same time, though they may be so closely connected as are the professor's "Introduction" to Isaiah and his "*Polychrome Isaiah*"? On the other hand, it may seem hard to blame the authors of the *Polychrome*

for mistakes which have existed uncorrected since LXX time. But they provoke it themselves by their novel Procrustean method of treating Holy Scripture. In former times it has been the practice continually to mend the errors of the LXX translation. The Vulgate, Pagninus, and all following translators and commentators have kept improving one upon another. That there is room for further improvements I have shown in the article referred to. But it is the pride of the newest school to inaugurate rather a different system—a system of overthrow and rejection of the original.

As for the critical edition of the Hebrew text which I seem to have been guilty enough not to consult, I am far from convinced that the text of Isaiah existed at the time when I wrote my article. Even so late as the fourth of this month there was no copy of it in the British Museum Library. Moreover, if it had existed, it would have made no difference, for it is only the Hebrew text manipulated in the same manner as the English without an authority from any ancient MSS. or version. I consider, therefore, that a review of the English Polychrome applies with equal force to the Hebrew Polychrome, and contains more than can be applied to the latter.

E. FLECKER.

Fishlake Vicarage, Doncaster.



Reviews.



Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.,
Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ
Church. Pp. vii., 268. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1898.
Price 6s.

EVERY movement to recover for the English clergy their ancient attribute of learning, which they are at present, it would seem, in a fair way to lose, deserves the gratitude of those who love the Church of Christ in their land; and of recent efforts in this direction none is more practical and promising than the lectures annually delivered in the long vacation at one or other of the great Universities. It is a cause of real regret that they are not more widely appreciated and better attended, especially by the juniors. What their loss is who could but will not use the opportunity, is plain from such a volume as this, Dr. Bright's last gleanings in a field where he has so long and so successfully laboured. His first work on Church History bears date 1860. But while the book before us makes sensible the loss, at the same time it goes far to make it good, and we wish that other of the lecturers, among whom are the best teachers of the day, would follow this example and obligate a larger audience with the printed page than it is possible for spoken words to reach.

The name of the book and of its writer are in themselves sufficient warrant of its interest and value, and where Dr. Bright keeps closely to the title the result is delightful.

The picture of the workaday life of the early Church, with its interests

and dangers, its difficulties and happiness, is drawn with the ease and skill that proclaim the master hand. We know of no better account of the Apologists than that which is given in Lecture V. Their points of difference are stated with a clearness that forbids all possibility of confusion, while proper prominence is given to the factor common to the best of them, that by which their work will live until the last and universal triumph of the faith they championed. It is difficult to doubt that Justin and Origen and the writer of the Epistle to Diognetus soon came to see that, while the appeal to prophecy and type and the analogy of Nature have their value, the best defence of Christianity is the Person of its founder and "the moral effects produced by His Gospel—that is, by His living presence and energy in the hearts and lives of men." This ennobling power of the "thought of Christ" is, of course, fully realized by Dr. Bright, and he recurs to it again and again; it evokes a true note of eloquence in one passage especially, which is too long to reproduce in its entirety, and too beautiful to present in fragments. See Address III., pp. 147-152.

The first address is not so much an aspect of Church life as a vigorous, though not a polemical, exposition of what may be called the conservative view of the origin of the episcopate. Dr. Hort's "Ecclesia" supplies the occasion. It is, we suppose, inevitable that this posthumous publication should awaken the mistrust of the important school of thought of which Dr. Bright is the honoured representative, but we cannot but feel that such suspicion is ungrounded, and springs from an imperfect acquaintance with the real mind of the great Cambridge theologian. His attitude toward Church order may best be gathered from the words in which one of Dr. Hort's most distinguished disciples, Canon J. A. Robinson, defended his master's memory against a criticism of just the points which Dr. Bright discusses. "What Dr. Hort . . . taught us, or, in so far as it was not new . . . specially emphasized for us . . . that Church order is from the beginning a sacred growth, directed by the constant presence within of the Holy Spirit, so as to meet the needs of a living and multiplying society; that it is not a scheme delivered by the Lord to the Apostles, and by the Apostles to the Church; that the Body of the Christ is an organism rather than an organization; that here, as elsewhere, life has its inherent law of orderly evolution; and that the most fruitful lesson of modern Biblical criticism is this: that in the consideration of all these topics we connect more closely than ever before our belief in the Holy Ghost and our belief in the Holy Catholic Church" (*Guardian*, March 9, 1898).

