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

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

CHURCH OF ENGLAND LEAGUE.

Spiritual in its Aims. ***Educational in its Work.***

Executive Committee:

President: THE LADY WIMBORNE.

The Countess of Ancaster.
The Viscountess Duncannon.
The Lady Edith Ashley.
The Lord Llangattock.
The Lady Llangattock.
The Lady Templemore.
The Lady Haliburton.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury.
The Rev. Chancellor Lias.
The Rev. E. J. Kennedy.
The Rev. W. H. Stone.
The Rev. E. A. Stuart.
The Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield.
The Rev. F. J. Key.

Col. the Hon. F. C. Bridge
Lady Hope.
S. Hope Morley, Esq.
Mrs. S. Hope Morley.
Mrs. Locker-Lampson.
Mrs. Frank Morrison.
Mrs. Walter.
Miss Margaret Bernard.

Consultative Committee:

The Rev. the Earl of Bessborough. The Lord Bishop of Durham. The Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man
The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough. Rev. Canon Meyrick. Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D., Litt.D.
Rev. Charles Hole. Rev. Arthur Galton.

Hon. Treasurer: W. Joynson-Hicks, Esq. *Clerical Organizing Secretary:* The Rev. G. F. Irwin, B.D.
Secretary: C. C. Osborne, Esq.

FOUNDED six years ago, the LEAGUE has organized over two hundred courses of lectures on Church History and the Prayer-Book.

It has held nearly five hundred meetings to explain the teachings and practices of the Primitive Catholic Church, and one hundred and fifty-five sermons have been preached.

It has published and distributed numerous books and pamphlets on the history, doctrine, and teaching of the Church, written by Churchmen of commanding position and scholarship.

It has provided for its members a central and twenty branch lending libraries.

It has founded a Church Sisters' Home, where ladies are trained and sent out to work under parochial clergy among the sick and the poor. In addition to the fifteen ladies residing in the Home, the League now has Sisters working in very poor districts in North London, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Plymouth (2).

It opened, on June 4th, 1904, a Seaside Convalescent Home for poor children, which is worked in conjunction with, and as a branch of, the Church Sisters' Home. The ladies from that Home, working in some of the poorest London parishes, have brought under their notice many most deserving cases where a Seaside Home is of the greatest practical value.

It has established two of the finest schools for girls in the country. At one of these (Uplands' School, St. Leonards-on-Sea) the fees are well within the reach of parents of small means.

It has been instrumental in establishing Cherwell Hall, a College at Oxford, for the training of secondary women teachers.

FUNDS ARE URGENTLY NEEDED

for the Maintenance and Extension of all these Works.

The LEAGUE is in no sense a narrow, a party, or a political organisation.

For further particulars apply to **THE SECRETARY,**

6, Grosvenor Mansions, Victoria Street, London, S.W.

THE CHEAPEST GIFT BOOKS.

Books by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

"THE MAN OF SCIENCE THE MAN OF GOD." Leaves from the Life of Sir James Y. Simpson. A valuable little work for all interested in Christian Missions. Cloth gilt, with Portrait, 2*s.*

THE CROWN OF THE ROAD. Leaves from Consecrated Lives. New Edition. Cloth gilt, with Seven Portraits, 5*s.*

"We wish it a wide work of such cheering, sanctifying influence on the crown of the road of Christian Literature."—*The Churchman.*

NEAR THE THRONE; Frances Ridley Havergal, the Sweet Singer and the Royal Writer. Now ready. Handsomely bound in half-parchment, gilt, many Illustrations, 2*s.*

THE LIVES OF THREE BISHOPS: James Fraser, D.D.; Robert Bickersteth, D.D.; James Hannington, D.D. Crown 8vo. Cloth gilt, 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE FORGOTTEN TRUTH; or, the Gospel of the Holy Ghost. With Selected Hymns of the Spirit. Now ready. Third Thousand. In rich cloth gilt, bevelled boards, gilt edges, with Illustration, 1*s.* post free.

THE OLD GOSPEL EVER NEW. The Story of Naaman; or, Sin and Its Cure. Tenth Thousand. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Cloth gilt, 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE WAY HOME; or, The Gospel in the Parable. An Earthly Story with a Heavenly Meaning. Seventieth Thousand. Crown 8vo. Cloth gilt, with Illustration, 1*s.* 6*d.*

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL? A Series of Papers by Various known Writers. Cloth extra, 2*s.*

THE POET OF HOME LIFE. By ANDREW JAMES SYMINGTON, F.R.S.N.A. With Centenary Papers by the Very Rev. Dean Farrar, D.D.; the Rev. John Callis, M.A.; Canon Wilton, M.A.; the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D., and others. With Twenty-four Fine Art Illustrations. Cloth gilt, for Presentation, 3*s.* 6*d.*

NEW CENTURY HYMNS for the Christian Year. By the Rev. F. W. ORDE WARD, B.A., Author of "Matin Bells," etc. Crown 8vo. Printed on antique paper, red border, forming a Handsome Volume for Gift or the Library. Price 3*s.* 6*d.*

BLAKENEY, ARCHDEACON, Memories of the Life and work of. By the Rev. W. ODOM, M.A., Vicar of Heeley. With Portraits and Illustrations. Cheaper issue, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE STORY OF ENGLAND'S CHURCH.

By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

Four Volumes of this work are now ready.

Cloth gilt. Illustrated. 1*s.* 6*d.* each.

SUNRISE IN BRITAIN; How the Light Dawned. Vol. I.

THE ECLIPSE OF TRUTH; How the Light was Obscured. Vol. II.

DARK DAYS IN ENGLAND, and the Dawn of Reformation Light. Vol. III.

MARTYR TIMES; or, The Seed of the Church. Vol. IV.

The above are sold separately by all Booksellers.

NOW READY. Crown 8vo., 132 Pages, in Cloth Gilt. Price 1s. 6d.
With 20 Original Illustrations by various Artists.

"HOLD FAST BY YOUR SUNDAYS."

By the Author of "Deepdale Vicarage," "Margaret's Choice," etc.

With Introductory Note by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

CONTENTS:

Introductory Note—"Hold Fast by your Sundays!"—My New Place—The *May* do and the *Will* do—The Motto Stared Me in the Face—The Office of the Good Shepherd—Ruth comes back Alone—Something Unexpected happens—The Voice was that of my Old Acquaintance Peter Clarke—The Gold and the Dross—To-morrow is the Day—An Order! the Word had a Welcome Sound—I looked again at the Motto—"A Good Example is worth Following"—More Changes Still—A Sunny Spot in my Life—The Two Weddings—Sunday "Pleasure" is not "Rest"—The Watchword of My Family—The Wanderer's Return—A Sunday never to be Forgotten.

SPECIAL TERMS FOR QUANTITIES FOR DISTRIBUTION.

(Direct from the Publisher.)

12 and under 25	**at 1s. 1½d. each.**
25 and under 50	**at 1s. 1d. ,,**
50 and under 100	**at 1s. 0d. ,,**
100 and over	**at 11d. ,,**
250	**at 10d. ,,**

A Cheap Edition of this Tale, 4to., Paper Cover, can also be had, price 2d., or 12s. per 100.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

Now ready. In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

GLEANINGS FROM A PARSON'S DIARY. By the Rev. WILLIAM BURNET, M.A., Vicar of Childerditch, Brentwood. With a Preface by the Venerable Archdeacon SINCLAIR, Archdeacon of London.

In small crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

AIDS TO BELIEF IN THE MIRACLES AND DIVINITY OF CHRIST. By the Rev. W. L. PAIGE-COX, M.A. With a Prefatory Note by the Lord Bishop of Chester.

In demy 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

THE PRINCE OF JUDAH; or, the Days of Nehemiah Redated. A Challenge to Commentators. By LUMEN.

"An exhaustive study of the history of the Jews just subsequent to their return from Babylon."—*The Rock.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d. net.

THE SHADOW OF ROME; or, the Relations of the Papal System to Progress and National Life. By H. C. PEDDER.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 6s. net.

NOT LEFT WITHOUT WITNESS; or, Divine Truth in the Light of Reason and Revelation. By the Rev. JOHN BLACKET.

"The volume bears traces of an enormous amount of work, and we are persuaded that it will prove really useful to those, be they young or old, who incline to rationalistic views of religion."—*The Record.*

"There is a good chapter on the Atonement, where the subject is well worked out on Scriptural lines and another on the conditions of salvation."—*The Rock.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 4s. 6d.

COMBER'S EXPOSITION OF MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER. Edited, with an Introduction, by Rev. R. H. TAYLOR, D.D.

"There is much in these pages that will help to illumine various parts of the Church services, and any clergyman proposing to preach a course of sermons upon Morning and Evening Prayer will find Dean Comber's exposition of much interest and of some value."—*Record.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 3s. 6d. net.

THE GREAT PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION; or, God's Eternal Purpose in the Human Race. By S. J.

"Earnest, thoughtful, and thoroughly Scriptural in principle."—*The Rock.*

"A carefully-thought-out and well-written book."—*Scotsman.*

In crown 8vo., bound in paper, price 6d. net.

MICHAEL THE MAN-CHILD. A Plain Statement of Bible Truth.

In crown 8vo., price 3d.

BABYLON THE GREAT: the Mother of False Religion. An Address.

In demy 8vo., paper cover, price 4d.

OCCULTISM IN "PSYCHICAL RESEARCH," "SPIRITUALISM," etc. By an INVESTIGATOR.

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

Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.

For Evangelistic, Medical, and Educational Work among the Women of India and China.

PATRONESS:
H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF CONNAUGHT.

CHAIRMAN:
SIR W. MACKWORTH YOUNG, K.C.S.I.

The Society has at present 65 Stations, and employs 206 Missionaries in Home Connection, 116 Assistants in Local Connection, and over 900 Bible-Women and Teachers.

It has 14 fully equipped Hospitals and numerous Dispensaries. Over 300,000 cases were treated last year.

The Magazines of the Society, "INDIA'S WOMEN AND CHINA'S DAUGHTERS," published monthly (price 1d.). "DAYBREAK," Quarterly (price 1d.); "HOMES OF THE EAST," Quarterly (price ½d.).

Donations and Subscriptions are Much Needed.

HON. TREASURER—**Col. ROBT. WILLIAMS, M.P.** CLERICAL SECRETARY—**Rev. G. TONGE, M.A.**
LAY SECRETARY—**Mr. H. L. HEBBERT.** CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECRETARY—**Miss MULVANY.**

OFFICE—**27, Chancery Lane, LONDON, W.C.**

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£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 PRINCE OF WALES, 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-six harbours are occupied. Income in 1903, £49,701.

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

OPERATIVE JEWISH CONVERTS' INSTITUTION

(Church of England.)

PRESIDENT: COLONEL ROBERT WILLIAMS, M.P.

OBJECT.—To assist young Christian Jews in distress by enabling them to help themselves. They are received for three years, provided for entirely, and taught trades.

SUPPORT.—Orders for Printing and Bookbinding are very helpful, but subscriptions and donations are also needed, and will be most thankfully received by the Principal, the Rev. H. O. ALLBROOK, Palestine House, Bodney Road, Hackney, N.E.; or by the Hon. Treasurer, A. R. PITE, Esq., Effingham House, Ramsgate.

Bankers—Messrs. BARCLAY & COMPANY, Ltd., 54, Lombard Street, E.C.

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.

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO THE JEWS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

President—THE DEAN OF WORCESTER.

Hon. Secs.—CANON SIR JAMES E. PHILIPPS, Bart., ARCHDEACON SUTTON.

Org. Sec.—REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

Work in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Bombay.

Applications for Grants have constantly to be refused owing to want of Funds.

Office: 39, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW NOVELS.

THE KNIGHT OF THE NEEDLE ROCK AND HIS DAYS, 1571-1606.

This is a story of Elizabethan times, the chief incidents taking place in the Isle of Wight, Guildford, and in London. By J. M. WILSON. In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, illustrated, price 6s.

"An entirely new and original kind of fiction."—*Athenæum*

"Gives evidence of great care, ability, and good taste —*Academy.*

THE PAINS OF HAPPINESS. A Novel.

By RASSAC TORRIANI. In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 6s.

"The author interweaves a double love story with no little skill."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

NEW VOLUMES OF VERSE.

VERSES CHIEFLY ABOUT NATURE.

By G. E. M. In crown 8vo., appropriately bound, price 1s. 6d.

"The versification is smooth and often graceful."—*Oxford Chronicle.*

"A pleasing gift of verse and an earnest religious spirit are the two notes of this little book of song."—*Glasgow Herald.*

THE TREASURES OF DARKNESS, AND OTHER VERSES.

By M. B. W. In crown 8vo., appropriately bound, 1s. 6d. net.

"Its gracefully turned and dignified lyrical pieces give a not unbecoming expression to feelings of familia simple piety of the refined ecclesiastical sort."—*Scotsman.*

ZETETES, AND OTHER POEMS.

By MAURICE BROWNE. In square 8vo., printed on hand-made paper by the Chiswick Press, appropriately bound, price 3s. 6d. net.

THE LOVE-SONG OF TRISTRAM AND ISEULT.

By CYRIL EMRA. In crown 8vo., appropriately bound, price 3s. 6d.

In demy 8vo., tastefully printed and suitably bound, consisting of 400 pp., 7s. 6d. net.

THE

YOUNG PREACHER'S GUIDE;

OR,

Secrets of Success in Sacred Oratory, as gathered from the Greatest Masters of the Art.

BY THE

REV. GILBERT MONKS,

Author of "Practical Guide to Bible-Class Conductors," "Manual of Short Liturgies, etc.

WITH A PREFACE BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON OF LONDON.

The Dean of Durham says: "It is quite a triumph to have succeeded in making a difficult subject really attractive."

"A substantial volume. We have read it with interest. It is well arranged, containing a store of pithy remarks, apt quotations, and personal reminiscences, while the author's earnestness is evident throughout."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"The excellent volume should appeal strongly to preachers in particular, and speakers in general."—*West Briton*, Truro.

"Cannot fail to be of great value to the young preacher, and be also of material help to all occupants of the pulpit or platform."—*Lincoln Chronicle.*

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1905.

OUR POSITION IN REFERENCE TO BIBLICAL CRITICISM.[1]

WE are challenged by a recent Declaration to review our position in reference to Biblical criticism, and it will be opportune to consider the subject under two aspects. The first is our general position, as Christians, towards such criticism; the second is our position at the present time in reference to the actual state of current criticism.

Now, with respect to the first, the true position of the Christian must always be one of readiness to listen to any light which critical processes can throw upon the Holy Scriptures, and to welcome any well-considered results which they may offer. The position of the believer must always be that described by our Lord: *He that doeth the truth*—and, in the same way, he that speaketh the truth—*cometh to the light, that his deeds*—or that his words—*may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.* If the Bible be the truth of God, the more light that may be thrown upon it, the more will its Divine origin and inspiration become manifest. This should be the fundamental attitude of the Christian, and especially of the Christian minister, towards all applications of criticism—which, after all, are but the application of reason—to the Holy Scriptures. We should remember always that striking saying of the Apostle Peter, that we should *be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear.* The word *fear* has been thought to mean also reverence, but it certainly implies a sense of the grave issues which are involved in any answer to inquiries respecting the grounds of our Christian faith. It is not, perhaps, sufficiently remembered, by those who raise critical questions and urge critical difficulties, that these also should be raised in that spirit of meekness and fear which St. Peter

[1] A paper read to the Midland Lay and Clerical Alliance on May 30 last.

requires, and that to cast doubts over books and narratives which have for centuries been bound up with the Christian faith is not a thing to be lightly taken in hand, or to be suggested to the world at large in loosely-worded Declarations.

