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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

DECEMBER, 1905.

BEMROSE & SONS' LIST.

H.R.H. The Princess of Wales
has been graciously pleased to accept a copy for the use of her children.

THE CHILDREN'S BOOK OF OLD TESTAMENT STORY. By Mrs. C. D. FRANCIS. Crown 8vo., cloth. Price 3s. net; post free, 3s. 3d.

"This is an excellent volume to put into the hands of young children."—*The Record.*

"These stories should prove interesting and instructive to boys and girls. . . . We heartily commend the handsomely-produced volume to parents and teachers."—*East Anglian Times.*

THE HOLY COMMUNION: Its Institution, Purpose, Privilege. By the Rev. A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A. Crown 16mo., 240 pages. Paper covers, 1s. net; cloth gilt, 2s. net. Postage 2d.

"This is a very precious little book; just that for which Evangelical Churchmen have long been waiting . . . is one that could be placed in the hands of Confirmation candidates and young communicants with great advantage to their souls' health. We have pleasure in recommending it most strongly."—*The Record.*

AN ELDER SISTER. A Short Sketch of ANNE MACKENZIE and her Brother the Missionary Bishop. By FRANCES AWDRY. Third Edition. Crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s.

"The book is a graceful tribute to two devoted lives."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"The man who did so much to sow civilization and Christianity along the valley of the Zambesi should never be forgotten, and this testimony to his work, as well as his sister's share in it, is in every way worthy of the occasion."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

THE HARMONY OF THE PROPER PSALMS. For the Fasts and Festivals of the Church Year. A devotional exposition by the Rev. MELVILLE SCOTT, M.A., Vicar of Castle hurch, Stafford. Crown 8vo., cloth; price 2s. 6d.

". . . The laity and Sunday-school teachers would find their money well spent over a work which the reviewer was so much interested with that he could not put it down until he had got half way through it."
—*Church Family Newspaper.*

THE EVANGELIST MONTHLY. Volume for 1905. A Church Magazine for Parochial and General Circulation. Admirably suited for Presentation or School Prizes. Profusely Illustrated. Crown 4to., cloth gilt, 2s.

"The letterpress is always readable and often instructive, whilst the illustrations form not the least attractive feature in the volume."—*Record.*

Complete Catalogue will be sent on application.

LONDON: BEMROSE & SONS, LTD., 4, SNOW HILL, E.C.; AND DERBY.

SEELEY & CO.'S NEW BOOKS

THE PORTFOLIO MONOGRAPHS. NO. 46.

THE CATHEDRAL BUILDERS IN ENGLAND. By EDWARD S. PRIOR, M.A., F.S.A. Author of "A History of Gothic Art in England," etc. With Four Plates in Colour, and Thirty-three other Illustrations. Price 5s. net; or in cloth, 7s. net.

"One of the fine Portfolio Monographs . . . The reader can hardly fail to derive keen pleasure from the series of illustrations."—*Scotsman.*

NEW EDITION.

OXFORD. By ANDREW LANG. With 50 Illustrations by J. H. LORIMER, R.S.A., J. PENNELL, etc. Including a Frontispiece in Colour. Extra crown 8vo., 6s.

"Andrew Lang's delightful book on Oxford."—*Academy.*

MISS MARSHALL'S NEW STORY.

HIS MOST DEAR LADYE. A Story of the Days of the Countess of Pembroke, Sir Philip Sidney's Sister. By BEATRICE MARSHALL, Author of "The Siege of York," etc. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

"A book one is loth to part company with."—*Sheffield Telegraph.*

THE CROWN OF PINE. A Tale of Corinth and the Isthmian Games. By the Rev. A. J. CHURCH, Author of "Stories from Homer," etc. With Eight Coloured Illustrations by GEORGE MORROW. Extra crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

"A vivid story . . . The atmosphere of those far-off times is very cleverly suggested."—*Yorkshire Post.*

THE LAST OF THE WHITE COATS. A Story of Cavaliers and Roundheads. By G. I. WHITHAM, Author of "Dick Chester," etc. With Eight Illustrations in Colour by OSCAR WILSON. Extra crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

"A story of great interest . . . Cannot fail to arouse the young reader's sympathy in a very high degree."
—*Glasgow Herald.*

THE ROMANCE LIBRARY. NEW VOLUMES. With many Illustrations. Extra crown 8vo., each 5s.

THE ROMANCE OF INSECT LIFE. By EDMUND SELOUS, Author of "The Romance of the Animal World."

"Most interesting description . . . a free and charming exposition and narrative."—*Educational Times.*

THE ROMANCE OF MODERN MECHANISM. By ARCHIBALD WILLIAMS Author of "The Romance of Modern Exploration," etc.

"Bright and readable."—*Academy.*

THE ROMANCE OF MODERN ELECTRICITY. By CHARLES R. GIBSON.

"Very entertaining and instructive."—*Queen.*

LONDON: SEELEY & CO., LIMITED, 38 GREAT RUSSELL STREET.

MACMILLAN & CO.'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW BOOK BY THE AUTHOR OF
"THE FAITH OF A CHRISTIAN."

CONVERSATIONS WITH CHRIST. A Biographical Study. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.

BY THE LATE CANON AINGER.

LECTURES AND ESSAYS. By ALFRED AINGER. Edited by the Rev. Canon BEECHING. Two Vols., crown 8vo., 15s. net.

ESSAYS ON SOME THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Members of the University of Cambridge. Edited by HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity. 8vo., 12s. net.

OUTLOOK.—"It is worthy, amply worthy, of those who stand in the succession to Lightfoot and Hort and Westcott."

Third Edition. Now Ready.

A GENERAL VIEW OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D. Third Edition, Revised by W. ALDIS WRIGHT. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

New Edition in One Volume.

LIFE OF THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP WESTCOTT.
By his Son, the REV. ARTHUR WESTCOTT. Abridged Edition. Extra crown 8vo., 8s. 6d. net.

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF PROPHECY. Being the Hulsean Prize Essay for 1904. By the Rev. E. A. EDGHILL, B.A., Scholar of King's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. [*Shortly.*

THE PASTORAL IDEA. Lectures on Pastoral Theology, delivered at King's College, London, during the Lent Term, 1905. By JAMES THEODORE INSKIP, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST: ITS LIFE AND WORK.
An Attempt to trace the Work of the Church in some of its departments from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 6s.

GREATHEART. Some Talks with Him. By a PILGRIM. Crown 8vo., 3s. net.

TIMES.—"The book starts us on speculations of great interest, not the less valuable because all have a practical bearing on the life that now is."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

Church Missionary Society.

CHURCH MISSIONARY ALMANACK for 1906.

Printed in red and black on a sheet 33 × 23½ inches. The centre of the sheet is occupied by a Wood Engraving, "ST. PAUL PREACHING TO THE ATHENIANS," by Gebhard Fugel. The theme for the Daily Texts throughout the year is "THE UNFOLDING OF CHRIST, in His Earthly, Risen, and Glorified Life. Price 1d. (1½d. post free); also mounted on canvas and rollers, 1s. net; by post. 1s. 3d.

The Almanack is arranged for LOCALIZING. *Particulars, etc., on application.*

NEW BOOKS.

NOTES ON INDIA.

By Mr. EUGENE STOCK. 112 pages in stiffened paper covers, with two Maps. 1s. post free, or cloth bound, 1s. 6d., post free.

This book is for the use of Missionary Students, and forms one of the text-books for the C.M.S. Study Scheme for 1905-6.

SYSTEMATIC SCRIPTURE STUDY.

A Series of Papers on "Illustrated Methods of Bible Study," by the Rev. D. H. D. WILKINSON, intended to help would-be Missionary Candidates and others in the study of the Bible. Small 8vo., 120 pages, cloth gilt, price 1s. 6d., post free.

RIVER, SAND, AND SUN.

The Story of the C.M.S. Mission in Egypt, in which the various phases of the work in that ancient land are graphically depicted. By MINNA C. GOLLOCK. 192 pages, small fcap. 8vo., profusely Illustrated. Art linen bevelled boards, 3s. 6d., post free.

IN SALISBURY SQUARE.

A portrayal of the work carried on day by day in the building spoken of by C.M.S. friends all over the world as "Salisbury Square." By IRENE H. BARNES. 244 pages, large crown 8vo., with 18 pages of Illustrations. Bound in buckram, gilt top, 2s. 6d., post free.

EMPIRE BUILDERS: Pioneers of the King of Kings.

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE. The "Empire Builders" are most of them Missionaries of the C.M.S. working in distant corners of the earth, who write on such topics as "A King Who Plays Football," "Wrong Side Up," "How I Shot Two Black Bears," and "A Grave on the Dragon's Tail," etc. The book is full of Pen and Ink Drawings. Crown 8vo., 220 pages. Well Illustrated. 1s. 6d., post free.

OUTLINE HISTORIES OF C.M.S. MISSIONS.

Vol. I. has been issued. Vols. II. and III. to follow.

This publication gives definite instruction on the work of the C.M.S. abroad, and is intended principally for workers amongst the young. Crown 8vo., 144 pages, with Sketch Maps. Stiffened paper covers, 1s. net, or 1s. 2d. post paid.

C.M. HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

Cheques and P.O. Orders should be made payable to Mr. D. MARSHALL LANG, Lay Secretary.

In crown 8vo., tastefully printed and bound in cloth. Price 5s. net.

STORIES OF GRACE.

Notable Examples of Christian Conversion.

BY

REV. C. S. ISAACSON, M.A.,

Author of "Roads to Christ," "Roads from Rome," "Rome in Many Lands," etc.

THIS work is in some measure supplementary to Mr. Isaacson's former book, "Roads to Christ." It is again a volume of conversions, eminently suited to times of revival. The subjects of the stories are not generally such well-known men as in the earlier book, but are perhaps of more general interest, as they are taken from more ordinary life. They are all believed to be true narratives, and are calculated not only to point the way to seeking souls, but also to help workers to deal with the anxious and lead them to the Saviour.

Many well-known religious writers have aided Mr. Isaacson in his work. Prebendary H. E. Fox tells a wonderful story of grace which occured in his early ministry in London, and another connected with the Church Missionary Society. Canon Hay Aitken tells of grace in parochial missions, and Cecil Polhill (one of the Cambridge seven) of grace in Thibet. The venerable Canon Christopher, of Oxford, contributes two stories, and so does Miss Catharine Marsh, the gifted author of "English Hearts and Hands." Dr. James Paton gives one of his "beautiful characters," and Miss Agnes Weston, of the Royal Naval Home, tells of a truly converted British bluejacket. Mr. W. T. Stead tells of his own conversion at school, and the Rev. Frank Swainson of his call through Moody's mission.

In all there are more than fifty stories, differing greatly one from another, but all exhibiting some wondrous dealing of the manifold wisdom and grace of God. It is a book full of encouragement, and we trust a blessing is in it.

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

NEW AND HELPFUL MANUAL FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION.

SECOND EDITION. In limp cloth, for the pocket, and uniform with the Prayer-Book, 1s. net in cloth, and in leather binding at 2s. net.; lambskin, 3s. net; and in Persian calf, 3s. 6d.

COMMUNION AND OFFERING.

By the Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of York, Rector of Lambeth.

Extracts from Personal and Press Notices.

The Rev. B. M. O. HANCOCK writes: "I feel the book is worthy of unqualified recommendation. It meets a real need, and no one who *uses* the book but will be enabled to enter devoutly and intelligently into the Great Service which in Christ unites all in heaven and earth before the Throne of God in adoration, thanksgiving, and self-surrender; the devotions and instructions are fervid, wise, and catholic."

BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS: "I think it a most useful little book, and shall be glad to recommend it."

"The distinguishing feature of this little manual of Eucharistic instruction and worship is its constant insistence upon the structure of the Liturgy as determining the course of Eucharistic devotion. The prayers are simple and well chosen, and the instructions for the most part clear and definite."—*Church Times.*

"The value of this excellent little book is very great. It is for busy people who want short and good prayers, and who welcome sound instruction if it can be briefly given. The whole forms a singularly complete and convenient manual, and we cannot doubt that it will be widely adopted."—*The Guardian.*

THIRD EDITION. In 32mo. size, cloth limp, for the pocket, 2s. net; also for presentation, in leather binding, 3s. net; in lambskin, 3s. 6d. net; and in Persian calf, 4s. 6d. net.

THE PEOPLE'S PSALTER:

A Plain Book for those who wish to use the Psalms in Church with intelligence and devotion.

"The book seems to be admirably adapted for its purpose, and I trust it will have a very wide usefulness."—BISHOP OF DURHAM.

"We think that this little book may be a useful help by suggesting ways in which different Psalms may be applied to present-day difficulties, and to the problems and anxieties with which the Church is always confronted."—*Guardian.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

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

VITAL RELIGION;

Or, The Personal Knowledge of Christ.

"The keynote of this interesting and beautiful book is the thought that religion is essentially the life of friendship and intimacy with God revealed in Jesus Christ. . . . We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily commend it to all thoughtful readers, especially to those who lament the 'decay of experimental religion.' The present volume is a solid contribution to the solution of the problem how 'to find a basis for faith in actual experience.'"—*Guardian.*

In 32mo., 8 pages, price One Halfpenny.

THE LITANY.

Divided and arranged for particular intercession. (Reprinted from *The People's Psalter.*)

Price 4d. Reprinted on cardboard and enlarged, size 16 in. by 10½ in., the frontispiece from "COMMUNION AND OFFERING," entitled—

"In the Mount of the Lord it shall be seen."

Intended for use in classes.

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

CHURCH OF ENGLAND LEAGUE.

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

Executive Committee:

President: THE LADY WIMBORNE

Chairman: THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

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

The Rev. Chancellor Lias.
The Rev. E. J. Kennedy.
The Rev. W. H. Stone.
The Rev. Prebendary E. A. Stuart.
The Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield.
The Rev. F. J. Key.
Sir Robert K. Douglas.

Col. the Hon. F. C. Bridgeman.
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 four hundred and seventy meetings to explain the teachings and practices of the Primitive Catholic Church, and one hundred and fifty 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, which contain standard works of reference on the Bible and Prayer Book, and many books of theology, biography, and history.

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. The Home now has twenty-four Sisters working under the clergy in very poor districts of London, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Plymouth. The Sisters give invaluable help to the over-worked Clergy in crowded parishes, where the poor are waiting to be reached, to be taught and helped in the many ways open only to women.