The motive of the mistrust which we deprecate is no doubt the fear lest a sword should be furnished to the Church's enemies by her own children. It may be that Dissenters find what they think are wide concessions in the "Ecclesia," just as they did in Lightfoot's famous "Essay on the Christian Ministry"; but the weapon has a double edge. That men like Hort and Lightfoot, who are glad to face the truth at any cost

and blink no facts, should, while conceding all that their learning and their scholarship marks as uncertain or untenable, yet hold with passionate conviction the theory of a divinely appointed order is surely strong proof of the soundness of our triple cord.

Dr. Bright, it is hardly necessary to say, is no mere ecclesiastical antiquary; he writes with an eye to present questions, and in his second address touches the vital problem of our time, viz., the share of laymen in the government and organization of the Church. His opinion is that there is no basis in catholic custom for allowing them an active membership of synods. "Influence without membership" is the phrase with which he summarizes the primitive relation of the laity towards these assemblies which "properly consisted of Bishops alone." There is surely room for question here. The statement holds of Cyprian, but can it be thus confidently asserted of all cases? On the whole subject see a valuable pamphlet by Rev. H. C. Powell, "The Church Crisis," Longmans, 1899, price 1s.

It will be seen that we do not unconditionally assent to all the contentions of the volume; but this will not, we hope, have a deterrent effect upon any subscriber to the *CHURCHMAN*. To read a book with which we are in complete agreement is often but a kind of self-indulgence and a waste of time, and the hours spent with Dr. Bright are never that. We may look at "some aspects" of history with other eyes than his, but that does not lessen our affection for the writer nor our sense of the great debt under which he has laid us all by his voice and pen for more than a generation.

The Ritschlian Theology: Critical and Reconstructive. An Exposition and an Estimate. By Rev. A. E. GARVIE. T. and T. Clark. 1900. Price 9s.

This admirable and timely work owes its inception to a proposal of Dr. Fairbairn that Mr. Garvie should deliver a course of lectures at Mansfield College, Oxford. The lectures were duly given during Dr. Fairbairn's temporary absence (in India), and are now published in order to appeal to a wider circle of students. The writer has not, he tells us, designed his book for theological scholars who are familiar with German; nor does he regard his book as an exhaustive and systematic account of the Ritschlian theology; he intends the work as a substantial help to those students who, realizing the far-extended influence of Ritschl and his school, are anxious seriously to understand the position of the Ritschlians, and to draw their own conclusions after careful study of their writings. Accordingly Mr. Garvie has, so far as was possible, allowed Ritschl and his followers to speak for themselves. His book is, above all things, an *exposition*. He says truly (Preface, p. viii) that, inasmuch as the Ritschlian theology seeks, honestly, if imperfectly, to win men beset by doubt for Christian faith, it deserves to be kindly as well as justly and truly treated. Taken in conjunction with Professor Orr's masterly little work, "The Ritschlian Theology" (Hodder and Stoughton, 1898),

Mr. Garvie's more elaborate treatise ought to put the student into thorough touch with the dominant ideas cherished by the Ritschlian school of thought. Briefly—to compare Evangelical theology with this new product of German idealism—we may say that, while Evangelical theology constantly endeavours to keep in actual touch with the fact of a living Christ, the Ritschlian theology, despite its honesty of aim, constantly tends to sink back into the sphere of *representative*, not actual, truth. At the same time, the tenets of the new school have influenced German thought so widely, and that influence has been, in some directions, so good, that we gladly welcome any clear exposition that will enable us to understand the position of Ritschlians. Such an exposition we find in Mr. Garvie's valuable work. E. H. B.

Short Notices.

Confirmation and Communion; or, The Royal Priesthood and its Offering.
By G. H. WHITAKER, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Truro. S.P.C.K. Pp. 118.

THESE eighteen brief instructions comprise six addresses entitled "The Royal Priesthood," and twelve under the title of "The Offering of the Royal Priesthood." The first series would serve as an excellent devotional accompaniment to the work usually gone through in preparation for Confirmation, and the second presents us with a quite admirable exposition, practical and spiritual, of the Communion Office. We hardly know a small book more likely to be of service during the weeks immediately before and after Confirmation. Canon Whitaker does not give one the impression of any particular "school" of Churchmanship. Certainly these positive and winsome addresses display no token of partisanship.