But, still, wherever questions are raised in the interest of truth, the Christian minister must have an open mind towards them, subject to one important qualification. That qualification is that the burden of proof always lies upon those who are questioning a long-established and settled tradition, still more a long-established and settled faith. To have an open mind ought not to involve the treating such questions as if there were no presumption on either side. There is an immense presumption—a presumption amounting to a settled prescription —in favour of traditions and beliefs which have held their ground for nineteen centuries—nay, in the case of the Jewish books, for some twenty-five centuries. Those beliefs respecting the Jewish Scriptures have passed through the ordeal of the conflict respecting their meaning and their character which was waged between our Lord and His Apostles on the one side, and the Jewish authorities on the other, at the foundation of the Christian Church. The main argument of the Apostles in their contention with the Jewish authorities of their day was based upon the interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures; and if those Scriptures had not been what they purported to be, their weak points must have been brought to light in that controversy; not to say that it seems incredible that the Apostles should have been allowed by the Spirit of God, by whom they were specially inspired, to build their main argument on foundations which were to be shown by a later criticism to be radically unsound. It is striking to notice the attitude of the Jews themselves towards the critical position represented by the school of Wellhausen. The contentions of that school appear to me to be incompatible with the Christian faith, but they are beyond question absolutely destructive of the Jewish faith; and I ventured to say as much to an eminent Jewish scholar, and to ask him why no great effort appeared to have been made by Jews to reply to the Wellhausen school. He made a gesture of something like impatience, and said that there were some things too absurd to be answered, and that he and his friends were content to wait "until this tyranny be overpast." I am glad to say that Jewish scholars, both at home and abroad, have somewhat abandoned that attitude. Powerful arguments against the Wellhausen position have lately been published by Dr. Hoffmann, Principal of the Rabbinical Seminary in Berlin; while the objections of the Higher Critics to the consistency of the Laws of the Pentateuch have been answered in a striking volume by Mr. Harold Wiener,

a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, entitled "Studies in Biblical Laws." But that general Jewish attitude, if marked too much, in some respects, by the characteristic tenacity of the race, has its justification, and is in some respects an example to ourselves. The Wellhausen theory implies nothing less than that the Jews have been mistaken as to the whole course of their history, from the time of Ezra downwards; and that is a proposition very much equivalent to a contention, which we might imagine put forward by some Higher Critic of English history, that we are entirely mistaken as to the course of English history previous to the Norman Conquest. Considering, what is now demonstrated, that not merely writing, but long documentary records, such as a code of law, existed in the time of Abraham, it is scarcely credible that Ezra and his contemporaries and successors should either have been under any such illusion themselves, or should have been able to impose it on their people; and, at all events, an enormous burden of proof rests on those who would defend such a supposition.

Again, the consideration just mentioned seems to have been too much overlooked, that a similar burden of proof has to be encountered by any theories which would involve a belief that the Apostles, under the special inspiration of what we believe them to have been the recipients, were entirely mistaken in the view they took of the ancient history of their race, and in the arguments they built upon prophecy. This consideration seems entirely lost sight of by those who adopt what have of late been the dominant views respecting the Old Testament in so-called critical circles. A journal has, for instance, of late been started, called the *Interpreter*, devoted to the dissemination of such critical views as I am referring to, and the first article in the first number was a discussion by Professor Driver of "The Permanent Religious Value of the Old Testament." That value Professor Driver discerns in seven points: first, "the surprisingly lofty and elevated conceptions of God which prevail in it"; secondly, "the clearness and emphasis with which it proclaims the duty of man both towards God and towards his fellow-men"; thirdly, that "the paramount importance, not only of what may be termed the more private or personal virtues, but also of the great domestic and civil virtues . . . is throughout insisted on"; fourthly, "the Old Testament is of permanent value in setting before us examples of characters, determined and moulded by the influence of their religion, which we may in different ways adopt as our models"; fifthly, "the Old Testament is of unsurpassed value for devotional use and suggestiveness"; sixthly, "the Old Testament possesses a peculiar value of its own on account of

the great ideals of human life and society which it holds up before its readers"; and seventhly, "the great stress laid in the Old Testament upon a pure and spiritual religion." That, in substance, is all. Now, is it not an astonishing thing, a thing sufficient to condemn the whole school of thought represented by such an article, that, among these points of permanent value in the Old Testament, there is no mention of that which constituted almost its cardinal value for the Apostles, namely, its prophetical character, its predictions of the Messiah, and the fact that our Lord's fulfilment of those predictions supplied the main argument on which the Apostles relied in their preaching? Could there, to a Christian eye, be a more extraordinary omission than the fact that the Scriptures pointed forward, from beginning to end, to Christ, and that, taken in conjunction with the fulfilment in the New Testament, we have thus an irrefragable proof that from Abraham—nay, from Adam—to Christ God has been speaking to men and controlling their history, since He gave promises from the first which have been faithfully fulfilled? In his last paragraph, indeed, Dr. Driver does say that the Old Testament Scriptures "exhibit the earlier stages of a great redemptive process, the consummation of which is recorded in the New Testament." But that general statement expresses something very far short of the definite, continuous, specific prophetic process on which the Apostles relied in their addresses to the Jews and the Gentiles. That single article, by a leading representative of the modern critical school, is enough to prove the incompatibility of such views with principles hitherto held to be inseparable from the Christian faith. Do not let me be supposed for a moment to say that, if the critical views which Professor Driver represents were reasonably established, they are not to be accepted. But do not let us shut our eyes, as too many competent authorities do, to the fact that, if we accept them, we shall have, as this example shows, to abandon the authority of the Apostles, to admit that they were mistaken in their most vital arguments, at the first great crisis of the Christian Church; and when this is admitted and realized, it cannot well be doubted that their authority in other respects would soon be grievously shaken. Wellhausen resigned the theological Chair which he held. His representatives in this country, who still hold such Chairs, are doubtless not inferior to him in honesty, but I fear they are inferior to him in clear-sightedness. In short, while listening patiently and, as St. Peter says, meekly, to all the arguments which criticism can produce, let us not listen to them as though the whole Jewish and Christian tradition had no presumption in its favour, but, on the contrary, with

a distinct recognition of that presumption, and a sense that any arguments which are adduced in opposition to it have a very heavy burden of presumption against them. The *onus probandi* lies upon such arguments, and an immense *onus* it is.

But now let us turn for a while to the position of the critical argument at the present moment. We are told on all hands, and it is assumed in the recent Declaration, that there are certain "assured results" of modern criticism, and that "many of the clergy have already, with advantage to Christian faith, and with a general assent on the part of their rulers, welcomed important results of a patient, reverent, and progressive criticism of the Old Testament." To put this into plain words, it means, probably, that what is commonly called the critical view of the Old Testament, which places the Law after the Prophets, and at the time of the Exile, is considered by many persons to afford a view of the Old Testament more in conformity with modern ideas, particularly in respect to the evolution of religion, and that it has received the countenance, and at least the toleration, of theological Professors, and even of Bishops. I am sorry to say that is the case. How, indeed, persons can receive with satisfaction and comfort a view of the Old Testament which, as I have said, is inconsistent with the teaching of every Apostle, not to say of our Lord, passes my comprehension.

But let us first ask whether these results are really assured. Now, I would first adduce one slight but crucial example of the nature of these "assured results." In Gen. x. 22 occur the words, "the sons of Shem, Elam," etc., and in Dr. Driver's edition of the Book of Genesis, in the Westminster Commentaries, there is the following note on these words: "Racially the Elamites were entirely distinct from the Semites, their language, for instance, being agglutinative and belonging to a different family; their geographical proximity to Assyria is in all probability the reason why they are here included among the 'sons' of Shem. It is true, inscriptions recently discovered seem to have shown that in very early times Elam was peopled by Semites, who were dependent upon Babylonia and governed by Babylonian *patesi's*, and that the non-Semitic Elamites spoken of above only acquired mastery over it at a period approaching 2300 B.C., but the fact is not one which the writer of the verse is very likely to have known." It would surely be difficult to find a more perverse piece of criticism. In any other department of literary criticism, if a statement were found in a book which was true before a given date, but not true after it, we should at once recognise that the statement dates the book, or, at all events, the portion of the book in

which it occurs. So that on the principles on which we should deal with "any other book" we have here positive evidence that the verse in question belongs to a document or a tradition older than 2300 B.C. Why does not Dr. Driver draw this natural conclusion? Obviously because he is possessed by the theory, which is one of the "assured results" of which he speaks, that the verse belongs to the portions of the chapter assigned to the source P, which he considers belongs to the age of Ezekiel and the Exile, or nearly 2,000 years after the date when Elam was peopled by Semites. Of course, if that is the date of the authorship, there is some improbability, not only in the writer knowing so ancient a fact, but still more in his making a statement which was, at least, inconsistent with the circumstances of his day. But ordinary readers will, we think, be more likely to conclude that Dr. Driver's theory is here encountered by a significant fact which is inconsistent with it. In an address in defence of the Higher Criticism recently delivered in London (*cf. Guardian*, June 7), Dr. Driver alleges that "the archæological and other facts adduced" by Professor Sayce and others "had no bearing on the Higher Criticism and left it entirely untouched." Here is one instance, at least, in which an archæological fact has a direct bearing on a critical theory, and gravely affects it. The case illustrates another point in Dr. Driver's recent address. He distinguishes between the Higher Criticism and Historical Criticism, and complains of Dr. Reich for confusing the two. "The historical character," he says, "of the Pentateuchal narratives . . . or of the Virgin Birth or the Resurrection is a question, not of the Higher Criticism, but of Historical." But this verse affords a conspicuous illustration of the manner in which the Higher Criticism affects Historical Criticism. If it were really established by the Higher Criticism that the Pentateuchal narratives were composed, at least in their present form, hundreds, or even thousands, of years after the events, the evidence on which Historical Criticism proceeds would be vitally affected. The consequence is, though Dr. Driver seems reluctant to recognise it, that archæological evidence, which proves the existence of documents contemporary with the Pentateuchal narratives, such as the Code of Hammurabi, materially affects the probabilities on which Historical Criticism works. If, as is probable from the verse in question, the Book of Genesis quotes documents, or at least reports traditions, which are at least as old as 2300 B.C., there is a reasonable probability that the narratives in that book may be based on equally contemporaneous documents.

For a similar reason the validity of the literary or higher criticism of the Book of Genesis is of the greatest consequence to the interpretation of the earlier chapters of the book. If,

as Dr. Driver's school supposes, they were of late composition, it is not unnatural to treat them as purified editions, so to speak, of Babylonian myths. But if there is ground for thinking it possible or probable that they are reproduced from very ancient documents, that presumption disappears. In truth, the mere fact of the existence of a resemblance in some important features between the Babylonian myths and the narratives of Genesis does not in itself raise the slightest presumption that the Babylonian myths are the older. It is at least as possible that the narratives in Genesis are the ancient and inspired documents, and that the Babylonian myths represent corrupted forms of them; and to many persons the latter supposition will seem much the more probable.

But it is an unfortunate time for Dr. Driver to say, as he did in his recent paper, that "it was a *suppressio veri* to say that the critics were divided amongst themselves; upon all important points they were agreed." Last year, in an important series of Handbooks of Classical Antiquity, edited by Dr. Iwan von Müller, Professor of Classical Philology in Munich, appeared the first half of a "Sketch of the Geography and History of the Ancient East," by Dr. Fritz Hommel, the eminent Professor of the Semitic Languages in the University of Munich, and the author of the articles on Assyria and Babylonia in Dr. Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible." Appearing in such a series, it appears with even more than Professor Hommel's authority, as it cannot but be regarded as being, in the view of the editor, a trustworthy account of the subject it treats. Now, in this work the conclusions of the school of Old Testament criticism to which, in the main, Dr. Driver belongs are treated as radically unsound. Thus, on p. 172, Dr. Hommel says, after referring to the traditional view, that "a very different picture is given by the representations of the so-called Old Testament science, as it has been conducted for many decades past, or of the modern criticism of the Pentateuch which since 1878 has been developed on the basis of the works of Julius Wellhausen. This criticism started at the outset from false presuppositions, and in consequence could not but arrive at false results. One of these false presuppositions is that analysis of the sources of Genesis which has long become a fanatically defended dogma." Again, on p. 174, he speaks of the Wellhausen view as one "which turns the whole Israelitish tradition topsy-turvy, and makes the greater part of the Pentateuch to consist of pseudographs." On p. 183 he says: "From all this a sober observer, especially if, in addition to the Old Testament, he also knows the ancient East, cannot but conceive the greatest possible mistrust of the so-called assured

results hitherto reached by the criticism of the Pentateuch (the so-called Wellhausen school)."

In the face of such statements by a scholarly archæologist of Dr. Hommel's eminence, the sober observer of whom he speaks—in this country no less than abroad—will be justified in declining to believe that any such assured results as Dr. Driver speaks of have been reached, in opposition to the substantial truth of ancient tradition and belief on the subject. There is, in fact, too much reason to believe that—since the time of Wellhausen, at all events, and perhaps much earlier—the criticism of the Pentateuch has, in the expressive French phrase, made *fausse route*, gone on an entirely mistaken tack. At all events, in the face of such confusions and contradictions as have been here illustrated, it would seem that the promoters of the recent Declaration are singularly unfortunate in suggesting that the results of Old Testament criticism, up to the present time, encourage us to look for satisfactory results from an application of similar methods to the New Testament.

On the latter subject, it would seem enough for the present to say that, by consent of the leading scholars both here and in Germany, the belief of the Church as to the dates and authorship of the books of the New Testament has been substantially vindicated; and if so, we have, at all events, the testimony of contemporaries, to the facts narrated in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. That simple fact, apart from the question of the inspiration of the writers, might alone suffice to reassure believers. It is difficult, for instance, to see how modern criticism can invalidate the testimony of a writer who has been proved to possess the careful historical capacity of an educated physician like St. Luke. Nothing, it may be safely said, has yet been established which invalidates the historical truth, in all essential points, of either the Old or the New Testament; and we may safely rest in the old faith while critics like Dr. Driver and Dr. Hommel are settling their differences.

HENRY WACE.

THE POET-PARSON OF MORWENSTOW.

IN a remote valley on the North Cornish coast, half-way between Bude and Clovelly, stands the ancient parish church of Morwenstow. It is interesting alike in its history, its architecture, and its situation. It nestles under the huge hill which ends in Hennacliff, the grandest rock in Cornwall, and—with the exception of Beachy Head—the highest perpendicular cliff in England. There are few

houses round it, and not much cultivation. The beauty of the situation is the work of Nature alone. The church is a very interesting building. It is said to have been founded by St. Morwenna, the Welsh virgin-saint, on a piece of ground given to her by King Ethelwulf, A.D. 840. Three of the arches of the nave are old Norman, as is the south door. In the chancel is that very rare feature a Norman piscina, but the most remarkable thing in the church is the very old Saxon font. This may well be as old as the time of Morwenna, even if the existing church is of later date. If the traditional date is correct, Morwenstow must be one of the oldest churches now existing in England. In any case, it is almost certainly the oldest in Cornwall. It contains a splendid complete collection of carved seats. These are common in North Cornwall, and are an object of general interest to antiquarians; but in most cases some of them have been removed or mutilated. Morwenstow is the only church, as far as the present writer is aware, in which there is *no* seat later than the sixteenth century.

For these reasons alone Morwenstow would be well worth a visit; but its chief interest is as the scene of the life and labour of Robert Stephen Hawker, one of the notable characters of Cornwall in the last generation, with whose memory Morwenstow will ever be associated. He was its Vicar from 1834 till his death, in 1875. His abilities and eccentricities attracted wide notice and brought many visitors to Morwenstow. Much more than local interest was excited by the report that on his deathbed he joined the Church of Rome, and a vehement controversy waged for some time on this point. Two memoirs appeared soon after his death—one by the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, the other by the late Rev. F. G. Lee. Mr. Baring-Gould's book has hitherto been the chief source of information about Hawker, and has made his name widely known both in England and America. Interest has lately been revived by the recent publication of a new "Life," by Mr. C. E. Byles, his son-in-law, containing a great deal of new information. It is too long and much too expensive, and is not always accurate in its description of persons and places; but it is extremely interesting, and gives such a picture of Hawker as cannot be obtained elsewhere. I have followed it for the facts referred to in this paper, which I propose to supplement by a few personal reminiscences. For the sake of those who have not read the new "Life," or the older ones which it largely supersedes, I give a very short summary of its chief events. But Hawker was a man who made much more impression by his *personality* than by his *work*, and it is with the object of recording the impression

that he left on me in boyhood, rather than of offering any comment on his life or works, that these lines are written.

