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

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

EDUCATIONAL.

DOVER COLLEGE.

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

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

Every Boy has a separate Bedroom.

SEPARATE JUNIOR SCHOOL FOR BOYS UNDER THIRTEEN.

WORCESTER CATHEDRAL KING'S SCHOOL.

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

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

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

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

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching. Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium, Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy naturally reducing Fees.

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

WARWICK SCHOOL.

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

Fees, £60.

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

THE FERNS, 133, GREEN LANES, N.

(Near Highbury New Park, London.)

MRS. WATKIN (successor to the MISSES BIRCHALL) receives a limited number of RESIDENT PUPILS. Large Staff of highly-qualified Teachers. Home comforts and loving care, combined with a high-class education, based upon Evangelical Christian principles. Eminent Professors attend for Languages, Elocution, Science Lectures, the Accomplishments, etc. Preparation for all Examinations. Large Garden for Tennis and other Games. Domestic Students received. TERMS: 60 to 75 guineas per annum. Highest references to Clergymen, Parents, etc.

SPECIAL ARRANGEMENT FOR ENTIRE CHARGE OF PUPILS FROM ABROAD.

NOW READY. CHEAP AND NINTH EDITION.

In demy 12mo., tastefully printed and bound, 1s. 6d. post free.

NOTES FOR BOYS (and their Fathers) on

Morals, Mind, and Manners. By "AN OLD BOY."

"The advice is simply excellent. It is practical, minute, and although high-toned, not too stringent."—*Literary World.*

"The teaching is high-principled, liberal-minded, and drawn from practical experience."—*Christian World.*

"An admirable little volume, full of sound sense and wise suggestions, plenty of sympathy with wholesome liberty."—*Daily News.*

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

THE MORAVIAN MISSIONS.

(ESTABLISHED 1732.)

Oldest Protestant Missions to the Heathen—First to the Lepers.

About **one in sixty** members is a Missionary. There are gathered under their care from darkest heathenism nearly 100,000—*i.e.*, more than **three times as many** as the Parent Church.

To help these devoted people whom God so blesses, and who, in the preponderating proportion of their Missionaries, are so largely doing the work of other Churches,

THE LONDON ASSOCIATION IN AID

Was formed in 1817. The following are some of many **pressing needs** for which

Earnest Prayer and Support are Sought.

FOR GENERAL FUND—largely increased annual help of at least £4,000 if existing Missions are to be maintained and Deficiency averted.

FOR THE LEPER HOME, Jerusalem, where Inmates have doubled in number, funds are still wanted to complete the provision of a larger Water Reservoir.

FOR LABRADOR, hitherto self-supporting, but crippled for a time in its resources, £2,000 annually is required for a few years, until the Mission can be re-established. For this need, and to avert loss to the General Fund, an ADDITIONAL Fund is being raised.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE THANKFULLY RECEIVED

and information given by the REV. W. WETTON COX, at the Offices of the LONDON ASSOCIATION, 7, New Court, Lincoln's Inn, LONDON, W.C., who will also gladly arrange for Meetings, Sermons, Lectures, etc.

THE ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL,

HAVERSTOCK HILL and HORNSEY RISE.

Founded 1758.

PATRONS { HIS MAJESTY THE KING.
HER MAJESTY QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

TREASURER: HORACE B. MARSHALL, Esq., J.P., D.L., Sheriff of London.

MAINTAINS and Educates **Five Hundred** Fatherless Children, varying in age from **Infancy** to **Fourteen Years.** An Undenominational Institution supported by Voluntary Contributions.

Help for the "Fatherless and the Widow in their affliction" is urgently needed. Contributions will be thankfully received and all information given by

ALEXANDER GRANT,
Secretary.

OFFICE: 73, CHEAPSIDE, LONDON, E.C.

Spanish & Portuguese Church Aid Society.

President: RIGHT REV. BISHOP INGHAM, D.D.

HELP URGENTLY NEEDED.

The **Bishop of Durham** writes, Oct. 30, 1901: "The Society's work has A VERY WARM PLACE IN MY HEART."

Contributions will be gratefully received by the Rev. H. E. NOYES D.D., or by the Rev. THOS. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Secretary, Church House, Westminster, S.W.

The National Protestant Church Union.

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

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary H. W. WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq., J.P.
General Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON.

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

OFFICES OF THE UNION,
324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

The Friends of Armenia.

President: THE LADY FREDERICK CAVENDISH.
Vice-Presidents: Hon. Mrs. FRASER and Mrs. ALFRED BOOTH.
Chairman of Committee: E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
Treasurer: HECTOR MUNRO FERGUSON, Esq.
Secretary: Miss E. CANTLOW.

600 ORPHANS MAINTAINED.

Funds Urgently Needed.

500 Destitute Cases waiting.

AN ORPHAN RESCUED, FED, CLOTHED, AND EDUCATED FOR *Per* **£5** *Annum* **BY THE MISSION HOMES IN ARMENIA.**

A letter recently received from one of the Armenian Mission Centres says: "Only a small proportion of the Orphans will be able to support themselves next year."

DONATIONS IN AID OF WIDOWS & ORPHANS gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer as above.
CHEQUES SHOULD BE CROSSED "LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK."

47, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

The Council of the Evangelical Alliance specially ask for continued financial help and for prayer. The need is urgent. Moneys are required for work on the Continent and in far-off lands, as also in Great Britain. The Council desire to give hearty thanks for the help already received. Subscriptions of smaller amounts will be gratefully acknowledged, but donors of £20 and upwards will be entitled to all the privileges of Life Membership of the Alliance.

The approaching great International Conference in Hamburg in August 27th-31st, 1902, will entail a very large expenditure of money, and the Council look for support in this effort, so helpful to the Gospel on the Continent.

Contributions and names of New Members may be sent to the Secretary, **7, Adam Street, Strand, W.C.**

ANNUAL CONFERENCE AT BOURNEMOUTH, November 26th, 27th, 28th.

HELP FOR THE OUTCAST.

102 LABOUR HOMES and Agencies in all parts of London and the Provinces, from Edinburgh to Plymouth, and Cambridge to Dublin, for Men, Women, Girls and Boys, Inebriates, First Offenders, Discharged Prisoners, Ex-convicts, Tramps, Hooligans, Destitute, Starving, and all who have "gone under" in the sea of life. Every case dealt with wholly irrespective of creed, and no helpable person ever refused instant practical help; 30,000 cases dealt with yearly; 56 per cent of those received started afresh in life. Headquarters staff almost wholly honorary. Donations, and cast-off clothing of all sorts urgently needed. Bankers, Barclays.

Rev. W. CARLILE, Hon. Chief Sec.

Church Army Hdqrs., 130, Edgeware Rd., London, W.

INFANT ORPHAN ASYLUM, WANSTEAD.

Patron—HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

This Institution entirely maintains and educates in accordance with the principles of the Church of England the orphans of those once occupying a fair position in life. Since the foundation of the Asylum, 4,460 Children have been received, and there are nearly 600 on the books at the present time.

It is dependent on Voluntary Contributions for five-sixths of its income, and the Managers **urgently ask** for **NEW ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS** to meet the heavy deficiency which deaths, removals and other causes have produced. The expenditure is very heavy this year owing to many absolutely necessary repairs.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION—One Vote, 10s. 6d.; Two Votes, £1 1s.; LIFE SUBSCRIPTION—One Vote, £5 5s.; Two Votes, £10 10s.

OFFICES—63, LUDGATE HILL, E.C. BANKERS—MESSRS. WILLIAMS DEACON'S BANK.

A. HARDING GREEN, Secretary.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The OLDEST Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.
The ONLY Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.
Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent
Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Secretary.
Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.
Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

Funds are Urgently Needed.

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE

IS

The OLDEST Society

Which has for its object the UNION OF ALL PROTESTANTS in maintaining the Scriptural Principles of the Reformation against Ritualism and Romanism. It is

The ONLY Society

Having an ILLUSTRATED Protestant Monthly Paper, post free to Members. A copy of the current issue will be sent GRATIS on application.

Contributions in support of the general work of the Protestant Alliance will be thankfully received by

S. W. BRETT, SECRETARY, 430, STRAND, LONDON, W.C

THE EAST END MISSION TO THE JEWS.

Funds urgently needed towards the **MEDICAL MISSION,** the **GENERAL WORK.** The **CHARITY WORK,** to alleviate the sufferings of the sick and distressed. **5,000** sick were treated at the Mission last year. Many confessed Christ.

Secretary: D. OPPENHEIM, 119, LEMAN STREET, E.

Bankers: LONDON & WESTMINSTER BANK.

BIBLE LANDS MISSIONS' AID SOCIETY (Founded 1854).

Office: 7, Adam St., Strand. Rev. W. A. ESSERY, Hon. Sec.

BY well-known national causes our Income was so reduced last year that many usual grants made by the Society were Shortened, and some entirely cut off. The Lord's impoverished workers in Bible Lands pathetically press us to send them our Aids this year; to do so we need a generous increase of £750. These Aids go to native churches and pastors, to schools and teachers, to hospitals and patients, and to children in Armenian orphanages. We aim to evangelize the Bible Lands. Will the readers of the "Churchman" kindly send us contributions in this present and instant need? KINNAIRD, Treasurer.

The Lord Bishop of Durham and the Rev. Preb. Webb-Peploe are members of our Hon. Council.

SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS.

Poor Jews in Jerusalem have suffered most severely this last year from disease and water famine. Relief given in the year to **8,834 souls,** besides employing **70** men daily on Abraham's Vineyard. Many more ask for work.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED for Food, Fuel, and Employment.

Hon. Treasurer: F. A. BEVAN, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.
Secretary: E. A. FINN, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CORNWALL AND YORK, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours are occupied. Expenditure in 1900, £49,166.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London, W.C.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY,

26, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

President—THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.
Vice-President—SIR G. G. STOKES, Bt., F.R.S.
Chairman of Council—THE LORD CHANCELLOR.
Treasurer—H. GOSCHEN, Esq.
Secretary—REV. C. LLOYD ENGSTRÖM.
Bankers—MESSRS. BARCLAY & CO., Pall Mall East, S.W.

Objects.—To declare and defend Christianity as a Divine Revelation, by Lectures, Sermons, Classes for Study and Examination (with prizes, etc.), Publications (books and tracts), correspondence, and interviews. An Evidential Mission, in London and great provincial centres, of the highest order will (D.V.) commence January, 1902.

FUNDS MOST URGENTLY NEEDED.

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1902.

ART. I.—ON THE COURSE OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

III.

IT is a striking fact that the Protestant theology of the sixteenth century both began and ended in strict theories of predestination. The first attempt at a comprehensive treatment of theology from the point of view of the Reformation was Melanchthon's "Loci Communes Rerum Theologicarum," which was published in 1521. The treatise which was the predominant exposition of the Reformed theology at the close of the century was Calvin's "Institutio Christianæ Religionis." The severe doctrine of Calvin on the subject of predestination is notorious; but it should be remembered that the teaching of Melanchthon in the first edition of his work was not less severe. The history of that work is in great measure the history of theology in the German Protestant Churches up to the time of Melanchthon's death in 1560. It passed through a great number of editions, and remained for at least half a century the great text-book of theology for the Protestant Churches; but it underwent during that time various important changes at the hands of its author. Originally, in 1521, it was a little work occupying less than 200 modern octavo pages, and it corresponded exactly to its second title, "Hypotyposes Theologicæ," or Theological Outlines. Melanchthon was then a young man, only twenty-four years old; and that he should have produced at that age a comprehensive review of the revived theology, which took its place at once as its most satisfactory statement, affords a wonderful illustration alike of his genius and of the profound impression made upon him by Luther, after little more than three years of that Reformer's public activity.

But the book derives a special interest from the fact that its successive stages mark the gradual development of the Reformed theology and of Melanchthon's teaching. In its earliest form—that of 1521—the Reformed teaching is exhibited in its first vivid, and in some respects immature, if not crude, elements; and it was enlarged and modified as the Reformed theology was developed and extended in scope, and as Melanchthon's own thoughts grew more mature and well balanced. In its final form it is one of the most instructive, comprehensive, and moderate treatises to be found in the literature of the Protestant Churches, and is comparable only to Calvin's "Institutes." But it is in many respects more interesting in its first form, in which the thoughts out of which the great movement of the Reformation sprang may be seen forming, as it were, in the minds of its authors. Now, as has been said, it is remarkable that this treatise commences with as strong a statement of the dependence of all things on Divine predestination as is found in the great treatise of Calvin. It lays down, at the very outset, that "since all things which happen necessarily happen according to Divine predestination, there is no liberty of our will."[1] Melanchthon was not a man of a stern dogmatic nature like Calvin, nor a man who approached questions with the intense vehemence of Luther. What, we must ask, is the reason why he should thus anticipate, at the commencement of the century, the characteristic teaching with which it ended?

The answer is apparent from this very treatise, and it casts a light upon the general bearing of the doctrines of predestination, which gives them at once a more intelligible and a more human character, than when we approach them simply from the side of theological philosophy. Melanchthon explains that the great purpose of his book is to give assistance in apprehending the practical, as distinct from the speculative, doctrines of Christianity. He enumerates the chief heads of theology as follows: God; Unity and Trinity; Creation; Man and Man's Powers; Sin; the Fruits of Sin, and Vices; Punishments; the Law; Promises; Regeneration by Christ; Grace; the Fruits of Grace; Faith; Hope; Charity; Predestination; Sacramental Signs; the Condition of Man; Magistrates; Bishops; Condemnation; Bliss. It may be noticed that in this enumeration predestination is one of the latter topics mentioned; but the main principles respecting it are laid down from the outset, and form the starting-point. Melanchthon goes on to say that there is

[1] *Die Loci Communes*, Philipp Melanthons in ihrer Urgestalt herausgegeben und erläutert von G. L. Plitt. Erlangen, 1864: p. 109.

no occasion for him to spend much labour upon those supreme questions respecting God, His Unity and Trinity, the mystery of Creation, and the mode of the Incarnation. The scholastic theologians, he says, have been discussing them for centuries, and he does not know what practical benefit has been gained. "Have they not," he asks, "as St. Paul says, 'become vain in their imaginations,' while they have been trifling all their lives about universals, formalities, connotations, and I know not what other inane words and expressions?" But, he says, "as to the other *loci*, respecting the power of sin, the law and grace, I do not know how a man can expect to be called a Christian who is ignorant of them. For it is from these that Christ is properly known, if at least the true knowledge of Christ is to know His benefits, and not, as the Schoolmen teach, to know His natures and the modes of His Incarnation. Unless you know for what purpose He assumed our flesh and was nailed to the cross, what benefit will it be to know of His history? . . . St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans"—on which Melanchthon had been giving lectures, which were the germ of this treatise—"when he wrote a compendium of Christian doctrine, did not philosophize about the mysteries of the Trinity, about the mode of the Incarnation, about active and passive creation. What is it that he treats of? Certainly of the law, of sin, of grace, which are the topics on which alone a knowledge of Christ depends."

This was the first impulse of the Reformed teaching—to make theology human, to bring it home to men's business and bosoms, and to explain its bearing on their lives and their practical necessities. Accordingly, with this brief introduction, Melanchthon goes on at once, and before everything else, to the question of human powers, and consequently of free will: "De hominis viribus, adeoque de libero arbitrio." That was the first practical question which had to be considered by a teacher who wanted to bring home to men the nature of the Gospel and the benefits which it offered. It is remarkable that this is precisely the order in which, some ten years later, Melanchthon explained the teaching of the Reformed Church in the formal statement he drew up for presentation to the Emperor Charles V., and which, under the name of the Augsburg Confession, became the cardinal Protestant symbol. In that Confession the first article is *De Deo*, declaring the acceptance by the Reformers of the Nicene faith; and the very next—the second—is *De Peccato Originis*, which says that all men who, after the fall of Adam, are naturally engendered are born "with sin—that is, without fear of God, without trust towards God, and with concupiscence"; and it denies that men can be justified before

God by the natural powers of reason. That Confession, however, is content to state this as a fact, without considering its cause. The characteristic of the teaching of the "Loci Communes" is that it traces the cause of this fact to the Divine predestination, and rests it upon that foundation. "Liberty," says Melanchthon, "is the power to act or not to act, the power to act in one way or another; and the question is: Has the will this liberty, and how far?" The answer is that "Since all things which happen, necessarily happen according to Divine predestination, there can be no liberty of our will," and the discussion is concluded with the following four statements:

"If you regard the human will in reference to predestination, there is no liberty either in external or internal works; but all things happen according to Divine determination.