The Sixfold Trial of our Lord, and The Prayers of Christ. By the late Rev. G. E. BROADE, M.A. Elliot Stock. Small crown 8vo., cloth. Pp. 76. Price 2s. 6d.

These two courses of Lent lectures, though they have a good literary quality and a certain calm earnestness and an instructive manner in common, are in some respects in striking contrast. Some of the "Trial" series—most of them—refrain from exhortation, and merely paint with fresh fidelity a picture which is to be mused upon. But the addresses on "The Prayers of Christ" add application and appeal to the portrayal and analysis of situations. Both courses give one an impression of reverent control of emotion.

Official Attacks on Christianity; or, The Anti-Christian Crusade. Vol. III.
By ROBERT P. CORFE. Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co.
Pp. 143. Price 1s. 6d.

This is a vigorous indictment of the "New Theology" and its "rediscovered Christ," and of the higher-critical improved version of the Psalms. In this protestation against the Extreme Left party in the English Church there is much with which the average Churchman will agree. The views and expressions—particularly the expressions—of certain writers connected with a recently-formed organization of Churchmen show a temper with which it is vain to discuss a sacred topic. Most of us would prefer not to discuss the nature of Holy Communion, for example, with a man whose criticism of the phrase "feeding on Christ by faith" is that "it amounts to a mixed metaphor and appropriate nonsense," and who assures us that "neither flesh nor blood, neither bread nor wine, have any spiritual use whatever." We also dislike, with Mr. Corfe, a version of the Psalms which substitutes "the young ravens that croak" for the "young ravens that call upon Him"; "Benjamin the diminutive" for "little Benjamin"; and "God fell in a passion of anger" for "He was wroth." One criticism of this "Polychrome Psalter" is that it appears to be the work of a man to whom grammar is the Divine science. But the views of Archdeacon Wilson and others, who are as severely criticised by Mr. Corfe as (shall we say?) Wellhausen and Mr. C. Beeby are, must at least be credited with freedom from flippancy or a disposition to treat the Bible chiefly as syntax. And the use of cathedrals for occasional lectures on Church History, Church Music, Temperance, and Sunday Observance, though a practice that needs to be carefully watched, hardly seems part of the "Official Attack on Christianity."

Church Questions. Sermons preached in St. John's Church, Paddington, by GILBERT KARNEY, Vicar. Elliot Stock. Crown 8vo., cloth. Pp. 121. Price 3s. 6d.

Mr. Karney has done well to publish these temperate and instructive discourses dealing with such serious and debated "questions" as "The Real Presence," "Eucharistic Sacrifice," "Auricular Confession," "Prayers for the Dead," "The Nature of a Sacrament," and "The Hour of Administration." These topics are handled with reference to the individual, the Church, and history, and handled with much sagacity. There are some particularly useful quotations from the less-read documents of the Reformation period.

The Faith in Outline. By the Rev. C. R. BALL, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Peterborough, Hon. Canon and Rural Dean. S.P.C.K. Pp. 115.

These "Catechetical Notes on Christian Faith and Practice" are, as the alternative title of the book tells us, "based upon God's Eternal Purpose and Calling." Lessons I. to VII. converge upon a treatment of the Incarnation as the fulfilment of God's Eternal Purpose, and of the Atonement by which that purpose is "partially fulfilled." Lessons VIII. to XXXIV. expound the position of the baptized, the Christian sense of the Ten Commandments, and Prayer. The two next "outlines" treat of Fasting and Almsgiving, and the remainder of the course comprises nine "outlines" upon the Sacraments or "channels of life," and seven dealing with the proper uses of the Bible, Prayer-Book, Church and Parish in "the Christian Life." The book will be found useful by teachers who can add the necessary illustrations and explanatory fillings to the outlines.

Conditions of Salvation—as set forth by our Lord. By G. R. WYNNE, D.D., Archdeacon of Aghadoe. S.P.C.K. Pp. 55.

These addresses treat plainly and with befitting seriousness of the conditions of spiritual life and health. The terms of this "Quicumque vult salvus esse" are taken from our Lord's words in St. Luke xiv. 27; St. John iii. 5, vi. 44, vi. 53; St. Matt. xviii. 3, v. 20. The spiritually healthy man is accordingly regarded as bearing his cross and responding to the Father's "loving" influence, as "born of water and of the Spirit," as endowed with the child-like spirit, as having a righteousness that "exceeds the righteousness of scribes and Pharisees," and as "eating the flesh of the Son of Man," etc. The "Conditions of Salvation," therefore, of which the Archdeacon writes are rather a study in the contents, practices, and aims of "the state of salvation" than a statement of the lowest terms on which a soul may escape rejection. The address will doubtless be read with profit by many.