Robert S. Hawker was born at Plymouth on December 3, 1804. His father left that town a few years later, to become Curate, and subsequently Vicar, of Stratton, a little town in the centre of the district in which Morwenstow lies. It was here that young Hawker played those boyish pranks which are still recounted with much amusement in the neighbourhood. In 1823 he matriculated at Pembroke College, Oxford, but migrated to Magdalen Hall in consequence of his marriage. This was the romantic event of his life. His wife was Miss Charlotte I'ans, a lady of some means and much character, who was more than twenty years Hawker's senior. In spite of this disparity of age, the marriage was an extremely happy one, and when Mrs. Hawker died in 1863, her husband was nearly broken-hearted. But in less than two years he married Miss Kuczynski, a Polish lady just forty years younger than himself. His only distinction at Oxford was winning the Newdigate Prize with a poem on "Pompeii" in 1827, but he was a well-read man and a good scholar. He was ordained in 1829 to the curacy of North Tamerton, and was appointed Vicar of Morwenstow in 1834. He hardly ever left the immediate neighbourhood, and only twice in his life visited London—once for his second marriage, in 1864, and ten years later for medical advice. He spent his first wife's money freely on the parish, building the vicarage and school, and restoring the church. He exercised a profuse hospitality of his own kind, and visitors from all parts of the county were welcomed at Morwenstow. By a strange accident he died in the town of his birth, having been received into the Church of Rome on the last day of his life, while he was unconscious. Mr. Byles wisely refrains from entering into discussion of this event, and I shall follow his example. It is enough to say that recent inquiries on the spot confirm the opinion at which most of his friends arrived at the time—that the reception was not due to his own initiative, and that there is no reason to suppose that his sympathies were ever with the Church of Rome.

Hawker is now known to the public as a poet and preserver of local traditions. In his own neighbourhood he is mainly remembered as an eccentric character. Such he certainly was—his habits, his speech, his surroundings were eccentric. His clothing has often been described. It included a brown coat, with claret-coloured lining, and a tight blue sailor's jersey, with a red cross on it, and ended in Hessian boots. Thus clad, he appeared at his front-door, holding a long stick surmounted by a cross, bare-headed, or with a hat to match his coat. He then welcomed his visitors, and invited them

into the house. The sitting-rooms were filled with old furniture and a quantity of china, collected from the country round. Among the china was a set of teacups without handles, in which tea was served to specially honoured guests, who, as the tea was always hot and the cups thin, found it difficult to partake of the one without breaking the other. Once when the post-bag came in during mid-day dinner, as it then did in that remote district, he uttered over it a prayer (I think in Latin) against bad news. This was not on any special occasion, and probably was his regular practice. There was generally a symbolic, and often a religious, side to his eccentricities. His quaint dress had its symbolism. He thought black a wrong colour for the clergy to wear, and the sailor's jersey was the fitting dress of a fisher of men. What the teacups without handles signified I never found out.

Another of his characteristics was his free use of Scripture in common conversation, and in support of his particular views. At least two instances of this came under my notice which have not been in any of the published accounts of his life. He was once showing a party of visitors round Morwenstow Church. My dog followed us unobserved, and came into the church. I was about to turn it out when Mr. Hawker said: "Don't turn the dog out—there were dogs in the Ark!" On another occasion three boys had gone over to Morwenstow, and were there at the time of the daily evensong. I had never seen Mr. Hawker officiate, and expressed my desire to accompany him to the service. He waited till long after the regular time, and then went to the church. It was getting dusk, and when he read the lesson he took a portable candlestick from the chancel, and held it over the lectern while he read. The congregation consisted of the caretaker, Mr. Hawker's young daughter, and ourselves. On our return to the vicarage one of the party—not the writer of this paper—had the temerity to say: "Mr. Hawker, is that the sort of congregation you generally get on week-days?" He was promptly rebuked by the Vicar in the following terms: "My young friend, I never count my congregation. David was punished for numbering the people."

Sometimes his characteristic sayings expressed suggestive and even striking ideas. Some of these are recorded by Mr. Byles. One of the best of them was addressed to myself, and has not yet found its way into print. I was walking with him on the grass terrace above Morwenstow Church, on whose antiquity Mr. Hawker enlarged, as he often did. I remarked that the population was small enough then, and must have been much smaller when the church was built. Mr. Hawker

said: "There was no population at all. The church was the first building in the parish." I innocently remarked: "I wonder how it occurred to anyone to build a church in this out-of-the-way place when there was no population to serve." The Vicar at once addressed me with his usual formula of reproof: "My young friend, in those days churches were not built to accommodate congregations. They were built *ad Dei gloriam*, and restored *ad majorem Dei gloriam*." In this he gave the explanation of the beauty of medieval architecture.

Hawker was, in fact, much more than a mystic or a character. He was a man of strong feeling, original ideas, and most attractive personality. His antipathies were strong, and often quite unreasonable. Few thinking people will endorse his sweeping condemnation of Milton and Wesley. Some of the most scathing comments on Dissent ever heard even in Cornwall were uttered by him, and are recorded by Mr Byles. Yet he was as much liked by his Nonconformist parishioners as by Churchmen. It will be new to many who know him only by his writings or the stories of the countryside to learn how diligent and earnest he was in his parish work. Yet he was one of the pioneers of some reforms that have now become nearly universal, one of the first clergy in Cornwall to introduce weekly offertories, and, as Rural Dean, to revive ruridecanal synods. And he completely altered the attitude of his parishioners towards shipwrecked sailors. These had hitherto been regarded as the lawful objects of pillage. Hawker made his people as keen to succour, as they had previously been to rob these unhappy victims of the sea. When rescue was impossible, he made it his business to give to each body a decent and honourable burial. The effect of this on the *morale* of Cornishmen can hardly be overestimated.

It is not my purpose now to discuss Hawker's merits as a poet. They were no doubt considerable. I cannot quite agree with the very high estimate that has been formed of his masterpiece, "The Quest of the Sangraal." It is a piece of true poetry, and certainly contains some beautiful passages; but to rank it, as some critics have done, with the poems of Tennyson, seems to me entirely to exaggerate its merits. It is rather as a writer of ballads that Hawker will be remembered. One of these spirited compositions—"The Song of the Cornish Men," the Trelawny ballad—is widely known. Some others—*e.g.*, "The Bells of Bottreau," and "The Gate Song of Stowe"—are at least its equals, and will probably have a permanent place in English literature. And some of his prose compositions in "Footprints" will always be read with interest by students of Cornish folklore. On the whole, Mr. Byles has shown us that one who has long been known

as one of the characters of Cornwall was also one of its worthies. And the object of the present writer will be attained if he has given the readers of the CHURCHMAN some better idea of the picturesque personality of the Parson-Poet of the West.

BARTON R. V. MILLS.

THE WORLD INTO WHICH CHRISTIANITY CAME.[1]

"Das Heidentum ist verchristlicht, das Christentum romanisiert."—WERNLE: *Die Anfänge.*

IN order to understand any religious or social movement, it is important to get as clear a conception as possible of the condition of the society which it seeks to influence; for both the course and the results of any such movement will, to a great extent, be governed by the condition of the material which it struggles to affect. In the New Testament Christianity is likened both to a seed cast into the ground and to leaven placed in the midst of meal; and the lesson of our Lord's first parable is that the harvest will depend, not only on the nature of the seed, but upon the condition of the soil.

Christianity may be said to have been a seed containing the possibility of a new life planted in the midst of the great Roman Empire; and during the earliest period of the Church's history the Empire was practically the field in which it grew. What, then, was the social and religious condition of, say, Asia Minor, Greece, or Italy, and especially of Rome itself, during this period? What were the social, and ethical, and religious standards and ideals then accepted? and how far were these actually realized in various classes or grades of society? What, apart from Christianity, were the chief philosophical and religious influences which were moulding men's opinions and conduct? How far were such religious conceptions or convictions which had been influential in the past still of present power? and what new religious ideas, or forces, or forms of worship, apart from Judaism and Christianity, were competing for the attention or acceptance of men?

An answer to all these questions cannot fail to be very helpful to the student of early Christian history, and especially if the answer be evidently based upon very adequate

[1] "Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius," by Samuel Dill, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co., 1905.

knowledge. Such an answer to each of these questions will be found in Professor Dill's volume.

Usually our study of the period of which it treats—the period of 125 years between A.D. 54 and A.D. 180—has been, and still is, far too one-sided. The period is "a crisis and turning-point in the life of humanity, a period pregnant with momentous issues, a period in which the old order and the new are contending for mastery, or in which the old is melting into the new" (p. v). As we study this period we are witnessing a conflict; but the vast majority of students are content to view only the action of one party in the struggle—namely, the Christian. Professor Dill's book is an extremely valuable picture of the other side, a picture so complete and crowded with detail that it is often difficult to get a comprehensive view of even this side of the conflict. And possibly his attention is so concentrated on this one side that he hardly does justice to the effects which were already being felt from the Church's mission. But the balance both of knowledge and interest has for so long and to such a degree preponderated on the one side that there is little fear that the importance of the Church's work should be forgotten.

Let us take a modern parallel. Christianity is to-day being propagated among various peoples—*e.g.*, among the educated classes in India, China, and Japan, as well as among savage tribes in Africa. Suppose we could look forward a hundred years. Will the *resultant* Christianity at the end of the present century be the same in each of these various fields of effort? In the essentials of the faith—in a belief in one God who is the Father of all, in one Divine Saviour who has redeemed all, in one Holy Spirit who sanctifieth all—we hope and believe it will be the same; but while it is influencing and moulding the social and religious character of those among whom it is working, the local or national character of the resultant Christianity will be affected by the racial, ethical, and former religious forces and peculiarities inherent in these various peoples. And when the history of Christianity during this twentieth century comes to be written in the distant future—say, a thousand years hence—one key to the changes or developments in its presentation or expression, or in the influences which it exerted, will be found in a careful study of the various societies or peoples among whom it was propagated.

Professor Dill's book, as its title suggests, describes to us the condition of the Roman world during the first 125 years in which Christianity was being propagated as a missionary religion in its midst: it describes the world to which the teaching and appeals of St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, of Justin Martyr, Irenæus,

and the early apologists, were addressed. A study of this book will help to make clear not only the cause of the difference of the presentation of Christianity in the Epistle to the Ephesians and in the Gospel of St. Matthew, but that of the difference between the Catholicism of the end of the second century and the picture of the Church in the early chapters of the Acts.

I might draw yet another analogy. We are, I think, learning more and more the meaning of the words, "God never left Himself at any time without witness." There was a preparation for the Gospel not only in Judaism, but also in the higher teachings of the old Greek philosophy—*e.g.*, in the more spiritual teachings of Plato. The same is true of the best side of Stoicism, and (though to a less extent) in one aspect of Cynicism. That St. Paul was in agreement with—indeed, that he may to some extent have been influenced by—some of the ideas of Stoicism, is now widely accepted. Professor Dill's book gives us not only a very clear account of the principles of those philosophies which were influential during the first and second centuries, but it reveals to us the means and methods by which they were propagated: and many of these methods, as I shall point out, were remarkably similar to the methods employed by the Christian teachers. Then, again, as the Gospel followed the Law—a truth whose practical importance is often forgotten—or as the Law formed a foundation for the Gospel, so the higher teaching of Stoicism, and the self-denial of the Cynics formed among the heathen, at least a portion of the foundation (at any rate, in regard to ethics) upon which the Christian teacher had to build. Lastly, as the Old Testament has become more intelligible since it ceased to be studied in isolation, and since it has been read in the light of researches made into other Eastern religions, so will early Christian history become more luminous when we consider it side by side with other religious systems at that time claiming the allegiance of men.

To pass now to the book itself: let me say at once that what can easily be found elsewhere will not be found here. We have no history of the Empire, or of any of its various provinces; there is nothing about the succession of the Emperors, about the laws they made, or about the wars they waged. But we have a wonderfully complete picture of how various classes of people were living, and especially of the views they were holding and expressing upon a great variety of subjects.

The period of which the book treats was, as our author states, a very important one. It was, indeed, an age in which "great social and spiritual movements were incarnate in some striking personalities, who give a human interest to dim forces

of spiritual evolution" (p. v). Looked at from a distance, the change from a Nero or a Caligula to a Marcus Aurelius was certainly very great; but the age must not be thus measured, and we shall probably feel that the more we know about this period the less ready shall we be to give a verdict which shall presume to be at once adequate and comprehensive. It was "a period of almost unexampled peace and prosperity under skilful and humane government. It closes as an age of civic splendour, not only in Rome, but in almost countless great towns scattered throughout the various provinces; and the life of these towns was remarkable for its many social charities. At the same time we are shocked by the materialism and the social vices—the concomitants of a luxurious highly-organized civilization—for which this period is notorious." This is one aspect, but there is another. As Professor Dill says, the age "was one dignified and elevated by a great effort for reform of conduct, and a passion—often, it is true, sadly misguided—to rise to a higher spiritual life, and to win the succour of unseen Powers" (p. vi).

To students of philosophy and ethics this book will be of special interest. During the reigns of the Antonines, and, indeed, in the immediately preceding age, philosophy made "a serious and very practical effort to effect a moral revolution; but the effort was to a great extent vain." Philosophy "might hold up the loftiest ideal of conduct; it might revive the ancient gods in new spiritual power; it might strive to fill the interval between the remote Infinite Spirit and the life of man with a host of mediating and succouring powers. But the effort was doomed to failure. It was an esoteric creed, and the masses remained untouched by it. They longed for a Divine light," (as they do still), for what they believe to be "a clear authoritative voice from the unseen world. . . . The voice came to them at last from the regions of the East." As far as heathenism was concerned, "it came through the worships of Isis and Mithra, which promised a hope of immortality, and provided a sacramental system to soothe the sense of guilt and prepare the trembling soul for the great ordeal on the verge of another world (p. vii). To a description of these "worships," their strength and their weakness, a great proportion of the latter part of the volume is devoted, and the treatment of them, as of other subjects with which the book deals, is very full. While this is an advantage to the student, to the ordinary reader the method pursued may appear a little tedious. The whole volume is so packed with information, its author is so steeped in the literature of the period, and he evidently feels that so much of that literature throws valuable light upon the ideas and standards of the time, that possibly—at any rate,

for a truly artistic picture—he has overcrowded his canvas with detail. Then, many of the chief figures—*e.g.*, Seneca, Epictetus, Pliny, Tacitus, Juvenal—appear and reappear in quite different connections; they move so rapidly on and off the stage that the effect is apt to be confusing. We do not wish to accuse the author of undue haste, though the many cases of repetition of the same statement, often in almost identically the same words—*e.g.*, p. 96, *cf.* p. 94; p. 147, *cf.* p. 143; p. 140, *cf.* p. 144, etc.—seem to suggest that by some condensation his book would have gained in lucidity.

The whole work is divided into four "books." In the first of these there are three chapters: "The Aristocracy under the Terror," which gives a vivid, indeed a lurid, picture of life during the reigns of Nero and Domitian; "The World of the Satirist," for which Juvenal is the chief authority; and "The Society of the Freedmen," a chapter of great interest and one that deserves to be very carefully read, because, as far as I know, the information which it contains has not elsewhere been collected.

Into these three chapters "religious" questions enter less than they do into the rest of the book. Still, they will repay careful study, for they give an excellent insight into the *private* life of various classes in the chief cities of the Empire at the end of the first and at the beginning of the second century. I have not space to deal with the first two of these chapters in detail, but the following extracts will give an indication of some of Professor Dill's judgments:

"Nero formed a school which laughed at all virtue and made self-indulgence a fine art" (p. 52).

"Domitian, who was the ruthless enemy of the nobles, like all his kind, was profusely indulgent to the army and the mob. . . . The populace of Rome was pampered with costly and vulgar spectacles. Domitian's indulgence of that fierce and obscene proletariat was only a little more criminal than that of other Emperors, because it ended in a bankruptcy which was followed by robbery and massacre" (p. 56).

"Juvenal seems to be as much under the influence of old Roman conventionality as of permanent moral ideals. He condemns eccentricities, or mere harmless aberrations from old-fashioned rules of propriety as ruthlessly as he punishes lust and crime" (p. 77).

The third chapter, as I have already said, is especially important; for in the rise of the "Freedmen" we see a movement which, like Christianity itself, demanded the practical recognition of a new conception of society. It was not merely the beginning of those "middle" classes, of which the ancient world knew nothing, but who were destined to play so im-

portant a part in the modern world, but it was also the recognition that in work and in "trade" there was nothing essentially degrading—that there might be a "true nobility of labour." And in this chapter, as in the whole book, we are struck by the remarkable similarity between the experiences of the second century and those of the present time. Human nature was then very much the same as human nature is now; hence the "social problems" which then caused difficulties and demanded solution are almost identical with those demanding solution now. I am tempted to quote from almost every page of this chapter, but the following must suffice.

How essentially modern is the following experience of wealth without culture! Speaking of the opinion of the rich freedmen held by men like Juvenal and Martial, Professor Dill says: "The polished man of the world was alternately amused and disgusted by the spectacle of sudden fortune—with no tradition of dignity to gild its grossness, yet affecting and burlesquing the tastes of a world from which it was separated by an impassable gulf" (p. 104).