"If you consider the will in reference to external acts, there appears, in the judgment of nature, to be a certain liberty.

"If you consider the will in reference to the affections and passions, there is clearly no liberty, even in the judgment of nature;

"And when the affections and passions have begun to rage and burn within us, they cannot be restrained from breaking forth."

Now, as has been said, as Melanchthon grew more mature and moderate, he became content to assert the fact of the corruption of the human will, without ascribing that corruption thus absolutely to Divine decrees. But what it is important to observe is that the purpose with which the idea of predestination is introduced is to afford some explanation of the helplessness of man's will, and of the hopelessness of his condition by nature. It is introduced, that is, for a practical purpose, and arises out of the contemplation of moral and religious weakness. Melanchthon and those who felt with him found themselves, according to their bitter experience, in a condition of spiritual feebleness and moral corruption. That unhappy state seemed to them a part of the present constitution of things, and they could only attribute it to Divine ordination. The argument is the same in Luther's characteristic treatise, "De Servo Arbitrio," which he wrote three years after the first publication of Melanchthon's "Loci," in answer to the treatise of Erasmus, "De libero Arbitrio." He, similarly, in asserting the servitude of the will, lays down the principle that all things which happen, even if they seem to us to happen under conditions of mutability and contingency, nevertheless really come to pass necessarily and immutably, if we look to the will of God. He says that God works all things in all things and is alone free, and from hence it follows irre-

sistibly that there is no freedom in the human will. "Hoc fulmine et sternitur et conteritur penitus Liberum Arbitrium." The will of man is ever determined and led by some other. Luther even compares it to a beast of burden, which is ridden either by God or by the devil. Now, we may again observe in this treatise that the motive, from which this extreme theory starts, is that of illustrating and confirming the fact of the free grace of God, and the complete incapacity of the human will to work or do anything of its own initiative, in matters which pertain to salvation. Luther himself describes this as the purpose of his treatise. He, too, with further reflection and experience, ceased to assert predestination in this extreme form, and the Lutheran Church, in the "Formula Concordiæ," finally determined the matter in a sense which is closely parallel to our own Article on the subject. But what it remains important and instructive for us to observe is, that the ideas of predestination took their rise in the sense of human feebleness and incapacity for good.

It will be found that it has been so throughout Church history. It is St. Augustine who was the first great representative of predestinarian teaching, and how did he arrive at it? His teaching arose out of his controversy with Pelagius on free will. The error of Pelagius arose from his very goodness in a moral sense. He did not realize the weakness of human nature, and thought that it had natural powers still left to it which were capable of doing good. As Luthardt has remarked, it was by no moral levity that the course of Pelagius's thought was prompted, but, on the contrary, by a certain moral earnestness. He was aiming at a moral reform of life, and was vindicating the monkish efforts at self-discipline, charity, poverty, and the like, and he thought Augustine was cutting the sinews of such moral endeavours. But Augustine, in a terrible experience, had realized the utter weakness of human nature, and felt that it was solely by the grace of God, and not by any moral efforts of his own, that he had been delivered. But if, as he felt, his salvation had been entirely God's work, he could not but go on to ask why it was that he had been saved from his own evil, and not others; why should grace be effectual in some cases and not in all? There seemed no answer to this question except in the absolute power and will of God, which works irresistibly in some cases and not in others. Melanchthon and Luther were but following precisely the reasoning and the experience of Augustine, in passing from a sense of human helplessness, and of the absolute dependence of the Christian on the grace of God, to the conclusion that God's will is supreme, and that all things are predestinated by Him.

There is a striking passage in Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection," a work particularly instructive on this and the cognate subjects, in which this train of thought is illustrated with great force and beauty. It is in his comment on his Second Aphorism on Spiritual Religion. He begins by observing that "no impartial person, competently acquainted with the history of the Reformation, and the works of the earlier Protestant divines, at home and abroad, even to the close of Elizabeth's reign, will deny that the doctrines of Calvin on redemption and the natural state of fallen man are in all essential points the same as those of Luther, Zwinglius and the first Reformers collectively." Then, after some discussion of the philosophical problems involved, he goes on to consider the case of a man who has reason to believe, from his spiritual experience, that he has received the grace of God, and is "on the right road to the life promised under these conditions." "Now," he says, "I dare assert that no such man, however fervent his charity and however deep his humility may be, can peruse the records of history with a reflecting spirit, or look round the world with an observant eye, and not find himself compelled to admit that *all* men are *not* on the right road. He cannot help judging that even in Christian countries many—a fearful many—have not their faces turned towards it. This, then, is a mere matter of fact. Now comes the question. Shall the believer, who thus hopes on the appointed grounds of hope, attribute this distinction exclusively to his own resolves and strivings—or, if not exclusively, yet primarily and principally? Shall he refer the first movements and preparations to his own will and understanding, and bottom his claim to the promises on his own comparative excellence? If not, if no man dare take this honour to himself, to whom shall he assign it, if not to that Being in whom the promise originated, and on whom its fulfilment depends? If he stop here, who shall blame him? By what argument shall his reasoning be invalidated, which might not be urged with equal force against any essential difference between obedient and disobedient, Christian and worldling—that would not imply that both sorts alike are, in the sight of God, the sons of God by adoption?"

In these observations of Coleridge it will be found, perhaps, that we have the secret of the earnest discussions with which the sixteenth century is occupied respecting the relations between free will and grace, liberty and predestination—the so-called Synergistic controversies, or those which concern the question of the mutual relations and actions of the human will and the Spirit of God in the conversion and salvation of men. They are controversies which arose out of the moral and religious experience of the men of that day, and they are

the expression, less of their thoughts, than of their spiritual struggles.

This is indeed a characteristic of all controversies respecting subjects of this class—those which relate to the moral nature of man—which it is essential to bear in mind, if they are to be at all adequately apprehended. Respecting such controversies, it may well be doubted whether they ever will be, or, rather, whether they ever can be, settled. They are not controversies respecting abstract or eternal truths, like those respecting mathematics, on the one hand, or those respecting the attributes of God, on the other. They are controversies respecting matters of human experience, and the premises from which men argue vary with that experience. Pelagius sees one side of that experience; St. Augustine sees another; and neither can quite appreciate the facts which his antagonist has in view. So, in the century we are considering, Erasmus is arguing from the point of view of the experience of a successful and somewhat cold-blooded scholar, who is looking at the human will from an abstract and philosophical point of observation. Luther was arguing from the point of view of a man immersed from his youth up in intense moral and spiritual struggles, sensible of the tremendous temptations against which he has to contend, and feeling that, if God be not for him, if he be not chosen by God and upheld by God, he has no hope of victory and deliverance.

It may be a question in this controversy on which side is the best philosophy; but there can be little question on which side is the best experience. As Coleridge puts the case in his comments in the "Aids to Reflection" on a passage from Bishop Jeremy Taylor on Original Sin: "What less than disease can we call a necessity of error and a predisposition to sin and sickness? Taylor, indeed, asserts that though perfect obedience became incomparably more difficult" (after Adam's fall) "it was not, however, absolutely impossible. Yet he himself admits that the contrary was universal—that, of the countless millions of Adam's posterity, not a single individual ever realized or approached to the realization of this possibility; and (if my memory does not deceive me) Taylor himself has elsewhere exposed—and, if he has not, yet common-sense will do it for him—the sophistry in asserting of a whole what may be true of the whole, but is in fact true only of each of its component parts. Anyone may snap a horsehair; therefore anyone may perform the same feat with the horse's tail. On a level floor (on the hardened sand, for instance, of a sea-beach) I chalk two parallel straight lines, with a width of eight inches. It is possible for a man, with a bandage

over his eyes, to keep within the path for two or three paces; therefore it is possible for him to walk blindfold for two or three leagues without a single deviation! And this possibility would suffice to acquit me of injustice, though I had placed man-traps within an inch of one line, and knew that there were pitfalls and deep wells beside the other!"

In short, in proportion to the depth of men's moral and spiritual struggle, in proportion to the intensity with which they apprehend the height of the Divine righteousness and the Divine ideal, must there arise in them a sense of the utter feebleness of their own powers, of the weakness and servitude of their wills, and of their absolute dependence on Divine grace and the Divine will. They are driven to that sense of utter incapacity, and of entire dependence upon God, which St. Paul expresses so forcibly in the Epistle to the Romans. But, unfortunately, they are almost always impelled, as Melanchthon, Luther, and Calvin were, to step beyond that practical statement of their experience, and to speculate on the ultimate philosophical, or metaphysical, causes of their condition; and then their moral conclusions become entangled in the meshes of a speculative and uncertain philosophy. As Coleridge, again, says, after the first of the two passages just quoted:

"If the self-examinant will abandon this position, and exchange the safe circle of religion and practical reason for the shifting sand-wastes and *mirages* of speculative theology; if, instead of seeking after the marks of Election in himself, he undertakes to determine the ground and origin, the possibility and mode of Election itself in relation to God—in this case, and whether he does it for the satisfaction of curiosity, or from the ambition of answering those who would call God Himself to account, why and by what right certain souls were born in Africa instead of England," and similar problems, "in this case, I say, we can only regret that the inquirer had not been better instructed in the nature, the bounds, the true purposes and proper objects of his intellectual faculties, and that he had not previously asked himself, by what appropriate sense, or organ of knowledge, he hoped to secure an insight into a nature which was neither an object of his senses, nor a part of his self-consciousness; and so leave himself to ward off shadowy spears with the shadow of a shield, and to retaliate the nonsense of blasphemy with the *abracadabra* of presumption. He that will fly without wings must fly in his dreams: and till he awakes will not find out that to fly in a dream is but to dream of flying."

Those observations of Coleridge are an admirable com-

mentary alike on the strength and on the weakness of the predestinarian theories of the Reformers. Only let us remember that, when men are in the thick of a mortal struggle for great spiritual and moral truths, they naturally lay hands on any weapon that is within their grasp; and that they are almost forced to become philosophers and speculative theologians, against their will, if they are to maintain what they feel to be the most vital moral truths, against the assaults that are made on them from all sides.

There is, however, a special aspect of Calvin's doctrine of predestination which deserves distinct recognition, and which distinguishes it, in great measure, from those of Luther and Melanchthon. There does not seem evidence that Calvin was drawn into his theory by such intense moral experience as we have traced in Augustine, Luther, and others, and there seems to be another impulse operating in him. He is a man with a profound sense of the necessity of law and government. His conversion, he says, was sudden; and as soon as he is converted and convinced of the truth of the Reformed theology, his dominant idea is that of obedience to the will of God. It has been said of him that obedience was the watchword of his life. He is the Protestant Loyola; and as Loyola taught that every Jesuit should be as a staff in the hand of his superior, so Calvin's idea was that every Christian should be at the absolute command of God—as, in fact, every man really is, whether consciously or not. God is regarded by him, not so much in the character of a Father, which is Luther's favourite conception, but as a Lord and Judge. He is the Lord of lords, who, according to His unrestricted will, disposes of the destinies of men. Accordingly, in considering the relation of God to the world, the emphasis is laid upon the power of God, and the relation of men to Him is pre-eminently that of obedience.

Calvin's work at Geneva is to realize this aspect of Christianity and of the Church. Luther leaves the utmost possible amount of freedom to the renewed and sanctified will. "Christian Liberty"—the title of Luther's most beautiful and least controversial work—is also the watchword of his practical conception of the Church. He would have as much liberty as possible, within the bounds of Christian life and love. But Calvin's conception was that of a strictly regulated life. "Under his influence Geneva is transformed into a theocracy. The Church lays down the rules and regulations for faith and life, and the State enforces them. . . . Amusements are forbidden; the very discipline of the family is brought under control; attendance at church and Communion at stated times are made obli-

gatory."[1] No doubt Calvin rendered a great service to the Protestant cause at a critical juncture by thus insisting, even with this exaggeration, upon the necessity of discipline and order in the Christian life. But by that inevitable tendency by which men transfer, in some degree, their own image and similitude to their conception of God, so Calvin conceives of the world as regulated by definite and immutable Divine decrees. All is determined by God beforehand, all is regulated by precise decisions; and the place and fate of every individual has been assigned to him. Carried to this speculative length, it was an exaggeration which provoked a dangerous reaction; yet we have only to look to our sister Church in Scotland in order to see that such a view exhibits a real side of human experience, and has worked out magnificent results. Human nature disregards, in practice, the extreme points in such theories and systems, and assimilates their excellences. It may be, as Calvin himself confessed, a *horribile decretum* that some men are everlastingly predestinated to damnation, as others are to salvation. In some cases such a doctrine leads men to the desperation of which our article speaks; but the great mass of men instinctively disregard the supposition that they themselves may be among the condemned. They hope for the best for themselves; and then there remain for them only the grand and fortifying elements of the system. There remains for them the spectacle of a firm, holy, unbending law, to which they must conform if they are to be in harmony with the truth and reality of things. There remain for them those conceptions of the eternities, the infinities, the immutabilities of life, which Carlyle, for instance, brought out of his Scottish training and habits, though he discarded their Christian form. Calvin was to the men of his day something of what Carlyle was, though in so different a shape, to the last generation of Englishmen. He deepened immeasurably their sense of the eternal and unalterable realities of life, and impressed upon them the absolute necessity of conformity with the will of God. Had not such a proclamation of universal predestination and immutable law been combined with the more gracious message of the Gospel, it would have been intolerable to the feebleness of human nature. But, with whatever inconsistencies, it was in fact combined with that message; and men and women learned, at one and the same time, their insignificance amidst the vast and eternal system of decrees and laws with which they were surrounded, and

[1] *Cf.* Thomasius' *Dogmengeschichte*, ed. Seeberg, vol. ii., p. 639; edit. 1889.

the grace of God, by which they were saved from the effects of such crushing and awful powers.

It is hoped that even these slight sketches of the vast and profound subjects, with which the theology of the sixteenth century was occupied, may have served to illustrate the intense human interest by which that theology was prompted and animated. Whatever the cause may be, something in that century stirred human nature to its very depths, threw up to the surface all its struggling forces, and challenged the theologians of the day to interpret them and to bring them into order. To some thoughtful readers[1] Shakespeare, at the end of the sixteenth century, has seemed an isolated phenomenon, concerned only with the passions and affections of human nature, and standing calmly aloof from the controversies of his day. But it may be, on the other hand, that he is but the final illustration of the whole character of the century—a century in which human nature, too long confined in the swathing-bands of medieval discipline and philosophy, cast them aside, burst into the realities of the great world of man and nature, asked itself what they meant, what nature meant, what God meant, what Christ was, not to theologians, but to common men and women; not to theological virtues and vices, but to common struggles, common passions, common experiences. The theologies of the sixteenth century are the record of this experience and of its interpretation. They are marked by errors and exaggerations, like the human beings who threw them up to the surface of their hearts and minds in that battle of giants. But considered from the point of view here suggested, they cast an intense light upon the needs of the human heart and upon the Divine answer to them; and it may be added, in conclusion, that their best results, and the truest record of the experience they have won for us, are embodied in our own Thirty-nine Articles, which are, as it were, the aphorisms of the *Novum Organum* of a new religious world.

HENRY WACE.