It has opened a seaside Convalescent Home at Birchington, where poor children, from the parishes in which the Church Sisters work, are sent for three or four weeks' change and care.

It has established two of the finest schools for girls in the country. At one of these (Uplands School, St. Leonard's-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 women secondary 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 organization.

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

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

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.**
LAY SECRETARY—**Mr. H. L. HEBBERT.**
CLERICAL SECRETARY—**Rev. G. TONGE, M.A.**
CENTRAL ASSOCIATION SECRETARY—**Miss MULVANY.**

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

INFANT ORPHAN ASYLUM, WANSTEAD.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

This Institution maintains and educates the orphans of persons once in prosperity from their earliest infancy until 15 years of age.

Nearly 500 children now in the Asylum.

Annual Subscriptions are urgently needed.

Life Subscription for one Vote, £5 5s.; Annual Subscription for one Vote, 10s. 6d.

OFFICES: 63, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

Commr. H. C. MARTIN, R.N., *Secretary.*

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.

"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.

(With which is incorporated the Thames Church Mission).

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons: H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G. THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS. THE BISHOPS, ETC.

One hundred years ago our sailors won for us the inestimable blessing of peace around our Island coasts.

To-day we owe to our sailors: (1) The safety of our Empire; (2) our food and luxuries; (3) the safe passage of our commerce, mails, friends and relatives to all parts of the world.

We can show our gratitude by helping The Missions to Seamen to maintain its 229 "Sky Pilots" (Chaplains, Readers, Boatmen, etc.), and 116 "Harbours of Refuge" (Seamen's Churches and Institutes) in 86 Seaports all over the World.

Expenditure in 1904, £50,306. Contributions, Offertories, Drawing-Room Meeting Collections, etc., will be gratefully received by the Secretary, **Stuart C. Knox, Esq., M.A.**, 11, Buckingham St., Strand, 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.

THE

CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1905.

ABOUT OURSELVES.

WITH the January number THE CHURCHMAN will enter not only upon a new volume, but also on a new series, which will be enlarged in size and produced in different type. With this enlargement will be associated some other changes which we believe will be regarded as distinct improvements. In the prospectus, which will be found enclosed with this number, our new plans are stated in greater detail, and we will only add here that nothing shall be wanting to make THE CHURCHMAN appeal as widely as possible to the life and interests of the large central body of Church of England clergy and laity. We feel sure that we may confidently appeal to our readers to second these efforts to increase the circulation and extend the influence of THE CHURCHMAN. Further copies of the prospectus will gladly be sent on application to the publisher, and we hope it is not too much to ask that each reader will endeavour to obtain at least one additional subscriber.

IS FASTING COMMUNION THE LAW OF THE CHURCH?

THERE are few questions of Church order which need more careful consideration than this by English Churchpeople at the present time. Many clergymen answer it without hesitation in the affirmative. They go so far as to say that it is better not to communicate at all than to do so after receiving even the smallest amount of food. And they maintain that this is no new opinion, but a rule dating from primitive, even

from Apostolic, times, and therefore one with which no branch of the Christian Church is entitled to dispense. If this position can be sustained, it is clear that our whole system of public worship requires reconstruction. The Holy Communion cannot be the principal service of Sunday morning, except by regarding *presence* at it as equivalent to *participation* in it. The inevitable result will be either to relegate that Holy Sacrament to a position of less prominence than that of Morning Prayer, or to encourage an entirely wrong view of its nature in the minds of Churchmen in general. This is why the prevalence of rigorist teaching on this subject has excited so much alarm amongst many besides Evangelicals. The views of such Churchmen found expression in the able book written more than thirty years ago by the present Bishop of Fredericton. No adequate answer to that book has ever appeared, but the teaching whose fallacy it exposes continues to be widely given. The present writer does not claim to add anything to Bishop Kingdon's powerful arguments, but hopes to show their bearing on the present state of the question, and to induce other readers to study the matter for themselves.

The first thing to be clear about is what the question really is. It is not one of the relative merits of early or late Communion, nor of the propriety of receiving the Holy Communion before ordinary food. It is whether there is a rule of the Church so clearly ordering such a practice that to act otherwise is disloyal. There is such a rule in the Church of Rome. What we have to consider is whether it binds the Church of England. If it does, it must be because it is one of those very few customs which can claim to have been observed "everywhere, always, and by all Churches"; or because it has been enacted by one of those General Councils which the Church of England recognises, or by that Church itself. I shall try to show that neither of these conditions is fulfilled.

I.

The first point to be considered is the origin of the rule itself. This involves two inquiries—first, as to how the practice arose; secondly, how the *practice* passed into a *rule*. For though there is no evidence of a rule of Fasting Communion before the very end of the fourth century, the practice probably existed at a somewhat earlier date. And its history sheds a good deal of light on the reason and meaning of the subsequent rule.

1. The practice of fasting before Holy Communion was reached by three well-marked steps.

The first of these was the change of the time of the celebration. In the Apostolic age the Holy Communion was certainly celebrated in the evening, in close connexion with a solemn meal known as the "Agapé," or "love-feast." But the two were soon separated, the celebration of Holy Communion taking place in the early morning, while the Agapé was taken in the evening, and a little later was dropped altogether. It is not certain when this change was made. If we could be sure that *sacramentum* in Pliny's famous letter to Trajan refers to the Holy Communion, we might conclude that when it was written (about A.D. 110) the change had already taken place. But the reference is not certain; and there are expressions in the nearly contemporary "Didaché" and in Ignatius' letter to the Smyrnæans which point to the connexion being still maintained. Justin Martyr, in the well-known description in his first "Apology" (A.D. 165), says nothing as to the hour of the celebration, but implies that it was a separate rite. In the time of Tertullian (A.D. 200) it was certainly so, for he says: "The Sacrament of the Eucharist, which was delivered by our Lord at the time of food, we receive in assemblies before daybreak" ("De Corona," Cap. III.). In another work ("Ad uxorem," ii. 5) he asks a wife "whether her husband will not know what it is that she tastes in secret before all food" (*ante omnem cibum*). These two passages are relied on by rigorists as proving the antiquity of Fasting Communion. But the first only refers to *early* Communion, and says nothing about fasting. The second—even if the last three words do not mean "before every meal"—refers to a practice of reserving the consecrated Sacrament for private reception at home. It therefore has no bearing on the present aspect of the question, since there is no suggestion of the revival of such a practice amongst ourselves. The evidence shows that *early* Communion became the custom before the end of the second century, and possibly during its first half, but is conclusive as to nothing more.

The next step was the discovery of a religious reason for this change. It had been adopted on purely practical grounds, and probably to avoid unnecessary interference with social customs, by holding religious services at a time when attendance at them would interfere with ordinary duties. But during the third century it acquired a religious significance as a commemoration of our Lord's resurrection in the early morning. A plain and early reference to this is found in Cyprian, who, in a letter to Cæcilius, says: "It behoved Christ to offer about the beginning of the day that the very hour of the sacrifice might show the falling and the evening

of the world. . . . But we celebrate the resurrection of our Lord in the morning."[1] Similar language is used about a century later by Gregory Nazianzen ("Orat.," xl., § 30). Neither of these great Fathers lays any stress on *Fasting* Communion; but their language is significant, as showing that a religious value was already attached to Communion at an early hour.

The first exhortation to fasting before Communion that I have been able to find was made by St. Ambrose. It occurs in his eighth sermon on Ps. cxix. (§ 48, on verse 62). The passage is too long for quotation here, and its meaning is not quite clear. Bishop Kingdon understands it as an exhortation to Communion preferably before food, but afterwards if that is impossible. But it seems to the present writer to be a definite injunction to communicate fasting, even if so doing entails some personal inconvenience. The fact that St. Ambrose makes such an exhortation surely shows that there was in his time (*circa* A.D. 370) no recognised rule. And it is significant that St. Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350), whose catechetical lectures are the standard patristic authority on the Holy Eucharist, says nothing whatever about fasting before Communion, though he does mention it as a devout preparation for Baptism. This is the more remarkable, because his teaching on the Real Presence approaches more nearly than that of any other of the great Fathers to the materialism of the Middle Ages. The attitude of St. Chrysostom is noteworthy. One of the charges made against him by his enemies was that he had celebrated the Holy Communion after taking food. He denies this, and says that, if he did so, his name may be struck off the roll of Bishops, and out of the Book of Life. But he goes on to say that the same course will have to be taken with regard to St. Paul, and even to our Lord Himself—an addition which considerably modifies the meaning of the first part.[2] Elsewhere he lays stress on the propriety of fasting *after* receiving,[3] and in another place repudiates with much warmth the charge of having *baptized* persons after food.[4] The upshot of these passages is that the great Archbishop fasted before Communion himself, thought it a highly desirable and reverent practice, and did *not* regard its omission as a deadly sin.

St. Augustine is even more decided in his opinion. In his

---

[1] Ep. lxii., Ante-Nicene Libr.
[2] Ep. cxxv. (vol. iii., 668, Paris edition).
[3] Ep. i., Cor. Hom. xxviii.
[4] Orat. ant. Exil., iii. 421.

letter to Januarius he says: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost that, in honour of so great a Sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of a Christian before other food, for on that account this custom is observed throughout the world."[1] This is decisive as to the opinion of the greatest of uninspired theologians, and as to the practice of the Church in his time. But it does not prove, as it is sometimes said to do, that he held it to be a practice dating from Apostolic times. The words *placuit spiritui sancto* probably allude to the "placet" of the Canon passed by the Council of Hippo a few years before this letter was written (A.D. 373).

II.

This Canon marks the first step by which the prevailing *practice* became a *law* of the Church. It was made to stop the disorders which had become scandalously common, especially at celebrations in commemoration of the dead. It runs: "The Sacraments of the altar shall be celebrated only by fasting men" (*a jejunis hominibus*), "except on the anniversary on which the Supper of the Lord is celebrated. For if the commendation of any dead person . . . has to be made in the afternoon, let it be made by prayers only, if those who make it are found already to have had luncheon" (*jam pransi inveniantur*). It will be seen that the contrasted terms are "jejunus" and "pransus," and this contrast has an important bearing on the interpretation of the Canon. A person would be within its meaning if he had not taken the "prandium"—the first full meal of the day. It was the practice at that time—as it still is in many parts of Europe—to take light refreshment, called the "jentaculum," at the beginning of the day, and two full meals—"prandium" and "cœna"—afterwards. Bishop Kingdon perhaps overstates the case in comparing the "jentaculum" to "the usual light English breakfast"; but he is probably right in saying that the Canon of Hippo, and those of some later Councils, would not have been broken by partaking of it.

In the two following centuries several Canons were passed ordering Communion to be received fasting. Their tendency was to make the rule more strict. One of the Council of Auxerre (A.D. 578) has a significant development. It runs: "It is not lawful for a priest, or deacon, or subdeacon, after partaking of food or drink, to take Masses, *or to remain in Church while Masses are being said.*" This Canon goes a good deal farther than most rigorists would care to go now,

[1] Ad. Januar., Ep. cxviii.

forbidding, as it does, not only Communion, but presence at the Celebration, after partaking of food.

In England both the practice and the rule were later. The first clear evidence of the former is in Bede, who alludes to Fasting Communion as a custom of the universal Church. But the rule does not appear till the reign of Edgar, when a Canon was issued (assigned by Spelman to A.D. 967) ordering "that no one who is not fasting shall receive the Eucharist, unless on account of excessive illness." There are notices during the episcopates of Sudbury and Peckham which point to the rule of Fasting Communion, and the evidence certainly warrants the belief that it was enforced in England during the Middle Ages.

Lastly, we come to the existing rule in the Roman Missal. It is found in "De Defectibus," § ix., and certainly has the merit of being explicit. It runs: "If anyone has broken his fast since midnight, even by the taking of water only, or of any food or drink, even by way of medicine, and in however small a quantity, he can neither communicate nor celebrate." The origin of this rule is not certain. It is not in the Sarum Missal, though there are provisions in the "Cautelæ" which are nearly as strict. It has been ascribed to Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1270), and he certainly uses language strongly resembling it.[1] It may be remarked that in these he is answering supposed objections in a way that looks as if the rigorous rule was not fully accepted in his time. It was probably his immense authority that finally settled the question. At all events, this rule can lay claim to no greater antiquity. And it is this *Roman* rule of the *later Middle Ages* which is now declared in some quarters to be of Apostolic authority, and for ever binding on the whole Church!

III.

The question we have now to consider is how far, if at all, this claim can be admitted.

We may dismiss at once the stringent rule just quoted from the Roman Missal, though it is for nothing less than this that some of our rigorists contend. There is not a scrap of evidence to show that such a rule existed in the undivided Church. The reason for its adoption by the Church of Rome is clear enough. It is closely connected with the grossly material doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist known

[1] See especially Summa iii., Qu. lxxx., art. vii., §§ 4 and 5; and *cf.* Qu. lxxx., ver. 4, and II. 2, Qu. cxlvii. vi. 2.

as transubstantiation. If that doctrine be accepted, the Roman rule of Fasting Communion is reverent and reasonable. When that doctrine is rejected—as it is explicitly by the Church of England—this rigorous rule becomes unmeaning. The rule and the doctrine stand or fall together.

The much more moderate rule of the Council of Hippo stands on a different footing. It was made long before transubstantiation was heard of; its object was practical, not doctrinal, and its requirements were much less. So far from claiming to embody an unalterable custom of the primitive Church, it had direct reference to the evils then existing which it was intended to correct. It did indeed embody a most important principle, and one that is of perpetual obligation—viz., the need of approaching the Holy Sacrament in the condition most calculated to promote reverence. In the circumstances of the time, this was best secured by forbidding anyone to communicate after taking "prandium." In its strictest interpretation, and supposing it to be still valid, it would only forbid Communion after a substantial meal.

But there remains the question as to the obligation even of this moderate rule in the Church of England at the present day. It has been argued that a very similar rule was made by more than one English Council, and has never been definitely repealed. It is therefore urged that some rule of Fasting Communion is still in force in the English Church. This is the line generally taken by the more moderate advocates of the practice amongst ourselves. The argument is a reasonable one, but there are two considerations which seriously diminish its weight.