Yet there was a better side, for "after all reservations, the ascent of the freedmen remains a great and beneficent revolution. The very reasons which made Juvenal hate it most are its best justification to a modern mind. It gave hope of a future to the slave; by creating a free industrial class, it helped to break down the cramped social ideal of the slave-owner and the soldier; it planted in every municipality a vigorous mercantile class, who were often excellent and generous citizens; above all, it asserted the dignity of man" (p. 105).

The second book, like the first, also contains three chapters. These are entitled respectively: "The Circle of the Younger Pliny"; "Municipal Life"; and "The Colleges and Plebeian Life"; and in them we may be said to have three pictures—each again somewhat overcrowded with both figures and detail—of the *social* life of the period in three different grades of society. How difficult it is to form a judgment of any society which shall be at once true and comprehensive is at once suggested to us when we compare "the high tone of the world which Pliny has immortalized with the hideous revelations of contemporary license in the same class which meet us in Juvenal, Martial, and Tacitus. . . . The truth is that society in every age presents the most striking moral contrasts. . . . That there was stupendous corruption and abnormal depravity under Princes like Caligula, Nero, and Domitian, we hardly need the testimony of the Satirists to induce us to believe; that there were large classes among whom

virtuous instinct and all the sober strength and gravity of the old Roman character were still vigorous and untainted is equally attested and equally certain" (p. 142).

There are many other passages in this chapter I should like to quote, but I must be content with two:

"In this sounder class of Roman society it will be found that the saving or renovating power was not so much any religious or philosophic impulse as the wholesome influence, which never fails from age to age, of family duty and affection, reinforced, especially in the higher ranks, by a long tradition of Roman dignity and self-respect, and by the simple cleanness and the pieties of country life" (p. 144). And again this with regard to Quintilian, who was Pliny's teacher: "Quintilian believed that in education moral influence and environment are even more important than intellectual stimulus. . . . Quintilian's first principle is that the orator must be a good man in the highest and widest sense. . . . This tone, combined with his own high example of seriousness, honour, and the purest domestic attachment, must have had a powerful effect on the flower of the Roman youth who were his pupils for nearly a generation" (pp. 149, 150).

The next chapter, upon "Municipal Life," is full of most valuable information. It deals with that life, not only in Rome, but in the vast number of provincial towns scattered throughout the Empire; and, as Professor Dill says, "in any attempt to estimate the moral condition of the masses in that age the influence of municipal life should occupy a large place" (p. 199). To the student of the social problems—the problems of "town" life—at the present time this chapter will be most instructive. Again and again he will see that also in this sphere the difficulties of that age were strangely like our own. Those who groan to-day under municipal burdens will learn that then "the demands of the populace, together with the force of example and emulation, contributed to make the load which the rich had to bear more and more heavy" (p. 245). Those who deplore the way in which municipal office to-day is often shunned by the men who should be the best fitted to fill it will find how Plutarch "exhorts men to strive by every means to raise the tone of their own community, instead of forsaking it in fastidious scorn or ambition for a more spacious and splendid life" (p. 246).

In the third chapter, upon "The Colleges and Plebeian Life," we approach a subject which cannot fail to interest the student of early Christian history. We are reminded how "the immense development of the *free* proletariat in the time of the early Empire is one of the most striking social

phenomena which the study of the inscriptions has brought to light" (p. 251). Then we are told of "a growing pride in honest industry . . . a new and healthy sign, a reaction from the contempt for it engrained in old Roman society"; and of how the workmen "were finding a means of developing an organization which at once cultivated social feeling, heightened their self-respect, and guarded their collective interests" (p. 253). Then we are reminded of the "laws of association," and how "down to the time of Justinian the right of free association was jealously watched as a possible menace to the public peace." Again, how "the primary object of a multitude of colleges . . . was undoubtedly the care of the memory of their members after death." Those who have wandered through the catacombs, and who call to mind the words, "This do in remembrance of Me," will not be suprised at the analogy which has been pointed out between the earliest Christian societies with their "common meal" and these *collegia* or brotherhoods. And those who read this chapter carefully will obtain much help in any effort they may make to realize the nature and the ideas of the society which Christianity was then penetrating, which it was affecting, but by which it was also as surely in turn being affected. A consideration of the rest of Professor Dill's interesting volume must be deferred until next month.

W. Edward Chadwick.

SPAIN AND RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE.

In the opinion of many thoughtful students of international politics Spain is destined to play an important part in the future of Europe. Its geographical position, mineral wealth, and increasing population point in this direction, and the intellectual and scientific revival of the last twenty years are too little considered by most Englishmen. During the present year the Nobel prize for literature was awarded to Don José Echegeray, and the most coveted scientific honour, the Helmholz Medal of the Berlin Academy, was given to the eminent histologist, Señor Ramón y Cajal. In every branch of knowledge a renaissance is observed, and freedom of thought and discussion take the place of former apathetic acceptance of traditional beliefs.

The Madrid Athenæum gathers together the forces that form and mould thought. During the months of March and April the "religious problem" was discussed every week in the

Athenæum by representatives of the Ultramontane, the so-called "Liberal Catholic" party, and the agnostic Republicans and Socialists. The public galleries were always crowded, and impartial spectators declared that the applause of the audience was most heartily given to the speeches of men who declared themselves emancipated from Christian belief. The right of every man to worship God in accordance with his conscience was asserted, and, although in private life the speakers would not hesitate to show contempt for native Protestants, they publicly protested that Spaniards had the right to think and act as they thought best in religious as well as secular matters. This marked advance is not confined to Madrid. The Rector of the University of Salamanca, in a recently-published book, astonished his admirers by largely quoting Scripture, giving chapter and verse: it was a surprise to Spaniards to find anyone in his position referring to the vernacular version of Holy Scripture. The same thinker is responsible for the administration of the new Education Act in his province, and when an effort was made to influence him to close a school belonging to the native Reformed Church, he at once asked: "Are the sanitary and other conditions of this school inferior to those of the municipal schools?" When he discovered that they were not, he immediately said: "I shall not be any party to the injustice of condemning schools on account of their religious character." No more was heard of the agitation, for the enemies of freedom knew they would not find the Rector a willing tool in their hands.

Turning from the general trend of enlightened Spanish thought to the legal position of those who find themselves unable to follow Roman teaching, a contrast is at once seen. In the Concordat between Rome and Spain, made in 1851, Article I. maintains that—

"The Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion, which with the exclusion of every other form of worship continues to be the only religion of the Spanish nation, will be always preserved in the dominions of his Catholic Majesty, with all the rights and prerogatives which it ought to enjoy according to the law of God and the disposition of the sacred Canons."

This Concordat, according to Canonists, still remains the law of Spain, in spite of the famous Article XI. of the Constitution, which was made after the Revolution of 1868. This Article declares that—

"The Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is that of the State. The nation is obliged to maintain its worship and its ministers. Nobody shall be molested in Spanish territory for his religious opinions or for the exercise of his own worship, saving the respect due to Christian morals. Nevertheless, no ceremonies or public manifestations will be permitted other than those of the State religion."

The Ultramontane Party has always chafed under the existence of this clause, but when a republic and the brother of Victor Emmanuel were in power they could do nothing. In 1876 Pope Pius IX.—seeing a son of Isabella II., to whom he had given the "golden rose," on the throne—wrote to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo:

"We declare that the Eleventh Article completely violates the rights of Catholic truth, and of the religion, and, contrary to all right, the Concordat of this Holy See with Spain is abrogated in its principal and most precious part."

Spain was then in a period of reaction, and much agitation was roused by the erection of a Protestant chapel in Mahon (Balearic Islands). Señor Canovas, who was Prime Minister, in response to the appeals of ecclesiastics, gave, in a Royal Order, an authoritative interpretation of the law. This Royal Order, to be distinguished from a Royal Decree, as the one is signed by the Minister alone, and the other is signed by King and Minister, declares:

"All public manifestation of worships or sects dissenting from the Catholic religion is henceforward prohibited outside the limits of their temples or cemeteries, and in order to carry out this rule everything will be understood to be a public manifestation which is carried out on the public way or on the outside walls of the temple or cemetery, by which are made known the ceremonies, rites, uses and customs of the dissenting worship whether by means of processions, placards, flags, emblems, announcements or bills."

This is the law of the land to-day, and its enforcement is in the hands of the Central Government.

During the reign of Alfonso XII. Palace influence was always on the side of liberty. The King was a subscriber to *La Luz*, the periodical written by Bishop Cabrera, and, as far as lay in his power, His Majesty endeavoured to put in practice the lessons he had learned in England. On his death his able widow, Queen Maria Christina, became Regent, and as she had been an ex-lay Abbess of a Convent, and is a devout and bigoted Roman Catholic who is entirely in the power of her ecclesiastical advisers, every possible effort was put forward to increase the intolerance of Rome, and to ecclesiasticize national affairs. In direct violation of the Concordat the religious Orders were permitted to flood the country. Instead of the three Orders permitted by the Concordat of 1851, there were in Spain, in 1903, 2,656 communities of women, and 597 communities of men. The total number of nuns reached 40,030, and of monks 10,630. They overran the country, and as they paid no taxes, their activity in commerce undersold their less privileged neighbours. The deportation of the monks from the Philippine Islands, and the influx of the ex-

pelled French Orders have added to their strength. The regular clergy are the most thoroughgoing enemies of freedom, and their presence acts as a direct stimulus to hostile demonstrations against the small Protestant groups.

This was the condition of affairs until the beginning of the present year, when public attention was called to official acts which showed glaring illegality. A young soldier in Galicia, who had entered the army as a Protestant, was asked to attend Mass. He replied that he was a Protestant, and a worshipper of God in spirit. His officer refused to accept his remonstrance, and he was placed under arrest and thrown into prison. He appealed to the Military Court, and, in consequence of the agitation, was promised a fair trial. Some evangelists belonging to the Plymouth Brethren were violently assaulted in a village, and, as they happened to be British citizens, an outcry was raised, and the Press denounced the village brutality that committed such excesses. No notice had been taken of former outrages, and even when the writer was fired at in Villaescusa it was considered a matter unworthy of attention. Had he been a Spaniard public opinion a few years ago would have said "serve him right for deserting the religion of his country and becoming a Protestant."

These events would have been soon forgotten were it not for the erection of the English Church in Barcelona. The English colony in that city had bought a piece of ground, and were there erecting, under the patronage of the Colonial and Continental Society, a little church. The plans of the church, made by one of the churchwardens, had been approved by the municipal authorities. No hostility was expected, as Barcelona prides itself on its liberality, and is in many respects more like a French than a Spanish seaport. It is the centre of Republican activity, and is noted for pronounced anti-clericalism. Although it is customary to make municipal grants in support of religious processions, Barcelona has refused any subvention, and neither ecclesiastical prayers nor threats moved the civic fathers.

The first signs of a coming storm were seen in a letter published last August, protesting against the sanction given by the Government to the opening of a building whose form proclaimed it to be a "Lutheran" or "Protestant" place of worship. The writer called for the removal of everything of a distinctive character, and endeavoured to set on foot a public movement to compel the authorities to do their duty. In last March the Catholic Associations of the city addressed a petition to the Prime Minister denouncing the form of the building, which has the exterior appearances of a temple of Gothic architecture, and two crosses, one over the roof and the

other surmounting the entrance-door. Attention was directed to a text, which did not exist, and the Prime Minister was asked to cause the disappearance of the crosses and text before the opening should be permitted. The petition was forwarded, and nothing more was publicly said until, on April 14, Don José Estanyol y Colom, Professor of Canon Law in the University of Barcelona, published in the *Diario* of Barcelona an article entitled "A Monument of Infamy." After calling upon—

"All those who work and live and breathe for Christ in the city to work without rest or truce until they secure that in this land, watered with the blood of martyrs and vivified by the heroism of our saints, we may not have to look upon . . . a temple which defies God, completely denying to Him what he values most—the worship which He demands from men"—

he added the staggering paragraph:

"Although our unhappy city is to-day the cesspool in which welter the foulest vices . . . let us at least work to avert that which is worse than this—that which would bring us face to face with the advance of heresy—manifested by that which would be the greatest monument of infamy in our religious city."

The day for the opening of the chapel was drawing very near when the Cardinal Bishop "published a pastoral on the construction of a Protestant chapel, which the Press says will soon be opened." The Cardinal stated that he had appealed to the Government to have the opening prevented, but was still ignorant of the result of his protest. Having proved to his own satisfaction that Roman Catholics should agree that Romanism is the only religion which has a right to be respected and accepted by a Catholic State, and that it alone has the right to propagate itself, he proceeds to discuss the teaching of the Church on liberty and tolerance of worship. Liberty of worship is not allowed in Spain, for

"The word Liberty carries with it the conception of right and faculty of doing a thing; the word tolerance considered in itself consists in supporting patiently an evil. Accordingly liberty of worship would signify right, or a faculty of embracing any worship whatever; whereas tolerance of worship signifies that the authority, to avoid the very grave evils that the prohibition of false worship would cause the Church or State permits—which is the same as saying suffers or tolerates that anyone may follow a false worship."

"Liberty of worship is in itself impious and absurd—for it is an impiety and absurdity to suppose that anyone has the right not to adore God and not to give Him the worship with which He wishes to be honoured. The faith teaches us that Jesus Christ, God and very man, instituted the Church, and that outside of it there is no salvation. To affirm that man has the right to embrace dissenting worships is a heresy—is to have shipwrecked in the faith."

It is unnecessary to quote further a document which is full of the intolerant spirit of the sixteenth century, and upholds the absolute claims of the Church to show no "condescension" to the Protestant sects.

On May 2 the Prime Minister replied to the Cardinal that the Ministers had determined to observe the law, and would not "consent to the opening of the chapel until all the exterior symbols disappeared. There will therefore be no 'condescension,' and the laws of the kingdom will be faithfully observed. In this sense the Government will reply to the note received from the English Government." The crosses were removed (according to *El Nuevo Mundo*, which published two excellent photographs of the church) as an act of tolerance and courtesy, and by desire of the Bishop of Gibraltar, and the church was consecrated and opened on May 5.

The Liberal Press made the Pastoral of the Cardinal the starting-point of a vigorous campaign againt the Government and religious intolerance. And among the many remarkable articles that appeared, none was more striking than that in *El Pais*, one of the most important Madrid papers. In the course of an earnest plea for liberty, it said:

"The nation is indignant in seeing how the Catholics (Roman) cannot say *evangelical* chapel, but 'Cabreraized,' alluding to the name of the Protestant Bishop, whom they insult as market women, without respecting the sacredness of the family, since they direct the same or even greater insults to his wife and daughters in return for the correct attitude they observe towards Catholicism, in return for the silence, the patience, and the forgiveness of injuries of which they always give an edifying example, an undeniable proof that they are a hundred times more Christian than those Pharisees."

The agitation would probably have had an early and unfruitful end had there not appeared in print on May 17 the following private letter from the young King to Cardinal Casañas, of Barcelona:

"MADRID, *May* 1, 1905.

"VERY REV. SEÑOR CARDINAL,—With great interest and profound sympathy I read the letter which your Eminence was so good as to send me on the 22nd ult., and the contents of which confirm the notices already received concerning the intention to open a new Protestant chapel in the Catholic city of Barcelona. I am earnestly endeavouring to have the matter settled in accordance with the text of the law fundamental and its consequential dispositions, and in proof thereof I have had it discussed some days ago by my Council of Ministers, to find in union with them the most effective means of correcting an abuse incompatible with the legislation now in force and the unanimous sentiments of the Spanish nation. As Catholic King and a submissive son and believer in the only true Church, this new attempt against the faith of our ancestors and the religion of the State, which has been confided to me now by Divine Providence, profoundly grieves me, and I do not hesitate in assuring you, Señor Cardinal, that it is my duty, within my attributes as Constitutional

Sovereign, to do all in my power that the projects which your Eminence exposes may be overthrown by my Government. I implore your blessing, repeating all my respectful esteem and affectionate goodwill,

"ALFONSO XIII."