ART. II.—BAPTISMAL REGENERATION IN CHURCH HISTORY.

"SEEING now that this child is regenerate." Few will deny that these words are one of the chief stumbling-blocks that the Prayer-Book presents to devout and thoughtful minds. We have all felt their difficulty. Probably every clergyman

[1] Brewer's "English Studies," p. 271.

has had one or other of his people coming to him for their explanation, and explanation has not been always easy to give. Does the truth lie with the High Churchman, who takes them as literally and invariably true in the case of every baptized infant, or with the Low Churchman, who believes them to be nothing more than the language of faith and hope in view of Christ's Sacrament? We feel our need of a clue, and a clue is not at once apparent. The Canons do not help us. The Fifty-seventh Canon declares that "the doctrine, both of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used at the administration of the said Sacraments, as nothing can be added unto it that is material and necessary." Wherein we must for once humbly beg to differ from the Canons! The Articles say, "It is not in us"; and this is true, for the Articles, so far as they deal immediately with the doctrine of Baptism, are constructed with an inclusive purpose, and carefully avoid any statement to which one or other party in the Church could not assent. The Prayer-Book, then, alone is left to us, but if the Articles avoid dogmatism on this question we may be certain the Prayer-Book avoids it too. If anything is sure to us it is that the Prayer-Book and Articles are at one. They issued from the same hands, and for all practical purposes at the same time. The saying that "we have a Popish Liturgy and Calvinistic Articles" is as smart as it is absurd. The Prayer-Book had no stouter defenders against the Puritans than the Calvinists.

There is but one way left to us of determining the meaning of the words of the Baptismal Office, and that is in the *history of the doctrine of Baptism.* The result is so satisfactory, and so surely establishes their Protestant sense, that no better service can be done to Churchmen than by asking them to look at that language from such standpoint.[1]

Regeneration Defined.—Before doing so, however, it is essential to define what we mean by regeneration. Nothing has confused this controversy more than the fact that the disputants have meant different things in their use of the same terms. To-day theological opinion is in the main divided over two definitions of regeneration, viz.: a state of pardon and actual goodness; and a state of pardon and a new capacity for goodness. Eliminating for clearness' sake that which is common to both, we find that one party declares

[1] I follow throughout this paper the great authority and often the words of Dr. Mozley in his "Baptismal Controversy," and of Dean Goode in his "Effects of Infant Baptism." Both works are masterpieces of close and scholarly investigation, and have never been answered.

regeneration to be a state of actual goodness, the other that it is a new capacity for goodness. This difference is not by any means verbal only; its importance becomes apparent as the history is studied.

Turning to the Scripture, a Churchman's one court of appeal in such an issue, we find that the word "regeneration" is only used four times in the New Testament, but its meaning is perfectly clear from its synonyms and equivalents, such as "born of God," "child of God." Now these terms obviously mean an actual goodness, and not merely a capacity for it. In like manner a "child of the devil" indicates not merely one who has the power to be wicked, in which case the reader of this paper could hardly claim exemption from the title, but one who is actually a wicked person. Regeneration signifies, then, an actual goodness, and its connexion with baptism does not alter its meaning; indeed, it is because it has this meaning that it is connected with baptism. We do not get the meaning of regeneration from baptism, but our idea of the baptismal blessing from regeneration.

Baptism to be Studied in the Adult.—Again, it is essential to this controversy to remember that baptism must be studied in the adult. Infant baptism, agreeable as we believe it to be to the mind of Christ, is no essential part of the original institution of the Sacrament. Wall, in his great treatise, insists that infant baptism is not *de fide*, and should not separate members of the same Church; it is simply the shape baptism has taken in actual working. It is clear that the omission of infant baptism in the New Testament carries with it the omission of the regeneration of infants in baptism, and the subject therefore can only be studied in the adult.

Now it is a doctrine both of Scripture and of the Catholic Church, held universally and without contradiction, that no adult is regenerate in baptism without faith and repentance. In other words, a good disposition is the condition of baptismal grace, but, if so, it cannot be the effect of it. Even Peter Lombard, the typical medievalist of the twelfth century, taught that baptism does not impart faith and repentance in the adult, but that faith and repentance together constitute his title to baptism. Our (Twenty-second) Article on baptism in like manner has the adult in view, for it assumes the existence of faith[1] in the catechumen. So also the Catechism is speaking of the adult when it declares that faith and repentance is the condition of this Sacrament.

---

[1] "They that receive baptism rightly (*recte*—*i.e.*, under right conditions) are grafted into the Church . . . faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God."

(i.) With these points clear at the outset, we are in a position to trace the course of the doctrine of Baptism, to note its gradual evolution, and to observe how by sheer force of moral principle the Protestant position of our Liturgy on the subject was slowly and irresistibly arrived at.

Faith and repentance, then, being universally recognised as the conditions of the baptismal regeneration of the adult, what of the man who came to the font unworthily, avowing what he did not really possess, and who, on the strength of such avowal, was declared to be born anew? It is clear that such cases must have early occurred. Simon Magus was but the first of a long line of descendants, and the Church was soon compelled to pass judgment upon cases of the kind. What was her doctrine on the subject? It was laid down with the utmost precision. This was the well-known case of the *fictus*, or feigned applicant for baptism, and it was held universally and without dispute that, while he received the Sacrament, he had not received the *thing* of the Sacrament;[1] and, further, that the grace not received at the time was received afterwards upon his change of heart. It is noteworthy that when this change came he was not then bidden to submit to a so-called "believer's baptism." That would have been nothing less than a denial of his "baptismal character," as it was called, by which from the moment of baptism he removed from the position of a heathen and was admitted to the outward fellowship of the Church.[2] The Early Church knew nothing of second baptism; if it had it might fairly be questioned whether our Baptismal Office would ever have gained its present Protestant character. On the contrary, it was held from the first in such cases that, while title to regeneration was given, the grace itself—the *res sacramenti*—was deferred. In other words, the Church drew a sharp distinction between the grace of baptism, and a title to grace conferred by baptism.

It is needless to point out the importance of this concession. It had far-reaching consequences at the time, and long after, when the Reformation divines drew up the Office of Infant Baptism. The matter could not stop here. The further question was inevitable. Presuming the existence of the Divine grace of faith and repentance before baptism, what special grace and benefit was derived from the Sacrament? This controversy was not so easily settled as the last. The Fathers were puzzled. Tertullian says: "Baptism is a seal of faith;

---

[1] "Ficte accedens recipit Sacramentum, at non rem" (Bonaventure).

[2] "Multi habent characterem qui nec habent nec habuerunt nec habebunt gratiam" (*Ibid.*).

which faith starts with, and is proved by, repentance. We are not therefore washed that we may cease from sin, inasmuch as we are already washed in heart, *corde loti*." Augustine is clearly perplexed how to define the benefit of the Sacrament in such a case. "What it does in the man, it is difficult to say;" and, indeed, he does not say at all.

With the coming of the Schoolmen, however, the Church's doctrine on this knotty point was assured of definition. Nothing in heaven or earth was beyond their analysis. In their own methodical way they gave the answer—nay, it was extorted from them. They accepted the true definition of regeneration as a habit of goodness, and it was this very definition that compelled them to one Scriptural concession after another. Of course such concession was gradual. First there was the case of unbaptized martyrs: was it possible that a catechumen who had laid down his life for Christ could be denied the title of a member of Christ? That could not be maintained, and hence it was that martyrdom became known as "the baptism of blood."

But this led to a further concession. There might be the spirit of the martyr without martyrdom. Was not such a one a member of Christ if he died before baptism? The answer could only be yes; and so it was assumed that in the case of the believing catechumen faith of itself supplied the place of the Sacrament. Men's minds were opening to the fact that *the* important thing before God is faith and holiness, and that where these are no defect in ritual can be assumed to stay God's acceptance.

Yet one step more. The faithful unbaptized needed something more than an *assumption* on so vital a point. And so gradually the doctrine of the Church as to the effect of baptism was modified, and the believing adult was declared to have the *thing* of baptism (*illuminatio* the Fathers called it, *justificatio* the Schoolmen) even before the Sacrament. "Do not wonder," says Lombard, "that the thing sometimes precedes the Sacrament when sometimes it follows long after." Such was the position arrived at by sheer force of logic, and it was accepted by Aquinas, Durandus, Bradwardine, Bellarmine, and by the most distinguished divines of the medieval Church.

It is clear that Lombard's doctrine cannot be distinguished from that of the Reformation divines, who laid down that the faithful adult is regenerate before baptism, while at the same time they were perfectly willing to admit the increase of Divine gifts in the Sacrament, as our Article XXVII. proves.

The ancient Baptismal Offices *in form* imply, like our own, that the person baptized is unregenerate up to the moment of

baptism, and regenerate immediately upon it; yet the history of the *doctrine* of Baptism proves conclusively that the *form* of the Office does not represent any actual doctrine to this effect. Upon the point of *time* our adult service is not doctrinal, and the declaration of the fact of regeneration upon baptism allows for its existence either before baptism or not till after baptism. In other words, that declaration is *hypothetical* in the case of the adult.

(ii.) Turning now to the baptism of infants, the question arises whether the term "regeneration" in its full Scriptural sense can be applied to all baptized infants. Allowing that actual goodness admits of degrees, are we debarred from applying the term to such infants in some way corresponding with their infantine condition? If this is conceded we must be careful not to alter the character of the gift. We do alter it if we make regeneration anything short of pardon of sin and actual goodness. This is important. In their desire to reconcile the language of the Office with the obvious facts of human experience, men have interpreted regeneration in senses other than the true one, little knowing that in its true meaning lies the secret of the Protestant position of our Office. A brief survey of the history will make this clear.

The Fathers were in the habit of speaking of the whole Church as regenerate, and in so doing they simply followed the method of language used in the Old Testament of the Jews and in the New Testament of all baptized Christians. It lay to their hand, and they used it.

Coming to their doctrine of Baptism, we find that they distinguished between the adult and the infant; the latter presented no *obex* to the grace of God, his infantine state was equivalent to faith and repentance, and they therefore declared that all infants were necessarily regenerated in baptism. It has been usual to identify all the exalted language of the Fathers with *infant* baptism, and to say that this cannot be denied without overthrowing the *whole* baptismal language of antiquity. As a fact, however, exalted as that language is, it is almost entirely general, and Mozley holds that it is not too much to say that the main body of language in exaltation of baptism which the first three centuries produced was composed with adult baptism specially in view. The statement of the regeneration of *all* infants in baptism has not the absorbing position some attribute to it; it is merely one particular assertion of the virtue of the Sacrament embodied in a vast amount of general assertion. The Fathers did, however, clearly hold that regeneration meant actual goodness, wherein they were right, and as clearly they predicated it of all baptized infants,

wherein they were wrong, as subsequent history shows. It is enough here to remark that in so saying they went beyond Scripture, and their language cannot therefore be binding upon us; and, further, that it has never been synodically adopted by the Church, either in General Council or in any Creed or formula. This is noteworthy, for, whenever the Church has wished to impose a truth she has always—as, *e.g.*, the Deity of Christ—clearly expressed it.

The Schoolmen, basing their baptismal doctrine upon the Fathers, confidently advance, as is their wont, from general statement to particular assertion, and interpret the formula that all baptized infants are regenerate to mean that all infants have actual goodness implanted in baptism. The infant left the font endowed not merely with the faculties, but with the "habits" of all Christian goodness already miraculously formed in him. It was true that infants are incapable of expressing these habits in action, but they were there in a seminal state.

Their view landed them in difficulties. A "habit," in the scholastic theology, is "a quality of the mind which acts easily and pleasantly," but somehow in the vast number of baptized infants reaching maturity it did not act at all! This was an awkward fact; but the scholastic mind never allows awkward fact to interfere with approved theory. If this chasm could not be filled up, at least it could be bridged. A second theory came to their rescue. "Habits," it was said, "do not move of themselves, but require the free will of the agent to set them in motion." For this a Divine impulse was needed, and hence arose the medieval distinction between *habitual* and *special* grace. Thus scholastic ingenuity triumphed, but with infinite dishonour to the grace of God. It is evident that the universal infusion of the habits of goodness in infant baptism might never produce one single righteous act on the part of all the baptized, just for lack of special grace to set the habitual grace in motion! Such an explanation is self-condemned as fallacious.

The reign of the Schoolmen lasted from the close of the eleventh century to the Reformation. They had attempted to demonstrate Christianity as rational, and the rational as Christian; to combine science with faith, philosophy with theology, and to press the whole into a rigid unity. They had failed. The principles of their theology, not less than the principles of their philosophy, were fatal to them. Their appeal to the authority and tradition of the Church availed only so long as the character of that authority was not critically examined.

Historically we now pass on to the Calvinists, a school of

divines partial and unyielding in their views, but as eminent in their theological learning as in their controversial acuteness. No just estimate of the Prayer-Book is possible until their doctrine of Baptism has been weighed. Their definition of regeneration was substantially identical with that of the Fathers and the Schoolmen, but instead of linking the Divine gift with the moment of baptism, they taught that it was bestowed at the moment of God's *effectual call* to sonship. To this they added the further doctrine that sonship, once possessed, could never be lost; once a son of God, always a son.

This doctrine of the indefectibility of grace, pushed to its logical extreme, landed the Calvinist in obvious difficulties. For men fall, and from a good life sometimes change to a bad one, and how was it possible to speak of one wallowing in the mire of sin as a child of God? The Calvinist's answer was this: that even a profligate might be to the Divine knowledge a son of God. God could see what man could not; the root of the matter was there, for the work of the Holy Spirit had begun, but its evidence and its completion were delayed. While, then, the Schoolman and Calvinist agreed as to their definition of regeneration at the outset, they parted company at this point, and from an actual *habit* of goodness it became to the Calvinist a *process of the formation* of goodness, all the earlier stages of which might be secret.

While their view of regeneration got the Calvinists into one difficulty, it got them out of another. For it was impossible for them to hold that *all* infants are regenerated in baptism, not merely because it was opposed to experience, but because it was wholly inconsistent with the doctrine of election. They held the connexion of regeneration with baptism, but they confined it to *the elect.*

We see, then, that while the true sense of regeneration has been maintained, the difficulty of holding it together with the view that all infants are regenerate in baptism has been met in different ways.

The Fathers do not explain the difficulty.

The Schoolmen give a fallacious explanation.

The Calvinists retain the true sense of regeneration at the cost of limiting the number of those regenerated.

But now a new and incorrect sense meets us. The Anglican divines knew well enough what regeneration meant, and Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Bull, South, Beveridge, and Bishop Wilson all constantly use it in its legitimate sense. But how, then, could it be applied to all baptized infants? The Anglican School had more respect for facts than the Schoolmen, more regard for history than the Calvinists. They therefore con-

structed a new and special sense of regeneration, as used in connexion with baptism, to denote only an implanted faculty of goodness, a capacity to be improved, a power to be cultivated, an assisting grace to be used. Bishop Bethell, a representative Anglican, sums up the ordinary language of the School when he defines regeneration as "the *potential* principle of a new life together with forgiveness of sins." This is certainly a new sense of regeneration. "The Anglican School," says Dr. Mozley, "with all its sagacity and knowledge, has not been without its failings, one of which has been to invent new meanings of words in Scripture when they were wanted for theological convenience. Some important Scripture terms thus change sense in Anglican use: 'Salvation' becomes power to obtain salvation. 'Death to sin,' power to forsake sin. 'Election,' the admission to Church privileges. The older School of Anglicans used this incorrect sense of regeneration with hesitation as being the true one; the later School unhesitatingly adopts it." The definition of terms, therefore, in this discussion is of peculiar importance. The Anglican sense of regeneration is admissible in argument so long only as we do not forget that it is incorrect.