The first of these is the principle generally accepted by canonists—that a Canon which has fallen into general disuse for forty years, and has not been enforced by authority, becomes obsolete. This, of course, applies only to Canons affecting *discipline*, for *doctrine* can never be obsolete, but must either be false or true. Nor can it be applied to rubrics in a book which is in legal use. These are binding on all those on whom the use of the book is enjoined. So the omission of a rubric at a revision of the book is a strong argument against the obligation of the practice which it enjoined. So the fact that the rubrics in the old service books ordering Fasting Communion were not inserted in the Prayer-Book goes a long way to show that they were not intended to be in force.[1]

The second point is that, if these Canons are valid, they prove a good deal too much. For they have, of course,

[1] On this whole subject, see Kingdon, cap. iii.

exactly the same force as other Canons passed by the same Councils. There are just as clear prohibitions of Communion without Confession to a priest, or of two Celebrations by the same priest on the same day, as there are of Communion after food. And one of the very Canons of the reign of Edgar to which reference has been made forbids anyone in Holy Orders to "grow a beard, or allow himself to be incorrectly shaved if he hopes for the blessing of God." A rigorous insistence on the observance of this Canon might be inconvenient to many clergy at the present day. And it is very doubtful how far these Canons apply to the laity at all. In most cases they deal with matters concerning the clergy alone.

Our inquiry, therefore, leads us to this result—that there is no law or custom having the force of law which requires members of the Church of England to communicate fasting. This is a very different thing from the condemnation of such a practice. There are certainly persons to whom it does appear—as it did to Jeremy Taylor[1]—to be a reverent custom, increasing the sanctity of the Sacrament. These are certainly right to communicate fasting when they can do so; and they deserve respect rather than reproach for persisting in a practice which may entail much inconvenience on themselves. It is a rule which they have a perfect right to make for themselves, but which they must not attempt to force on others. The duty of coming to the Holy Communion in a fit state of body as well as of mind is too obvious to need statement. But whether that fitness is increased or impaired by the previous partaking of food is a point which each communicant must determine for himself. And we have higher authority than that of Councils or Fathers for the law of Christian liberty—even the words of the inspired Apostle: "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not despise him that eateth. . . . Let every man be persuaded in his own mind."

BARTON R. V. MILLS.

---

1. "Worthy Communicant," cap. vii.; "Life of Christ," discourse xiii.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND SINCE HER DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT.

TO English Churchmen, in the increasingly probable prospect of Disestablishment and Disendowment, there is no more interesting and suggestive subject than that of the history and present position of the Disestablished Church of Ireland. Any unprejudiced person who, like the writer, has worked for even a few months in Dublin, and so become in a measure acquainted with Church life there, and from it as a centre has gleaned some information about the condition and working of that Church throughout the rest of Ireland, can scarcely fail to regard with thankfulness and wonder the tokens of God's good hand over her in spite of all her peculiar difficulties. It would indeed be most unwise and rash, as we shall endeavour to show at the close of this paper, to build on such facts any conclusions as to the advisability of a similar treatment of our own beloved National Church. Our special purpose is to present to our English readers a résumé of the principal features, financial, ecclesiastical, doctrinal, and spiritual, of the reformed Church of Ireland in the present day.

First, then, as regards finance. It reflects the highest credit on our Irish brethren that since 1869, when their Church was disestablished and stripped of most of its endowments, they have contributed (in round numbers) the sum of five millions sterling towards the maintenance of their clergy. During that period of thirty-five years they have built two cathedrals, one in Cork, the other in Belfast; erected a large number of new churches and restored others; built many glebe or parsonage houses and other parochial buildings; and raised for the foreign missions of the C.M.S., S.P.G., and other societies an annual sum, constantly, of about £43,000. All this, and more, has been done without any substantial help from England or elsewhere. The amount collected by the Misses Nugent in this country for the help of poor parishes in Ireland is only on an average £1,000 a year. All the rest has been raised within that Church's own pale, and those figures attest in the most satisfactory manner the devotion and liberality of Irish Churchmen, only a few of whom are possessed of any large share of wealth. In addition to all this, very recently an appeal has been made to meet an urgent and unexpected difficulty by raising an auxiliary fund of £250,000 in five years. The necessity for this has not arisen from any falling off of the ordinary sources of income. It has rather been occasioned by two facts stated in that appeal: (1) The Land Act of 1903 for the sale of estates, however

generally beneficial to the country, has threatened to seriously cripple the resources of the Church. It appears that the reinvestment of her remaining capital, which had been invested at about 4½ per cent. in mortgages on Irish land, can now yield only 3 per cent. (or 25 per cent. less), and would entail a loss in the aggregate of not less than £30,000 a year. (2) Moreover, the changed position of landlords will, it is feared, cause the removal of many of them from Ireland, and the very serious loss of their subscriptions. This appeal from the Archbishops and Bishops has been already most generously responded to not only by the wealthier classes, but by the poorer members. Early in the present year £66,010 was lodged with the Representative Body by the several dioceses. Of this £28,356 8s. 7d. was contributed by the Metropolitan diocese. From the whole Church about £200,000 towards the required sum has been already either paid or promised. It had been found that these anticipated losses could not have been averted by a reduction of the stipend of the clergy, since as many as 300 of the 1,500 incumbents, besides the curates, were receiving less than £200 a year, barely a living wage, which obviously did not admit of curtailment. And yet, if no special effort had been made, a general proportionate cutting down of salaries would have been inevitable. Indeed, already its poorer incumbents had begun to suffer, for it had been necessary to reduce by one-half a payment of £10 a year made to them in lieu of glebe rents. Nor, again, could an amalgamation of parishes beyond certain limits have been effected without injury to the Church in rural and scattered districts. For these reasons this appeal has been addressed to landed proprietors, farmers, the professional and commercial classes, as well as to persons of more limited means, and all have been urged, according to their ability, to "recognise more fully the duty of making adequate provision for the permanent maintenance of the Church of their fathers." One circumstance will, it is hoped, enable landlords, before parting with their property and leaving Ireland, to substitute a capital sum by way of endowment for the subscriptions which they have hitherto paid. The provision made by the Act of a bonus payable to the tenant for life makes this possible. It is surprising to hear that the stipend capital now belonging to the Church amounts to about £8,000,000, representing not only the original sum paid over by the State in 1871, but chiefly accumulations during the lives of the annuitant clergy in the intervening years, resulting from the gifts of Churchmen having been used to replace the commutation capital as fast as it was eaten up by the annuities charged upon it. In addition to all these heavy charges, two

other urgent calls are being made on the members of the Church of great importance to the wellbeing of the clergy and of the whole corporate body.

The first of these is for the Superannuation Fund for clergy permanently disabled by age or infirmity. A Bill for this purpose was enacted by the General Synod in the present year. Applicants for retiring allowances must be not less than seventy years of age, and have served for at least forty years in the Church of Ireland. These will receive annuities of £200 or under, according to their income. But if they have served at least twenty years and become permanently disabled, they will receive a proportionately smaller annuity. Recipients of such pensions may not undertake or discharge any paid ministerial duty in Ireland or elsewhere, not being occasional or private duty undertaken with the consent of the Representative Body. To the fund for this purpose every diocese has to contribute a sum equal to 3·75 over the total amount of the ecclesiastical incomes of the clergy of the diocese. The pension is not to exceed in each case two-thirds of that amount or of the recipient's ecclesiastical income, whichever is the smaller, the maximum being £200 per annum, or one-sixtieth for each year of service. This certainly appears to be an excellent arrangement, and might well be adopted, *mutatis mutandis*, in our own Church. Then there is the Widows and Orphans' Fund, which must be a source of very great advantage to the married clergy, through the provision which it makes to their families. It is derived chiefly from the annual contributions of the clergy who receive stipends from the Representative Body and are not more than forty years of age. Those who remain unmarried, or widowers without children, are required to pay £6 a year to the fund. Others, being married and above forty years of age, are admitted as contributors upon such terms as the Board, with the advice of an actuary, may determine. It is the complaint of some that these arrangements act as a premium on marriage, and inflict hardship upon celibates who remain such, by compelling them to contribute to the support of the families of their married brethren. How this part of the system works out we are not prepared to say; but it is an excellent idea to remove from the minds of the clergy much painful anxiety about the future of those most dear to them in the event of their own death. It may indeed be open to question whether our own Clergy Mutual Assurance Society has not put this matter on a freer and firmer footing. Still, we must admit that the Irish Church is far more careful

than our own in providing for the temporal wants of the clergy and their families.

Passing from this part of our subject, we will now briefly notice the methods employed for the maintenance of the churches and of the glebe-houses. The former obligation rests with the select vestry, who are to provide from the funds at their disposal the requisites of Divine service, and for the upkeep of the churches and of other parochial buildings. As to the glebes, or glebe, that is, parsonage houses, the incumbent at his appointment has to execute and accept a lease of the property, and to hand over to the Representative Body the annual sum payable for the glebe, without any deductions for rates, taxes, etc.; whilst that body undertakes all landlord's—that is, external—repairs and those of a permanent character, and to paint the house externally as often as they consider necessary, and to keep it insured. In the cases of incumbents for whom no residence is provided, the sum of £10 is added to their stipends in aid of house-rent. When repairs of glebe-houses are needed, the Representative Body informs the select vestry, and inquires whether they can, on behalf of the parish, provide all or any portion of the required sum, or the interest on that sum, so as to relieve the incumbent from the charge. In these and other ways, which we will not minutely describe, the burden of dilapidations, which presses so heavily on our clergy or their heirs, is in great measure borne by the general Church body or the select vestry of the parish. The incumbent receives nothing from the glebe, but, on the other hand, is not liable for the most serious repairs.

We will now pass from the secular side of Irish Church work to glance at the chief features of its minor operations and organization. Anyone who will take the trouble to study the constitution of that Church as framed by the General Convention of 1871 can scarcely fail to be impressed with the remarkable wisdom, soundness of judgment, and spiritual power given at that most trying crisis to the leaders, lay and clerical alike. Set free from State trammels, they applied themselves to reorganize, not to revolutionize, their Church polity and government. The Church, whilst she reverently and devoutly acknowledged her dependence on Christ, her Divine head, declared the General Synod, composed of Bishops, other clergy, and laymen from all her dioceses, to have the chief legislative power therein. This Synod consists of the House of Bishops, 208 representatives of the clergy, and 416 of the laity. The Bishops have the right to vote separately from the representatives, and no question can be decided unless with a majority of the Bishops and a majority of the

representatives voting conjointly or by orders. It is, however, remarkable that a separate voting by Houses very seldom occurs, and has not been taken for the last ten years at least. The power to call for a vote by orders was evidently reserved as a remedy for any difficulty that might arise from the number of the laity. From an English Churchman's point of view it would seem, to say the least, a very doubtful arrangement that the laity should outnumber the clergy in the relation of two to one.

In the Life of Archbishop Magee—who, as previously an Irish clergyman and Dean of Cork and Dean of the Chapel Royal, was deeply interested in the welfare of the Church of his baptism, and was assigned a prominent part in its reorganization—we find from a letter to a friend that he foresaw "three rocks coming over the surface already." They were (1) liturgical revision, (2) lay tyranny, and (3) schism between the North and the South. And he then wrote: "Still, I think you will weather them all; but the second is your greatest danger." So it might well have appeared to such a cautious and statesmanlike Prelate as he. But the event has wonderfully modified—if it has not wholly removed—the grounds of his fears. His masterly speech in the House of Lords against the passing of the Bill for Disestablishment, though it did not arrest the blow dealt against the Irish Church by Mr. Gladstone and his Ministry, probably had the effect of mitigating its force and of obtaining better terms for the despoiled Church. With respect to the prominence given to the laity in the General Synod, it may be well to add that an important member of that Synod, thoroughly conversant with the situation past and present, explained to the writer that it was thought likely that laymen, with their many claims on their time and thoughts, would oftener than the clergy be unable to attend the Synod, and that therefore it would be safer to elect a double number of them, in order that their voice might be duly and proportionately heard in its deliberations. Such has proved to be the case, and we are told by those best acquainted with the proceedings that, especially in recent years, they have been singularly free from friction and bitterness of spirit. This in an assembly of impulsive and warm-hearted Irishmen is not a little remarkable. It should be understood that the numbers of representatives for the various dioceses are proportioned to the Church population and importance of each; in fact, both the General and Diocesan Synods are far more truly representative than our own Houses of Convocation. The qualifications of a lay representative are that he should be at least of the age of twenty-one, a member of the Church of Ireland, a com-

municant, and should have signed a declaration to that effect. All such are eligible for election in any diocese. There are, therefore, no requirements about social status, as to being a ratepayer and the like, as with us. No place in the constitution seems as yet to be found for women. They are not even eligible for churchwardenships, as in our Church. As to the appointment to "livings," none are absolutely in the gift of Bishops, and, except in a few cases, of individuals. Each Diocesan Synod elects one layman and two clergymen from its members to form, with its Bishop, a committee of patronage for the diocese. In addition to these the registered vestrymen of each parish elect three persons, who are ready to act with the committee in the appointment of an incumbent for their own parish when a vacancy may occur. In this way the parishioners have a voice in the selection of their own clergyman, whilst their influence is counterbalanced by the wider experience and riper judgment of the Bishop and of the nominees of the whole diocese. There would seem to be much wisdom in this arrangement. No room is left for the discretion or indiscretion of a single patron. Again, the laity are assigned considerable power in the parish vestries. All male parishioners of twenty-one years of age who have signed a declaration of their belonging to the Church of Ireland are entitled to become registered vestrymen and to vote at the Easter vestry, etc. The select vestry consists of the incumbent, his curates, the churchwardens, and not more than twelve persons appointed from and by the Easter vestry. It has the control and charge of all parochial charities and church funds, provides from the funds at its disposal the requirements for Divine service, is bound to keep the church and parochial buildings in repair, and has the appointment and control of all church and parish officials and servants. The churchwardens are appointed, as with us, one by the incumbent, the other by the Easter vestry. The only difference is that both must be taken from the registered vestrymen, and not from outside the pale of the Church. In this and other ways ample scope is given to laymen, if they are disposed to rise to their opportunities. This would appear to have in many cases the effect of interesting them practically in their Church's work, and so of stimulating their liberality and their zeal in cooperating with their ministers in the service of God.