This letter—undoubtedly the work of a secretary and a private communication — added fuel to the flame. The Government at once assumed responsibility for the note, and the Conservative and Liberal press called for the censure of the Cardinal. Many refused to believe that the King who had decorated with the Order of Alfonso XII., the brilliant naturalist, Don Angel Cabrera—whom he personally knows—could be guilty of a wish to prevent the English colony in Barcelona worshipping in their own church. They saw in the letter the usual respectful, if not obsequious, tone adopted by Spanish monarchs in addressing Princes of the Church, and an allusion to the evident violation of the intolerant law which forbids the erection of crosses outside Protestant places of worship. The colony had unwittingly broken the law, believing that the approval of the municipality covered all the conditions that had to be observed. They were convinced that a monarch who in a few weeks proposed to visit England would not be guilty of an intolerant desire to deprive the countrymen of his future hosts of the opportunity of worshipping God in accordance with the ritual of the national Church of England.

The country was, however, roused, and saw in the unauthorized publication of the letter a desire to interfere with the *rapprochement* between England and Spain. Even the reactionary press published articles from priests who had lived abroad, contrasting the state of religion in Protestant countries with the superstition and deadness of the Church in Spain, and *El Universo*, a leading Ultramontane organ, went so far as to prefer England to France, for although the "English live in the lamentable error of Protestantism, they have some affinity with us, since they preserve the common Christian basis." This statement is most surprising, for in Spain the free-thought schools are permitted to have large placards outside their walls, and no obstacle is placed in the path of the materialistic propaganda, for custom prescribes that in the majority of instances they "should be baptized, married, and buried by the Church."

The Rev. Don Fernando Cabrera, seeing the time was ripe to draw once more public attention to the fact that the front door of the church in Calle Beneficencia, Madrid, had been kept illegally closed for more than ten years, wrote a letter to the leading newspaper, setting forth the facts. He told how Ministers had asked the door to be kept closed, and that the

congregation had been compelled to enter by the door of an adjoining house, pass through a courtyard and the vestry before reaching the interior. For obvious reasons he did not state that the Ministers had regretfully acknowledged the illegality of the order, and had refused to put it in writing, for they said they had received command from above (the Queen Regent) to have the law violated. The publication of the plain history of the different prohibitions led the Ministerial organ to remark that it had been closed by orders of Liberal Ministries, not by the demand of the Conservatives, who were not intolerant.

As Bishop Cabrera had arranged to leave Madrid on a visitation tour to Andalucia, he entrusted the task of approaching the Civil Governor to his son, who determined that the front door of the church should be opened in accordance with what seemed to be the official declaration of the Government. Don Fernando Cabrera sought an interview with Count de San Luis, who received him most kindly, and asked him to narrate in detail all that had happened. It appears that the President of the Council of Ministers had already been consulted; and when the Civil Governor heard all his visitor had to say, he not only gave his consent that the door should be opened, but also promised to take precautions that no disorder should take place. On May 28, the door was opened, and on the following day a leading newspaper wrote:

"With great surprise and no little satisfaction we saw yesterday, on passing through Calle Beneficencia, that tolerance of worship was yesterday a reality in Madrid. . . . Yesterday the Protestant chapel in this street had its doors wide open—a thing that had not been observed since the opening day. Two policemen respectfully placed on the doorstep sanctioned by their presence the legality of the opening. The church was filled with the faithful. We take a note and celebrate this breeze of liberty, which appears to be the consequence of acts of hostility recent and censured."

It is rash to prophesy concerning the future of religious liberty in the home of the Inquisition. One of the great political parties—the Liberal—has lately placed religious liberty as the first article of its programme. The action of the present Government commits the Conservatives to the maintenance of the present tolerance as a reality, and not as it has too often proved, an excuse for repression and persecution. Public opinion, now becoming an active factor in Peninsular life, is strongly in favour of the removal of all restrictions on liberty of worship. Spain once more seems to be at the parting of the ways. The Bible Society reports a greatly increased circulation of the Bible during the past year.

The little groups of reformers are more hopeful than they have ever been, and if the land is to be saved from the effects of the reaction from superstition and idolatry, it can only be rescued by the spread of primitive Christianity in a form that appeals to the historic instinct of the people—by a Church framed on the Apostolic model and essentially Spanish. The Spanish Reformed Church with its able Bishop is, above all things, marked by its devotion to the teaching of Holy Scripture and all lovers of Gospel truth will pray that it may have grace to seize its opportunity and to go forward. English and Irish Churchmen have a duty in this great work, which the Spanish and Portuguese Church Aid Society, so long and faithfully presided over by the late Archbishop Plunket, tries to perform. THOMAS J. PULVERTAFT.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER ON EDUCATION.

THE fact of the Rationalist Press Association having some little time back published a sixpenny reprint of the above work, of which more than 60,000 copies are apparently by now in circulation, challenges some criticism of its contents, and I should like to offer the following papers by way of a small contribution to the task.

Amidst much that is admirable and exhibits great powers of observation and of independent thought, it strikes me as a decidedly weak point that Mr. Spencer does not seem clearly to decide for himself, and keep before his mind, whether the object to be aimed at in education is to *acquire the knowledge* most likely to be useful to the learner in life, or to *train the faculties* for subsequently acquiring that knowledge by such a discipline as is most calculated to develop and strengthen them. The curriculum of public schools in England is based on the latter supposition. The study of language (the dead languages by preference, Greek and Latin) and the study of mathematics hold the chief place in it, as the best mental gymnastics. It is believed that, when the instrument of thought has been forged by this discipline, it can be applied to the acquisition of special knowledge, such as the learner requires for his particular career in life, with greater advantage than if his studies had *commenced* with that object.

Mr. Spencer criticises this theory, but he does not seem to me to go to the root of the matter, nor to be quite consistent in his objections. At one time he argues[1] that the things it

[1] *Cf.* chap. i., *passim*, especially pp. 22, 23, 39, 40.

is most *useful* for a boy to know for the future direction of his energies are left out of the curriculum of education; while at another he repudiates the notion that he should be educated with a view to getting money and making his way in the world.[1] And in enumerating the many subjects the knowledge of which is highly desirable, it never seems to occur to him to ask himself the question, Is it *possible* for anything more than the merest smattering of knowledge about them to be obtained in the years which make up a boy's time for education; and if not, is not *one subject*, or at least very few, *thoroughly* learnt, a far better training for the mental powers, however many valuable things may be left quite unlearnt, and a far better equipment for going on to master what is possible of the others during the ampler years that are going to follow school-days?

If Mr. Spencer would have *everything* that is useful for them taught to boys and girls, is he not advocating a sheer *impossibility?* If he would have *that special thing* taught which the particular boy or girl will find it most useful to know in his or her subsequent career, is he not assuming *another impossibility:* that at the outset of a child's life it is possible to determine the career it is best fitted to excel in, and that, if it is possible, it is desirable—two very debatable propositions?

I am quite in favour of a fairly varied curriculum to suit such variety in powers and tastes as is perceptible in children, even at a quite early stage. It is a mistake to have such a narrow choice that a child may have no aptitude for, or interest in, *anything* that is taught, and so may be led to the depressing conclusion that it is too stupid to master any branch of knowledge successfully. But though I would have the one or two special forms of mental gymnastics better fitted to the nature of the child's abilities and tastes than has always been the case in the educational curriculum, I would still have them remain *but one or two* during his school training. I still believe that the ideal underlying the curriculum of our public schools—that of training and developing *powers, not* that of imparting useful *knowledge*—is the right one, and that it can only be attained by teaching the subjects selected for that purpose *thoroughly* and *scientifically*, even at the cost of considerable mental effort on the part of the pupil, rather than at haphazard and empirically, with a view to making the process of learning more pleasant and popular with him.

Again, Mr. Spencer is a strong advocate for the study of *Nature*, and contrasts it with the general devotion to *Language*, much to the disadvantage of the latter.

[1] P. 59.

Here also, while I can go a bit of the way with him, I am quite unable to go the rest of it. What is called "natural science" is extremely interesting, and undoubtedly most useful in the business of life, the arts and crafts of civilization, with all the branches of commerce, being but the application of its teaching to practical ends. But it never seems to dawn on Mr. Spencer that *Nature* and *Man* are *not exclusive* of one another, but that *Man* is the *greatest thing in Nature;* that his thoughts and emotions and aspirations are as worthy objects as we can possibly have for our study; that Language is the key to the understanding and interpretation of them; and that if, as I have contended, a little learnt thoroughly is a far better preparation for after-life than many things learnt superficially, language may well stand high among the subjects which may profitably make up that little, a literary education, conducted on philosophical principles, being not only an excellent mental gymnastic, but also sure to be interesting as long as human nature lasts, and the *most fascinating study* for *man* is *himself*. Let the study of external Nature by all means form part of *advanced* education.[1] Mr. Spencer has some very true remarks on its tendency, besides other advantages it has, to help in forming a habit of right judgment.[2] But though I will not presume to dogmatize on the point, in the earlier stage of education, language, as the key to *human thought*, seems to me to hold a deserved pre-eminence. And ol all languages, those which are styled "the classics" are the fittest for the end proposed. What we call a dead language —*i.e.*, one that is no longer spoken, having all its forms and its vocabulary fixed beyond the reach of modification, which is a process always going on more or less in a living language —lends itself much better to scientific analysis. And of dead languages none are comparable to Greek and Latin. The former is not only the most beautiful, the most copious, and the most flexible of known tongues, but it is the vehicle of thought employed by the greatest thinkers and artists the world has ever seen, for it is a very remarkable fact, and one with which the theory of the evolution of man has to reckon, that brain-power has not, in all the centuries which have intervened since their day, apparently reached a higher level than that attained by such men as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Æschylus, Pheidias, to name no others amongst the pioneers

[1] This is not intended to depreciate in the smallest degree the training of children at a very early age to observe the sights and sounds of Nature around them, but only to deprecate the scientific treatment of them forming any but the slightest element in elementary school work.

[2] *Cf.* p. 37.

and leaders of human thought. While Latin, as the parent of a large group of modern languages, gives us the key to their structure and vocabulary, and very much facilitates the acquisition of them, besides having been for many centuries the universal speech of scholars, much as French has been of diplomacy and society, and so embalming the processes and conclusions of a vast deal of the thought which has gone to the making of modern Europe. If it be contended, as perhaps it reasonably may be, that too much time is at present usually devoted in schools to the acquisition of these two languages, a remedy may be found in the use of good "Eclogæ" from the works of classical authors in the place of the works themselves.

Yet again, Mr. Spencer lays much stress on the desirability of not introducing a child's mind to *generalizations*,[1] of which previous to experience he cannot appreciate the truth or the value, but of presenting to him only *concrete objects*, and making him go for himself through the inductive process by which generalizations are reached. Let the process of learning, is his formula, be for each member of the human race that which it has perforce been for the race itself.[2]

Here, also, I find myself able to go only a bit of the way with him, soon arriving at a point when we part company. For what does the method Mr. Spencer advocates come to but this—that for the proper education of a child all the accumulated knowledge handed down from past generations is to be for him as though it was not; he is to have no mental equipment in his search for truth but that with which he can supply himself by the application to Nature of his own powers?

Surely it might as reasonably be argued that the child should go naked and unfed till, like primeval man, he had found out by his own experience what it was best for him to eat and drink, and what clothing was the best protection against heat and cold, as to say that he should be debarred from appropriating any of the *mental* furniture which he finds ready to his hand till he has put it all together *de novo* for himself, as the very first of human thinkers had to do. Heir of the experience of all the ages, he is not to be allowed to enter upon his grand inheritance. All that is to be permitted to him is to occupy that little corner of it which he is able to buy at the cost of going through in his own person all the blundering steps and the repeated failures which his earliest predecessors had to do before success crowned their efforts!

It seems to me that a far more sensible way of going

[1] *Cf.* pp. 52, 53. [2] P. 53.

to work from the point of view of a *practical* education, to be effected within *a limited period of time*, is to present to a child *a selected number* of generalizations gathered from the general stock of knowledge, to explain to him the process by which they were reached, and to invite him to go under your guidance through the same induction from his own experiences, and see whether, travelling along the same road, he would reach the same end. If it is beyond him, as I contend that it is, to strike out generalizations *de novo* for himself, he can at all events do more or less to *verify* those he receives on the authority of his teachers with more experience; and to verify your principles is as good advice, and as good a piece of training, as to verify your quotations. This is a process which will not only save him from the waste of time and the depressing effect of wandering at random along wrong roads before finding the right one, which would be the inevitable result of starting forth to seek his generalizations with no material but the very slender stock of his own personal experience of particular facts, but, by enabling him to verify the generalizations of his *teachers in a limited number* of instances, will give him confidence *generally* in the truth of that vast body of knowledge which every man must perforce receive on the authority of others, so that he will be able to use it as firm ground from which he can set forth to conquer new regions of truth for himself when his powers have been fully disciplined and matured.

The last bone I have to pick with Mr. Spencer—and here I am much more fundamentally at issue with him—is furnished by his teaching on *moral* education.

A great deal that he says about the unwisdom exhibited by parents in the moral training of their children is only too true.[1] Unnecessary interference, angry interference, selfish interference, are frequently *en évidence*, and are discreditable to the thoughtfulness and temper with which parents ought to approach their responsible task. It is excellent advice that a child should sometimes be allowed, after warning, to feel the effect of violating the laws of Nature, instead of being forcibly prevented violating them.[2] But the chapter seems to me to present, on the whole, an *utterly inadequate* view of *moral obligation*, and consequently of the right process of moral training.

Mr. Spencer speaks throughout as if the test of an action being good or bad consisted entirely in its production of beneficent results or the contrary. "Weigh whether what you propose to do will promote your own happiness and the

[1] *Cf.* pp. 71, 72.

[2] *Cf.* p. 74.

happiness of others, and do it, or not, accordingly," is what, unless I do him injustice, his advice comes to. His philosophy of right and wrong is purely utilitarian.[1] It is characteristic of his point of view that he mentions *conscience* only once, and that in a sort of *obiter dictum*.[2] Of conscience as the supreme element in the composite nature of man, passing in review before it all his thoughts and actions, and judging them as right or wrong, and so by this very instinctive act announcing itself as possessing fundamental authority over all the other factors of his constitution, as Bishop Butler long ago so well showed—of this all-important truth Mr. Spencer knows *absolutely nothing*. And to ignore it is to make the most fatal mistake possible in a paper on moral education.

Antecedently to, and independently of, our experience of the effects on our welfare, or that of others, of what we propose to do, conscience issues its imperative command, "Do this; don't do that." An ill-instructed conscience, or a conscience warped by prepossessions, may issue a wrong order. If it is to judge truly, it requires to be informed of the essential facts of the case by an enlightened intellect, and to be kept clear by self-discipline from the attempts of passion and self-interest to mislead it. But when he has been at pains to secure these conditions, the religious man will in the last resort see in the *place of rule*, which conscience fills in his system, an intimation on the part of his Creator that he is to *obey* it; and to the Christian man its authority will be still further enhanced by the consideration that through it speaks the Holy Spirit, Who dwelleth in him. "For conscience' sake" means something far different from, "I am going to do this because, as the result of a calculation of pros and cons, I am persuaded that it is in the best interests of myself and others." It means, "I am going to do it because it is the nearest approximation at which I can arrive to the will for me of One Who is my Father and my Redeemer, to Whom I am responsible for all my thoughts and words and actions, and Whom I am bound to obey at all costs to myself." I do not mean for a moment that prudential considerations are not to come into the reckoning. Undoubtedly they are to have their place. And it is a great argument for the existence of a God, Whose supreme characteristic is love, that *right* actions prove in the long-run to be *beneficent* actions too. But it is

[1] *Cf.* p. 74.

[2] So strikingly is "conscience" ignored, that, having failed to make a note of it on first reading the book, I cannot, in searching for it since, light on the single sentence in which, to the best of my recollection, the word cursorily occurs.

by no means always the case that they are so *proximately* and to our short-sighted eyes. And it makes a world-wide difference whether we do them because we calculate they are likely to prove so, or because we believe them to be indications of the Divine will.

It is well, indeed, as Mr. Spencer urges, to explain to a child the laws of the *physical* universe of which he forms a part, and if, in spite of warning, he persists in disregarding them, to let him discover by his own experience that the breach of them inflicts pain and suffering on himself. But it is of still more consequence to make him understand the laws of the *moral* world, of which, as a spiritual being, he also forms a part, and the relation to him of that Supreme Spiritual Being Who has stamped these laws on both the spheres of existence in which he moves. And here, too, he needs, even more than in the other case, to be warned that he disregards these laws at his own peril; that his conscience, neglected as a teacher and guide, will become an *accuser;* and that, surrounded though he may be with every material element which makes for happiness, he is just as much *bound* to be self-dissatisfied, wretched, unhappy, beneath its stinging reproaches, as he would be if he violated the laws of his physical nature, until by penitence and self-amendment he is brought through God's grace again into accord with the eternal law of righteousness.