Turning, then, to the Prayer-Book itself, we find our Church has constructed her doctrine in full view of antiquity and in agreement with primitive doctrine. Her Reformers were men of great learning and thoroughly equipped for their task. They knew well the history of the controversy, and this knowledge settled their own position. They held:

1. That regeneration means actual goodness.
2. That faith must be implanted by grace in the infant equally with the adult as the condition of his regeneration.
3. That this faith, though seminal, actually constitutes his regeneration, so that before baptism he has the new nature in that very gift of faith which makes him the worthy recipient of baptism.

It will be remembered that this last condition was identical with what the Schools had taught as to the adult. Assuming the infant's seminal faith, the Reformation divines had as much right to antedate the infant's regeneration before baptism as the Schoolmen had to antedate that of the adult. An antecedent inward grace being supposed in both, both stood upon the same ground. In a word, instead of saying, with the Fathers and Schoolmen, that the infantine state was equivalent to faith and repentance, they held that the grace of baptism was *always* conditional, and infant and adult were dealt with in one and the same way. The baptismal formula, "seeing that this person is regenerate," had already contracted a latitude of construction as to the *time* of regeneration, and

the Reformation divines merely copied and extended a precedent they found ready to hand.

But what of the infant baptized without such seminal grace? Again the Reformers turned to history, and found the key they wanted in the case of the *fictus*. The doctrine of the *fictus* was, as we recollect, that, though he secured the baptismal character, he missed the *thing* of the Sacrament—viz., its full and justifying effect. He had the title-deeds, but not actual possession. He could get it afterwards, not without reference to his baptism, on his faith and repentance. The compilers of the Office of Infant Baptism said exactly the same of the unregenerate infant. Their view is summed up by that theological giant, Archbishop Ussher, thus: "All the promises of God were in my Baptism estated upon me, and sealed up unto me, on God's part; but *then* I come to have the profit and benefit of them when I come to understand what grant God, in Baptism, hath sealed unto me, and actually to lay hold on it by faith." In a word, they only applied to the infant the same law and rule of baptism which the Fathers had applied to the unqualified adult.

Regeneration, then, though linked with infant baptism, is not necessarily tied to it. Such regeneration is always conditional, and in point of time the fulfilment of that condition may precede or follow the Sacrament. *But this is the hypothetical view.* It is, and that view rests on the solid foundations of history; and, moreover, nothing short of a full and complete recognition of the hypothetical interpretation of the words of the Infant Baptismal Service can effect the inclusion of the Calvinist, for outside he is compelled to stand so long as the literal sense is enforced. If not all Calvinists themselves, the Reformation divines were on intimate terms with the leading Continental Calvinists, admitted them to their counsels, and invited their criticism. It is significant that the words "Seeing now that this child is regenerate" are not found in the First Prayer-Book, but in the Second, when the Reformation "was full blown." Bucer and Peter Martyr passed no note of disapprobation of the Office, and in his new Cologne Service Book, in 1543, Bucer actually inserted the very statement we are considering—viz., "Seeing that this child is regenerate." For more than a century after the Reformation the Church was Calvinistic. Calvinism had possession of the Episcopacy, Universities, and Theological Faculties; it was supreme; its interpretation of the Baptismal Office was dominant and authoritative, and it was the hypothetical interpretation. The Puritans, keen-sighted and jealous, never objected to this statement of the Office, though objecting to much else that it contained. The "Ecclesiastical Polity" of

Hooker was written to answer Puritan objections; we find sponsors, the sign of the Cross, etc., complained of, but not this seemingly literal statement. Hooker himself held the doctrine of the indefectibility of grace, which is obviously inconsistent with the literal interpretation. When the Laudian party assumed the reins they never thought of interfering with the hypothetical interpretation even in the plenitude of their power, nor was that interpretation ever seriously called in question until our own day in the Gorham case, and then it was triumphantly vindicated. The judgment was in keeping with the tradition and history of the Church.

Let me earnestly plead, then, with doubting Churchmen for a full and hearty acceptance of the terms of the Baptismal Office as they stand. It is not the words, but their interpretation of the words, that is at fault. They have confounded the general doctrine of baptismal regeneration with the particular assertion that all infants are regenerated in baptism. They have conceived that a literal *statement* must needs bear a literal *meaning*, forgetting that were such meaning the doctrine of the Church she would have defined it dogmatically in her Articles of Religion. Above all, they have neglected the clear daylight of history which puts distorted things in their true perspective, and proves conclusively that in actual usage the literal form is consonant with the hypothetical interpretation. There is nothing strange in such usage; it is simply the counterpart of the Apostolic rule of presumption by which they address the whole body of the baptized as "saints." Such Churchmen may rest assured that a service compiled by those great divines to whom chiefly we owe the blessings of the Reformation has no taint of Popery in it, but is Scriptural and Protestant throughout. If these be the words of faith that our Prayer-Book teaches us to employ, let us see to it that we use them in faith. Above all, let us mark well the element of thanksgiving which permeates the whole. This Office was constructed of old material, but in the new light and liberty of a rediscovered Gospel. The truths of the Fatherhood of God, the completed atonement of Jesus Christ, and the constraining love of the Spirit filled the compilers' hearts. It is when we take our stand beside them that we shall best interpret their meaning and employ their words.

A. E. Barnes-Lawrence.

ART. III.—MR. BALFOUR'S "FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF."

THE appearance of Mr. Balfour's work on the "Foundations of Belief" in a new and revised edition revives interest in the book, and suggests its reconsideration. The first part of the volume is critical and destructive. It is brilliant and epigrammatic, and makes its points with precision. The second is apologetic, and rather plaintively so. It does not pretend to prove the Faith true, but it offers some cogent pleas for not abandoning it until it is proved to be false. The effect, perhaps, reminds one of Descartes' "Morale par provision." The illustrious father of modern Rationalism was prepared to submit himself to the laws and religion under which he was brought up, while stripping himself to the skin of all beliefs unproved. We must remember, however, that Descartes started with a profound conviction that God and himself had a real existence. To-day both self and God are thrown into the midst for discussion, and a provisional belief in either is scarcely compatible with any but the most superficial conformity to our religion. If any man, however, have a firm belief otherwise derived, it may not be superfluous to have somewhat to say on its behalf when plagued by argumentative worldlings. Mr. Balfour's pleas will be of service indeed to believers of any and every faith, provided only that they do not make it themselves, and do not know whence it comes. In these provisos, nevertheless, it well may be that every faith perishes but the faith in God, and in making cosmogonies who shall say that to believe nothing that can be proved is not at least as good an axiom as to believe nothing until it is?

The form of unbelief that Mr. Balfour criticises has many names. Rationalism, Empiricism, Naturalism, Materialism, Sensationalism, Agnosticism are the commonest, and express variously its principles, methods, and results. As Rationalism it doubts till it has proved; as Empiricism it uses the methods of inductive science; as Naturalism it finds for every fact and event in nature "a cause in nature," and, with that working hypothesis run wild, leaps from Darwin to Democritus; as Materialism it pronounces the universe a material mechanism, the body a machine, man an automaton, thought an excretion, and consciousness a superfluous accompaniment of some of the machine's activities; as Sensationalism it is a theory of knowledge. In this it asserts, first, that all our ideas and knowledge are derived by evolution from simple sensations derived themselves from the sensible world; secondly, it asserts that we know only sensations, feelings, thoughts, or

modes of consciousness, but nothing of any external world or matter, and nothing of any causalities connecting them, neither anything of any entity called mind or self; finally, it passes into Critical Idealism, which is, if Professor Huxley may be believed, its legitimate outcome. Agnosticism is its last word, and Agnosticism is not the confession that we cannot know "God as He is," but the assertion that we cannot know that He is. We have no knowledge of an *external world*, or of *self*, or of *God*, and can have none, either by nature or revelation.

At first sight this Agnosticism seems likely to favour the cause of Faith, for if the three faiths are rationally on a par, the plain man is likely to switch the one which he very often lacks on to the two to doubt which he counts lunacy. That we "walk by faith" in walking on our feet has been a rather too common text of late. Mr. Balfour, however, is not *quite* easy in his mind. The two are "inevitable"; the third is plainly not so. The two are universal; the third, he pleads, comes down to us with the authority of the *best* of men; it is therefore only inevitable to those who live "in the spirit," as the other two are to those who live "in the flesh." This, perhaps, is the cause that philosophers' gods are so precarious—here to-day and gone to-morrow—and that Rationalism runs so much in a circle. The "inevitable" two are again liable to go the way of many predecessors as soon as the plain man discovers that the Agnostic gives him a *quid pro quo*, and allows a phenomenal world and a phenomenal self as good for all practical purposes as the real ones taken away.

Mr. Balfour presents the inconsistencies of the polyonomous monster he assails with much force. In the main the contradictions are between Materialism and Sensationalism or Idealism. Professor Huxley, the metaphysician, explained that his postulates of the existence of matter, of a law of causation in nature, and so on, were postulates for use in the laboratory. "Materialism is shorthand Idealism" is his formula; in much the same way he talks of final causes, and credits Nature with design; to do otherwise would necessitate cumbersome paraphrases. One would like, indeed, to see his physiology of the sensations translated into the language of Idealism, or a version even of such a single expression as "movements in the matter of the brain." On the other hand, Professor Huxley, the physiologist, bases his Agnosticism itself on an insuperable gulf between matter and consciousness, which no wit of man can ever explain; and when in that frame of mind, Materialism and Sensationalism set limits, each upon the other, for him. Neither can account for the other, and neither by itself for the universe. It follows that

no account can be given, and we should content ourselves with a quiet ignorance.

In fact, Materialisms never have found God; Idealisms have, but have never been able to keep Him. They stumbled over matter. They became Gnostics, and imagined emanations sinking imperceptibly into the accursed stuff. Professor Huxley determined not to be a Gnostic.

Mr. Balfour lays less stress than one would expect on the emancipation of these systems from the canons of evidence, which they print in their prospectus. That which is proved by them of Evolution would scarcely fill a nutshell, and the proved is unproved so often that to keep up with the variations is difficult. The fashionable "Christian" accommodation "*evolves*" man after the flesh, but not man "after the spirit." Mr. Balfour appears to go further, and to accept an evolution of the Idea of God in "the advanced guard of Humanity." An evolution *in* the Idea of God, which we recognise, is not, however, an evolution *of* the Idea of God to which we demur.

On consequences, that *facilis materia*, Mr. Balfour speaks with force. The considerations nevertheless which he urges are secondary, his complaints and fears those of the politician or the man of culture, rather than the bitter cry of, or for, the soul whose light is being withdrawn. This follows, perhaps, from the character of the audience whom he is addressing.

Morality, "he pleads," would suffer from the loss of a theory of origins from above. He does not assert that the keystone of the arch would be missing, so much as that a halo and glory would be gone. We should travel actually into the land of the sophists, without worship, without reverence, without ideals. Perhaps one might argue that the more probable issue would be a considerable invention of idols.

Of Beauty he thinks Naturalism has no standard or measure. Here the author is at his best. Professor Huxley, as we know, thought the difference between Beethoven's Sonatas and "Cherry Ripe" clear and distinguishable by the natural man, who has, or may have, not merely a perception of difference, but a perception of values. Ruskin tells us that we build ugly houses because we are godless. There are others, like the author of "Nature for her own Sake," who find Beauty in her, without thought of her origin or even in the thought of her self-origination. If Beauty and the Infinite hang together, the practical eternity and infinity of Nature, the Vastness of her activities, provide practically enough of Infinity for Art. Naturalism inspired a great poem.

Of course the only convincing form of the argument from

consequences is that the consequences are incompatible with facts. Without the idea of a Living God the morality of Theism would be impossible. If the first has no foundation the last goes with it. The question whether a morality purely finite in its conception and outlook would not suffice for finite man leads us into regions of prophecy on the one side, and debates on the nature of man on the other.

The object of the discussion thus far is to discredit indirectly the original principle of Rationalism, by the use of which the results have been attained. That principle was to doubt everything until we have proved it by the "method of Zadig." Mr. Balfour proceeds to discuss the principle itself. He distinguishes between the reasons and causes of Belief, and dwells upon the commonplace that Belief may follow on bad reasoning or no reasoning. Authority is of course the alternative plank. Under Authority are included not only authority of kings and priests, promulgating decrees and dogmas, but public opinion, habit, and ultimately indeed the imperative of the nature into which without reasoning we have grown. The paradox emerges that it is this very authority which commands us to reason, and points to "belief with the understanding" as an indispensable condition of believing rightly. On the other hand, again, the original authority has been unwilling or unable to prevent us reasoning badly, and these bad reasonings have been taken up into and blended with authority itself. If, then, we admit that we are by nature under a Law and subject to Categorical Imperatives, there are so many of these, and these so conflicting, that one knows not which to obey. Is there among them any one Categorical Imperative that stands out from the rest, and gives us a *point d'appui* while we reason? Rationalism gives us one. "Thou shalt doubt," and by doubting thou shalt come to understand. Faith gives us another: "Thou shalt believe, and by believing thou shalt understand." It is speculatively an insoluble problem, and so far the verdict is against speculation. "The morale *par provision*" is plainly inapplicable. Authority provisionally believed in collapses as a "cause of faith." The only question is whether the recognition of Categorical Imperatives in any form is not the very *point d'appui* we seek, and whether "I am the Lord thy God" is not an implicit assertion in each of them.

Certainly in our religion the ventures of reason are subject to an obedience and guided by Faith.

There is much interesting matter, many fertile suggestions, in this last half of the volume. The writer has seen many things with open eyes; he puts what he has seen clearly, without extravagance, with courtesy and moderation and

humility, yet with firmness, and we know not where we shall find the pleas for Religion more convincingly put for the circle and from the point of view of the general reader. "General reader" we take in this case to mean, not one ignorant, or unversed, or superficial, but one not necessarily distressed at the loss of his Lord (that Rationalism threatens), with the special and peculiar distress of him from whom is being taken away the *bonum quo non majus aliud*. For him there is another and a different voice. "Why weepest thou?" "Whom seekest thou?"

Those who are troubled not about the deeper verities of the Faith, but minor points, may find much to help them in Mr. Balfour's suggestions. That words are ambiguous, that the meaning of propositions changes, that formulæ have other uses than to express thought, that the submission of the intellect is good for the intellect itself, that the strength of faith is to sit still, all these are excellent maxims, sceptical perhaps in their tendency until examined a little in detail, but useful. We know not where they are more conveniently discussed than in this volume, and in an age in which the growth of knowledge so incessantly assails old landmarks and dogmas the discussion is forced upon us. Mr. Balfour treats them as a statesman and a man of letters, rather than as either a metaphysician or a theologian. He would be the first to admit that, without very considerable limitations, the line of reflection which he pursues may very well end even politically in disaster. No party, much less the Church, can live by a form of words alone, possessing by them alone its identity and unity. The Church requires a fundamental unity in essential faith. Ambiguity as a bond of comprehension fails if it touch the essential, or if, while touching the essential, it be anything more than a temporary suspension of judgment.

It is, on the whole, such a temporary suspension of judgment of which Mr. Balfour is the advocate. He shows cause, on the one hand, why Naturalism should be sent back for revision before acceptance; he shows cause, on the other hand, why the Christian Faith may still be retained on rational principles. We should say that the effect of the line of reasoning followed would be an indulgent toleration for all kinds of idolatries as equally rational and equally irrational.

W. D. ALLEN.

ART. IV.—THE PHYSICAL CAUSE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

MR. FRAZER'S theory that the Crucifixion was only an annual ceremony which the Jews brought back with them from the Captivity raises again the question of the physical cause of our Lord's death. Some brief notes on the subject may be useful at this season.