In conclusion, it may be well to recapitulate the principal changes which were introduced in 1871, and have been since retained, as to the ordering of Divine worship and the administration of the Sacraments. In the first place, all the unhappy disputes occasioned amongst ourselves by the am-

biguous Ornaments Rubric have been summarily ended by its removal. By Canon IV., Chap. IX., it is distinctly laid down that, "Every Archbishop and Bishop shall use the customary ecclesiastical apparel of his Order, and every Presbyter and Deacon shall wear a plain white surplice with sleeves, and may wear bands, the customary scarf, and, being graduates of a University, the hood of their degree." A plain black gown for preaching is also permitted. With these explicit directions no place is left for ritualistic vestments. Lighted candles on the Communion Table, except for the purpose of giving light, incense or any substitution (*sic*), crosses on or behind the Table, processions with a cross, banner, or picture through a church in any religious service, are all strictly forbidden. It is also prescribed that the "Table" itself shall be a movable table of wood, with such a covering as the Ordinary shall approve of. The "north side" of the Holy Table is defined to be "that side or end which in churches lying east and west is towards the north." This precludes an "eastward position." No sign of the cross is to be used, except when prescribed by the rubric. Bowing or acts of obeisance to the Lord's Table, or anything there or thereon, and the ringing of a bell during Divine service, can have no place. One more very important alteration in the Irish Prayer-Book must not be omitted. It relates to the Athanasian Creed. That ancient and invaluable symbol of the Catholic faith is retained in the Liturgy without any change or diminution in its clear and forcible statement of the faith; but the rubric enjoining its public recital has been removed, as being inexpedient in some, if not in all, cases, and since the Creed is so liable to be misunderstood. The appeal to it in the Thirty-nine Articles remains as it always has been. This was surely a wiser course than that adopted by the American Episcopal Church, in expunging the Creed itself and its endorsement from the Prayer-Book and the Articles of faith. If the action of our Irish brethren in this matter were followed with authority in our own Liturgy, many painful scruples would be relieved, and the hearts of probably a majority of loyal Churchmen would rejoice.

As regards the whole question of Disestablishment, its gains and losses, we may quote from an excellent pamphlet by Dr. Bernard, now Dean of St. Patrick's, on the present position of the Irish Church. He there wrote: "Disestablishment has not, of course, been an unmixed blessing. But two great advantages at least it has secured for the Church: (1) Autonomy, the freedom to legislate for herself in correspondence with her need; and (2) it has brought about the hearty cooperation of the laity with the clergy in the work of

the Church. This last is a matter of great importance. Nothing has done so much to attach the laity to the Church in Ireland as the work which has been given them to do." But if all these gains should be used as an argument for a similar treatment of our own Church, not by a stalwart High Churchman like Mr. Gladstone, but by a Radical and anti-religious Government, we may quote a humorous appendix to the parable of the Good Samaritan, which is attributed to the late Dr. Salmon. The narrative leaves the wounded man at the inn; but the apocryphal story proceeds to tell us that when the patient was convalescent some visitors called to see him. He thought that their faces were familiar, but was not sure of them until they began to speak. Then they proved to be the robbers who had caused his misfortunes. "How are you, my good friend?" they came in with outstretched hands. "We are so glad to see you so much better. Now, did we not really do you a good turn that day when we interrupted your journey and relieved you of your superfluous cash? You were a little hurt for the moment, but it was nothing. We are so glad to see that you have got all that you want for your frugal requirements! Do take care of yourself in future! We shall always be glad to hear of your welfare!" May we not as English Churchmen apply the parable by anticipation to ourselves when threatened with even worse treatment?

"*De te fabula narratur.*"

WILLIAM BURNET.

THE JEWISH ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

IN his article in the July number of THE CHURCHMAN on "Our Position in Reference to Biblical Criticism," the Dean of Canterbury touches on the attitude of the Jews towards the contentions of the Wellhausen school of criticism.[1] No fair-minded Jew could regard Dr. Wace's

[1] No. 226, p. 502: "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.'"

references as other than entirely sympathetic, but it may be thought that there is more justification for this attitude than is at once obvious to an outside observer. By the courtesy of the editor, I desire to say a few words in its defence, and also to challenge the central conclusion of the higher critics.

Some of the reasons for the Jewish attitude are so similar to those put forward by Dr. Wace himself that it is not necessary to do more than touch lightly on them. Jew and Christian alike know that the Bible has outlived so many schools of commentators and so many forms of error that it is difficult to feel much anxiety about the temporary dominance of any particular school of criticism. Jew and Christian alike know that the Pentateuch—which, according to the critics, is a very inaccurate record of past events—in many cases foretells the future in a manner that has been wonderfully justified by subsequent history. For the Jew as for the Christian, religion is not something that can be destroyed by counting words. Whatever his creed may be, one who believes that the Pentateuch was given by God will never be greatly affected by any statistics as to the occurrences of any words or phrases in particular portions of the book.

Such reasons are practically common to members of both religions. I propose now to note the difference of attitude induced by the fundamentally different Jewish conception of the Pentateuch. In so doing I shall have to point to a fatal weakness in the critical position, and also show why it is that the orthodox Jews are unable to answer the critics satisfactorily, and yet are so little affected by them.

To the orthodox Jew the Law *is* a law in fact as well as in name. All his actions are regulated by it. His education comprises the study of the vast legal system that has been founded on the Pentateuch, and his mental training and atmosphere are largely those of a lawyer. To that extent he has an advantage over the higher critics, whose main arguments are derived from the laws of the Pentateuch, and who yet have treated those laws in an absolutely unique manner. An English layman knows that he cannot form an opinion on any technicality of the English law of his own day without special training. Still less would he attempt to dogmatize about the technicalities of a strange system of law belonging to a bygone age and written in a dead tongue. But this is just what the critics invariably do. The natural consequence is that they make assertions and draw inferences that immediately break down when tested by a trained lawyer. I shall illustrate this by exposing the foundations of the central Wellhausen theory; but first I would show why it is that the orthodox Jews are not in a position to answer the critical

case by reference to their traditional explanations. So long as a law is anything more than a piece of literature—that is, so long as it is a binding rule of conduct—account must be taken of the ever-changing circumstances of life. New conditions and new cases are perpetually arising, and the law must be interpreted with reference to them. Now, in many cases the traditional explanations represent the views of persons who had to construe rules drafted in the first instance with special reference to the circumstances of one period in the light of the conditions and needs of a widely different age. It is not necessary for the purposes of this paper to consider how far such interpretations should bind the Jew, or whether they are justified by any authority, express or implied, in the Pentateuch itself. Suffice it to say that the orthodox Jews themselves see no difficulties in their position, and could easily defend it in case of need. But undoubtedly these interpretations stand in their way when they desire to answer the critics. Lawyers they are, but their legal methods and interpretations are those of an age far remote from the time of Moses. Hence they are at a disadvantage when the question at issue is not what a particular legal passage has come to mean, but what it originally meant. The critical case on the laws can only be considered by historical lawyers, and here the orthodox Jew necessarily fails.

Hitherto I have spoken as if all the difficulties felt by the critics about the laws of the Pentateuch were in connection with the jural laws—that is, the lawyers' laws, as distinct from, say, sacrificial rules. This is far from being so; but even in the case of sacrificial rules the same principle applies. Legal training is necessarily more valuable for the construction of any rules of conduct than a mastery of either philology or theology. Perhaps the most satisfactory way of proving this is to unmask the central errors of the Wellhausen school without further preliminaries. Amazing as it must appear, they are almost entirely due to the ambiguity of a single German word, "Heiligtum," and its English equivalent, "sanctuary," and to the confusion engendered in the minds of the critics by these expressions.

Stripped of details, the central portion of the Wellhausen theory may fairly be summarized as follows: There are three principal codes[1] in the Pentateuch. Of these, Deuteronomy is the middle one in point of time, and demands a single sanctuary. The earliest of the codes (JE) recognises a plurality

[1] The composite character of JE and P is immaterial for the purposes of the present paper.

of sanctuaries as legitimate; the last (P) assumes unity of sanctuary. Corresponding to these three codes three periods of history may be traced—the age of Josiah, when a great centralizing reform was carried out, the time preceding it, and the post-exilic period.

I shall show that the critics, by using the ambiguous word "sanctuary," have confounded three entirely different things —viz.: (1) An altar of earth or unhewn stone, on which sacrifices of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, sheep and oxen, might lawfully be offered to the Lord by laymen without the assistance of a priest; (2) the "house of the Lord," where alone certain sacrifices might be performed, and then only with the assistance of a priest; and (3) a heathen high place, which was generally situate on a high mountain or a hill, or under a green tree. Such high places seem normally to have contained altars, pillars, Asherim, and graven images, sometimes also houses, and the worship was always offered to some god other than the Lord.

As it will doubtless seem incredible to most readers that men who have the reputation of being scholars should be unable to distinguish a house from an altar, and a heathen high place from either, I shall insert references to the Oxford Hexateuch.[1] This will serve a double purpose: first, it will enable my readers to verify my statements; secondly, it will throw the *onus* of putting forward any answers there may be to my charges on certain defined persons. In criticism, as in other things, what is everybody's business is nobody's, and doubtless the members of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology will not lack an advocate if they have a defence.

First, then, I say that by means of the ambiguous word "sanctuary" the critics have confounded an altar of stone or earth with the house of the Lord. The *locus classicus* on which they rely as showing the lawfulness of a plurality of "sanctuaries" is Exod. xx. 24-26 (E): "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and thou mayest sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in every (*or* in all the) place where I record My Name (*or* cause My Name to be remembered) I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones," etc. It is quite clear that what is here sanctioned is a plurality of *altars* of a particular kind, not a plurality of *houses* of the Lord. An examination of the history fully illustrates this.

[1] "The Hexateuch . . . Arranged in its Constituent Documents by Members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford," edited by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, first edition, 1900.

For instance, we read that after the battle of Michmash the people slew sheep and oxen, and ate them with the blood. Saul, on learning this, ordered a great stone to be rolled to him. Accordingly, the people "brought every man his ox with him that night and slew them there. And Saul built an altar unto the Lord: the same was the first altar that he built unto the Lord."[1] Or, again, if we turn to the Book of Kings, we read how on Mount Carmel Elijah built an altar in the name of the Lord with twelve stones.[2] In these historical instances, as well as in the law under consideration, we have to do with altars which are in no way covered, and could not by any possibility be regarded as "houses." But the same "code" that contains this rule about altars also contains rules that point with equal clearness to a single religious centre that could be described as a house. "The first of the first-fruits of thy ground thou shalt bring into the *house* of the LORD thy God" (Exod. xxiii. 19 [E], xxxiv. 26 [J]). Here there can be no mistake, especially when we turn for illustration to the history, for there we find a "house" of the Lord which was something very different from an altar of earth or unhewn stones, and where the ministry was performed by priests.[3]

---

[1] 1 Sam. xiv. 32-35. [2] 1 Kings xviii. 31-32.

[3] See, for instance, 1 Sam. *passim*. This argument may be further strengthened by three observations:

1. It has been pointed out by Wellhausen himself that the rule sanctioning a plurality of altars contemplates lay sacrifice. Now, if that were the only method of sacrifice in vogue, priests would be entirely superfluous. Nevertheless, we know that priests did exist at the time to which the critics attribute J and E, both from the portions of the Book of Joshua that they assign to those sources, and from the Books of Samuel and Kings. Hence there must have been in use some sacrifices other than those which might be offered by laymen at an altar of earth or unhewn stone.

2. In the passage cited in the text we find an offering of "first-fruits"—that is, an offering which was neither a peace-offering nor a burnt-offering. Now, the law of Exod. xx. only authorizes the sacrifice of peace-offerings, burnt-offerings, oxen and sheep, on an altar of earth or unhewn stone. It does not so authorize an offering of first-fruits. Had the "house of the Lord" been identified with an altar of earth or stone we should here find a rule sanctioning the offering of first-fruits on such an altar.

3. We read in Exod. xxxiv. 23 [J]: "Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord GOD, the God of Israel" (*cf.* xxiii. 17 [E]). The following verse provides that no man "shall desire thy land when thou goest up to appear before the LORD thy God three times in the year," and is therefore treated by the critics as a Deuteronomic addition. But a little reflection shows that even without these words the appearance before the Lord cannot mean an appearance at an altar of earth or unhewn stones. Wellhausen has pointed out that these altars were made of materials that could be readily obtained in any field. Their erection would, in ordinary circumstances, be the work of a few minutes. Could

I have now shown that both the laws attributed to J and E and the early history recognise a house of the Lord which cannot be identified with an altar of earth or stones. The next step in the argument is to show that the laws of Deuteronomy also recognise a plurality of altars. For this purpose it is sufficient to refer to Deut. xvi. 21, 22: "Thou shalt not plant thee an Asherah any kind of tree beside the altar of the LORD thy God, which thou shalt make thee. Neither shalt thou set thee up a pillar; which the LORD thy God hateth." This obviously assumes a multiplicity of altars under the control of laymen, and the critics have felt this. Hence we find the annotator in the Oxford Hexateuch alleging that this prohibition of an Asherah beside an altar of the Lord "belongs to the older cultus before the unity of the sanctuary was enforced in xii." That is to say, he does not question the fact that this passage recognises a plurality of altars, but he believes that the twelfth chapter contains a law prohibiting such altars and enforcing a single "sanctuary." Let us, therefore, turn to chap. xii. It contains not a single word prohibiting altars, or high places, of the Lord. To understand the full significance of this fact we must remember, not merely the difference between altars of the Lord and heathen altars, but also the distinction between an altar and a high place. An altar was not synonymous with any kind of high place, though both phrases are sometimes used of the same thing. It is not merely that by no stretch of language could an altar like that erected after Michmash be called a high place. We have clear evidence elsewhere of the distinction between some high places and some altars. Hezekiah "removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah,"[1] not, be it observed, the altars; but Rabshakeh speaks of high places and altars.[2] If the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy be carefully read as a whole, it will be seen that it is aimed at "the places wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree," which contained altars, pillars, Asherim, and graven images of their gods. Nobody who compared the passages relating to lawful altars and high places with those referring to heathen

anybody speak of attendance at, say, the Michmash altar as an "appearance before the Lord"? Elkanah's pilgrimages show us what was in fact understood by the phrase.

[1] 2 Kings xviii. 4.