Outline Lessons on the Parables and Miracles. By the Rev. H. D. S. SWEETAPPLE, M.A. Church of England Sunday-School Institute. Pp. 239.

In this course of lessons, parables and miracles are taken alternately, the miracles being arranged, so far as may be, in chronological order, whilst the parables are arranged to suit the subjects of the miracles. This plan of correspondence is in most cases successfully carried out, and in no case have we noticed any palpably forced harmony. The illustrations are well chosen, and the diagrams and summaries of the lessons (whether a blackboard or a card be used) are a good and simple device for marking the outline of the teaching on a child's mind. The earnest tone of the book should make it otherwise helpful to teachers.

An Architectural Account of the Churches of Shropshire. Part IV. (The Hundred of Stottesden). By Rev. D. H. S. CRANAGE, M.A., F.S.A. Hobson and Co., Wellington, Salop.

We are glad indeed to welcome a fresh part of Mr. Cranage's monumental work on the churches of Shropshire. The work, like all really important works, progresses very slowly; but a substantial portion of the entire book is now finished, and with the conclusion of Part V. over half the work will have been accomplished.

Part IV., like the preceding parts, is fully illustrated; thirteen full-page plates (from photographs by Mr. M. J. Harding), twelve minor illustrations, and six ground-plans (drawn by Mr. W. A. Webb, A.R.I.B.A.), are included in it. They are finely done, and reflect immense credit on the artists responsible for their production.

We have spoken of Mr. Cranage's splendid quartos as "monumental." This is literally true. So carefully, so thoroughly, so learnedly has Mr. Cranage carried out his work that it may now be regarded as done once for all. It is for books like these, produced slowly, but with laborious skill and patience, that after-generations will have reason to be thankful.

Characteristics of the Four Gospels. By Dean LUCKOCK. Longmans. 1900. Price 6s.

This book is a most interesting and readable piece of work. The author has the gift of making his meaning clear—a virtue, indeed, that is not so common as it might be. The Dean of Lichfield is not a man to startle us with novel opinions; he clings to the traditional view wherever he can; yet he contrives to make out an exceedingly good case for some of the old interpretations. One point he has, we think, settled pretty

decisively, that the "woman that was a sinner" is *not* to be identified with Mary Magdalene. And we think the Dean is quite justified in terming as "inappropriate" the attempt (on the part of artists, from time immemorial) to assign the emblem of the man to Matthew, and the lion to Mark.

We do not at all follow the Dean in his twenty-second chapter (on the sacrificial character of the Eucharist), nor do we think his interpretation of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* (in St. Luke) can be sustained.

The Fundamental Ideas of Christianity. By the late JOHN CAIRD, D.D., LL.D. In two volumes. Glasgow: Maclehose and Sons.

These two volumes have a notable interest for all thoughtful students of the philosophy of religion. First there is the interest derived from the fact that these volumes are by Principal Caird—this alone would secure for them an audience fit, though few; then, secondly, they are in the nature of the late Principal's final words to us on the majestic verities he spent his life in endeavouring to illustrate and expound; lastly, they contain a memoir by his brother, the present Master of Balliol, Edward Caird, a man whom it would be impertinent to praise, and who has probably (next to Dr. J. H. Stirling) done more to vindicate the position of philosophy and theology in Britain than any man living.

We do not propose to criticise these volumes. They contain the Gifford Lectures (or, rather, some portion of those lectures) which Dr. Caird was called upon to deliver shortly before his death. What these lectures would have been, had Dr. Caird lived to complete them, can only be conjectured. They lack, obviously, something of the fine finish of form that we are accustomed to look for in everything Dr. Caird wrote. Yet we may rest confident that, in preparing these lectures for the press, everything that *fraterna pietas* could do has been duly done. Suffice it to say that (even after making the deductions that one is bound to make in the case of a posthumous work), for beauty of style, depth and tenderness of thought, and clearness of spiritual vision, these volumes must rank among the masterpieces of modern scientific theology.

E. H. B.

The Month.