And it is just because Mr. Spencer has no word of this kind for the child, moves altogether in his teaching on a lower plane of thought, mutilating the grand conception of our moral education by making it equivalent to a mere enlightened prudential forecast of the interests of ourselves and our neighbours; it is because his system seems to leave God out of the world which He has made, and which He is guiding to its goal; and to leave the child out of sight of the Father, Whom to know and love and serve with all our heart is true liberty and the only happiness—it is for this reason, far above any others I have suggested, that I venture to call Mr. Spencer's theory of education, spite of its many merits, not only inadequate, but *positively misleading.*

5. I would ask, in conclusion, whether we may not find in a consideration on the one hand of Mr. Spencer's mental characteristics, and on the other of his environment, a clue to the secret both of his power and of his weakness as an educationalist? Roughly speaking, his merits seem to be his own, and his faults those of his antecedents and surroundings. Gifted with an acute intellect and a commanding will, he is keenly alive to the part which the human child is capable of playing in the education and development of himself, and is

unwearied in claiming for him deliverance from the trammels of thoughtless routine and short-sighted interference, which so often prove prejudicial to it. But having had no experience of such a training in his own case, he is quite out of sympathy with a *literary* education, as putting the individual in touch with the best thought of the race and being the best discipline for the formation of *thought-power* in himself; and he gives the preference to the observation of Nature, as the best means of acquiring the *knowledge* most likely to be *useful* to him in his subsequent career. Further,[1] he carries his *dislike of authority* to what I cannot help calling such an irrational extreme, as to let it apparently blind him to the fact that in natural science, just as much as in other departments of knowledge, the learner is *obliged* to take the *vast bulk of the facts* with which he has to deal on the *authority* of his teachers, and that life itself would prove too short for the task, if he must verify more than a mere fraction of them in his own experience before he is to be allowed to set forth on the discovery of new ones. And in the domain of morals he lets the same dislike lead him into the still more serious error of dropping out of sight the *authoritative position and functions of conscience*, and making a man's own experience of the consequence of his actions his sole criterion for the discernment of right and wrong.

W. Jefferys Hills.

THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THEIR CONNECTION WITH SUSSEX.

Part V.

ISLIP died at Mayfield in 1366, and was succeeded by Simon Langham. In the first year of his primacy he visited Sussex, and resided at Mayfield for a time. He was early concerned with matters connected with the county, and in his first year of office issued a commission of inquiry into the charge of non-residency against John, Vicar of Cuckfield, a village in the Weald. Again at Mayfield in 1368 he confirmed the grant by the Prior of Lewes of tithes from Perching to Edburton. His short tenure of the primacy ended the same year, and William de Whittlesea ruled the Church in his stead. During his by no means lengthy primacy he does not

[1] *Cf.* p. 42.

seem to have had any connection with Sussex, save that involved in visitation duties.

At his death, in 1375, SIMON SUDBURY succeeded to his honours and offices. While resident at Mayfield in 1378 he issued permission to the Augustine Friars to wear stockings and hose of black or of brown cloth. During his primacy a certain John Whitclyve was Vicar of Mayfield—a cleric often confounded with the celebrated John Wickliffe the reformer. With the view, apparently, of improving this incumbent's position, Archbishop Sudbury made him a grant of land. The next year this Primate met with the singular death of beheadal by the rebellious followers of Wat Tyler.

His successor, WILLIAM COURTNEY, like so many of the Primates, was often at Mayfield. In 1385 he issued from thence a prohibition from preaching against William Skynderly, a heretic of the Diocese of Lincoln. At the *inquisition* taken on his death, of the possessions of the See of Canterbury in Sussex, the following extensive list was recorded—viz., the Manors of Tarring, South Malling, Stoneham, Rammescombe, Slindon, Lavant, Tangmere, Newtimber, North Bersted, Schripeney, and Aldwicke, with the half hundreds of Pallant and Wittering, the hundreds of Lokkesfield, Ringmer, Aldwicke, and Lindfield; the port called Le Havene, the mill called Bignor Mill, and the Rectory of Mayfield, the manor probably being alienated on lease at the time.

The Primate succeeding Courtney is usually called THOMAS ARUNDEL, but as a scion of the noble family taking name from that little town, and which united the Warenne possessions to the inheritance of the FitzAlans, it would appear that he should more properly be designated Thomas FitzAlan. This family connection with the powerful Sussex house was probably his greatest concern with the county. When visiting his province in 1405, he sojourned for a while at Ford, in Sussex, and while there issued his license for the consecration of South Bersted Church after some re-edification and the addition of a cemetery, the parishioners having previously had to seek sepulture at the mother church of Pagham. On this occasion the Bishop of the diocese granted a year's indulgence to all penitents worshipping at the newly consecrated church, and a minor indulgence of forty days to those who attended on the principal feast days.

In the latter part of Richard II.'s reign this Archbishop became involved in the troubles of his family, and in 1396 was impeached by the Commons for taking part in an illegal commission derogatory to the royal authority, and other political offences. Pleading guilty, he was condemned to

exile, and suffered sequestration of his temporalities. It does not appear that his banishment bore heavily upon him, for there is extant a letter to his monks at Canterbury, which he subscribes as written "with his own hand, in the terrestrial paradise near Florence"—"manu propria in Paradiso terrestri prope Florenciam."

He died in 1413, and was succeeded by HENRY CHICHELEY. When visiting in Sussex and resident at South Malling, this Primate undertook a revision of the statutes of the collegiate house there, particularly as to the due proportioning of the stipends of the Canons. He also added to the possessions of the see by his acquisition of the Manor of Scotney in Lamberhurst, in the north-eastern corner of Sussex, where once so much ironwork was carried on, the 2,500 iron balustrades around St. Paul's Churchyard having been made there.

In 1443 he was succeeded by JOHN STAFFORD. He also, when residing at South Malling, made additions to the statutes of the establishment. Possibly it was on one of these visitations of his Sussex *peculiars* that the Archbishop appointed John Lyttel keeper of the park of Plasshet, a tract of woodland on the northern border of Ringmer, a portion doubtless of the primeval Wealden forest. A record of this appointment inserted by the Chamberlain of the manor in one of his Account Rolls is interesting as evidencing the concern of the Archbishops in the appointment of quite subordinate officials, and of the necessity the Primates were under of having such details ratified by the Chapter. The Chamberlain's note is in connection with his payment of the exiguous salary, at the rate of twopence per diem, to John Lyttel, parker of Plasshet, "by Letters Patent of John Stafford, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, approved, ratified, and confirmed by the Prior and Chapter of the Church of Christ at Canterbury." Plasshet was—and is, for it is still a game preserve—one of the most ancient parks in the county, and there are indications that this fringe of the forest of the Weald had associations with prehistoric man, for on its north-eastern border is a tumulus, now grown over with oaks, while in the close neighbourhood of another large grave-mound on the south-western edge of the park are distinct traces of lines of earthworks, doubtless contemporary with the tumulus. The origin of the name Plasshet is probably from the old French word *plesseiz*, a park. The Abbot of Battle had two or three parks, and one of them was called *le Plesset*. Another derivation of the name is the old vernacular word *plashy*, meaning a watery ground, a derivation everyone would adopt who rode or walked through this wood at any season but midsummer, since, in spite of its high

situation, the ground is almost everywhere swampy, while two little streams run through it or along its border.

To Archbishop Stafford succeeded JOHN KEMP, a prelate who, like Peckham, Bradwardine, and possibly Winchelsey, was connected with Sussex by birth. He was born, indeed, as Leland says, "a pore husbandman's son," at Slindon, where he was destined to inhabit at will a palace, the inheritance of those who sat in the seat of St. Augustine. Kemp was a prelate of much ecclesiastical experience, having been successively Bishop of Rochester, Chichester, London, and Archbishop of York. Beyond such association with the county as was involved in visitations, ordinations, and institutions, his connection with Sussex was not noticeable.

Nor did his successor, THOMAS BOURCHIER, have much connection with the same county other than ordinary, though probably the appointment of his relative and namesake, Sir Thomas Bourchier, as forester of the Broyle, was made on some occasion when this Archbishop was resident in Sussex. Among the Manor Rolls of the archbishopric I have been able to find only one Account Roll of this forester—a document, however, sufficiently unique to deserve quotation for its exiguity. It reads thus: "Foresta de Broyle, Thomas Bourchier, K^{t}. forestarius. Arreragia nihil. Set de." The rest is a blank, and so this remarkable roll ends.

Of JOHN MORTON and HENRY DEAN, successors to Archbishop Bourchier, there is nothing to relate in connection with Sussex, except that a certain John de Clinton, for the purposes of a lawsuit, applied to Morton for the "evidences" of the Manor of Hamsey, remembering doubtless that it had in former times been in the possession of the See of Canterbury.

But WILLIAM WARHAM, who became Primate in 1504, and was the last Archbishop under the Roman obedience, has left several records of association with the county during the course of his lengthy tenure of the see. The supervision which the Archbishops maintained over the appointments of their various manorial officials is well exemplified by a letter which he wrote to the Dean of South Malling on the subject of the appointment of Chamberlain for the Manor of Ringmer. It is one of the first documents written in the vulgar tongue among the manorial MSS. in the archiepiscopal library:

"To the Stewarde and tenaunts of my Lordshippe of Ryngmer. I commende me to you and when I am informed y^{t} ye have chosen ye Sextenes of my College of Mallyng to be Chamberlains to gather the rents of my Lordshypp of Ryngmere whereas none officer or servaunt of my said college hath been chosen to ye office tyme out of mynde and whereas the said college holdeth no lande of me by such service as y^{t} is

credeblie showed me. Foreasmuch also as the master prebendarie or other minister of my sayd college were ordayned by their founders to be dilligently occupyed in God's service and not to be called from y^{t} to goe about temporall affaires and business. In my mynde ye chowsyng ye sayde sextenes to be chamberlaines have not doon as ye ought to do and therefor I will that ye resort to a new election for chamberlaynes to be chosen or else that two or three of the saddest and most substantial come unto me to show in the name of you all sufficient cause if any so be why ye said Sextens ought to be charged with the said office, which yf ye do not yt ys like to turn you to coste and trouble through takyng of distresses for my rent from tyme to tyme which ys lyke to be ungathered by yo^{r} chowsyng of the said sextenes and yf you wilbe occasion of yo^{r} own trouble and costes ye shall blame no man but yo^{r}selves. Gyffen at my man^{or} of Oxford the xx day of October W^{m} Cantuar."

It would be interesting to know the upshot of this matter. Apparently the Dean and Canons did not pay that attention to their spiritual and temporal lord which was his due, for a note in a contemporary hand is appended "that no tenant came hither to the lord for a hearing"—"mem^{d} quod hic nullus tenentium venit ad dominum ad audiendum."

Among the archiepiscopal MSS. at Lambeth connected with the manors of the see, there are several items relating to William Warham and his *peculiars* in Sussex. Of these, we may mention the warrants for the delivery of deer to various persons issued by this Archbishop, and signed with his signature "W^{m} Cantuar." As these grants are drawn up very generally in the same formula, a specimen of one will suffice as an example of all. It is dated 1511.

"We will and charge you that w^{t}out chacing or disturbance of o^{r} game being in your keeping ye doo sley ther oon buk of season and the same to delyver to my right welbeloved frende Richard Sakvyle Escuyer or to the bringer herof to the use of the same any restraint or commandment heretofor on our behalve geven to you to the contrarie notw^{t}standing or els that ye suffer our friende to sley the same buk with his greyhounde so that he nor you let renne noo bukhounde ther and this bill signed with our hande shall in that behalve sufficiently warrant and discharge you Given at or manoir of Knoll the fifth day of September the third yer. . . . To the kep^{r} of o^{r} parke of Broyle and in his absence to his deputie ther. Will^{m} Cantuar."

There is one slight memorial of this Archbishop, last of the mediæval Primates, still remaining on the remnants of his palace at Mayfield, and that is his coat of arms carved on the

spandrel of a door, a fesse between a goat's head in chief and three lozenges in base.

With Archbishop Warham we may well conclude our consideration of the connection of the Primates with Sussex, and in particular with their *peculiars* therein; for the alienation of Church property which was commenced towards the termination of his primacy affected Sussex as well as other counties, Canterbury as well as other sees, while much of the ecclesiastical property in that county which escaped the rapacity of the robbers was lost to the see by exchanges effected with the Crown by Cranmer, the succeeding Archbishop.

How little did my Lord Archbishop Warham, lord of so many manors, parks and chaces, woods and warrens, foresee that within a few years the archbishopric would be stripped of so many of its worldly possessions, and that his fair "lordshyppe of Ryngmer" and his "parke of Broyle" would so soon pass into the hands of the family of that man, albeit his "right welbeloved frende," to whom he had made the poor present of "oon buk of season"; or that within a generation an Archbishop of Canterbury would have to beg a buck from a Minister of State out of a royal park as a small return from the monarch "for taking away my Broyle"!

For such was the fate not only of Broyle Park, but also of the Manors of Lindfield, South Malling, and Ringmer, the two former being granted by Henry VIII. to Sir Thomas Palmer, while in after-years Ringmer and Broyle Park were exchanged by Archbishop Parker with Queen Elizabeth for the Manor of Croyden. Previous exchanges effected by Cranmer with Henry VIII. had alienated from the Church all those possessions (which had come to it by Wilfrid's devise of Cædwalla's gift) at Pagham, Slindon, Tangmere, Bersted, Bognor and the appendent manors, the peculiar jurisdiction and presentations alone remaining with the see. The same Archbishop alienated in a like manner that ancient and particular possession of his see, the Manor of Mayfield, where from the days of Dunstan so many Primates had spent perhaps the pleasantest part of their days in a mansion dating from before the Conquest, and added to by succeeding Archbishops, until in Islip's time it was become a palace; and wherein, too, three of them had ended their lives. Such was the fate of the wide lands and the many manors of the See of Canterbury in Sussex, while as regards its powers and privileges, what Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth spared suffered further diminution on the completed fall of the feudal system as the result of the "Great Rebellion," and

all that now remain are the rights of presentation and the shadowy special jurisdiction in the few surviving *peculiars* of the see.

W. HENEAGE LEGGE.

THE MONTH.

THE Bishop of Exeter's Primary Charge has created widespread interest, not only because it is a Primary Charge, but also on account of the personality and scholarship of Dr. Robertson. There is a further element of interest in the fact that in the Diocese of Exeter are some of the most notorious of extreme churches. The subjects dealt with in the Charge include some of the burning questions of the day, and they were discussed with a balance of judgment and a freshness of treatment which are deeply interesting and often very suggestive, even to those who are unable to accept *in toto* the Bishop's position. His historical knowledge often throws great light on some of the questions of present-day controversy. In dealing, for instance, with the small proportion of communicants to population, Bishop Robertson passed in review some of the causes of infrequent Communion in earlier days. The fact of the laity communicating but once a year dates back to a time long before the Reformation, and, according to the Bishop, is attributable to three causes: the numerical preponderance of merely nominal Christians; the law of compulsory confession; and, greatest of all, the unwritten law of Fasting Communion. Dr. Robertson points out that the elevation of a pious custom into a stringent law did more than anything else to kill frequent reception and to lead to the divorce of worship from communion. Then the Bishop sums up in the following words:

> Was the result wholly to be regretted? Almost wholly, he thought. For the whole benefit of the Eucharist, whether as sacrament or as sacrifice, was promised to the communicant only. There was no specific benefit attached, by any words of our Saviour or His apostles, to the act of merely being present; mere presence was not the fulfilment of any obligation imposed either by the Word of Christ or by the voice of the universal Church. This seemed absolutely clear. Moreover, without entering upon a discussion of doctrine, it might be safely affirmed that the idea of the adoration of the present Body of Christ as a main feature of the Eucharistic worship was not to be found in the ancient liturgies, still less in the New Testament.

Nothing need be added to these conclusive words. They carry their own lesson as to the true meaning of Holy Communion.

On the subject of non-communicating attendants the Bishop of Exeter, while feeling neither "obliged nor disposed to say anything to condemn the presence of those who did not receive if there be reasonable cause," significantly added:

> Only it must be insisted that no commandment of our Lord, nor any ecclesiastical rule in force amongst them, required attendance except for actual communion, nor recognised such attendance as fulfilling any obligation whatever. It was very difficult to say when the idea of any such obligation first arose. As non-communicating attendance was still forbidden in the false decretals, they might be sure that as late as the ninth century (when the decretals were composed) the obligation to be present, as distinct from the duty of communion, was not rooted in the minds of Churchmen. Such a rule was, it was true, now imposed in the Roman Communion, but from the beginning it was not so. No such rule was Catholic.