I find in the British Museum a treatise by Dr. William Stroud (London, 1847), "On the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ." In this he shows that death was due to actual rupture of the heart—that is, a rupture of the heart-wall. The escaping contents in these cases exhibit after death exactly and unmistakably such a stream of blood and water as flowed from our Lord's side. This condition is not infrequently found by anatomists in post-mortem examinations in such cases, as I have, at least once, personally verified. Many of these are on record in the medical text-books, where both the quantity and the quality of the blood escaping from the ruptured heart has been carefully noted. Dr. Frederick Roberts says that "this rare lesion is almost invariably induced by some exciting occurrence, and is much more frequent in males and old persons, and is generally the result of some *structural* change in the cardiac walls, great dilatation, cardiac aneurism, hæmorrhage into the walls, or fatty disease, especially degeneration. It is much more frequent in the left ventricle, and the direction of the laceration is generally parallel to the chief fibres of the heart. Death may be instantaneous, or very rapid after *sudden* insensibility, preceded by 'a loud cry' or shriek." Sophocles, the greatest of Greek tragedians, expired thus, on its being announced to him that he had been awarded the palm of victory over all competitors. Dr. Stroud, in the work I have referred to, notes, amongst many other cases of broken heart from mental emotion, that of a father dying in this way on being told that three of his sons had been crowned as victors in the Olympian games in one day.

Post-mortem examinations now reveal many such instances, formerly attributed vaguely to joy, grief, or anger, but actually due to rupture of the heart, producing immediate death. The muscle is rent or torn by the *sudden* violence of its action, and the blood, issuing from the laceration thus produced, stops the action of the heart by its pressure upon the pericardium, the envelope by which the heart is surrounded and enclosed. When rupture of the heart takes place, and the blood passes from it into the enclosing sac, it coagulates slowly, the watery part separating from its thicker substance,

and the escaping contents then exhibit, after death, a mingled stream of blood and water. In the death on the Cross we have the literal fulfilment of Ps. lxix. 20, 21, "Reproach hath broken my heart," etc.

Professor Walshe, in his classic treatise on "Diseases of the Heart," when treating of the symptoms indicating death by rupture of the heart, says, "The hand is suddenly carried to the front of the chest, a piercing shriek uttered," and all is over. Dr. James Begbie, of Edinburgh, Sir James Simpson, Sir John Struthers and others, on being written to by Dr. Hanna, my old Sunday-school teacher, drawing their attention to Dr. Stroud's treatise, entirely endorsed his conclusions as to the actual physical cause of Christ's death, as described by the eye-witness, John.

The whole physical aspect of the subject is exhaustively dealt with by Dr. William Hanna, of St. John's Free Church, Edinburgh, son-in-law of Dr. Thomas Chalmers and colleague of Dr. Thomas Guthrie, in his work on "The Last Day of Our Lord's Passion" (Edinburgh, 1862). He also fully explains, in this connection, the actual physical meaning of the words, "not by water only, but by water and by blood," in the most interesting and convincing manner.

This view of the physical cause of Christ's death disposes of an objection of M. Renan, in his "Vie de Jésus." "A few hours' suspension from the cross," says Renan, "seemed . . . altogether insufficient to produce such a result." Renan's position is rendered untenable by the fact that a sufficient cause of death is shown. On this point Sir John Struthers says that any intelligent medical man will be satisfied, and adds: "No other hypothesis will satisfactorily explain the separate escape of blood and water from a wound in that region." Sir James Simpson puts it in detail thus: "Let me state the arguments for this view in the form of a few brief propositions: (1) Death was not the mere result of crucifixion, for, firstly, the period was too short; a person in the prime of life not dying within six hours, as He did, but usually surviving till the second or third day, or even longer. Secondly, the attendant phenomena, at the time of actual death, were different from those of crucifixion. The crucified die, as is well known, under a lingering process of gradual exhaustion, weakness, and faintness. On the contrary, Christ died with a loud voice, and spoke once and again, all, apparently, within a few minutes of His dissolution. (2) No known injury, lesion, or disease of the brain, lungs, or other vital organs, could account for such a sudden termination of His sufferings in death, except (*a*) arrestment of the action of the heart by fatal fainting, or syncope, or (*b*) rupture of the

walls of the heart, or larger bloodvessels issuing from it." After showing that it was not syncope, and quoting Dr. Walshe to the effect that the symptoms were those of rupture of the heart, "a piercing shriek uttered," etc., Sir J. Simpson goes on to say that (3) "the details regarding Christ's death are most strikingly peculiar in this respect, that they offer us the result of a very rude dissection, as it were, by the gash made in His side after death by the thrust of the Roman soldier's spear, and I do not think anything could possibly account for the appearance of 'blood and water,' as described by the Apostle, except a collection of blood effused into the sac of the pericardium in consequence of rupture of the heart, and subsequently separated into the usual red clot and white or limpid serum. . . . (4) Death by mere crucifixion was not a form of death in which there was much, if, indeed, any, shedding of blood. The whole language and types of Scripture, however, involve the idea that the atonement for our sins was obtained by the *blood* of Christ shed for us during His death on the cross. . . . (5) He was ultimately 'slain,' not by the effects of the anguish of His corporeal frame, but by the effects of the mightier anguish of His mind; the walls of His heart—like the veil, as it were, in the temple of His human body—were rent and riven, as for us 'He poured out His soul unto death'; in that awful hour 'the travail of His soul' thus standing out greater than even that of the body." Dr. James Begbie, late President of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh, affirms also that "such a lesion accounts for the phenomena recorded in the Scriptures regarding Him, namely, the earlier than usual cessation of life during crucifixion, and the issuing of blood and water on the piercing of His side with the spear, thus literally fulfilling the prophetic words, 'Reproach hath broken My heart,' in the Old Testament writings concerning Him."

J. Moir.

Art. V.—THE LIFE AND TIMES OF GREGORY OF TOURS.

II.

THESE "weaker vessels" were too powerful for the Church to restrain or punish, and with others the Church, as represented by Gregory, was hardly more successful. Thus, a certain Ingeltrude had built and furnished a monastery, and her married daughter was appointed Abbess. But the latter's

husband objected to his wife taking the veil, and she withdrew to the neutral ground of the Bishop's house. The mother, as foundress, at once claimed the furniture of the monastery as her property, while the daughter declared it belonged to her as Abbess. The dispute was referred to King Childebert, who deputed Gregory and another to settle the matter. They found, however, that interference with "family jars" is neither a pleasant nor a satisfactory undertaking. Striving to please all parties, their decision was that the furniture should be divided into four equal parts, Ingeltrude and her three nephews (her heirs) to have three parts, and her daughter the remaining fourth. But neither side accepted this partition. Ingeltrude hoped to simplify matters by deposing her daughter, and appointing in her stead as Abbess her grand-daughter. The ejected daughter, however, abode her time, and when her mother died she approached Childebert, and got herself recognised as heiress to her mother. Armed with new powers, she made short work of the pretensions of the young Abbess. She went to the monastery, took away every bit of furniture, "leaving only the bare walls."

In fact, very few of the women mentioned by Gregory bear characters that win our esteem or respect. As a rule, they are bloodthirsty and vindictive, greedy of power and wealth, totally unscrupulous both in methods and morals. To take only one more instance: Chrodield, conceiving a hatred for the Abbess of St. Croix, charges her with all sorts of vices, and under this pretext attacks the monastery with her armed men. The Abbess managed to escape, and appealed to King Gontramn for redress. The King delegates Gregory and other Bishops to hold a court of inquiry into the alleged grievances. Their report was as follows: (1) The charges were without a shred of foundation. (2) The Abbess should be restored. (3) Chrodield should be punished with excommunication. They attached the request that Gontramn would see the judgment carried out. These two cases are interesting, not only as throwing a strong light upon the state of Frankish society, but as showing how little punitive power rested with the Church. In each instance the grieved party appeals to the King, though the matter in dispute is ecclesiastical. In each case the Bishops are merely Royal Commissioners, with powers to investigate and report only. The executive lies wholly in the hands of the King.

From the careers of these Frankish Jezebels we turn with a sense of relief to the study of the controversies on Christian dogmatics. In Gregory's eyes orthodoxy covered a multitude of sins, while heterodoxy was the mother of all wickedness.

It is well known that the Franks from the time of the conversion of Clovis were orthodox in their views upon the Holy Trinity. The Gauls, whose country they possessed, were also equally sound, but the Burgundian and Visigoths were strongly Arian. Hence, Gregory appears as a defender of the faith. His weapons, broadly speaking, are reproductions from Constantinople and the fourth century, but we miss in him the subtlety of the Greek and the casuistry of the Oriental. Both sides, orthodox as well as Arian, display an acquaintance with the stock arguments, gained either by reading or tradition. But while we expect to find the clergy well versed in such theology, we read with astonishment of Kings, with whom the sword was mightier than the pen, and force than persuasion, entering with the greatest zeal into these controversies, and supporting their views even in writing.

Besides the Arian controversy, we have a good deal of "free thought" respecting such cardinal dogmas as the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Canon. Incidentally we obtain considerable information on the accepted text of Holy Scripture, for frequent appeal is made to it as the final arbiter in matters of faith by all parties of disputants. This part of Gregory's writings has been rendered still more interesting and serviceable to students of textual criticism by the publication in 1883-1885 of a new edition of his works,[1] in which the greatest care and the ripest scholarship have been devoted to reproduce the grammar and spelling in the original rude and provincial Latin just as Gregory wrote it.

We are left in no doubt as to Gregory's own doctrinal convictions. "I will hold," he says, "without any guile or hesitation, only that which is authoritatively pronounced to be the faith of the Church."[2] To this general declaration he adds an expansion of, or commentary on, the Nicene Creed, after the pattern of Cyril's "Catechesis," or Augustine's "De Fide et Symbolo." In this commentary we find Gregory expressing his belief in the perpetual virginity of Mary,[3] although it should be stated that the clause is wanting in the "Codex Regius," and should be viewed with suspicion.

An example or two of these controversies may be of interest, and serve to illustrate the methods by which they were conducted. Chilperic published a pamphlet in which he sought

[1] "Monumenta Germaniæ Historiæ," under the editorship of W. Arndt and Br. Krusch.

[2] "Illud tantum studens ut quod in ecclesia credi prædicatur, sine aliquo fuco aut cordis hesitatione retineam."

[3] "Credo beatam Mariam ut virginem ante partum ita virginem et post partum."

to revive the errors of Sabellius upon the Trinity. Gregory felt himself constrained as a Bishop of the Church to refute the King's opinions, and declare his own belief in the following words: "In Person the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost mutually differ. The Father did not assume flesh, nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son, in order that He who had taken flesh in the world might Himself be offered for the world. Still, what I say of the Persons must be understood, not corporally, but spiritually." With this statement of faith the Bishop confounded and silenced the King. He was, however, not equally successful with Ægilan, an Arian, who happened to be at the Court of Chilperic on an embassy from Leuvichild. The Arian rested his position upon John xiv. 28, "My Father is greater than I." Which Gregory meets with John x. 30, "I and My Father are one." From this passage he contends: "Therefore the Son is equal in Deity to, not less than, the Father; neither has He anything less. For if you acknowledge Him to be God, you must acknowledge Him perfect (*integrum*) and lacking in nothing. If, on the contrary, you deny Him to be perfect, you do not believe He is God." Ægilan rejoins: "From the time that He assumed humanity He began to be called the Son of God, for there was a time when He was not." Gregory parries this with John i. 1, 14, and against this the Arian apparently could not stand, for the discussion passed on to the status of the Holy Spirit. Ægilan maintained that the Holy Spirit is not equal to the Father and the Son, because the latter had sent Him, and therefore the Holy Ghost bore to the Son the relation of a servant to a master, or ambassador to a King. Gregory warns Ægilan that he is rendering himself liable to the charge and penalty of speaking against the Holy Ghost, quoting Matt. xii. 32. He also reminds him of the fate of Ananias and Sapphira—both extraordinary and, in fact, distorted applications of the Word of God. These arguments failed to convince Ægilan, till at length Gregory, greatly exasperated at his stubbornness, exclaimed: "You Arians think nothing rightly concerning the Holy Trinity. How iniquitous the perversity of your sect is the death of your founder, Arius, clearly shows." Ægilan quietly rebuked him for his intolerance: "Do not blaspheme a dogma because thou dost not hold it. Though we do not believe what you believe, we do not blaspheme it, for it is not reckoned a crime if there are differences of worship. We have a common saying that if a man passes between the altars of the heathen and a Church of God, he is not offending if he venerate both." "But I," continues Gregory, "seeing his foolishness, said: 'As I see, thou showest thyself to be a defender of heathen and an

advocate of heretics, since thou dost foul the dogmas of the Church and preachest that we should adore the filth of Pagans. . . .' Whereat he, stung to fury, and gnashing his teeth like a madman (I know not why), replied: 'May the breath leap the fetters of this body ere I accept a benediction from any priest of your religion.' And I retorted: 'May the Lord never allow our religion or faith to become so indifferent to us that we should cast His Holy One to dogs and expose the sacred things of precious pearls to dirty pigs.'"

Gregory carried his faith in the doctrine of the Trinity to such lengths that he regarded its special formula ("In the Name," etc.) as a sort of charm or prophylactic against injury. In an attempt to traduce the heretics he only exposes his own superstition. Amalsuintha, daughter of Theodoric, the Ostrogothic King of Italy and an Arian, had, according to one account,[1] murdered her mother by putting poison into the chalice at Holy Communion. Gregory's observation on this outrage is as follows: "In the face of these deeds, what will these wretched heretics answer, that the enemy should have place in their holy things? *We*, who confess the Trinity to be co-equal in dignity and omnipotence, even if we drink anything deadly in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, shall receive no hurt." In the prologue to his third book he would have us believe that national prosperity and adversity are dependent upon right and wrong views of the Trinity. "I will," he says, "with your permission, for a little while relate how prosperous were the affairs of those Christians who acknowledged the Blessed Trinity, and what disasters befel those heretics who divide the same. . . . Clovis the King believed in it, and by its aid overcame the heretics themselves, and enlarged his kingdom through the whole of Gaul. Alaric denied it, and lost his kingdom, his people, and, what is better than all, eternal life itself." He further instances the fate respectively of Godegisil, Godomar, and Gondobad, "who lost at the same time their fatherland and their soul." But, unfortunately for this theory, history is against it. Gondobad, at any rate, ruled over a most flourishing fatherland, died a natural death, and left his kingdom to his son Sigismund. He also compiled the Burgundian code, known as the "Lex Gondobada," or "Loi Gombette," "one of the famous barbarian codes which go far to prove that the name of barbarian must not be too indiscriminately applied to the Teutonic races."

[1] Gregory himself gives another version; Procopius and Jornandes again differ from Gregory. Gregory is doubtless wrong in his account, but that does not affect our argument above.

The doctrine of the Trinity was a fundamental article of faith in the Frankish Church. Not so, apparently, the doctrine of the Resurrection. Gregory tells us there were certain presbyters in his own church who did not believe in this article of the Christian faith, contending that it was contrary to (1) reason and (2) Scripture. (1) How can those human bodies which have nourished animals come together in their several parts? (2) How can we reconcile the doctrine of a general resurrection with Ps. i. 5—"The ungodly do not rise again (*resurgunt*[1]) in the judgment"? Gregory rests his counter-argument upon Holy Scripture and Apostolic tradition. The whole chapter ("Hist. Franc.," x. 13) is very interesting, but it would take too much space to particularize it.

In Holy Scripture Gregory included the Apocrypha. This is proved by the controversy he held with a certain Priscus, a Jew, touching the crucifixion of our Lord. The discussion was begun by Chilperic, but his controversial powers were exhausted when Priscus asked how a God could allow himself to be treated so shamefully. Gregory came to the rescue. As Priscus did not accept the authority of the New Testament, Gregory cites passages from his own prophets, and so slays him with his own sword, as David did Goliath. His first quotation is from Baruch iii. 36, 37, and his second is the well-known variation in Ps. xcvi. 10, "Dominus regnavit a ligno,"[2] against the genuineness of which the Jew raised no objection. But Gregory's principal weapon, which he drew from the armoury of the Old Testament, was, of course, Is. liii. His readings are of considerable interest and value, and go to show that there was no "Authorized Version," unless we agree that he is quoting from memory.[3]

---

[1] Vulg., *resurgent.*

[2] Gregory's reading agrees with that of Tertullian, Augustine, etc., but differs from the Vulgate. Justin Martyr is the first to accuse the Jews of erasing the words for polemical reasons. They are found both in the Latin and Gothic Psalters.