THE 19th of May will, no doubt, rank henceforward among red-letter days in the calendar of Imperialism. The announcement that Mafeking, after a siege of protracted duration, and against besetting (and, indeed, overwhelming) odds, had been relieved, was indeed good news. The relief of the brave little garrison meant also the relief of nearly the entire English-speaking race.

"It never rains but it pours," says an old proverb. Certainly ever since Lord Roberts renewed operations in the Free State, after his enforced halt at Bloemfontein, there has scarcely been a morning without an account of "something attempted, something done"—thanks to the valour and skill of British troops—towards accomplishing the object in view, namely, the clear assertion of the paramountcy of England in South Africa, now and for all time. From every part comes news of small but substantial gains.

MAY MEETINGS.

The May meetings have come and gone. Take it all in all, they were very successful—and this despite of the (apparently) all-absorbing interest of the Transvaal War. We note the following points :

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—The substance of the President's speech in Exeter Hall (May 1) was a call for an increase in the Society's income of £50,000.

The annual sermon this year, at St. Bride's, Fleet Street, was by Bishop Johnson, the first native Christian who has had the honour of preaching the annual sermon for the Society. The attendance was not only large, but representative.

The statistics of the Missions for the year 1899-1900 are as follows : Stations, 520. European missionaries : Ordained, 418 ; lay, 140 ; wives, 341 ; ladies, 336—total, 1,235. Native clergy, 358. Native lay teachers, 6,459. Native Christian adherents (including catechumens), 268,240. Native communicants, 71,051. Baptisms during the year, 19,161. Schools, 2,144. Scholars, 104,388. Medical work : Beds, 1,484 ; in-patients, 11,457 ; visits of out-patients, 630,356. The figures are approximate, as no returns have been received from some of the Missions.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.—The annual meeting was held under the presidency of Sir J. W. Pease, M.P. (Vice-President), who rightly called attention to the singular catholicity of this great Society. The annual report shows that the issues of the Society for the past year had been as follows : Bibles, 843,990 ; Testaments, 1,265,990 ; portions, 2,937,812—total, 5,047,792. This result had surpassed last year's by no fewer than 568,353 copies. The Society had supported in round figures an average number of 770 colporteurs at work for the whole twelve months—an increase of 45 on the number for 1898—and they sold above 1,650,000 copies of Holy Scripture. Among British troops embarking for South Africa 126,000 Gospels and Testaments have been distributed. The payments for the year have been : For translating, revising, printing and binding Scriptures, £113,076 15s. 11d. ; for grants, home and foreign agencies, colportage, depots, and all other charges, £122,133 17s. 8d.—total payments, £235,210 13s. 7d. The receipts for the year have been as follows : New income, £126,853 10s. 5d. ; receipts from sales, £84,614 17s. 11d.—total receipts, £211,468 8s. 4d. This shows a *deficit* on the year's working of £23,742 5s. 3d.

C.P.A.—The Church Pastoral Aid Society held its 65th anniversary on May 2, under the presidency of Mr. J. H. Buxton. The report shows that the Society at present remains responsible for 925 grants, involving a direct expenditure of £56,450. This is the largest number of grants ever voted in the Society's history. Despite the war, the committee were able to report a total income of £64,633, or £4,449 in advance of last year. "We aspire," said the report, "to be, in an increasing measure, a handmaid of Evangelical truth in our National Church. The fact that nearly six million souls, one-fifth of the population of the country, are to be found in the parishes helped by the Society brings home to all the conviction that a grand field is open for increased exertions." The annual sermon for the C.P.A. was preached by the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

S.P.G.—The anniversary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was celebrated with the usual service at St. Paul's Cathedral, and meeting at St. James's Hall. The preacher this year was the Bishop of St. Albans. The Report presented at the annual meeting stated that the

gross income was £136,846, an increase of £4,490. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who presided, said that the report seemed to him to be an encouragement for the future. The whole Church was awakening to the great task—they were beginning to put to their consciences the words with which Christ sent forth His Apostles just before He left the earth—the great task for which the Church existed.

The meeting in the Church Room, St. Paul's, Onslow Square, of the Barbican Mission to the Jews was in every way encouraging. The President, Prebendary Webb-Peploe, was in the chair, and was supported by Bishop Barry, Dr. R. N. Cust, and others.