[2] *Ib.* 22. *Cf.* W. R. Smith's "Religion of the Semites," second edition, p. 490: "A distinction between a high place (bāma) and an altar (mizbeăḥ) is acknowledged in the Old Testament down to the close of the kingdom.'

high places with care and impartiality could conceive that the two were identical. The former were marked by the worship of the Lord and the absence of any graven image, pillar, or Asherah; the latter by the worship of heathen deities and the presence of the three objectionable symbols.[1]

The twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy, in fact, leaves untouched the existing provisions of the Law as to altars. If, for example, an Israelite desired to enter into a covenant for which an altar and the slaughter of peace-offerings and burnt-offerings were essential, there is nothing in this chapter that could be construed as preventing him. The real difficulty arises through our ignorance of the precise meaning of the Hebrew word which in Exod. xx. and elsewhere is translated by "sacrifice," and in Deut. xii. 15 and 21 and some other passages by "kill." At first sight it may appear that eating by the unclean shows that the slaughter must be non-sacrificial, and there seems some plausibility in the hypothesis that the Deuteronomist intended to relax the law by which all slaughter of certain animals was sacrificial, and introduce a purely non-sacrificial form of slaughter. But consideration

---

[1] The term "high place" has led to confusion. A high place was not *per se* illegal; but it could become illegal in one of many ways, either because the worship was to a false god, or because the altar did not comply with the requirements of the Law, or because of the presence of some heathen symbol, or because sacrifices were offered there that should have been offered at the religious centre. But so long as the essential portion of a high place merely consisted of a lawful altar at which the sacrifices permitted by the Law were offered, it did not become illegal simply because there was accommodation for guests or for the people. Samuel had a high place at Ramah (1 Sam. vii. 17, ix. 12-22), but there is no hint that it was in any respect illegal. W. R. Smith (*loc. cit.*) remarks that "ultimately bāma is the name applied to any idolatrous shrine or altar." Perhaps the critics have sometimes been led astray by applying this meaning to high places that were perfectly innocent.

In dealing with passages in the prophets relating to these subjects a further caution is necessary. It was on the altar of a high place that illegal sacrifice was offered, and consequently the prophets frequently mention the altar only. Similarly, modern writers speak of leading a bride to the altar. They do not mean that an altar is erected in the fields for the purposes of the marriage service; but they assume on the part of their contemporary readers such knowledge as is common to all persons of ordinary intelligence. So it was with the prophets. No contemporary could have misunderstood their invectives against altars as referring to lawful altars. This may be very curiously illustrated by a passage of Amos, where the prophet says: "For in the day that I shall visit the transgressions of Israel upon him, I will also visit the altars of Beth-el, and *the horns of the altar* shall be cut off, and fall to the ground" (iii. 14). It cannot be suggested that the prophet was here inveighing against an altar of earth or unhewn stones, because such a structure could have no horns. We need only remember the scene at Michmash to see that this was the case.

shows that this cannot be correct. In 1 Sam. xxviii. 24 we find the same Hebrew word used to describe the act of a *woman*, which shows that the act described cannot have been sacrificial. Hence in the days of Saul—that is, before any of the dates assigned by the critics to their various sources —a form of non-sacrificial slaughter was already in use.[1] Again, it is improbable that on all the occasions when we read of sudden sacrifices by laymen at improvised altars the persons who ate the flesh were in a state of sacrificial purity. Moreover, there are early passages where we read of the killing of domestic animals for food in which there is not a hint of any altar or sacrificial rite. I need only refer to the case of the kid given by Abraham to the servant to dress (Gen. xviii. 7 [J]). The truth would seem to be that the critics have construed rules relating to clean and unclean, which were perhaps applicable only to sacrifice at the religious centre, as affecting the lay sacrifices recognised by the Law, and have assumed too hastily that all slaughter—at any rate, of domestic animals—was sacrificial in the earlier stages of Biblical history.

One small point in the history of the laws under consideration may be noticed. Exodus apparently authorises the erection of altars only "in all the place where I shall cause My name to be remembered"—that is, in the land of Canaan. It follows that when the Jews went into exile and left that land, they could no longer erect altars. Whatever may have been the case earlier, sacrificial slaughter by laymen for food must then have ceased. A similar remark applies to all lay sacrifices, whether made for the purpose of entering into a covenant or for any other reason. Hence, after the exile, the provisions of the Law had to be interpreted by persons who were no longer accustomed to erecting altars in any circumstances whatever. What wonder if they construed the rules of both Exodus and Deuteronomy in the light of their own habits and of the conditions of their own age? But the meaning so put upon them was not the original meaning. The Law authorizes the erection of altars for sacrifice by laymen in cases where custom prescribed such sacrifice. It prohibits the use of heathen high places, and directs that the Israelitish rites corresponding to those practised at them by the Canaanites should be performed elsewhere—that is, at the house of the sacrificant in the case of rites used simply to obtain the flesh of a domestic animal for food, and at the

[1] It must be remembered that at Michmash the Ark was in the camp, so that the permission of Deut. xii. 21 would not apply.

central "place," where was the "house of the LORD," in all other cases.

We may now briefly see how the confusion engendered by the ambiguous word "sanctuary" runs through the Oxford Hexateuch. First (i. 50) the law of Exodus is quoted, but on the next page we are told that "D lays down a very different principle. The Deuteronomic code opens in xii. with the demand that all local sanctuaries shall be abolished." We have here a tacit identification of altars with heathen high places. Four pages later (p. 55) an altar of earth or stone, called a "sanctuary," suddenly develops a door, which is "the centre of the administration of justice," and a doorpost, to which is affixed the ear of the slave who desires to remain with his master six years after he has been purchased. Finally, in a note on page 241, the "house of the Lord" is identified with the "local sanctuary." No wonder that in a note on page 247 we are told that "the laws as to the site of the sanctuary present perhaps the clearest instance of the modifications introduced by time in the legislation. The stages are clearly marked from (JE) the earlier sanction of the primitive plurality of sacred places to (D) the urgent demand for centralization of worship, succeeded by (P) the quiet assumption of a single lawful sanctuary."

There is probably no parallel in literature to the reconstruction of a nation's history by the higher critics on the basis of the mental confusion induced by a single ambiguous word of their own choosing. It stands out as an awful warning to all who would attempt to do the work of lawyers, historians, and other specialists with no better equipment than an extensive but unintelligent acquaintance with the roots of dead languages.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

ARTHUR STRONG: CRITIC, LIBRARIAN, PROFESSOR.[1]

THE publication of Mr. Strong's literary remains marks an event in the world of letters. By his death England has lost and Europe mourns a foremost son in the ranks of universal learning. Orientalist, classic, modern linguist, art-critic, scientist, musician, mathematician, entomologist, and antiquary, Mr. Strong strove to attain the ideal

[1] "Critical Studies and Fragments." By the late S. Arthur Strong, Librarian to the House of Lords, Professor of Arabic and Lecturer in Assyriology at University College, London. With a Memoir by Lord Balcarres, M.P. London: Duckworth. 16s. net.

which in the eighteenth century Gray had set before England and Goethe before Germany—namely, that of accomplishing in himself the round of all those sciences of which other men are content to be single exponents. But in the attempt, like the celebrated John Leyden before him, Mr. Strong was cut off at an early age, a victim at once to disease and to intemperate erudition. And this charming volume, which pays the most fitting tribute to his memory by bringing together the scattered contributions of a lifetime, serves only to quicken in us the sense of his loss.

The story of Mr. Strong's intellectual career may be briefly told. It reads like a dream. After three years spent at Oxford, whither he had migrated from St. John's College at Cambridge to work in the Indian Institute under Professors Sayce, Max Müller, and Sir Monier Williams, he went abroad to become the pupil of Schrader at Berlin, and at Paris the guest and lifelong friend of Renan. It was here that he completed laying the foundations of an Oriental learning that embraced the languages and the literatures of no less than eight divisions of the human speech—viz., the three Semitic tongues of Hebrew, Assyrian, and Arabic, with their distant kinsman Egyptian, besides Sanskrit, Pali, Persian, and Chinese. The scholars on the Continent were astonished at the range and exactness of his attainments, and congratulated him, with all the polite extravagance of native compliment, on having acquired "an equal knowledge of the primary sources of science, and of the huge bibliography pertaining to its various provinces." It is well known that Mr. Strong ended his days as Professor of Arabic in the University of London. It may not be so well known that he kept himself so well abreast of modern research that he became our leading Assyriologist; and death overtook him engaged in editing for the Royal Asiatic Society the Arabic History of Jakmak, one of the Sultans of Egypt.

But Mr. Strong's studies were by no means confined to the Eastern hemisphere of learning. Aiming, like the youthful Erasmus, at compassing the whole round of knowledge, his eager mind embraced the Western hemisphere also. To a working acquaintance with the two great classic tongues of Greece and Rome he joined the study of the polite languages of modern Europe. Yet all this was, so to speak, but the pillars of Wisdom's house which she had builded. By still fairer acquisitions of knowledge were the chambers to be filled with all precious and pleasant riches. Not content with sinking the foundations, Mr. Strong found time for several *πάρεργα* ("hobbies") with which to garnish the superstructure.

He was by nature an artist; by study he became an art-critic, so acute in the detection of original authorship that by his means Hans Holbein had to part with a famous picture ("The Wheel of Fortune") which he owed to Hans Schaeufelin, and Lotto recovered his characteristic and long-lost "St. Anthony." At the age of eleven his note-book traces the hand of the budding Michelangelo—for so Strong ever spelled the name—pursuing in every imaginable shape and posture his studies in the skeleton.

He was no less proficient in the theory of music, and familiar with the evolution of musical instruments. Indeed, after the playing of the first few chords he is said to have instinctively recognised the hand of the composer.

He was also something of a naturalist; and to the science of botany and entomology added such a good knowledge of the local antiquities of many parts of this country that Lord Balcarres assures us there was no better guide than Mr. Strong to be found, whether in exploring the New Forest or in traversing the Norfolk Broads.

The essays before us embrace a strange and bewildering medley of subjects. First we have art in all its forms—the art of modern Europe, early and late; the art of Buddha and of Pliny; art in theory and art in practice. Then there are the Tell-el-Amarna tablets and the early civilizations of Egypt and of the Celts. Martineau's attack upon the authority of the Acts and the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel confronts Max Müller's assault upon the Evolution theory. Gladstone's "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" jostles in strange neighbourhood a sympathetic review of Renan's "Histoire du Peuple d'Israel"; while the music of Mozart accompanies Darmesteter's "Songs of the Afghans" and Mr. Theodore Watts-Dunton's latest poetry.

But the list is not yet complete. There are papers devoted to the noble memories of Erasmus and of Westminster Abbey; to a discussion of the privilege of peers, and of the Duke of Devonshire's relations with Dickens, Thackeray, and Leigh Hunt. Not the least interesting is that which traces the romantic story of Lady Sarah Lennox. Hardly inferior interest attaches to an original discovery of Mr. Strong's—a manuscript letter of Warren Hastings to his Indian secretary, Thompson, giving the great Governor-General's own impressions of the famous trial at Whitehall. These lighter papers complete our astonishment by showing Mr. Strong in the new light of antiquary and biographer. They reveal also his possession of an elegant literary style set off by a neat and effective wit.

The Catalogue Rolls compiled for the House of Lords and Chatsworth House present, perhaps, the most abiding

memorials of his fame. They afford proof of a still more curious learning, fertile in all the mysteries of ancient law and modern politics, as well as of the minute and abstruser details of ecclesiastical jurisprudence and theological debate.

Finally, lest a single province in the world of science might be left unspanned, Mr. Strong was seriously meditating in the last week of his life a history of the mathematics.

"The theme," remarks his memorialist, "was suited to his talents, and nobody could have dealt with so technical a subject in a more broad and comprehensive fashion."

It is a little difficult to survey without rising envy this record of apparently universal learning and flawless success. We feel at once inclined to ask, Is it possible to reduce within just limits the proportions of this seeming omniscience? Can we gauge the essential unity underlying this vast variety?

> Δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὸς καρδίᾳ προσήμενος
> ἄχθος διπλοίζει τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον.

We will lay to heart the warning of the wise old poet-theologian of Greece while we attempt the solution of these two questions.

1. Mr. Strong undoubtedly possessed the twin gifts of fine genius: swift and sure insight, based upon extensive and accurate knowledge—St. Paul's combination of *αἴσθησις* and *ἐπίγνωσις* (Phil. i. 10). Given a sound general training, such as most men carry with them to the University, and those habits of precise technical scholarship, such as all men carry away with them from Cambridge, and join to these that boundless leisure in after-life which enables a man to become familiar with the contents of public libraries and private collections—given these conditions, a mind of this fine, rather than great, order will readily absorb all the details of those subjects which form the staple of modern thinking, and are scattered up and down the countless journals devoted to every science and pursuit under heaven. Armed with text-books, and supported by books of ready reference on every hand, the student, working—as Gibbon, Macaulay, and Gladstone worked—at the respectable rate of fourteen hours a day, may acquire, without possessing a tithe of their ability, an immense general knowledge. If too much indulged, this sponge-like thirst for universal information becomes a craving. It assumes, before long, all the forms of disease. The brain becomes (so to speak) consumptive, and absorbs with almost feverish activity the multitudinous objects of its unlimited curiosity. And with what result? The victim becomes a gigantic index, a cyclopædia on two legs, or, at best, a colossal glossary. The memory, stimulated to its utmost powers, waxes greater

than the faculty of invention, which in turn becomes the organ rather of wit than reflection. The man no longer reads, like Milton, "reading only to grow." He reads—that is to say, he devours folios of printed matter—in the mad hope of attaining universal knowledge for its own sake. But knowledge is not so to be attained—*Est quædam etiam nesciendi ars et scientia.* Knowledge is of worth only in so far as it goes to make one wise. It has a moral value of its own, and not a purely scientific one ending in itself. Else what genius could compete against leisure and a good memory? Neglecting this sound rule, we may become great surface scholars and prodigies of intellectual valour; but this is surely a field of glory that may safely be abandoned to some one of the higher orders of chimpanzee. Knowledge implies at least a certain fruitfulness in the propagation of ideas, and not merely the industrious reflection of other men's facts and opinions. We have seen in some places of popular resort a candle set in a mirror, whose single light is a thousand times refracted by the myriad facets of a revolving prism. This contrivance reminds us at once of certain types of literary genius, which Johnson characteristically summed up in his definition of Voltaire: *Vir est acerrimi ingenii sed paucarum litterarum* (He is an infinitely smart wit, but a poor scholar).

We are far from wishing to visit upon Mr. Strong the full force of this criticism. We intend it chiefly as a warning against what both Macaulay and Bishop Creighton foresaw would be a besetting danger of the present age. Yet the volume before us seems to go some distance in proving our general contention. We look in vain for traces of original learning, or for reflections and criticisms of any permanent value. We have before us the spoils of all ages, the thefts of all literatures. But these are not always stolen with accuracy. "It has been said," remarks Mr. Strong at p. 42, "that Pope borrowed from the ancients out of poverty, Addison out of modesty, and Milton out of pride." Poverty was certainly not Pope's failing. The phrase is Warburton's, and is cited by Johnson in his Life of Pope. What its author wrote was: "Dryden borrows for want of leisure, Pope for want of genius, Milton out of pride, and Addison out of modesty."