[3] Isa. liii. 12: Greg., "Ipse peccata nostra portabit, et orabit pro transgressoribus"; Vulg., "Ipse peccata multorum tulit, et pro transgressoribus rogavit"; Vers. Antiq., "Ipse peccata multorum suscepit, et propter iniquitates eorum traditus est." Cypr., Tert., Ambr., Aug., also have this "traditus est." Gregory's reading is unsupported. Isa. liii. 17: Greg., "Quasi agnus coram tondente se sine voce, sic non aperuit os suum. In humiliatione judicium ejus sublatum est"; Vulg., "Quasi agnus coram tondente se obmutescet, et non aperiet os suum." Vers. Antiq. reads "mutus" for "sine voce"; Iren., "in conspectu tondentis sine voce." Tert. varies; sometimes he is exactly like Gregory, except "velut" for "quasi"; at other times he differs from him, always, however, retaining "sine voce." Novat., Cypr., Lact., Ambr., Aug., agree with Gregory's reading.

Gregory had to confess that he was not so successful with Priscus as David was with Goliath: "Though we brought forward these and other references, the wretched man was not moved to compunction or conviction." One other argument remained, at any rate with Jews—that of coercion; but Gregory refrained from availing himself of this, preferring the opinion and example of his tutor, Avitus: "I do not compel you by force to believe on the Son of God."

The circumstances under which this principle was stated and acted upon are very striking, and throw a strong light upon Frankish social life. Avitus, Bishop of Auvergne, had converted a Jew to Christianity. His baptism took place at Easter. As the procession moved from the church to the Basilica of St. Martin some Jews, annoyed with the pervert, threw some rancid oil over him, in mockery of his having been anointed with the consecrated oil. The populace were furious at this outrage, and retaliated by demolishing the synagogue of the Jews. Avitus, while deprecating such violence, urged the Jews to follow the example of the new convert, and accept baptism. He pointed them to the Good Shepherd, Who had them in His mind when He said: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, that there may be one *flock* and one shepherd."[1] The sequel remains to be told. When King Gontramn entered the city after a successful campaign, the Jews were particularly demonstrative in their acclamations. But Gontramn was not to be caught so easily. "Woe to the Jewish race!" he exclaimed—"wicked and perfidious! living ever by craftiness! Their applause and adulation would convey the impression that all nations should adore me as lord, but their real purpose is that I should be deluded into ordering that their synagogue, which has been razed to the ground by the Christians, should be rebuilt at the public expense. God forbid that I should ever do such a thing!" . . . "Oh, noble King! what wondrous insight to detect thus the cunning of the unbelievers!"—a comment which shows that Gregory's sympathies were wholly with this prejudice.

It must not be assumed, however, that the controversialists were divided into two sharply-defined camps. Amongst the Trinitarians there were several "schools of thought," more or less divergent from what, according to the Council of Chalce-

[1] Gregory reads "ex *ovili* suo . . . unus *grex*"; Vulg., "ex hoc ovili . . . unum ovile"; Vers. Antiq., "*ovile* . . . grex." Jerome has not caught the important distinction between "ovile" and "grex." Augustine varies, reading sometimes "ovile" in both places, sometimes "ovile . . . grex." The old Latin texts agree with Gregory. *Vide* Bishop Westcott's Additional Note on John x. 16.

don, is τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ ἀμωμήτου πίστεως ἡ ἔκθεσις. Gregory stoutly upheld and defended the doctrine of the Church as defined by her Councils. Thus, when Chilperic attempted to enforce upon his people *his* views of the Trinity, Gregory boldly resisted him. The King recited what he had written upon the subject, adding: "It is my will that such shall be thy belief also, and that of all other doctors of the Church." "Deceive not yourself, my lord King," the Bishop replied; "in this matter you must follow the teaching of the Apostles and doctors of the Church, the teaching of Hilary and Eusebius, according to the confession you made at your baptism." "It appears, then," said Chilperic, "that Hilary and Eusebius are my declared enemies on this point." "Not so," answered Gregory; "neither God nor His saints are your enemies." And he proceeded to expound unto him the way of God more clearly—*i.e.*, the Catholic and Apostolic doctrines of the Trinity. The King was not, however, to be shaken in his opinions. "I shall set forth," he said, "my ideas to those that are wiser than you, and they will approve them." "Never," retorted the Bishop; "it would be no wise man, but a lunatic, that would accept such views as yours!" Religious controversy is hopeless and discredited when it falls into vituperation.

Late in life Gregory went to Rome[1]—his only visit—when his namesake, Gregory the Great, was Pope. Gregory of Tours was a Zaccheus in stature, and it is said that when Gregory the Great saw Gregory the Small he humorously expressed his astonishment that so great an intellect should be contained in so small a body. Gregory replied: "The Lord made us, and not we ourselves, both small and great." The aptness and piety of this repartee raised the Frankish Bishop higher still in the estimation of the Pope.

The greatness of his intellect, which astonished the Pope, is unquestionable. No one can withhold his admiration for a man who, amidst incessant civil wars and journeyings often, could find time for so much historical and other writings of a miscellaneous character. We have only space for a short notice of his voluminous works. He says himself: "I have written ten books of Histories, seven of Miracles, one of the Lives of the Fathers. I have compiled in one book a treatise on the Psalter and one book on Church courses."[2] The Seven

[1] The date of Gregory's death is generally given as November 17, 595, and the year, at any rate, is probably correct; for he mentions the death of Gontramn (593), but not of Childebert II. (596). Now, in 596 the Pope addressed a letter to *Pelagius*, Bishop of Tours, who may be regarded as Gregory's successor.

[2] "Hist. Franc.," x. 31, 19.

Books of Miracles he explains in his Prologue to the "Glories of the Confessors": "In the first book I have given some particulars of the miracles of our Lord and the holy Apostles and other martyrs; in the second, the virtues of the holy martyr Julian; four books contain the virtues of St. Martin; the seventh the life of certain monks; and this eighth the miracles of the Confessors." The seventh is really the "Lives of the Fathers." All these works are extant except "De Cursibus Ecclesiasticis" and the "Commentary on the Psalter,"[1] of which only fragments remain. He had several works on hand at the same time, as may be shown directly from his own statements and inferred by examining and comparing his writings. His principal work, "The History of the Franks," was written in two parts (i.-vi. and vii.-x.), the first six books reaching as far as the death of Chilperic. Fredegaire knew only of the first six books, for he expressly says in his preface that his is a continuation of the history by Gregory from the death of Chilperic. "Anonymous," who wrote "Gesta Francorum," knew only these six, and the older MSS. contain no more. He leaves us in no doubt as to what were his objects in compiling this "History of the Franks." These were: (*a*) That he might narrate the wars of kings with hostile tribes, of martyrs with pagans, of the churches with heretics; (*b*) that, for the sake of those who despaired of the world coming to an end, he might by means of chronicles and histories show the total number of years since the beginning of the world. With these objects before him he selected from the Old Testament only those things which illustrated local or contemporary history. He traces the struggle of belief with unbelief. A "pious" or "religious" vein runs through his historical works. He strives to prove from history that "righteousness exalteth a nation," where righteousness is equivalent to orthodoxy and obedience to the Church. This is equally true to individuals. What brought about the assassination of Sigibert? His disobedience to Bishop Germanus, who warned him against attacking his brother Chilperic. And "what killed Chilperic, but his own wickedness and thy prayer, O Gontramn?" There could be no doubt upon the matter, for had not both he (Gregory) and Gontramn seen a vision that revealed to them the cause? This unfortunate partiality everywhere disfigures his history, and other blemishes no less serious mar his work. His writings

[1] At one time it was thought that this "Commentary" had been discovered in the Vatican library with the title "Florentii Georgii et Gregorii Commentarius in Psalmos"; but authors were cited therein of a later date than Gregory, and the title was also by a later hand.

lack balance. Councils at which he himself was present are fully noticed, but others at which very important business was transacted are omitted altogether. Some things are related twice—*e.g.*, the sedition of Hermengild. There is no chronological order: an account of Sigibert's attack on Arles in 566 is followed by particulars of a landslip in 563, and that again by events which occurred in 571. Again, in all probability his "History of the Franks" was never finished. The last book (x.) is much shorter than the others.[1] The second, third, fourth and sixth books end with the death of kings (the other books were too lengthy already to be prolonged), and we should naturally look for the tenth book to end with the death of Gontramn. He, however, takes leave of us rather lamely with an account of a famine. His other works are rounded off with "Amen," but this habit is not followed in his history. We should have expected, if the author himself regarded as finished such a *magnum opus*, some reflections upon its completion; but there are none. The Epilogue tells us plainly that the History was written in the twenty-first year of his episcopate (*i.e.*, 593-594), and some have therefore supposed that, being sick, he composed the Epilogue, which *assumes* the History to be completed, in the hope that he might finish his great work on recovery. On the other hand, the authenticity of this Epilogue has been questioned. It is not found in some very good MSS., and it contains statements which are at variance with the History itself.

Gregory apologizes for his style of writing. "I crave," he says, "the pardon of my readers if I have transgressed the laws of spelling or of grammar. In these matters I have not been fully taught." He evidently looked for readers of his works beyond the limits of his own semi-civilized nation, and particularly in Italy, where he felt that his rude diction and cumbersome phraseology would excite the smile or the frown of the learned. Himself the most educated man amongst the Franks, he nevertheless was sensible of the inferiority of his style to that of authors who wrote in their mother tongue. His own narrow views were largely responsible for this fault. He believed that it was contrary to his Christianity to have any fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Of the classical authors whose literary beauty and force he despised off-hand he thus writes: "The presbyter Jerome tells how he was brought before the tribunal of the Eternal Judge, before Whom he was laid flat for punishment and grievously beaten

[1] Except Books I. and III., which have good reason for ending respectively where they do—viz., the death of St. Martin and of King Theudebert.

because he had frequently read the sophistries of Cicero or the fables of Vergil. . . . No one ought to relate preposterous fables or follow the wisdom of philosophers that is hateful to God. . . . This I fear to do."[1] Still, it is greatly to his credit that he *was* conscious of his defects, for it shows that with all his disadvantages he possessed at least a literary *taste* of a high order. We must admire him not only for what he accomplished, but for his aspirations to accomplish it better and make it more acceptable to his readers. We must not allow his own modest disclaimer to blind us to a just appreciation of his real merits. His industry and perseverance are beyond all praise when we think of the conditions amid which he searched and wrote. He has no rival; his writings are of unique value. If they were lost, nothing that we have could fill their place. His pictures may be rough in their execution, but they are true to life.

The student of the "Life and Times of Gregory" must be profoundly grateful that his directions with regard to his works were faithfully observed: "Although these books of mine are written in a somewhat unpolished style, I nevertheless adjure all the priests of the Lord who, after my unworthy self, shall be pastors of the Church of Tours . . . that they never suffer these books to be destroyed or to be copied with selections or omissions, but let them all remain with you, entire and unmutilated."[2]

H. J. WARNER.

ART. VI.—THE SERMON: EXPOSITORY OR TOPICAL?

"Non vi si pensa quanto sangue costa
Seminarla nel mondo, e quanto piace
Chi umilmente con essa s' accosta.
Per apparer ciascun s' ingegna, e face
Sue invenzioni, e quelle son trascorse
Dai predicanti, e il Vangelio si tace."
Parad., xxix. (91-96).

NOT very long before his death the late Bishop of London is said to have stated to a layman in his diocese that, in order to improve the modern style of sermons, he was accustomed to give two practical rules to his ordination candidates—viz.:

[1] "Mir. Proem."

[2] "Conjuro omnes sacerdotes Domini, ut nunquam libros hos abolere faciatis aut rescribi quasi quædam legentes et quasi quædam prætermittentes, sed ita omnia vobiscum integra inlibataque permaneant" (Epilogue Hist. Franc.).

(1) "Always preach about a subject, not a text"; and (2) "Never talk about truths in the abstract, but apply them to the actual problems which you know are felt by those to whom you are speaking."

The only comment I would make upon the second of these rules is that no thoughtful man can have any possible doubt of its value. Preaching which does not help people to think more clearly upon the actual problems, whether personal, social, intellectual, or spiritual, with which they are faced, and which does not help them to live better, happier, and more useful lives in the actual circumstances under which they are living, entirely fails of its object. We can only trust that those preachers who read this rule will be careful to notice that it contains a very large assumption—that the preacher does know, and therefore has taken the trouble to get to know (and this kind of knowledge is only gained from long, close, and intimate personal intercourse), what are the problems and the circumstances upon which and in which his hearers are needing light and help.

But the first rule, "Always preach about a subject, and not a text," stated thus shortly, strikes one as open to misconception, if not to misconstruction, and I cannot help suspecting that, in transmission, the Bishop's words must have suffered at least some measure of mutilation. Amplified and wisely interpreted, as the rule doubtless would be when given, it certainly contains a view of preaching for which much can be said; but taken just as it stands, it might be held to depreciate expository preaching, and to assert that the so-called "topical" sermon was likely to be much more useful than the sermon which is chiefly concerned with the careful exposition of a fragment of Holy Scripture.

But can the best preaching be briefly divided under the two heads of "topical" and "expository"? Can we say of the great sermons of the great preachers, either of the past or the present, that this particular sermon could be adequately described and labelled "topical," and that particular sermon "expository"? Will not the two qualities be generally, more or less closely, combined? A merely "topical" sermon might be little more than a discussion of some particular subject, with a text prefixed as a motto. Was not this the style of sermon which in the not very distant past was stigmatized and condemned as the "mere moral essay"? It need not be hortative or even judicial, but might consist simply in the setting side by side different, and, possibly, even contradictory, views of some current topic, or of a subject of general interest at the particular time.

On the other hand, the merely expository sermon may no

doubt differ but little from an enlarged or altogether overgrown critical note, such notes as are found in the appendices of several well-known modern commentaries. It may consist in a discussion of the etymology of the words, the grammar of the sentences, and the different ways in which the language may be interpreted, without finally deciding what the writer's real meaning or intention was. (Passages in which the preacher feels he cannot arrive at such a decision are surely best not chosen as texts for sermons.)

I cannot help thinking that most readers of these pages could, if they would try to do so, recall occasions on which they have heard, "in the place of the sermon," discussions of both these kinds. Either one or the other may have been so far useful as to stimulate thought or study upon the subject or the text on the part of one or two hearers, but such discussions will never effect what a sermon is meant to effect; they will not help to bring forth the *fruits* of repentance (in the true meaning of the word); they are not likely to stimulate to action.

But the preacher who bases exhortation upon exposition of Holy Scripture can—at least, in some measure—say, "Thus saith the Lord," and more especially so if he has been interpreting, and is now applying, words of our Lord, or some message of a prophet.

One great weakness which is wont to be charged against expository preaching is that it frequently "lacks point." It has been well said that the message which "goes home," which finds entrance into and dwells in the heart and conscience of the hearer, must be shaped as a nail or a wedge: it must "grow to a point." But in the ordinary exposition of a passage quite a number of applications or lessons are discovered, all very necessary, very practical, and much needed at the present time. To omit any of these seems like robbing the passage of a part of its meaning, or its writer of a portion of his intention. Here lies one of the greatest difficulties and problems of expository preaching.