It is well to be reminded by so competent authority what Catholic rules on such a subject really are.

On the question of evening Communion the words of the Bishop are well worth pondering by both sides. On the one hand, Dr. Robertson said that no hour had been prescribed by law for the celebration of the Holy Communion, doubtless for the simple reason that it was assumed that the celebration would be invariably at some time in the morning. On the other hand, the Bishop fully recognised the position of those who urge that modern conditions make it expedient to have evening Communion for people who cannot come earlier in the day. Then he gave expression to the following opinion, which seems to call for special attention:

> There was the further question whether or not the evening hour was conducive to a proper disposition of body or mind. That was a question of experience. He had never himself been present at an evening Communion, so that he was not able to pronounce upon it; but he would regard the morning as *a priori* more likely to be favourable to freshness and devotion.

We are convinced that if those who have never attended an evening celebration of Communion would make a point of seeing for themselves what takes place, they would never be able to charge the observance with irreverence or lack of devotion. We venture to urge that this question of freshness and devotion is not to be judged solely on *a priori* grounds. We can quite understand that very many communicants prefer the morning hour; but there are many others who know by blessed experience the joy of an evening Communion after a day of Sabbath rest and worship. The entire day has been a spiritual and beautiful preparation for the evening Eucharist, and it is the spiritual testimony of thousands that evening Communion to them is infinitely more precious than that of the early

morning or of middle day. These testimonies of spiritual experience should have their due weight, and the whole question left to the spiritual liberty of all communicants. As Bishop Robertson rightly said, the question is involved in that of Fasting Communion, and it is a sad pity that it should be so. The time of Holy Communion should be decided on its own merits, quite apart from extraneous considerations due to heated controversy. Scripture and common-sense clearly point to the necessity of liberty to observe the Holy Communion at any hour of the day or night convenient to the people. "One man esteemeth one *hour* above another; another esteemeth every *hour* alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the *hour*, regardeth it under the Lord, and he that doth not regard the *hour*, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Let not him that preferreth evening Communion despise him that preferreth it not; and let not him that preferreth it not judge him that preferreth it. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own Master he standeth or falleth."

The discussion at the London Diocesan Conference on "Divorce and Re-marriage" showed very clearly the wide differences of opinion which exist among the clergy as to the position of the innocent party. As the law stands, the Divorce Act of 1857 makes one exception as to the impossibility of the re-marriage of divorced persons in church; that exception is, of course, the innocent party, and, according to present law, the innocent party has, as Bishop Creighton once said, all the rights of an ordinary parishioner. The result of the voting at the Diocesan Conference indicates that a large majority of the members wish to make it impossible for either party to be married in church. In our judgment this would be a grievous wrong to the injured and innocent party, and would be totally opposed to the spirit and letter of the teaching of our Lord. The arguments in favour of continuing to allow the innocent party to be married in church which were adduced by one speaker—, the Rev. G. R. Thornton—seem to us irresistible, and certainly no answer to them was vouchsafed at the Conference. It would be a deplorable thing if the impression became widely disseminated that the clergy wished no distinction made between guilt and innocence, simply on account of a theory of marriage which will not stand the test of Scripture, equity, or common-sense. Our Lord's words clearly allow marriage to be dissolved on one ground only, and it would be surely impossible and intolerable to place both parties upon the same level of disability. Happily the resolution of the

London Diocesan Conference only expresses the opinion of the majority, and will not go any further. Meanwhile the law is clear, and there is no likelihood of its being altered.

The very important question of the religious influences surrounding the young people of the well-to-do classes has been usefully discussed during the last month from different points of view. At the annual meeting of the Parents' Educational Union the head-master of Winchester spoke strongly about the luxury and indulgence of the home spoiling the simplicity of school-life. Dr. Burge showed the utter incompatibility of shooting, hunting, late dinners, cigarettes, and the theatre during vacations with the very different routine of life during school terms, and he rightly urged the importance and absolute necessity of not allowing so great a difference to be made between school and holidays. It is not so much a question of the sinfulness of this or that, as the requirement of a simpler ideal of life for those who in a few years will doubtless be occupying high and important positions in society. This question was also dealt with from another standpoint by the Bishop of Kensington at the London Diocesan Conference, when he spoke of the neglect of religious education by parents of the upper classes. It is probably true to say that no class is generally so ignorant of Holy Scripture and of religion as children of well-to-do people, while it is certainly true that scarcely any class is so difficult to reach by the ordinary parochial ministrations. The problem calls for immediate and thorough attention, for it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of influencing with vital religion the children and young people of the upper strata of society.

Discussion on religious education in elementary schools has also been making good progress on the whole during the last few weeks. An article in the *Daily News* seemed to favour the drastic solution of a secular system of education, the State having nothing whatever to do with religious education in any shape or form. A good many correspondents of that journal wrote in support of this plan as the only way out of our present educational troubles. The air, however, has been greatly cleared by a notable speech from Mr. Asquith, whose position in the councils of the Liberal party gives the greatest possible weight to his words:

> What do people mean when they talk of a secular system of education? It means, and it can only mean, nothing more nor less than this—that during such time as the school is being used for public purposes any form of religious teaching is absolutely and by law prohibited. Now, remember

that as regards the provided schools of the country, any Council may now, if it pleases, have a system of perfectly secular education. There is no obligation by law to give any religious teaching at all. The popular voice decides; and what is the practice? I am not speaking of Wales, but I suppose if you were to take this country of England you would find very few provided schools in which the local authority, popularly elected and popularly responsible, has adopted that solution. But the proposal is that secularism, which is now optional, but not adopted, should become compulsory. That means that the teacher, the person who is brought every day into contact with the children, and from whom children take their inspiration, is to be absolutely and compulsorily dumb in regard to all matters of this kind. Such religious instruction as is given, if it is to be allowed at all, would be given after school hours—I mean if it is allowed in the school building—by, I suppose, the representatives of the different denominations. The practical question is: Are the people of England prepared for that? I very much doubt it.

Mr. Asquith is right. The people of England are not prepared for a compulsory secular education for their children, and we are glad to see that several leading men among the Nonconformist Churches, like Mr. Lidgett, a Wesleyan, and Dr. Horton, a Congregationalist, have come, or are coming, to the same conclusion. Another well-known Nonconformist minister, Rev. F. B. Meyer, who has taken an active part in the Passive Resistance movement, has just returned from America, evidently impressed with the inadequacy, and even danger, of the secular system of education prevalent in the United States. An association is actually being formed to advocate the intrduction of the Bible into the public schools of that country. If anyone wishes to see some of the results of secular education on the Continent and in America, he should study the remarkable pamphlet just issued by Canon Wilson, formerly Archdeacon of Manchester, on "Education and Crime" (S.P.C.K.), in which he will find proof-positive of the disastrous results that accrue from the abolition of religion from the elementary schools.

If we should ever arrive at the position of a secular system of education, it will be mainly due to the extremists on both sides. The Roman Catholics and extreme Anglicans, on the one hand, are demanding full freedom and facilities for teaching their own particular tenets in elementary schools which are mainly supported from the rates. The extreme Nonconformists, on the other hand, are pressing for an absolutely secular system in which the State shall not recognise any religion whatever, leaving it to the Churches to supply what is needed. The latter position is, as everyone can see, and as Mr. Asquith truly said, perfectly impregnable from the standpoint of logic, and there is no real logical halting-place short of the absolute exclusion of the Bible, for dogma is dogma

whether Nonconformist, Anglican, Roman, Unitarian, Theistic or even Agnostic. But, as Mr. Asquith went on to say with refreshing common-sense:

> If you are to have a working educational system you must desert the altitudes of logic and come down into the street.
>
> Is there not here in England a body of simple truths held in common by the vast majority of Christian people which most parents desire that their sons and daughters should be taught, which from their simplicity and breadth are suited to the intelligence of young children? . . .
>
> . . . One way or another, a solution upon lines such as those of the religious difficulty is surely not beyond the reach, I won't say of statesmanship, but of common-sense, and I am not using the language of exaggeration when I say that it will be, in my opinion, a national scandal and disgrace if some concordat of the kind cannot be arrived at.

This is practical statesmanship, and we are confident that the people of England, by an overwhelming majority, agree with this view so tellingly put by a leading statesman of the Liberal party.

The debate in the Canterbury Convocation on the employment of laymen in churches gave rise to a very useful discussion, in the course of which it was clearly shown that we are in pressing need of greater facilities for the employment of suitable laymen in consecrated buildings, especially where the clergyman is alone or unable to obtain clerical help. We confess, however, to being greatly surprised at the opinion of Sir Arthur Charles, which was quoted by the Bishop of Salisbury:

> I am of opinion that laymen may lawfully, in a consecrated building, say the Litany or any other part of the Morning or Evening Prayer, which is not expressly directed to be said by a priest, provided they are authorized so to do by the incumbent and Bishop.

If this opinion were applied literally, there would be some very curious results. It is perfectly obvious that the terms "minister" and "priest" are often used interchangeably in our Prayer-Book services, and if a layman were allowed to read all those portions of the service where the word "minister" occurs, the arrangement would soon reveal some glaring absurdities. In any case, however, there is no possible doubt of the pressing need of utilizing lay help much more than we do, and, we fear we must add, much more than we legally can do at present. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States allows a licensed lay-reader to read all the service except the absolution, and the writer can testify from personal experience the help and relief afforded by this provision when three long services had to be taken and two sermons preached, in an American July with the thermometer at ninety in the shade. We shall watch

with great interest the further developments of the proposals put forth by Convocation. In the fullest possible use of qualified and accredited laymen will be found the practical solution of some of our pressing problems of Church work.

The Lower House of Convocation has appointed a Committee "to consider whether the possession of an authorized hymn-book would be an advantage to the Church of England." This subject has cropped up again and again during recent years, but without any definite or practical results. It is urged that as the Episcopal Church in the United States, the Church of Ireland, and the Nonconformist Churches have their authorized hymnals, it ought to be possible for the Church of England to have one. This is, no doubt, "a consummation devoutly to be wished," but in the present confused state of opinion and practice in our Church we fear it is a counsel of perfection to advocate it. A large body of hymns acceptable to all Churchmen could certainly be drawn from the three representative hymnals, "Hymns Ancient and Modern," "Church Hymns," and the "Hymnal Companion," but in the narrower confines of sacramental hymns our acute differences would quickly be felt and shown. The sacramental standpoints of, for example, "Hymns Ancient and Modern" and the "Hymnal Companion" are widely and even essentially different, and it is impossible to imagine a hymn-book which would meet with acceptance from the parties that at present use the above-mentioned books. There are other and lesser (though still acute) differences in connection with poetic and musical taste and feeling. The criticism evoked in these respects by the two last editions of "Hymns Ancient and Modern" shows what differences exist, and we may well despair of obtaining the hymn-book which would meet the varying and often conflicting views of doctrine, poetry, and music now included within the ecclesiastical boundaries of the Church of England. Mr. Eugene Stock's motion at the London Diocesan Conference to the effect that the present system is, on the whole, best for the true spiritual interests of the Church seems to be the only possible way of settling the question. In spite of the example set us by other Churches, we feel sure that our "unhappy divisions" will long prevent us from having any authorized hymnal in the Church of England.

Echoes of the controversy aroused by the Declaration on Biblical Criticism still continue to be heard, but the chief interest has already abated, and unless a recrudescence is seen when the full list of names is published, this latest mani-

festo seems likely to be relegated to that limbo of oblivion to which former similar ephemeral publications have been consigned. Out of 30,000 clergy to whom the Declaration was sent, only some 1,700 had signed it up to the end of May. This does not seem a very striking or epoch-making result so far as the hopes of the promoters are concerned. It may be that the vagueness of the Declaration has had a good deal to do with the paucity of the signatories, or possibly the clergy have had their eyes opened to the danger of a movement which can deal so freely with the details of New Testament narrative. In any case, we are inclined to think that the only good which has been done by the Declaration is that it has called renewed attention to the fundamental differences between the traditional and truly Catholic view of Holy Scripture and that put forth by the modern school of critics. In the course of an interesting correspondence in the *Standard*, which arose out of this Declaration, Archdeacon Sinclair well and wisely summed up the matter in a few words. After expressing his opinion that the majority of the signatories belonged to the more reasonable school of critics, Dr. Sinclair added:

> But from my knowledge of the kind of statements and opinions that are sometimes to be found among some of the younger clergy, I am no alarmist when I express the hope that those who reckon themselves amongst that school will hesitate to set their hand to a document which takes the line indicated by the manifesto. I am sure the promoters of it are wholly conscientious, and believe they are doing good and solid work for the Church; but I do not think that they commend their propositions to more favourable consideration by the plan of obtaining the signatures first and offering explanations and answers afterwards.

Canon Driver recently read an important paper to a body of Broad Churchmen in London known as "The Churchmen's Union." The subject was "The Need and Importance of the Higher Criticism of the Present Day." In the course of his paper he claimed that "some results of the higher criticism rested upon such a wide induction of facts that they were practically certain and might be regarded as assured." It probably did not lie within the scope of the paper, but nevertheless it would have been a real help to have been told what these assured results are. Dr. Driver also claimed that these results are "illuminative of the Old Testament," and again we could have wished for justification of this statement. Further, he urged the duty of promoting a general knowledge of the chief results of the higher criticism. This is his advice to the clergy:

> A beginning should be made; the subject might be introduced judiciously and uncontroversially into sermons, the historical occasion of a text from

the Old Testament could be briefly and simply touched upon, and the interest of a sermon would thus be enhanced. A great cause of the prevalent infidelity was the stubborn adherence to the doctrine of the inerrancy of Scripture and its verbal inspiration, popularly (though erroneously) supposed to be essential, a doctrine which was unsupported by Bible or Church, and was otherwise quite untenable. This should be stoutly combated, and the fact that the revelation contained in the Bible was a gradual one, and was so interwoven with the history that the record of the one shared the imperfections of the record of the other, should be unambiguously insisted upon. The human element in the Bible should never be placed on the same footing as its fundamental doctrines.

We are afraid that there is not very much light and leading in these excessively general statements. The "human element" in the Old Testament is so emphasized that it is a little hard to see what the Divine revelation really is, and wherein lies the Divine authority of the book. It ought never to be overlooked that the great and outstanding questions raised by the higher criticism are the trustworthiness and Divine authority of the Old Testament, and on these two fundamental and pressing problems Dr. Driver's paper seems to afford us no help. Literary and historical questions pale before the two great issues: Is the Old Testament trustworthy? Is it of Divine authority? When these two inquiries are answered clearly and definitely by the higher criticism, we shall begin to know where we are.

Notices of Books.

The Conception of Immortality. By Professor JOSEPH ROYCE. London: Constable and Co. Price 2s. 6d.

This little book—little in compass, but considerable in importance—is a noteworthy attempt to give the old doctrine of immortality a basis ultra-rational yet not anti-rational, upon the conception of individuality. Professor Royce points out how far above the possibility of merely intellectual proof, how far beyond the reach of empiricism, is the notion of the individual in its essential fulness. Human thought, capable of defining *types*, can never define *individuals*, who are, in the truest sense, unique. If we try to define the unique, we get an abstraction, not a person; only an infinite process can show us who we *are*. Now, an individual is a being that possesses individuality just because that selfsame individual expresses purpose—the very root-idea of reality being the idea of something that fulfils purpose. But individuality, here and now, is partial and incomplete; yet it is the one warrant we have for asserting a world beyond, where incompletion is merged in fulfilment. And the world, in its totality, as the expression of purpose, is neither more nor less than the

world of the Absolute, for whom all life is individual just because it expresses a meaning. And just because God is One, and Individual, and therefore unique, all our lives possess uniqueness in the totality of the Divine life. The life of the world must, in the end, receive individual expression, by virtue of its unity with the Divine.

Such in brief are some of the teachings inculcated in this book—a book that requires, and will repay, attentive study.

Our Lord and His Bible. By Rev. H. E. Fox. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 1s. 6d.