The best of Mr. Strong's reflections are those devoted to art, to languages, and to the manners of society. These require only nice observation and a happy memory. But when he moves out of the sphere of sense-perceptions into the realms of philosophy, science, and theology, he becomes confused in his notions, stumbles over fallacious analogies, or amuses himself with the barren task of transcribing whole

paragraphs of his author without comment and without discrimination.

Let our readers judge for themselves. They will doubtless take most interest in the subject of Mr. Strong's religion. He was a firm believer in evolution, which he views alternately as an original force and as merely a mode of working in Nature.

To the many objections launched against this confident theory from the days of Virchow in 1877 to Mr. Balfour in his recent republication of the "Foundations of Belief" Mr. Strong opposes a substantial "proof." A pike was placed in an aquarium, shut off from the smaller fry by an inserted glass panel. When the panel was silently withdrawn, the pike declined to devour its easy prey. Our author's explanation of this obvious miracle is certainly interesting (the italics are his own):

"The training of the pike was not based on judgment. It consisted only in the establishment of a certain direction of *will* in consequence of certain uniformly recurring sensuous impressions. The view of the smaller fish provoked, no doubt, the natural desire to swallow them, but evoked at the same time the *recollection* of pain suffered on their account. The same sensuous impression proceeding from the same fishes was always in his *soul* the beginning of the same series of *psychic acts*. He could not help repeating this series, like a machine, but like *a machine with a soul*, which has this advantage over mechanical machines, that it can adapt its work to unforeseen circumstances."

We can find a more rational and less rationalistic explanation. The pike, deceived by the glass pane through which it could see its prey, but by means of which it was mysteriously prevented from getting at it, did not, when the pane was removed, at once realize its possibilities. How long the pike was in this state of illusion, and whether it was kept hungry by the experimenter, are two facts Mr. Strong forgets to state; yet they are the two strongest items necessary to his proof. We may be sure, however, that as soon as the deception wore off, this "machine with a soul" showed himself in deed and in truth a "pike with a will," without confirming or upsetting newly-discovered laws of cosmic autonomy.

But hereby hangs a corollary:

"A machine with a soul! A machine that can adapt its work to unforeseen circumstances! What is man," asks Mr. Strong, "but a machine with a soul?"

Solvuntur risu tabulæ.

The rest of Mr. Strong's creed is of a piece with this—is based on the same foundations. He holds with "that great

discovery of modern science, that of the *infinite* extent and duration of the universe" (p. 273). (We have read of this modern discovery before in the pages of Aristotle.) From this we get another corollary, that "within earth's narrow circle man is of no more final account than any other of the million organisms passing in endless succession between birth and death" (p. 165). (By death he appears to mean annihilation.) This somewhat dreary theology, worthy of the Cumæan Sibyl's

Desine fata deum flecti sperare precando

(notwithstanding a rhetorical reference to the value of prayer at p. 211), has this disadvantage on the side of our author, that he brings to this upper air a theology suited only to the souls of the under-world.

In place of Ewald and Baur or their numerous school we get Renan and Dr. Martineau as representatives of the Higher Criticism of the books of the Old and New Testament. Dr. Martineau's accuracy is hardly on a level with his powers of discovery. Thus we learn, in spite of thirty years' accumulating evidence to the contrary, that the author of the Acts confuses all history, and exaggerates the Church's earliest conditions of life, and, though he has been called a Pauline disciple, "betrays not the slightest insight into the system of thought which distinguished the Apostle of the Gentiles or sympathy with his special genius." Yet surely modern research has established the minute accuracy of St. Luke as a historian from the days of the discovery of the coin confirming the senatorial rule of the province of Cyprus (Acts xiii. 7, "proconsul") against the once general judgment of historians, down to the recent controversy in connection with the name Quirinius (Luke ii. 2). The other astounding assertion of this writer's ignorance of St. Paul's theology enables us to draw one only inference—to wit, that Mr. Strong's mutilated version of the Acts, like that of Dr. Martineau, did not contain the verses marked xiii. 38, 39 in *our* copies!

The following is Mr. Strong's attitude toward the Old Testament. It is a transcription from Renan, and is a proof, presumably, of his sense of historic impartiality.

"Jérémie peut compter entre les hommes qui ont eu le plus d'importance dans l'histoire. . . . C'est avant tout un homme pieux et d'une moralité sévère. C'est un fanatique (il faut le dire), haîneux contre ses adversaires, mettant tous ceux qui n'admettent pas d'emblée sa mission prophétique au nombre des scélérats, leur souhaitant la mort et la leur annonçant. *Voilà qu'il est loin de notre suprême vertu, la politesse!*"

2. We have now to ask ourselves, What is the clue that may serve to guide us out of this labyrinth of learning? In other

words, what is the ruling idea which controls this vast and various curiosity? This will prove at first sight difficult to discover, for nothing has come down to us but the débris of a universal erudition—literally, *Studies and Fragments.* Of these "fragments," by far the largest is that devoted to art; and here we think it is that we shall strike a trail. It was in the direction of art, we believe, that the bent of Mr. Strong's powers chiefly lay. It was the artistic in life, in letters, and perhaps in languages and science, that coloured his attitude towards most things. Of this we have several indications in the volume before us The essays devoted to this one subject alone make up fully one half of the whole book. They review the subject on every possible side. They reveal an intimate knowledge not only of the theory, but also of the technique of art. And few passages will better prove Strong's mastery of this subject than his brilliant defence of Reynolds' canon about the due proportions required in massing certain colours with a view to producing "warm" and "cold" effects, a canon which Gainsborough tried to upset by painting "The Blue Boy" (p. 78).

We must close with a review of Mr. Strong's gifts of literary criticism. The second half of this volume opens characteristically with a review of Froude's "Life and Letters of Erasmus." There is a subtle bond of connection between Froude, Erasmus, and Mr. Strong. They were all three supreme literary artists. Macaulay once wittily described himself as viewing art from the standpoint of a man of letters. With Froude, Erasmus, and Mr. Strong the reverse is equally true. They view letters from the standpoint of artists. Hence Strong was not less valiant in defence of Froude than Froude of Erasmus.

This invites the curious subject of Froude's accuracy. Mr. W. S. Lilly, in his "Renaissance Types"—a book which is the very model of what such brief classic biographies ought to be—is too good a Catholic to allow such a Protestant as Froude the merits of an historian. *Patrium erat illi potare aquam* misrendered "his father was a water-drinker"; *non ex more* translated "he uses no forms (of prayer)"; Bucklersbury confounded with Chelsea; and, in a summary of Reuchlin's life, no less than twelve errors of detail in as many lines of narrative! We think Froude can be defended at more points than Mr. Lilly may be in the mood to allow. Meanwhile, Mr. Strong has lighted on a truth which Mr. Lilly has missed; for he always indicated the honour of Froude with the retort: "Mais malgré tout il a vu juste!" (p. 12).

With Erasmus' character Mr. Strong was in still completer accord. As if vying with his great model, this essay seems

to have engaged some of our author's happiest wit. Yet we think his wit rejoices over his judgment when he describes that great man as the "brain of the movement" that freed the human mind from the bondage of a thousand years:

"As an embodiment of reason . . . Erasmus enjoyed more prestige than power. For when the moment for action comes, it generally happens that passion snatches the control. So in this case: Erasmus might and did propose to Pope and Emperor. But it was the fanatic, after all, that disposed."

This is well and truly said, but is it all the truth? Surely the man who, in the universal convulsion of Europe, was content to take no side, who had no rule of conduct either in religion or politics but that of serving the present hour, who boasted of having laid the egg which he refused to allow Luther to hatch, who was all his life suspected by both parties of being alternately Roman and Lutheran, Zwinglian and Arian, and who, in what he knew to be a life-and-death struggle of Europe for her liberties, declined under shelter of the sacred name of liberty to throw a single page of serious divinity or philosophy into the struggle—surely such a man can hardly claim to be regarded as the *brain* of the movement which he so conspicuously adorned in the hour of triumph, and in the hour of trial not less conspicuously deserted!

To return to our author. Mr. Strong has revived (but only in order to quell) Scaliger's famous sneer at Erasmus' Latin. The subject is one of more than passing interest. Moreover, such are the obligations of literature to Erasmus (as the learned Mr. Charles Butler, the author of "Horæ Biblicæ," well remarks) that men of letters should eagerly rise in his defence whenever they think he is unjustly accused. We will for once join hands against Scaliger in defence of Erasmus.

We cannot better conclude both this reference and this review than in the words of our author:

"Where Scaliger led the way, Dryasdusts and Gigadibs have not been slow to follow. Any Don can now pelt Erasmus with his *telum imbelle*—Dead-Sea apples. Erasmus's works, nevertheless, remain, but as the fixed points which determine the form and compass of a luminous orbit. They help to explain what he did, but they borrow the light from what he was. *The man included the scholar, and the artist expressed both.* And herein lies the secret of the ever-fresh vitality of Erasmus."

Herein, too, lies the secret of Mr. Strong's peculiar genius, and of the pleasure his Muse imparts to the reader.

A. H. T. CLARKE.

THE MANY MANSIONS IN THE FATHER'S HOUSE.

DEEPLY to be deplored is the current conception of the Father's house as

> "a lordly pleasure-house,
> Wherein at ease for aye to dwell,"

to win a place in which is at best an aspiration for *the future*, an aspiration only *after death* to be realized, and ever intertwined in those who cherish it with a morbid self-pity for the intermediate discomfort and labour and lack of enjoyment. This idea has been embodied in so many hymns whose literary grace or apt musical setting has won them popularity, that the underlying interpretation of our Lord's discourse in John xiv. has become instinctive now and stereotyped, dominating the minds of even the most thoughtful, learned, and suggestive commentators. The following well-known hymns may be taken for examples:

> "When I can read my title clear
> To mansions in the skies,
> I bid farewell to every fear,
> And wipe my weeping eyes.
>
> "Let cares like a wild deluge come,
> And storms of sorrow fall,
> May I but safely reach my home,
> My God, my heaven, my all.
>
> "There shall I bathe my weary soul
> In seas of heavenly rest,
> And not a wave of trouble roll
> Across my peaceful breast."

"Mansions" being placed in the skies, earth is excluded from the "Father's house"; "my home" is conceived as out of present reach; and the "heavenly rest" is an elysium of lotus-eaters.

> "One sweetly solemn thought
> Comes to me o'er and o'er,—
> I am nearer my home to-day
> Than I ever have been before:
>
> "Nearer the great white throne,
> Nearer the crystal sea,
> Nearer my Father's house,
> Where the many mansions be;
>
> "Nearer the bound of life,
> Where we lay our burdens down;
> Nearer leaving the cross,
> Nearer gaining the crown.
>
> "But lying darkly between,
> Winding down through the night,
> Is the deep and unknown stream
> To be crossed e'er we reach the light."

Here, again, "my home" is described as at a present distance from us; "My Father's house" as beyond the bound of life, with the stream of death "lying darkly between." Life meanwhile on earth is irksome, dark, and melancholy, filled with longing to escape "the cross," and exchange it for an easeful "crown." Can "cross" and "crown" be thus distinguished, separated, and contrasted?

"Thou art gone up on high
To mansions in the skies,
And round Thy throne unceasingly
The songs of praise arise.

"But we are lingering here,
With sin and care oppressed:
Lord, send Thy promised Comforter,
And lead us to Thy rest."

Again:

"As when the weary traveller gains
The height of some o'erlooking hill,
His heart revives if 'cross the plains
He eyes his home, though distant still;

"Thus when the Christian pilgrim views
By faith his mansion in the skies,
The sight his fainting strength renews,
And wings his speed to win the prize."

There is a strange tendency in this class of hymns to substitute the vague and impersonal "skies" for the tender image of "My Father's house"; to place the "many mansions" there, and tacitly assume them to be the destined abodes of the redeemed in the blissful hereafter.

Hymns are largely responsible for moulding and fixing theological conceptions in the popular mind, and it is through their influence that a certain definite meaning has been stamped upon our Saviour's words in John xiv. 2 *et seq.*, and the question is if that meaning is the true one.

A suspicion of its correctness must be instantly aroused on recollection of the words of St. Paul: "So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and *of the household of God*" (Eph. ii. 19); and this suspicion is confirmed when we mark the words which St. John has recorded, and the connection in which they are given.

The connection is with a warning to the disciples as to their present inability to follow the Saviour to the goal, now so close at hand, of His complete self-sacrificing love (xiii. 33); a charge to deepen their capacity of loving, and so to win their escape from those hesitating, shrinking, and calculating emotions of self which caused their present inability to follow Him fully to the end (vers. 34, 35); a promise, in answer to

Simon Peter's question, that the as yet lacking ability should at length be bestowed upon them (ver. 36); a crushing reply to the boastful self-confidence of Peter (vers. 37, 38), the severity of which was immediately alleviated by the cheering bidding that they look away from themselves up to God and His Christ. There was no need to sink into despair because "the flesh," through that weakness so soon to be realized by all of them, could thwart for the present the willingness of "the spirit": "Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in Me."

Then follow the words which are so generally and so deeply mistaken: "In My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you," the true purport of which is a gracious, reassuring explanation of their present incompleteness of character, and of the method by which it would be remedied.

The rendering of *οἰκία* as "house" gives far too definite and limited a meaning. *Οἰκία* is distinguished from *οἶκος* as an entire *household*, or establishment, from a simple *house*, or dwelling-place. It is a word not intended to suggest the idea of an edifice, but rather what is termed in law *an estate*. It must not, therefore, be taken as "the spiritual and eternal antitype of the transitory temple." Neither is the image derived "from those vast Oriental palaces in which there is an abode not only for the Sovereign and the heir to the throne, but also for all the sons of the King, however numerous they may be." Allusion is not made to either temple or palace. To introduce any thought of a building is to make difficulty when mention is presently made of "the way," which is surely most inadequately explained as a passage from chamber to chamber, or ascent from court to court, in the Temple at Jerusalem. It is true that we read elsewhere in this Gospel (ii. 16) of "My Father's house," where the reference is undoubtedly to the material temple; but there the word employed is *οἶκος*. And the rendering of *μοναί* as "mansions" has had a mischievous effect on exegesis. The idea conveyed is wholly false. *Μονή* occurs again in the New Testament only in ver. 23. But *μένειν* (one of the characteristic words of St. John, in whose writings it appears more frequently than in all other books of the New Testament together) occurs with marked and exceptional frequency in this and the following chapter.