Some may recollect how the late Dr. Vaughan overcame it in such expository sermons as those upon the Epistle to the Philippians or on the Revelation. In these sermons there seem to be generally three parts—(1) A careful exposition, not of a single verse, but of several consecutive verses; (2) a brief indication of the various practical lessons contained in or suggested by them; and (3) a choice of one or, at most, two particularly outstanding applications, and a driving home of these by a fuller expansion and, it may be, by repetition of them under somewhat different aspects. Thus, while the thoughtful listener, who has carefully followed the sermon, has

gathered a rich harvest of instruction, the more careless hearer may, in the final narrowing of the application, have had one or two "nails" driven home by one who is a master at his art.

A serious danger and disadvantage which may attach to the topical sermon is that the preacher may seem to be speaking simply in his own name, giving his own reasons, using his own experiences. That to some extent he must do all these is no doubt true; indeed, unless he has personally felt the need and the value of what he is offering to others, he will do very little good. But suppose any thoughtful, humble-minded man, and especially any young man, were to realize that he was preaching in his own name, I suppose that the very revelation to him of the arrogancy of his daring to occupy such a position would convince him not merely that such a position was unfit, but that it should be impossible. If he speaks in his own name, without directly or indirectly basing his reasons, arguments, exhortation, or appeal upon the spirit or words of Holy Scripture, without feeling that he can say, "Thus saith the Lord," he must know that on whatever subject—apart from the interpretation of Holy Scripture—he is speaking, there are among his hearers, probably, more than one or two who are far more fitted to speak upon that subject than himself.

Of course, there are topical sermons which are thoroughly and intensely Scriptural, whose every statement is based upon either the spirit or the words of the Bible, and whose arguments are knitted by references or by texts from the same. Look, for example, at the "Parochial and Plain Sermons" of Cardinal Newman. A very great many of these may well, from their titles, be classed as topical—*e.g.*, "Religious Emotion," "The Religion of the Day," "Unreal Words," "The World our Enemy," "The Praise of Men," "Ignorance of Evil." Yet what sermons, preached within the last hundred years, are more full of Scripture references and Scripture quotations? The footnotes to the various pages, where the references are given, are a proof of this. As a test I took a sermon at random—that upon "The Gospel Feast" in vol. vii.—and I counted at least fifty-four quotations from the Bible in its nineteen pages. The same is true of the sermons of Canon Liddon. Let anyone glance at the footnotes to the sermons upon "Growth in the Apprehension of Truth," or upon "Christ's Service and Public Opinion." Both sermons, as far as (1) unity of subject and (2) application to present thought and present needs, might be described as topical. And it is upon these two qualifications that we believe Bishop Creighton was insisting when he gave his two rules.

When we hear a sermon praised as *practical*, we shall generally find that it has fulfilled these two conditions:

1. It has possessed *unity* of subject and purpose: its purpose has been clear. This cannot be said of very many sermons that are preached. It was my lot some years ago constantly to sit in church close to a somewhat clever barrister, who was known for the clearness and force with which he could state a case or could make an appeal to the jury. At the same church one of the curates had a habit, towards the end of his sermons, which were distinguished usually by neither clearness of arrangement nor by unity of purpose, of asking the question, "What may be learnt from this?" The barrister's replies to this question (intended only for his wife's ear, but occasionally audible in the next pew), if neither reverent nor complimentary, might have been valuable to the preacher—"Bless'd if I know"; "Not much, I'm afraid"; "Precious little, as far as I can see," were among the most frequent of those replies.

2. But besides unity of subject and clearness of purpose, the sermon praised as "practical" will generally be found to have dealt with some subject upon which the appraiser (and therefore in all probability others as well) has been thinking. The definitions of the word "practical" given by the dictionaries might with advantage be remembered by the preacher—*e.g.*, "that which may be turned to use"; "reducible to use in the conduct of life"; capable of reducing knowledge to actual use"; "derived from practice or experience."

Suppose the preacher praised as "practical" shall have carefully based his teaching upon some words of our Lord, or even upon other words of Holy Scripture, or suppose that by judicious quotation of well-chosen verses he has shown that what he is trying to inculcate is in accordance with the teaching of the Bible, it will at once be seen that his hearers may feel that for what he is asserting he has the highest authority. They may feel that not only are they getting light and help, but are obtaining these from the highest possible source.

In pleading for a fuller measure of, and for a foremost place for, Holy Scripture in the pulpit, I may perhaps be met with the assertion that no doubt at one time, when Bibles were few and many could not read them, ample quotation was most necessary, but that in these days, when everyone can read and when a Bible can be bought for sixpence, such ample quotation of the words or contents of Holy Scripture is unnecessary. But of this I am firmly convinced, that the majority of preachers are apt to assume that the knowledge of the Bible possessed by the average hearer is far greater than

what it really is. Because Bibles are cheap we must not assume that they are universally bought, and if they are bought, we must not assume that they are read, much less understood. In spite of its cheapness, in spite of the almost innumerable editions—authorized and revised, with notes and without notes—which are available to-day, I really doubt if so large a proportion of the people, even of those who do "attend a place of worship," have anything like so good a knowledge of the contents of the Bible as was possessed by their fathers and grandfathers fifty or a hundred years ago.

In those days the Bible might have five competitors on the poor man's bookshelf, now it may have fifty, whereas in the rich man's house it's competitors have increased a hundredfold. Too often the halfpenny evening paper and the sporting paper now consume the time that was once given to the reading of the Bible by the poor, as, with richer people, it is the multitude of magazines and the never-ending supply of new novels from the circulating library which leave "absolutely no time at all" even for a few verses of Psalmist, Evangelist, or Prophet. Indeed, I assert without fear of contradiction, that at present, from the day they leave school, there are multitudes of Churchgoers whose only study (save the word!) of Holy Scripture consists in hearing it read or explained once a week—during the single Sunday service which they attend—in Church.

Many are familiar with those sentences of J. R. Green—the opening words of the eighth chapter of the "Short History": "No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament. England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible. It was as yet the one English book which was familiar to every Englishman; it was read at Churches and read at home," etc.

There are amongst us to-day those who fear they also see present indications of a "moral change" at work in the nation, only, unfortunately, it is in the contrary direction to that change of which Green was speaking. May not one of the causes of this change be a growing want of familiarity with those great Eternal Laws of Righteousness set forth in Holy Scripture?

There are, I know, complaints made from time to time of sermons being nothing better than "strings of texts." But where such complaints are made it will not generally be due to their wealth of Biblical quotation or illustration: it will be due to the carelessness and irrelevancy of the manner and matter of such quotation.

Where Holy Scripture is used in the manner of Cardinal Newman's Anglican sermons, or as by Dean Church and Canon Liddon, men will not complain of, but will heartily welcome, the Bible in the sermon.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

ART. VII.—TEMPERANCE "SPADE-WORK": IN THE SOUTH LONDON POLICE COURTS.

LORD ROSEBERY has talked of the need of "spade-work" in politics. There is a kind of "spade-work" which is amongst the best results of the Temperance movement. It may be found elsewhere than in London—in Liverpool, for example—but I shall take my example from London, and from that part which is in the Diocese of Rochester.

Placing our trust in statistics, we congratulate ourselves on the decrease in the number of criminals in the Metropolis, but a few days spent in the South London police courts afford such unpleasant proofs of the crime, vice, and misery still existing that we are compelled to think that, after all, we have not very much cause for satisfaction. Truly, we might pass some weeks in the police courts without seeing a prisoner charged with murder or robbery with violence; but day after day there is the same depressing procession of men and women arrested for degrading offences committed, in most cases, while the prisoners were under the influence of drink.

Every morning, at about half-past nine, a number of people may be seen outside any of the South London police courts waiting for the doors to be opened. Some are standing listlessly on the curb, others are walking slowly up and down, and a few, not wishing it to be thought that they have any business at a police court, are on the other side of the road, surveying, with an assumed air of interest, the goods displayed in the shop windows. Many of these people are prisoners who were bailed out on the previous night; others have heard that a "pal" has been arrested, and are come to see how he fares; the remainder is composed of witnesses, and men and women attracted to the court by curiosity.

When the doors are opened the prisoners out on bail enter and surrender. They are not placed in the cells, but taken to a waiting-room, where they sit, in doorless boxes somewhat resembling the dressing-rooms of a swimming bath, until the time comes for them to be taken into court.

In the meanwhile "Black Maria," the familiar police-court

van, has arrived with her load of prisoners, collected from the various police-stations in the district, and nearly all the cells are now occupied. Looking through the inspection-hole in the cell-doors, we see prisoners of all types. Here is a dirty, beery-faced, middle-aged man, described by himself as a labourer, although his right to that designation cannot be recognised, for it is only when he is in prison that he works. He is to be charged with begging.

In the adjoining cell is a well-dressed, gentlemanly-looking lad of about nineteen. He had been to a smoking-concert on the previous evening, and, for the first time in his life, drank too much. Coming out into the night air he grew noisy, and, refusing to take a policeman's advice to go home quietly, was arrested. Now he is overcome by remorse, and filled with shame at the prospect of his parents reading in the papers of his disgrace.

In another cell is a thin, pale-faced, shabbily-dressed man, who has been out of employment for several weeks. On the previous night, in a fit of despair, he had jumped into the river, but had been rescued by a policeman.

The magistrate is now hearing applications for summonses and advice. Applicants follow each other in quick succession. A respectably-dressed girl of about twenty asks for a summons for assault against her husband, who struck her on the face with his fist. Her application is granted, and, lowering her veil to conceal her blackened eye, she quits the witness-box.

Fully three-quarters of the applicants are women, and, in the majority of cases, they have a grievance against their husbands. One is anxious to know if she may burst open the door the next time her husband shuts her out. Another complains that she had made her husband an apple-dumpling for dinner, but that, as it did not meet with his approval, he threw it on the fire, and supplemented the proceeding by thrashing her. The strange thing is that the woman appears to resent the treatment accorded to the apple-dumpling more than the assault upon herself, and, upon reflection, decides not to take out a summons.

The applications having been disposed of, the first prisoner is placed in the dock. She is about thirty years of age, and is carrying a one-year-old child. A policeman enters the witness-box and rattles off: "At 11.45 last night, your Worship, I saw the prisoner creating a disturbance outside the Elephant and Castle." He adds that she was drunk, refused to move on, and used obscene language. On arresting her she bit his hand, flung herself down on the pavement, and had to be taken to the police-station in the ambulance. This evidence is denied in a loud voice by the prisoner, who characterizes it as

"a pack of lies," and, excitedly pulling off her jacket, invites the magistrate to "see where the brute tore my bodice." She is given the choice of a fine or a fortnight's imprisonment, and in an impudent manner declares her intention of going to prison, adding scornfully, "I can do that bit on my 'ead." Nevertheless, when she has passed from the magistrate's presence, she pays the fine.

Cases similar to the above can be seen daily, but there are others, almost as numerous, which are far more worthy of sympathy. Here is a boy charged with "sleeping out." He has no home, and his parents are habitual drunkards. What is to become of him? Who will save such a lad from a criminal career? Happily there is a friend at hand. The magistrate passes the boy on to the police-court missionary, who takes him to the Boys' Shelter Home, 134, Camberwell Road, S.E. This institution is a part of the organization of the Rochester Diocesan Branch of the Church of England Temperance Society, whose police-court mission was mainly founded, at the suggestion of a journeyman tailor named Rainer, by the late Canon Ellison.

The first missionary began work in South London in 1876, and before the end of 1880 three more were appointed. To-day it has missionaries working in the police courts at Lambeth, Southwark, South-Western (Battersea), Greenwich, Woolwich, Rochester, Chatham, Kingston, Richmond, Wimbledon, Mortlake, and at the Surrey and South London Sessions. Two women missionaries, whose stipends are paid by the Diocesan C.E.T.S. Women's Union, also work in these courts. The magistrates have, on many occasions, expressed their warm approval of the good work done by the South London police-court missionaries, and the Society now receives not only commendation, but financial support from every court where it has a missionary. A few months ago Mr. E. W. Garrett, the magistrate at the South-Western Police Court, writing to Mr. Evan Griffiths, the Diocesan Secretary of the C.E.T.S., said: "I have great pleasure in testifying to the great and valuable assistance rendered to the magistrates sitting at this court by the missionaries appointed to attend here by the South London Police-Court Mission. The missionaries do their work with great zeal and discretion, and I have great confidence in them. Without their help it would often be difficult and almost impossible for the magistrates to give a youthful prisoner one more chance of redeeming his character and becoming an honest citizen."

A still more conclusive proof of the value of the Society's work is the letter, appealing for funds for the Boys' Shelter Home, which was signed by *every* South London police

magistrate, and appeared in the *Times* and other newspapers.

The Boys' Shelter Home was opened in February, 1896, to provide a temporary shelter for lads, above school age, who had been rescued by the missionaries from the danger of drifting into a criminal career, and since then some six hundred boys have been sent to it by the magistrates. Had it not existed these boys, whose offence in many cases was simply "sleeping out," would have been sent to prison until suitable homes were found for them.

In the course of last year 109 boys were brought to the Home from the police courts. Twenty-eight of these were placed in situations, twenty-one were transferred to other institutions, seventeen were restored to their parents or friends, ten enlisted in the army or navy, six were provided with outfits and sent to sea, and twenty-seven left of their own accord. Under the heading "left of their own accord" are included boys who ran away. The number of runaways would have been much smaller had not the council ordained that every boy in the Home was to be vaccinated. On the morning that this order was issued thirteen boys decamped. Anti-vaccinationists must not claim that this incident is a triumph for their cause, as it was simply the fear of a little pain which prompted the lads to evade vaccination.

Many of the inmates of the Boys' Shelter Home have been brought up in the midst of crime and vice of the most shocking description, and it is therefore somewhat surprising to find that the offences with which they were charged were comparatively trivial, and frequently the result of sudden temptation. For instance, one homeless boy was walking barefoot along the Thames Embankment when he saw on the steps leading down to the water a pair of boots belonging to a boy who was bathing. He appropriated them, was arrested and charged. Another youngster was brought before a magistrate for selling newspapers which had been stolen by another boy, who saw them laying in the doorway of an unopened shop. The latter distributed them among other boys, who sold them in the streets. A third inmate, who had been turned out of doors by his parents, was charged with stealing three eggs from a van.

As already stated, many of the boys who are admitted to the Home have simply been charged with "sleeping out." Some of these are the sons of respectable people able and willing to support them. Quite recently two boys made their way to London from Scotland, and were found by a policeman asleep in a doorway. The magistrate passed them on to the missionary, and before they had been in the Home a day

Mr. Griffiths discovered that one of them was a respectable youngster who had been led away by his companion. His parents were written to, and eventually, to their great joy, he was sent back to them.

Another very recent case was that of a boy who told the police and the magistrate that he had been turned out of doors by his stepmother, who, he declared, was such a bad-tempered woman that his father had drowned himself in a pond. He also stated that he had been wandering about the London streets for six weeks. On being brought to the Boys' Shelter Home he repeated this story to Mr. Griffiths, who, however, suspected that the boy was not speaking the truth. "Show me your boots," he said; and on the boy raising his feet he saw that the soles were perfectly sound. He also noticed that the boy's clothes were fairly clean. It was very evident that the youngster had not been six weeks on the tramp. He questioned him closely, but the boy maintained that he had spoken the truth. Nevertheless, in reply to further questions he let slip the name of a certain town. This was a clue. Mr. Griffiths telegraphed to the Vicar of that place asking if a boy was missing from the town. On the following morning a reply was received. A boy was missing, and the father was going up to London to see if the lad at the Home were his son. The father arrived during the morning, and the description he gave of his son, who had, however, only been missing for two days, satisfied Mr. Griffiths that it was his boy whom they had in the Home.

The youngster, who had half an hour previously assured Mr. Griffiths that the story he had told was true, was then called into the room, and was considerably surprised to see his father sitting there. "This doesn't look as if I had drowned myself in a pond," the father remarked, and forthwith questioned his son as to his reason for running away. The boy then burst into tears. He admitted that he had always been well treated at home, and confessed that for some time he had been stealing coppers from his employer's till. One day he stole half a crown—the first piece of silver he had ever taken—and a few minutes after he had committed the theft he saw his master and the head shopman looking at the till and speaking about it. Thinking that they had missed the half-crown he became frightened, and, slipping out of the shop, ran away to London. The boy returned with his father, and has since written to Mr. Griffiths thanking him for his kindness.