The Rev. Dr. Chavasse, late Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, was consecrated, on May 3, in York Cathedral, Bishop of Liverpool, in succession to Dr. Ryle, the first Bishop of the new see. An early celebration of the Communion preceded the Consecration Service. Soon after ten o'clock the cathedral began to fill. A special train from Liverpool brought a large number of clergymen and laymen to witness the ceremony. The consecration took place in the nave of the cathedral. Members of both Houses of Convocation and the House of Laymen attended officially, and a large procession of clergymen and choristers preceded the Northern Primate and the Bishops of the Northern Province from the west end, singing, "The God of Abraham praise." The Archbishop of York commenced the Communion Office, taking the Eastward position, the Bishops of Oxford and Durham reading the Epistle and Gospel respectively. The Rev. Professor Moule, D.D., preached the sermon, taking his text from Acts xxiii. 11.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, presiding over a meeting of the National Society, held in the Cathedral Library at Canterbury, said the new system of secondary education would require very careful watching to see that the Church did not lose her proper position. They would have to fight hard to secure that there should be real religious instruction. The Dean of Canterbury said that if England did not take up the cause of education in this spirit, she would fall behind the example of almost every great nation. He also pointed to the immense decrease in the prison population since the Education Act of 1870.

On May 1 the Archbishops of Canterbury and York delivered their long-expected opinion on the Reservation question. The following are the main points of the Archbishop of Canterbury's decision:

1. Every national Church has authority to change and abolish "Catholic" ceremonies.
2. Our 28th Article condemns Reservation altogether.
3. External gestures are the very stronghold of superstitious doctrines.
4. Reservation led to gross abuses which our Church felt bound to stop.
5. The alleged necessity of the practice is not made out, for Holy Communion is not a magical charm to be administered to those incapable of following the minimum service of consecration, and therefore incapable of intelligently receiving at all; nor is it required by primitive custom that the clergy must observe a strict fast until late in the day with a view to private consecration.
6. All Reservation is, under the present law, illegal.

The Archbishop of York coincided, but delivered a separate decision on certain disputed points submitted to him.

The Boyle Lectures for 1900 will be delivered by the Rev. Dr. Robertson, Principal of King's College, at Holy Trinity Church, Sloane Street, on Sunday, May 6, and the seven succeeding Sundays, excepting June 3 and June 10 (Whit Sunday and Trinity Sunday), at 4 p.m. The subject is "Christ as a Moral Teacher." The course is intended as a contribution to Christian Ethics.

Appeals for war funds have had a disastrous effect upon the influx of subscriptions for the restoration of Peterborough Cathedral. At a recent meeting of the Restoration Committee, it was reported that since the last meeting only £135 had been received. When this amount had been expended the work would be brought to a standstill—a step the committee hoped might be prevented by the receipt of further funds.

St. Paul's Cathedral has been enriched by two new stained-glass windows—one in the north transept, presented by the late Duke of Westminster (by whom the companion window also in the south transept was given), and one in the east end of the north choir aisle, the gift of Lady Carnarvon, in memory of her husband.

New statues of the Apostles are to be placed in the roof of St. Paul's Cathedral, owing to the disintegrating elements of the City's atmosphere.

BEQUESTS.—Amongst the charitable bequests of Mrs. Leigh, of Halifax, are the following: Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, £5,000; C.M.S., Bible Society, C.P.A.S., C. and C.C.S., L.C.M., P.R.S., and Army Scripture Readers' Society, £2,000 each; Ragged School Union, £1,000; Dr. Barnardo's Homes, I.C.M., Missions to Seamen, Thames Church Mission, £500 each.

The Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, which has just been keeping its anniversary, was originated as long ago as the middle of the seventeenth century, and incorporated in 1678. Last year it awarded 1,689 pensions and grants to clergy and their families.

It is stated by the Bishop of Southwark that out of the £130,000 required for his new South London see, over a fifth, in sums varying from £5,000 to £100, has already been received.



Obituary.

BY the death of Prebendary Stanley Leathes, at the age of seventy, not only does the professorial staff of King's College, London, lose one of its most brilliant ornaments, but Hebrew scholarship at large is left much the poorer. The *Times* devotes considerable space to a record of his great learning and valuable services in the field of Old Testament criticism. The late Professor, who belonged to the conservative school of Bible criticism, was a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee. He was the author of several exegetical and critical works, among them a volume, which appeared a few years ago, entitled "The Law in the Prophets." The Professor was the author also of a Hebrew Grammar. Dr. Leathes was for some time a valued contributor to the pages of the *CHURCHMAN*.