The connection of these frequent verbal forms with the twice used substantival is very suggestive. It leads one to suppose that each act of "abiding" that is mentioned will throw light on the meaning of the "abodes" in the Father's house, and why those abodes should be "many." This con-

nection has been obscured for English readers by the variety of rendering—*mansions* and *abode* for the substantive in the Authorized Version, *abide* and *dwell* for the verb. The revisers have brought little relief; for, while retaining the faulty word *mansions* in the text of xiv. 2, they give in the margin "or *abiding-places*"; but in ver. 23 they repeat, without alternative, the *abode* of the Authorized Version. *Abode* and *abiding-place* are not even equivalent terms.

The Latin version is consistent throughout in the use of *mansio, manere.* The *mansions* of our versions is a direct importation from the Latin, and a singularly unhappy one, for the English word has accumulated a meaning widely different from that of its Latin original.

It has been generally noticed, but the full value of the clue does not seem to have been appreciated, that *mansiones* is the word used in the Vulgate to denote *the camping-grounds* of Israel in the wilderness: "Hæ sunt mansiones filiorum Israel, . . . quas descripsit Moyses juxta castrorum loca, quæ Domini jussione mutabant" (Num. xxxiii. 1, 2).

Alike in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the word employed signifies no more than a halting-place, a stage of a journey. Very different is the English word "mansion," with its acquired suggestion of solid endurance, permanence, and stately repose. No thought of the μοναι πολλαὶ as mere halting-places, breaks in a journey, stages of the soul's progress, points whence fresh departure must be made, is conveyed by the English "many mansions," and the very opposite of the true meaning is unhappily conveyed. A beautiful connection has also been lost between these *stations*, only temporarily occupied, and the mention immediately made of "the way," which reminds us of "the way" by which Israel went to possess the Land of Promise—that way which was marked out by resting-places (*mansiones*), whose positions were determined by the pillar of fire and cloud, which controlled the host as to all its marchings and encampments (Exod. xl. 36-38; Num. ix. 17-23; Deut. i. 33); that way in which no long tarrying was at any time permitted, for ever, after a sufficient breathing space, another stage was set before them, until the final goal was reached. They were not led by the shortest or the easiest way, and though they were at times "discouraged" (Num. xxi. 4), there was a disciplinary purpose in their wanderings, which could only be accomplished by such diversified experience as from that of Elim, with its wells and palm-trees, where they "encamped by the waters," to that of the wilderness of sin, and "Rephidim, where was no water for the people to drink"; and they were bidden to "remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee

these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldst keep His commandments or no." There was a certain character to be formed in them, and to shape that to completeness was the object of their Divine Guide in leading them from one point to another; not always forwards, but sometimes also backwards, so that, under varied or repeated conditions, what was strong in them might be strengthened, what was faulty be corrected, what was weak be detected and exposed. It would all have been in vain if they had suffered the lessons which they thus had been taught to escape them, lessons of their strength and their weakness, and of their privilege of dependence on One who had ever proved Himself adequate to supply their every need, and deliver them out of all their distresses.

And to this school of the wilderness there answers now the school of Christ. For "the wilderness" the "Father's house" is substituted; but in the Father's house, as in the wilderness, there are "many halting-places." There is point after point to be reached by the soul in its progress; and for the untroubled ease, the unbroken rest, suggested by the "mansions" of the English versions, we are given really the thought of continual movement, a constant passage from one set of conditions to another, for the enrichment of life by experience, the clothing of the soul with fresh graces, and an ever deepening knowledge both of self and of God.

It is with us in the Father's house as with children in a school. It is not enough to be members of a school—mere enrolment makes them that, makes them heirs of all the school's traditions, subjects of its discipline, and all to be equally schoolfellows. But in each such school are many forms—forms through which to *pass*, not in which to *stay*, and which answer exactly to the so-called "mansions" in the Father's house. As there is a way to be made through the school, so there is a way through the Father's house, a constant going to be made from strength to strength (Ps. lxxxiv. 7), from grace to grace (John i. 16), and from glory to glory (2 Cor. iii. 18; see Rom. v. 3, 4, and 2 Pet. i. 5-8).

And so the halting-places are many, not "because men are many, and that there may be room for them all," nor yet because of the vastness of heaven, of the richness and variety of the life we are to live in it, but because the grace of God is "manifold" (ποικίλη, 1 Pet. iv. 10), and answers to the "manifold trials" (ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, 1 Pet. i. 6) by which the life is trained and disciplined, for the very sake of encountering which it is led, as was Israel, from station to station, from joy to sorrow, from poverty to plenty, from

security to trouble and anxiety, making at each stage a discovery of deficiency, and thus compelled to "grow in grace," until at length it be "perfect and entire, lacking in nothing."

It is surely a mistake to regard the phrase "My Father's house" as descriptive of the final, everlasting abode of the redeemed, for which they are now in a state of probation. It seems rather to refer to the here and the now, and mainly, but perhaps not exclusively, to those now in the flesh upon earth. And with this agree the words which follow, though they be generally, if not universally, taken as of totally different meaning: "I go to prepare a place for you" (*πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν*). We read again of this "place" in Rev. xii. 6, with an express declaration of its reference to the present position of the Church: "The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath *a place prepared of God* (*τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*), that there they may nourish her a thousand two hundred and three score days." And for a strictly parallel passage in the story of the wanderings of the children of Israel, see Deut. i. 32: "The Lord your God went before you in the way, to seek you out a place (*ἐκλέγεσθαι ὑμῖν τόπον*) to pitch your tents in, in fire by night, to show you by what way ye should go, and in the cloud by day."

But it may be thought that the words which next follow determine the reference to the eternal hereafter. "If I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." It must, however, be observed that the coming promised is in the present, and denotes, therefore, not the final advent, but the continued, age-long, spiritual coming, which is promised again, and more fully described in vers. 15-21.

And "*where I am.*" Does this refer to the heavenly glory? It seems to be so taken in the popular hymn:

> "Let me be with Thee where Thou art,
> My Saviour, my eternal Rest;
> Then only will this longing heart
> Be fully and for ever blest."

But where was the Saviour *at the time of making this promise?* Was He not on earth, and beneath the very shadow of the cross? That, then, was the place where the disciples should be when the promised "power from on high" had invested them, and enabled them for the "fellowship of Christ's sufferings." That was where as yet they could not be (see Mark viii. 31-35, x. 32-39, xiv. 27-72. We may note also and specially the passage John xiii. 36-38, where the self-confidence of Peter and the predicted defeat of it seem to

give its immediate occasion to this present discourse. That was where, in His High-priestly prayer, Christ prayed that they might be (xvii. 24); that was where it was promised that they at length should be (xiii. 36); and where we find them to be in their subsequent history, able to endure all things for His Name's sake (Acts ii. 14 *et seq.*, iv. 16-21, v. 17-42, vi. 9-vii. 60, viii. 3, 4, xviii. 12-18, xx. 22-24; Rom. i. 14-15, vi. 6; Gal. ii. 20, v. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 9-13).

Nothing can be more clear than the witness that we cannot be with Him where He *now* is, unless we shall first have been with Him where He *then* was, when He held it out to His disciples as the prize of a higher attainment of grace that "where I am, there shall ye be also."

HERBERT G. MILLER.

THE JEWISH CLERGY IN ENGLAND.

DIFFERENT aspects of Jewish life in England are described from time to time in our periodicals, but there is one phase of the subject that has not yet received treatment anywhere. Its omission is all the more surprising considering the importance that attaches to it. The clergy is an institution inseparable from every civilized community, and the Jewish clergy of England has many points of interest, not only for the student of ecclesiastical affairs, but also for the social historian. The duties of the Christian minister are practically confined to religious activity. The fact that this is a Christian country is an advantage to the Christian cleric that he is perhaps unconscious of, for all its being so obvious; though, doubtless, in his pessimistic mood he will say that it is becoming an un-Christian country. He will, therefore, be able to appreciate to some degree the difficulty of the Jewish minister who works in an environment that does not tend to the preservation intact of Jewish religious life. But before we deal with the activity of the Jewish minister it will be best to describe the preparatory stages of his career, and the various species—so to speak—of which he consists.

The Jewish minister in England is a man either of English or foreign birth, who has received a special training at a theological seminary, and who, of course, employs English as his medium of speech; or a native of some foreign country, chiefly Russia, who ministers to his fellow-countrymen here with little knowledge of English, and therefore uses Yiddish, the language of the Pale, as his vehicle of communication.

These two species of the Anglo-Jewish clergy are differentiated by name, the English pastor being spoken of as a minister and the foreign one as a rabbi. This distinction requires a little explanation, since the Christian is wont to speak of all Jewish ministers as rabbis. The English Jew never, or hardly ever, speaks of his minister as a rabbi; and, on the other hand, the foreign Jew would certainly never dream of designating his rabbi a minister, for this term in his eyes implies an inferiority both in erudition and in orthodoxy. But, it will be asked, what of the Chief Rabbi, the head of the Jewish clergy in this country, who is an English-speaking minister? Here, it must be confessed, there is an anomaly. It is a frequent matter for satirical comment in Jewish circles that the Chief Rabbi is a chief without any rabbis, for all his subordinates are entitled "Reverend So-and-so," but never "Rabbi So-and-so." Further references will be made to this matter later on. For the present let it only be added that the Jewish minister is not a "priest." The priests in ancient Israel, as in modern Jewry, were the *Cohenim* (plural of *Cohen*), a branch of the tribe of Levi. Theirs is the privilege of being "called up" first to the reading of the Law, even before the minister, and of blessing the congregation on festivals; but unless they are ministers professionally they exercise no ecclesiastical function. It so happens that the present Chief Rabbi, Dr. Herman Adler, is a *Cohen*, so that he combines in himself the priesthood with the ministry. It will be understood that the priesthood is hereditary, and it includes in this country men like Mr. Arthur Cohen, K.C., and Mr. Benjamin L. Cohen, M.P.

The Jewish minister, properly so called, receives his training at Jews' College, which is located at Queen Square House, Guilford Street, within a few minutes' walk from the British Museum. In accordance with the provisions of the foundation deed, Jews' College must be situated within easy distance of University College, so that the students may be able to attend special courses of lectures at the latter institution without losing much time in going from one place to the other. Until some three or four years ago the seminary was located at Tavistock House, of Dickensian fame, but now merely a memory, for the building has been levelled to the ground. The seminary was founded in 1856, and will therefore be celebrating its Jubilee next year, an event that is to be commemorated by the publication of a special volume containing learned contributions from past and present students. The principal is Dr. Michael Friedländer, an eminent Orientalist and scholar of encyclopædic attainments, who has presided over the institution for the last forty years. Among

his many works may be mentioned his "Essays on the Writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra," a translation of Ibn Ezra's commentary on Isaiah, a compendium on "The Jewish Religion," and a translation from the original Arabic of Maimonides' "Guide of the Perplexed." The last-named work has recently been reprinted, in response to a growing demand, by Messrs. Routledge.

The curriculum of Jews' College is very comprehensive, for in addition to the instruction in specifically Jewish lore, the students are also prepared for the Arts degree of the London University. Admission to the College is obtained on passing the London Matriculation and an entrance Hebrew examination. Candidates are prepared for both of these tests in the preparatory class attached to the institution, in which a complete secular as well as religious education is given. The College, which consists, therefore, entirely of undergraduates and graduates, is divided into three divisions. In the junior division students are prepared for the Intermediate Arts Examination as well as for the examination entitling them to the certificate of Associate of Jews' College. This latter examination consists of ten different subjects, which thus show the variety and the multiplicity of the disciplines that the Jewish theological student must pass through. In religion he must show a systematic knowledge of Judaism as well as the special knowledge of a specified text-book, such as the manual by Babja ibn Pakuda (eleventh century) "Duties of the Heart." In history he must know the outlines of Jewish history and literature, and he must be able to translate and expound set books of the Old Testament as well as the commentaries of Rasbi (eleventh century) and of Moses Mendelssohn on the Pentateuch. In liturgy, translation of the Festival Prayer-Book is required, and in grammar questions are set on Hebrew and Aramaic accidence and syntax, in addition to a piece of Hebrew composition. In Rabbinical subjects there are two parts—the Talmud and the medieval religio-legal code-books. In the former the candidate must know one order of the Mishna, as well as one tractate of the Gemara with commentaries, and be able to expound easy unprepared passages of the Talmud. In the legalistic lore, books or portions of books are specified each year. So far the examination has to deal with the general intellectual equipment of the future minister. He must, however, also show his competence in the practical duties of the Jewish minister. One of these is the reading of the Law from the parchment scroll, which has neither vowels, nor singing accents, nor even the division of verses. The Law is thus read, or rather cantillated, according to the traditional

air in the synagogue on Sabbaths, fasts and feasts, and on Mondays and Thursdays; and the candidate for the Associateship of Jews' College must show himself competent to cantillate ten weekly portions, and the first section of all the fifty-four portions of the Pentateuch. He has, moreover, to prepare and deliver a sermon on some given text or theme.

In the senior division the students are prepared for the London B.A. examination, and for the examination entitling them to the certificate of Fellow of Jews' College. In religious philosophy they must possess a thorough knowledge of two of the following works: Maimonides' "Book of Instruction," "Eight Chapters" (a psychological excursus), "Guide of the Perplexed" (each part counted as one work); Jehuda Halevi's "Kuzri"; Ibn Gabirol's "Fount of Life"; Soadiah's "Beliefs and Opinions"; and Albo's "Principles" (each part counted as one work). In history a general knowledge of Jewish history and literature and a thorough knowledge of one epoch are demanded. In the Bible a general knowledge of contents, composition, authorship, age, etc., of each book is required, in addition to translation and a thorough knowledge of one book, with its ancient and modern versions. Of Commentaries, Rashi on the Pentateuch is required, as well as two of the following: Mendelssohn, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Rashbam, Abarbanel on one of the books of the Prophets or of the Hagiographa. Candidates must also have a thorough knowledge of two tractates with their principal commentaries, and of specified religio-legal code-books. They must be possessed of an advanced knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic grammar, and must prepare and deliver a sermon on some given text or theme.