Letters are continually received from old boys. A lad who left the Home in 1896 to enlist has recently written from South Africa. "I have been getting on all right since I left the

Home," he declared, "and when I come home I will come and see you." Another wrote from a man-of-war cruising around Japan. He had heard that a boy who was at the Home with him had joined the Royal Navy, and wrote: "If ever he gets on the same ship as me you can say that I shall stick to him through thick and thin." A third old boy, in the Royal Fusiliers, wrote from Burma, which he calls "No white man's land." The frequency of sudden death and the necessary rapidity with which burial follows it in the pagoda-dotted land had evidently made a deep impression on his mind. "No soldier," he wrote, "ever knows when his last hour has come; he is singing with joy and happiness one minute, and a few hours after he is below the ground, lying at rest." He concluded with "fondest love and wishes to you all at home."

Every boy on being admitted to the Home is compelled to have a bath—a luxury which is rarely appreciated—and is then sent to bed, while his clothes are subjected to the very necessary ordeal of fumigation. If, as is frequently the case, his clothes are exceedingly ragged or dirty, they are destroyed, and a respectable second-hand suit given to him. The first work he is put to is sawing, chopping, bundling, and selling firewood, and he remains thus employed until a fairly accurate opinion of his character has been formed. Should it be a favourable one a situation is obtained for him, unless he prefers to join the Army or Navy.

The South London police magistrates said, very truly, in their letter to the press, that it is on the lines of the Boys' Shelter Home that the problem of "Hooliganism" is to be solved. The results achieved by the Society have been very good, but they would have been still better had the work not been hampered by the want of suitable premises. The Home is an old house and, it must be confessed, somewhat dilapidated; but the Society has now an opportunity for purchasing the site, and if the required sum, £5,000, be obtained, a new and larger building will be erected.

The Boys' Shelter Home is, however, only one branch of the South London Police-Court Mission's work. Men, women, and girls are continually being saved from utter ruin by the timely help of the missionaries.

Cases such as the following are common: A servant-girl "got into trouble," and was dismissed by her mistress. Ashamed to go to her parents, who lived in the country, and having no real friends in London, she wandered about the streets until a policeman found her "sleeping out," and took her to the police-station. She refused to give any information concerning herself, and consequently the magistrate remanded her for inquiries to be made. When she

quitted the dock one of the missionaries, an elderly man, had a quiet talk with her in the female gaoler's room, and obtained from her the information she had hitherto withheld. He wrote to her parents, but, as they declined to receive her, he made other arrangements, with the result that when she was taken before the magistrate on remand she was discharged. Many girls, arrested for petty thefts and bound over under the First Offenders' Act, are visited at their homes by the women missionaries.

The South London Police-Court Mission by no means restricts itself to helping "first offenders." The oft-convicted man or woman is not regarded as hopeless, and many of both sexes have been induced by the missionaries to lead respectable, law-abiding lives. A recent case is that of a young woman who had so frequently been convicted of being "drunk and disorderly" that she spent twenty-two months out of twenty-four in prison. At the expiration of her last term of imprisonment one of the missionaries met her at the prison gates, and, before her former associates could get hold of her and give her drink, induced her to go home with him. His wife gave her some respectable clothes, and they kept her until she had come to the conclusion that it was quite possible for her to live without beer and gin. She was then sent to the country, and eight months later wrote to the missionary, beginning: "Sir, just a feu lines to you i am still the same i was i am still a tetelor and intend to keep so by the help of God." The postscript was: "Dear Sir i am only just a feu door from the plocie-station and they would not have far to take me you know." Evidently she was very proud of having lived for eight months close to a police-station without having been compelled to pass a night in one of its cells.

The wives and children of convicted prisoners find in the missionaries real friends, and many are the pathetic letters which they write to them. "I am writing a few lines," one letter began, "to know could you possibly get or deliver a message to my husband it will do him a world of good and I feel so anxious about him he looked so ill in court and I know will worry terribly about me and our dear little children. I will enclose a note and if it is anyhow possible let him have it if not read it and let him know somehow this suspense is awful and I know I do not feel it a atom more than he will as there never in this world was a better or kinder husband or father. He has been more sinned against than he has sinned and far more to be pitied than blamed."

Many women send open letters to the missionary with the request that if they cannot be delivered he will read them and repeat their contents to their husbands. "I am so sorry for

you, my dear hubby," one poor woman wrote, "but you must try and bear up for our sakes. I wish I could take your place. I would willingly do so. Do not worry in the least about us dear one as we are alright."

It sometimes happens that a man of education appears in the dock through no fault of his own. A man who could speak French, German, Spanish, Italian, and English was recently charged with "sleeping out." For twenty-five years he had been employed in the City as a foreign correspondence clerk at, for the greater portion of the time, a salary of £300 a year. He was discharged through ill-health, and, being unable to obtain other employment, was soon reduced to a state of poverty. The magistrate sent him to the workhouse, and the police-court missionary at once interested himself in him. Having found that the man's story was true, he applied to the Guardians for permission for him to absent himself for three weeks in order to look for work. The leave being granted, the missionary provided the man with a new suit of clothes, and quickly obtained employment for him.

In many other ways the South London Police-Court Mission is doing excellent work, not only for prisoners and their families, but for the State also, and the following letter, received by Mr. Griffiths from the Bishop of Rochester, testifies that it is fully appreciated by those who have unrivalled opportunities for judging it: "I met nearly all the police-court magistrates of South London the other night, and it was very delightful to hear the unanimous and most emphatic witness which they bore to the value of our police-court missionaries. I have seldom heard such decisive testimony on any subject."

HENRY CHARLES MOORE.

EASTER.

AGAIN we see, nor doubt, the flowery signs
Of Spring's return to hill and field and dale;
Willows with tenderest green in wavy lines
Move to the music of the April gale.

And mark clear-pencilled on the April blue
The blush and gleam of peach-flower and of plum;
Clover and violets every green mound strew,
Tulip and hyacinth in the gardens bloom.

So without doubt before those human eyes
Appeared on that first Easter Day the Lord;
No phantom vision from the midnight skies—
In daylight done to death, at dawn restored.

The sun of Easter shone upon that Face,
Which is the Sun of Heaven; they heard His tread
Who shakes the skies in thunder, quickening pace
To join in converse those who thought Him dead.

More glad, more certain, than the sweet Spring's token,
With burning hearts they listen to His voice;
They handle, and they see that Body broken,
And in His life for ever young rejoice.

Now pasque flower, Lenten lily, clear proclaim
The primal Easter morn; for had He stayed
In Joseph's tomb, where after death of shame
With tears and hopeless sorrow He was laid;

Seeing His hand alone can clothe the side
Of the black wintry woods with leafy gleam;
Seeing His voice alone can loose the tide
Of melody from bird and rippling stream;

Hope then would die, and dark despair remain;
Spring would desert the dead world's naked shore;
But hope lives on, and spring returns again,
For the great Lord of Life is risen to die no more.

A. E. MOULE

Written in China.

The Month.

THE month of March, up to the time when this magazine went to press, had furnished few incidents of serious importance. The prospects of the Education Bill were extremely doubtful, and the hope of the measure being carried through during the present Session was growing less. Of course, every year's delay increases the difficulties of the weaker voluntary schools; but it is hardly fair to blame the Government without recognising the difficulty of their position. They cannot work impossibilities. The war still occupies so much of the time of Parliament that, with the rearrangement of Procedure to complete, the amount remaining for constructive legislation is not great.

The appointment of Bishop Copleston, of Colombo, to the See of Calcutta has been received with general satisfaction. His difference with

the C.M.S. in his early Ceylon days is a matter of history, but he has long since made a name for himself as one of the most efficient of missionary Bishops. The name of Bishop Hodges, of Travancore, has been associated with the vacancy in the See of Colombo. The death of Bishop Bousfield, of Pretoria, removes a prelate whose episcopate was one long struggle against difficulties. Twice the work of his diocese had been broken up by war, but his own courage and industry never failed. It may be remembered that even when he was being driven from Pretoria by the Kruger Administration he found time to send a considerable centenary gift to the C.M.S.

"The Report of the Fulham Round Table Conference on Confession and Absolution," edited by Dr. Wace, with a Preface by the Bishop of London, was issued too late for consideration in the present issue of the CHURCHMAN. The April number will contain an article on the Report. To the same number the Rev. N. Dimock will contribute the first of two articles on "Apostolical Succession and Non-Episcopal Communions," with especial relation to the proposals of Canon Hensley Henson.

It is only possible at present to indicate a few points in the Report. Speaking generally, it is a clear vindication of the position which Evangelical and all moderate Churchmen have taken up in regard to Confession. The cause of the extreme Anglicans is left without a leg to stand on.

1. The Conference agreed that the words from St. John's Gospel, "Whosesoever sins ye remit . . . retained," are not to be taken as addressed only to the Apostles or the clergy, but as a commission to the *whole Church*, and as conveying a summary of the message with which it is charged. The Church does this by the administration of God's Word and Sacraments, and by godly discipline.

2. The Conference agreed, however, that the discipline of private Confession and Absolution cannot be shown to have existed for some centuries after the foundation of the Church. It grew out of the abuse of the godly discipline of public penance which the Commination Service refers to as existing in the Primitive Church.

3. In view of all this, the Conference agreed that our ordination formula could not be regarded as in itself inculcating the duty of private Confession and Absolution.

4. The Conference agreed, however, that our other formularies permitted such Confession and Absolution in certain circumstances.

5. But the Conference could not agree as to the extent to which these formularies encouraged Confession.

6. Nor could the Conference reach any agreement as to the value of Confession as an aid to the spiritual life.

The Bishop of London, in his short Preface to the Report, says that the admission that Confession and Absolution are under certain circumstances permitted by our Church "is all that the great majority of the parish priests of the Church of England who ever make use of it wish to maintain." But it will be seen in a moment that the *permissive* use is by no means that which is inculcated in the special literature of the extreme Anglicans. It should be added that it is impossible to read the Report without recognising the important and most valuable contributions to the discussion made by Dr. Wace, Dr. Gee, and Mr. Drury. The Bishop of London in his Preface also pays a well-merited compliment to "the ability and fairness which marked the whole conduct of Dr. Wace in the chair."

The financial position of the societies which end their year at March 31 is always a subject of some anxiety at this time. In the case of the Church Missionary Society the position is of more than ordinary difficulty. Humanly speaking, there seems little hope of averting a heavy deficit, and yet the Society's Committee has been encouraged by its supporters to continue the policy of sending out to the mission-field all approved candidates. In that policy, of course, lies the key of the situation; for, short of giving up some considerable mission, it is only by sending out fewer men that an effective reduction of expenditure can, and even then not immediately, be obtained. During the current year the Society's payments have been watched with even more than ordinary jealousy and care, but there seems no probability that the savings thus effected will bring about an equilibrium between expenditure and income. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the last few years have been, financially, a trying time. We have only to look at the comparatively humble sum produced by the Bicentenary effort of the S.P.G. to see what the influence of the war on foreign missionary income has been.

Reviews.

NONCONFORMIST HISTORY.

Sketches in the Evolution of Congregationalism. By ALEXANDER MACKENNAL, D.D. London: James Nisbet and Co.

A History of the Plymouth Brethren. By W. BLAIR NEATBY. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

IF Canon Hensley Henson's proposals in regard to intercommunion with Nonconformity are to be sympathetically considered, it is essential that Churchmen should know something of the history and principles of English Dissent. We are grateful, therefore, for any works which set before us in the spirit of the historian the origin and progress of the familiar Nonconformist organizations. Dr. MacKennal's book is an excellent specimen of the kind of work needed. It is not too long and not too elaborate. Originally delivered as the Carew Lectures in Hartford Theological Seminary, Connecticut, the book has something of the picturesqueness of treatment natural to such a method of delivery and not unwelcome to the reader. It is in no way an exhaustive or comprehensive work, but it will very well serve the purpose of the English Churchman. Dr. MacKennal traces in an interesting way the origin of Congregationalism, and has a particularly interesting chapter on the relations of Congregationalists and Anglicans. Those who are weighing Canon Henson's proposal to acknowledge the separate Churches of Nonconformity will note Dr. MacKennal's reminder (p. 157) that Wesleyan Methodism came but slowly to the idea of total separation; for "down to the middle of this [the nineteenth] century Wesleyan Methodism repelled the idea of constituting itself a Church." And again:

"The next noteworthy fact about the Evangelical Revival is that it is sprung out of the Church of England, not out of eighteenth century Dissent. John Wesley was the descendant, through both his parents, of Presbyterian clergymen ejected from their livings on Black Bartholomew Day, 1662. His father and mother had voluntarily and conscientiously, and at some cost of feeling, gone back to the Establishment before their

marriage. The filiation of the present Wesleyan Methodist Church to the old Puritanism of the Presbyterian type is more than the accident of its founder's parentage. It is Presbyterian in its government, Puritan in ecclesiastical habit. There is no inherent antagonism in it to the theory of a National Church; many Wesleyan Methodists would probably prefer the machinery of such a Church if it left them freedom of spiritual movement; and they would not regard the two conditions as incompatible. The patience with which Cartwright and Baxter bore with the imperfections of the National Church—its petty interferences, sometimes its malignant persecution, hoping against hope that there would be found a place for them within its constitution—was like that of Wesley. And the reason was the same: not love of ease, or of consideration, but the deep conviction that a National Church gave a Gospel minister such opportunities and advantages for the full exercise of his ministry as no other Church relation could furnish."

The later concession is worth noting in the face of the Liberation Society. We commend this book to all who would understand the principles and spirit of modern Nonconformity.

Mr. Neatby's volume on the Plymouth Brethren enjoys the advantage of having the field very much to itself. It is the first general history of the movement it describes. The perplexities surrounding the origin of that movement are clearly discussed, with a careful consideration of the attitude of the founders of Plymouthism towards the English Church. The expansion of the work is a subject of real interest, and presents a happy contrast to the strife which in time broke out amongst its leaders. The development of minor sects and heresies supplies still more painful evidence of the frailty of man, even when he aspires to the most intimate knowledge of the Divine oracles. Perhaps it is to these divisions that we may trace the absence of leaders which Mr. Neatby seems to deplore. We commend this book to all who would understand a movement which has had for some types of mind a curious power of attraction.

HOMILETICAL AND DEVOTIONAL WORKS.

Prayer. By the Rev. A. J. Worlledge, M.A. London: Longmans and Co.

This is a volume in the "Oxford Library of Practical Theology." It is like most of its author's work—conscientious, laborious, and solidly useful; but it is also heavy, pedantic, and unattractive. Whilst Canon Worlledge disclaims any intention to produce "a formal treatise," the arrangement of the work and the treatment of the subject are formal to the last degree. It is full of matter worth deliberate consideration, but it is hardly the kind of book to which the average layman is strongly attracted. It is more likely to be in favour with clergy, who, indeed, should find its treatment of prayer suggest to them many ways of handling the subject for the benefit of their people. But, as a personal appeal, something warmer, something less suggestive of the library and more of the experiences of living, palpitating humanity was needed.

Christ the Way. By the Bishop of Oxford. London: S.P.C.K.

The addresses in this volume were delivered to a gathering of college tutors, schoolmasters, and others engaged in educational work. They are the plain talk of a man of faith and a man of letters to other men whose calling compels them to view with reverence the responsibilities of life and character. They present from various points of view our Lord as "the Way," suggesting the purpose in life, the peace in life, and the victory in life which belong to those who have indeed found Him to be "the Way." Men of education should read these short addresses with pleasure and with profit.