The problem of the authority of the Old Testament is always best considered from the standpoint of the New Testament, and in this and the following works the student will find invaluable help and guidance in the prosecution of his task. Prebendary Fox's sub-title clearly indicates his line of treatment—"What did Jesus Christ think of the Old Testament?" The thesis can best be stated in the writer's own words: "We have in Him an Arbiter whose decision upon all questions of moral and spiritual things, not least of the character of His own and our sacred books, must be final" (p. 22). Mr. Fox rightly says that our Lord's witness to the Old Testament "is too commonly overlooked by modern criticism," or else it is disregarded. Then follow chapters dealing with our Lord's testimony to the Scriptures as a whole, and with particular and personal applications of that testimony. A section on the kenotic theory closes the discussion by showing that ignorance and inaccuracy are essentially different, and that we cannot argue from the former to the latter. The conclusion is drawn that from our Lord's testimony to the Old Testament "there is a broad space of fact which neo-criticism fails to cover" (p. 90). In reply to those who urge that modern views about the Old Testament have preserved many from unbelief, Mr. Fox very aptly inquires, What is the faith that has thus been preserved? "Hardly faith in Christ as either Teacher or Saviour; certainly not faith in His Bible as it was to Him." We entirely endorse his view that "to foster doubt is a strange way to preserve faith," and that "neo-criticism is a bad half-way to the Saviour" (p. 92). The entire discussion is marked by great freshness and force. The arguments are trenchantly put, and the writer's position stated in the most unambiguous language. Within its own limits we have seldom read a more satisfactory and convincing piece of work, and we heartily commend it to the study and circulation of all our readers. It is just the book to place in the hands of thoughtful lay-people.

The New Testament and the Pentateuch. By C. F. Nösgen, D.D. Translated from the German by C. H. Irwin. London: Religious Tract Society. Price 2s.

This little work covers a wider field than Prebendary Fox's book, for it includes the testimony of the Apostles to the Old Testament. The writer urges that Christians of to-day are not justified in coming to a conclusion on the Old Testament "without regard to the opinions expressed by Jesus and His mentally-powerful witnesses" (p. 17). As he goes on to urge

with great force and truth, the point which is constantly obscured, but on which all depends, is whether a believer in Christ "can rightly apply to historical events and appearances in the sphere of the process of Divine revelation in the Old Testament rules and axioms which are deduced from purely naturalistic premises" (p. 17, note). This is, indeed, the kernel of the whole discussion. It is surely impossible to accept purely naturalistic premises without coming to purely naturalistic conclusions. The writer gives cogent reasons for the view that Christ's spiritual estimate of the Pentateuch must be a factor in the case (p. 33). Chapter I. discusses the New Testament attitude to the law. Chapter II. considers the New Testament use of the Pentateuch as history, and it is argued that a late origin of the Pentateuch is inconsistent with credibility of its historical statements (p. 81). It is also pointed out how Old Testament narratives are treated in the New Testament as records of fact (p. 83). Chapter III., on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, argues that the testimonies of Christ and His Apostles in this connection imply more than an acceptance of the traditional view (p. 108). And the book concludes by urging that the testimony of Jesus and His Apostles to the law, the history, and the origin of the Pentateuch admit of no uncertain conclusions. The arguments are clearly put and cogent in force. We welcome this new translation by Mr. Irwin as a worthy sequel to his translation of Möller's "Are the Critics Right?" The Religious Tract Society is doing very effective service to the cause of truth by introducing these scholarly works to the British public. This little book supplements that of Prebendary Fox, and should be in the hands of all students. We are convinced that these two works take the right line in the consideration of this very important subject, and, notwithstanding all that modern scholarship has to say from the standpoints of history and philology, the testimony of our Lord and His Apostles to the authority and credibility of the Old Testament is complete and final. Both Prebendary Fox and Professor Nösgen rightly lay stress on the spiritual nature of the evidence. Spiritual realities, such as are found in the Old and New Testaments, are spiritually discerned, and as long as this fact is either ignored or minimized by modern critics, so long will their view of the Old Testament differ fundamentally from that of Christ and His Apostles.

The Faith of a Christian. By a DISCIPLE. London: Macmillan and Co. Price 6d.

The value of this book is easily seen when it is mentioned that the first edition was only published last year, and yet it is already issued in a sixpenny edition. It is one of the ablest, freshest, most forceful, and convincing presentations of Christianity that we have read for a long time. There are eight chapters dealing respectively with "Man's Knowledge of God," "The Relation of God to the Universe," "The Problem of Moral Evil," "The Ideal Man," "The Restoration of Man," "Conversion to Type," "The Theory of the Trinity," "The Ideal Kingdom." For our part, we should wish to include somewhat more in our doctrine of the Atonement

than our author appears to do, but with this one exception we have nothing but praise for this admirable book. The chapters which discuss the more definitely evidential topics are especially well done. This is the very book to circulate among thoughtful people of the educated classes who are touched by present-day agnosticism and materialism.

Modern Criticism and Genesis. By Dr. HENRY A. REDPATH. London: S.P.C.K.

The larger part of this book has already appeared in our pages, and we therefore need not do more than call attention to the publication in this form. As the author truly says, there is much to be said in favour of a more conservative view of the Book of Genesis than that of Dr. Driver, and those who have been working carefully on Dr. Driver's book will find in these articles many reasons which should give them pause before they accept the conclusions arrived at in that work.

Bacon's Essays. Introduction by FREDERIC HARRISON. Notes by E. H. BLAKENEY. Red Letter Library. London: Blackie and Son, Ltd. Cloth, gilt top, 1s. 6d. net. Limp leather, 2s. 6d. net.

Silex Scintillans. By HENRY VAUGHAN, Silurist. Introduction and Notes by W. A. LEWIS BETTANY. London: Blackie and Son, Ltd. Cloth, gilt top, 1s. 6d. net. Limp leather, 2s. 6d. net.

Among the many modern reprints of the classics this series is certainly one of the choicest, daintiest, and most attractive. The publishers are to be congratulated on the enterprise and taste with which these books have been issued. They are a delight to handle, and a pleasure to read. Readers of *Bacon's Essays* will find distinct help in Mr. Blakeney's brief and appropriate notes.

An Exposition of Morning and Evening Prayer. By THOMAS COMBER, D.D. Abridged by Rev. R. H. TAYLOR, D.D. London: Elliot Stock. Price 4s. 6d.

This is a modern abridgment of Dean Comber's well-known book, *The Companion to the Temple.* The present abridgment includes only the Offices of Morning and Evening Prayer, and, without committing ourselves to all Comber's interpretations, we believe it will be found very helpful and suggestive for parochial work, as well as for private devotion. The editor hopes to follow this volume with another on the Litany and Communion Office, and we hope he may find encouragement to do so.

The Fight with France for North America. By A. G. BRADLEY. London: Archibald Constable and Co. Popular Edition. Price 3s. 6d.

This is the history of one of the most epoch-making struggles in which Great Britain has ever been engaged—namely, the Anglo-French struggle for empire in the old days of America. Its far-reaching results deserve for its subject a greater fame. It is the period that brought the United States to birth. Braddock, Loudon, Abercromby, Amherst, Wolfe, on the English side, Montcalm, Vandreil, Lévis, on the French side, draw many a vivid picture from the writer's pen. The calmness and impartiality of

the true historian are found united here to the glow and intensity of the accomplished novelist. The most fastidious critic of style could not fail to extend his cordial approval. Mr. Bradley has a complete knowledge of his subject and of the romantic country in which the various scenes were enacted. There is not a dull page in all the book; he holds us under a spell from start to finish. It is a worthy chapter of our colonial history worthily written.

Cities of India. By A. W. FORREST, C.I.E. London: Archibald Constable and Co. Popular Edition. Price 5s.

Mr. Forrest has provided us with a most useful book. Some of the papers—namely, those on Bombay, Delhi, and Calcutta—have already appeared in the *Pall Mall Magazine*. The traveller will find the book invaluable. An account of each city, its prominent objects, its architecture and antiquity, in clear and concise form, exactly meets the need. He shows us in beautiful and frequent illustrations what is worth seeing, and tells us in a most interesting way what is worth knowing. As Ex-Director of the Records of India, his words come with authority. He has written largely on the subject with which his whole career has been connected, and his work has been of considerable historical value. Judicious selections from old records and books of travel, as well as from the Anglo-Indian classics, call old scenes to life. We know of no better volume than this for a bird's-eye view of fifteen great Indian cities.

Bartholomew Sastrow, being the Memoirs of a German Burgomaster. Translated by A. D. VANDAM. London: Archibald Constable and Co. Price 3s. 6d.

An excellent introduction by Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, of New College, Oxford, meets us at the outset. The autobiographer draws a faithful, albeit at times an unsavoury, picture of the social life of Germany in Luther's day. His birth synchronizes with Luther's three great Reformation Tracts, and his childhood, youth, and manhood are spent amid the smoke and din of controversy and strife. Rifts deep and wide between Romanism and Protestantism are succeeded by rifts between Lutheranism and the other Reformed Churches. The Conference of Marburg and the Diet of Augsburg both proved failures. A hundred years passed before a peaceful settlement was effected. In these fierce times of "armed alarm" Bartholomew Sastrow enters the arena, and fights his way with no little pluck, pertinacity, and industry. Well-equipped physically and mentally, though not pecuniarily, he knows the meaning of hunger-pangs and the living of laborious days. The Diet of Augsburg taught him many lessons, and in the year 1544 he received the diploma of Imperial Notary. He became Secretary of Stralsund in 1555, and finally Burgomaster. He was a strong Protestant, with a deep veneration for Dr. Luther, and, with all his faults, which he is at no pains to hide, he is a firm believer in a God who interferes and helps in the affairs of men. Copious footnotes by the translator clear the reader's path, and the illustrations from paintings and engravings are distinctly good. The book is undoubtedly interesting, with plenty of life and colour in it.

Thoughts for Young Men. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D. London: Charles Thynne.

The late Bishop Ryle can never be accused of lack of sympathy with youth and its special difficulties. Old age in his case quickened the memory of early days, and gave it just that message young men need. "I learn from books," he says, "that, excepting infancy and old age, more die between thirteen and twenty-three than at any other season of life." From this springs this little volume. He adduces general reasons, warns of special dangers, offers general counsels, and concludes with special rules of conduct. The book commends itself for its Gospel truth, its solicitude, its directness, and its simplicity.

The Will of God. By DEACONESS WORSLEY. London: S.P.C.K.

There is much that is spiritually helpful in this "unpretending work," as Canon Carter calls it in his introduction, written in 1886. We do not endorse its brief assertions relating to Holy Communion. It is a reprint by request.

Nothing to Pay. By M. E. CURTIS. London: S.P.C.K.

Is this a series of addresses on Isa. lv. 1? No; it is a simple manual of hygiene. If M. E. Curtis is as bright and interesting a speaker as she is a writer—and the preface points that way—we can understand the zest of her audience. In these days, when children have only just been "discovered," parents would do well to digest every word of these fresh and interesting lectures. Hygiene from the highest point of view is not lost sight of.

The Messages of Christ. By NATHANIEL WISEMAN. London: Charles J. Thynne.

The author is apt in illustration and attractive in style. His message is intensely evangelical, and his matter abundant. He is a subtle and sympathetic student of human nature. We cannot fail to be interested, and are sure to be helped.

The Young Preacher's Guide. Rev. GILBERT MONKS. London: Elliot Stock.

Archdeacon Sinclair writes a preface commending the principles adopted in the book, and considers it a welcome and suggestive manual for young preachers. The writer has collected from every conceivable source the views of authorities on self-culture, composition, rhetoric, reading, and preaching. He has read widely, and in clear style seeks to force home the mass of opinion he has gathered. "Take heed to thyself and unto the doctrine . . . give attendance to reading and to exhortation," might well serve as his text. Bishop Gott has said, "A man may be nothing of a preacher, but if he be the right sort of nothing, God will make something of him." Mr. Monks shows that, as the German proverb runs, "the will does it," or perhaps he would be inclined to add "the consecrated will." In the preparation and delivery of a sermon he provides a definite and suggestive scheme for his readers. "If success comes to the man who has a programme," then success in the highest sphere—namely, in the

proclamation of Divine Truth—is ready to hand for those who peruse these pages.

RECEIVED.

Blackwood's Magazine, *The Leisure Hour*, *Our Little Dots*, *The Child's Companion*, *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, *Church Missionary Gleaner*, *Awake*, *The Round World*, *India's Witness*, *Canadian Churchman*, *India's Women and China's Daughters*, *The Bible in the World*, *Bible Society Gleanings*, *The Cottager and Artisan*, *Church and People*, *South American Missionary Magazine*, *The Sunday at Home*, *Protestant Observer*, *Golden Sunbeams*, *Annuals*, *The Dawn of Day*, *Public Opinion* (with monthly Religious Supplement for June), *Annual Report of the Children's Union*, *Grievances from Ireland* (No. 5), *The Bulletin* of the National Anti-Gambling League, *Kelway's Manual of Horticulture* for 1905, *Orient and Occident*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OUR BAPTISMAL FORMULARIES.

SIR,—Would you kindly allow me a brief space in which to utter a protest against any such revision of our Order for Baptism as Mr. Foxley in the last number of the CHURCHMAN has proposed? I do so on the ground that such revision utterly destroys that historical method of utterance on which the whole of our Prayer-Book is framed, and hence would by partial revision reduce to discord and contradiction what is now a consistent whole.

Perhaps the most convenient passage to select to explain what I mean is where Mr. Foxley proposes to alter the question and answer: "Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?" "That is my desire"—that is, the child's desire—into an expression of desire on the part of the godparents that the child should receive the Sacrament, and then, nevertheless, regards the child himself as henceforth "regenerate," because other people have fulfilled a condition on his behalf—a position which surely ignores the vital truth that the free offering of the self to God as "a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice" is that which Baptism doth represent unto us as our profession.

In a short letter I will only ask you to find space for one extract. Cranmer, in "The Lord's Supper," writes:

"Hitherto I have rehearsed the answer of St. Augustine unto Boniface, a learned Bishop, who asked of him, how the parents and friends could answer for a young babe in baptism, and say in his person that he believeth and converteth unto God, when the child can neither do nor think any such things. Whereunto the answer of St. Augustine is this: that forasmuch as Baptism is the Sacrament of the profession of our faith, and of our conversion unto God, it becometh us so to answer for young children coming thereunto as to the Sacrament appertaineth, although

the children indeed have no knowledge of such things. And yet in our said answers we ought not to be reprehended as vain men or liars forasmuch as in common speech we are daily to call Sacraments and figures by the names of the things that be signified by them, although they be not the same thing indeed."

May I add that in my opinion, if Mr. Foxley's attitude were so far correct, he would then be reasonably compelled to go further and plead for the abolition of infant baptism altogether?

Yours faithfully,

A STUDENT OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

"SACRIFICE: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION."

SIR,—Many of your readers will dissent from the paper in your last number from the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley entitled as above.

All authentic history is opposed to the idea of the evolution of religion with which the article opens. The historic facts are well presented by Dr. Ebrard when he says, "We have nowhere been able to discover the least trace of any form of upward movement from fetichism to polytheism, and from that again, to a gradual knowledge of God." Even so unwilling a witness as the late S. Laing, in regard to the minor question of civilization, confesses: "There is, in fact, no record of any such savage race emerging into comparative civilization by any effort or natural progress of its own. Even more advanced races trace back their knowledge of the higher arts and civilization to some Divine stranger." It is, in fact, Monotheism which we behold on the earliest confines of history, and to this succeed the gods many and other superstitions.

Next, as to the religious rite of sacrifice. The evidence we possess goes to show it never could have originated with men. It is to-day a spent force, a dying rite; this proves that it must have become incident, *from without*, upon the human race. Had it originated from them, it would have continued with them to-day in full force, as have the several rites and superstitions connected with the dead and their burial. Indeed, if unexplained by instruction or not favoured by tradition, the rite of animal sacrifice was meaningless. "When one of his contemporaries wished to do away with the offering of a lamb as a meaningless formality, Confucius reproved him."[1]

Again, the idea of the sacrifice being a gift of food to the Deity is a later and unscriptural thought. The archaic rendering of the words "a sweet savour" is *a savour of rest*, and points to the idea of *reconciliation*, and the "bread" or "food" of God simply signified that offered to God. The many similar expressions do not suggest this idea anywhere.

Mr. Oesterley trusts overmuch to Robertson Smith and similar writers, who, in point of fact, from their being hopelessly prejudiced by half-informed German writers, have no right authority in these matters.

Yours faithfully,

WM. WOODS SMYTH.

---

[1] Max Müller.