In addition to the subjects already indicated, students are given special instruction in elocution, with a view to effective delivery in preaching, and they are also trained in the traditional intonation of the synagogue prayers by an acting precentor. Hitherto they prepared for the ordinary Arts degree of London University; but since the institution a few years ago at this University of an Oriental Language School, the students are prepared for the Honours B.A. examination in Hebrew and Aramaic (including Syriac). The first time this examination was held was last October, and it is noteworthy that the only candidates were four students of the Jewish seminary, all of whom passed. A further remarkable circumstance is the fact that this number exceeded that of the successes in any other single Honours school of the Arts Faculty last year.

During his student days the future minister has many opportunities for the practice of clerical duties. He is fre-

quently invited to occupy the pulpit of some absent minister and deliver a sermon to a sympathetic yet critical congregation. An event of this kind is previously announced in the Jewish press, and it attracts to the particular synagogue the friends and admirers of the visiting preacher. On festivals there is a special demand for the budding cleric, particularly on the New Year and the Day of Atonement, when every student is required to preach and to conduct part of the service at the numerous temporary places of worship that are formed for the due observance of those solemn days. The recent innovation of choral services for children on the Sunday of Chanukah (the festival week in December commemorating the exploits of the Maccabees), as well as the special services held to voice the claims of the Hospital Sunday Fund, likewise afford an occasion when the student has a foretaste of his future career.

As a rule, the student of Jews' College seeks an incumbency as soon as he graduates, if he does not actually accept a position even before he can proceed to his degree. To such an extent does this prevail that until lately no post-graduate course was provided, though graduates might receive special tuition in any branch of Hebrew study that they chose to pursue. The transition from the *status pupillaris* to the ministry simply depends upon election to some vacancy. Judaism knows nothing of taking Holy Orders. A student who has received a theological training, and has proved himself possessed of the necessary qualifications, is appointed minister of a synagogue either by its board of management or by a majority of the congregation (in case there are rival candidates), and then he assumes the prefix "Reverend." On more than one occasion the Jewish press has contained the announcement that the Chief Rabbi has "ordained" a minister-elect with the title "Reverend." The ceremony implied in this statement at once evoked protests from the intellectual section of the community, since it has no basis either in law or tradition. The Anglo-Jewish minister's designation as Reverend is simply a case of assimilation to the customs of the predominant religious denomination of this country. In France the Jewish minister is "Rabbin," in Germany he is "Rabbiner," in America he is "Rabbi," but in England he is simply "Reverend."

The anomaly here presented has been a bone of contention for many years in Anglo-Jewry. Matters were brought to a head by a movement led by Professor Israel Gollancz, Secretary of the British Academy, who urged the necessity of theological students as well as acting ministers qualifying for the ancient title of Rabbi by a special examination. On the

Continent the custom has prevailed from the earliest times of conferring this title upon anyone who has shown himself, after a searching test, intimately conversant with Rabbinic lore, and competent to decide in matters of Jewish legal and religious practice. To satisfy this test with any degree of competency demands a few years' arduous study as well as a personal acquaintance with the minutiæ of such practical aspects of Jewish law as those relating to the rite of circumcision, the slaughtering of animals and fowls for food, the fitness (or state of being *Kosher*) of any article of food, the granting of divorce, besides a multitude of other matters concerning which there is a universally accepted authoritative code-book (called the "Shulchan Aruch," "The Table Prepared," compiled in the sixteenth century), with its numerous divisions and chapters, and paragraphs of regulations and prescriptions, and commentaries in the form of supplementary decisions. As a matter of fact, a few Anglo-Jewish ministers attached to English-speaking congregations have acquired the "Rabbinical diploma" abroad, among them being the Rev. Professor Herman Gollancz, a brother of Professor Israel Gollancz. But the latter wished to make it possible for every student of Jews' College to qualify for the distinction immediately after graduating. As a result of his advocacy, a scheme was adopted some two years ago for the holding of a special examination within the College for students desirous of obtaining the Rabbinical diploma. A special class has been formed for intending candidates, though until the present no call has been made for the holding of the examination. It is noteworthy, however, that even those who possess the diploma in this country are still called merely "Reverend," and without a reference to their biography in the "Jewish Year-Book," one would not know that they are entitled to any other designation.

There is nothing in the foundation deeds of Jews' College, so far as can be ascertained, that compels the instruction to be of an orthodox character. But the fact that the Chief Rabbi is also president of the seminary emphasizes what would perhaps be the rule in any case—namely, that the training imparted is that of a thoroughly traditional and orthodox kind, inasmuch as the great bulk of the congregations that the student will serve are of a conservative tendency. Nevertheless, there have been several cases of Jews' College students proceeding to "Reform" pulpits, either from the very start, or after occupying an orthodox position. The horizon of the seminarists is not bounded by the United Kingdom, for many of them have gone out to the Colonies—to Buluwayo and Johannesburg, Sydney and Toronto—as well as to the United

States of America. Their appointment to a position is the result either of a "call," or of an election in case there are rival candidates, all of whom must deliver a probation sermon and conduct the service in the coveted synagogue.

In the provinces the Jewish minister is responsible only to the committee of his congregation, but in London, if he is attached to a synagogue that is affiliated to the central body of the United Synagogue, he is also subject to the regulations of the latter. One of these is that he must devote the whole of his time to the service of the United Synagogue, and as a result, whatever leisure he might have after discharging his duties to his congregation must be employed in social work among the poor or in the visitation of hospitals, asylums, and penitentiaries that happen to have Jewish inmates. The ministers of the Metropolis meet periodically in a committee, of which the Chief Rabbi is president, for deliberation on different aspects of communal work. They arrange special Sabbath afternoon services at the Duke's Place Synagogue during the winter and spring months, at which addresses are delivered to working people; and they also supply with sermons the numerous children's services that are held in schoolrooms on the New Year and the Day of Atonement. In addition, the ministers have lately founded an East End centre in Thrawl Street, Spitalfields, where they attend in rotation, morning and evening, to give advice where it is sought and help where it is needed. As a regular adjunct to his synagogue, the minister has to supervise the religion classes held within its precincts and attended by children of his congregants. He also takes an active interest in the literary society, which has of late also arisen within the shadow of the synagogue, and which holds weekly or fortnightly meetings for lectures and debates of Jewish interest, diversified by periodical social gatherings. Interchange of pulpits is a frequent occurrence, both as regards the Metropolis alone and as regards the relations between London and the provinces. The minister who occupies most pulpits is the Chief Rabbi, who goes on a pastoral tour almost every year, visiting the principal congregations in the country and assisting at the founding of new institutions or pleading for the support of existing ones. He is not attached to any one particular synagogue, but as a rule worships at Duke's Place when in the City, and at the Bayswater Synagogue when in the West End. He must attend at his office in Finsbury Square daily (excepting, of course, Sabbaths and holy days), where he has to discharge a mass of work that can be described comprehensively only as the ecclesiastical administration of Anglo-Jewry.

ISRAEL COHEN.

THE MONTH.

THERE has been a lull in the controversy on the vestments during the last month, with two notable exceptions —the letters of the Archbishop of the West Indies and the Dean of St. David's, each of whom pleads for a permissive use of a distinctive vestment at Holy Communion, on the clear understanding that such use is accompanied by a declaration that no doctrinal meaning is involved and that no change of doctrine in the Church of England is intended thereby. We desire to speak with all possible respect of the opinions of so honoured a prelate as the Archbishop of the West Indies, and we echo most heartily his earnest longing for peace in our Church. But is it at all probable that his Grace's propositions would meet the need expressed by the demand for the permissive use of the vestments? The real question at issue is what is meant, not by those who do *not* wear them, but by those who do; not by those to whom all vestments are without doctrinal symbolism, but by those to whom they are full of significant meaning. And it surely must be evident that those who wear the vestments have said again and again that the sole reason of their use lies in their doctrinal significance. We can see this plainly in the way in which the *Church Times* has received the Archbishop's proposals for peace. We see it in the recent action of a London vicar in adopting the vestments because of the symbolic meaning. We see it also in the teaching of Mr. Vernon Staley that the chasuble is "a sacrificial vestment." This is the point which we would fain have faced by the advocates of a permissive use of the vestments. The Bishop of Winchester is no doubt historically correct when he states that there is no intrinsic connection between the vestments, considered in their origin and early history, and Roman doctrine. But the association of vestments and doctrine to-day is undoubted, and this fact surely rules the situation.

We notice that the *Guardian*, referring to our comments last month on the vestments, speaks of our attitude as "unreasonable," and says that it is an exaggeration to say that the permissive use would involve Roman doctrine. In reply we would again urge that it is not from those who presumably do not wear the vestments that we are to learn their meaning, but from those to whom the use is essential. If it were a matter merely of distinctiveness for the service of Holy Communion and a desire to give that service some special mark of importance, we can quite conceive of many Evangelical

and Moderate Churchmen being prepared to grant liberty for different uses for the sake of peace. And this, even though the principle of different uses would set aside a well-known historic declaration of the Prayer-Book, and even though a distinctive dress at Holy Communion would run counter to the spirit and letter of our formularies for the last three hundred and fifty years. But again we would point out that the chasuble has never been worn, never is worn, except at Holy Communion; that it is associated solely with a type of Eucharistic doctrine which is at least absent from the Prayer-Book; and that its use is justified by its advocates on the ground of distinctive doctrine. Why, then, should we be thought "unreasonable" in opposing a policy which would introduce into the Church of England an entirely novel situation, fraught with real dangers, and which would associate, however indirectly, with the Church of England that which has hitherto been regarded as outside her beliefs? For our part, we simply desire to identify ourselves entirely with the position laid down in the Dean of Canterbury's letter to the *Guardian* on November 15, in which he says:

"If the critical moment should arrive we should have to consider what Eucharistic vestments are, and not what the Bishops of Bristol and Chester, or other friends of compromise, would wish them to be."

In a recent review in the *Times* on Harnack's "Expansion of Christianity" the following acute and pertinent criticism of the great German Professor occurs, and it is deserving of careful consideration because of its application to several phases of modern criticism of Christianity:

"Professor Harnack is really confronted with a great difficulty. He has been trying all his life to reduce Christianity to its simplest elements, and has ascribed to external influences almost everything which we are accustomed to associate with the name. All Christian dogma and doctrine is, he holds, not only the result of development, but something inconsistent with its essence. Christianity, as we generally understand it, is really only a kind of syncretism. But he has seen, and seen clearly, that all these different elements have helped in its growth and spread. How, then, does it come to pass that Christianity grew just by the elements in it which were not divine? Surely his theory implies a very inadequate philosophy. The real fault lies, we believe, in the inadequate view of what syncretism means. At the time when Christianity first spread there was, as Professor Harnack has well brought out, a complete upset in religious thought. Old ideas were broken up; new ideas came in from all sides. An intelligent man of the time would naturally say that all these religions cannot be true, and if one is false, why may not another be false. He would then try and create a satisfactory religion by putting together elements he had selected from every source. In this way rose all the many forms of syncretistic religion which we know existed during the first and second centuries of our era. Christianity in its development was exactly the reverse of these. As a living organism

it had certain great principles derived from its Founder; and as it came in contact with every variety of human thought and speculation, new possibilities and capacities were developed which had not been realized before. The difference between the two forms of growth is fundamental, and it is because Professor Harnack has failed to see this, and because he would take away from Christianity everything which makes any strain on human faith, or might satisfy the human intelligence, that his investigations fail in the philosophy of Christianity."

Everything that exists and grows as Christianity has done must have an adequate cause. The one and fatal weakness of Harnack's position is that his explanation of Christianity is entirely inadequate.

It seems worthy of the careful attention of Churchmen that within a comparatively small area of London, reaching from Westminster to the City and Tottenham Court Road, there are six Nonconformist preachers who attract Sunday by Sunday an aggregate of at least 12,000 people. We refer to the City Temple; the Baptist Central Mission in Bloomsbury; the Congregational Mission at Whitefield's Tabernacle; the West London Methodist Mission at Exeter Hall; the Congregationalist Westminster Chapel; and the Wesleyan Church in Great Queen Street. Is it not a fair inference that if a man has a message, and can deliver it, he will never lack hearers, be the building large or small? And does not all this constitute a call to make our Church of England preaching as strong, spiritual, evangelistic, and sympathetic as possible?

In connection with preaching, the Bishop of Birmingham, at his Diocesan Conference the other day, gave expression to some important words in the course of a discussion on recent attacks on the faith:

"They did not want less intellectuality, but more. They must not from the pulpit do the damage they did do when they suffered themselves to get up and let sensitive, intelligent souls, men of average intellectual sensitiveness, feel that they were trifling with them, that they were really insulting their intelligence by saying things in a way that indicated that they had not given study, prayer, and preparation to such a message."

Dr. Gore here points out a blot on very much of our preaching. It does not bear the marks of "study, prayer, and preparation." The clergy, both senior and junior, are most of them so overwhelmed with the multiplicity of parochial organizations that they are unable to leave the "serving of tables" to give themselves fully to the ministry of the Word and prayer. The result is a state of affairs which will more and more tend to alienate thoughtful men and women from our churches. It is not too much to say that if the ordinary organizations of many a large parish were halved, and all

possible spiritual power put into the remaining half, the spiritual results would be more than doubled. It is in the attempt to cope with huge populations and their varied needs that the clergy find themselves unable to give that time to study and prayer which is absolutely essential to all true preaching and feeding of the flock.

The Bishop of London's Primary Visitation was an occasion of unusual interest on several grounds, both personal and diocesan; and Dr. Ingram had much to say that was worthy of the occasion, betokening once again his intense personal interest, sympathy, and enthusiasm in regard to all that concerns the highest welfare of the great diocese over which he presides. With reference to Church parties and controversies, the Bishop bestowed his praise and blame pretty impartially on both sides. His optimism as to the state of his diocese was once more in evidence, though we could wish he had better grounds for his somewhat roseate picture of the state of ecclesiastical affairs. On the questions of the sanctity of marriage and the diminishing birth-rate, the Bishop's words were true, forceful, and pertinent to the occasion; and, in particular, we would commend the following words to clergy and laity all over the country:

"Let teaching be given in suitable ways and at suitable times on the responsibility which married life entails, on the glory of motherhood, on the growing selfishness which thinks first of creature comforts or social pleasures, and then of the primary duties and joys of life. It is all part of this miserable gospel of comfort which is the curse of the present day, and we must learn ourselves and teach ourselves to live the simpler, harder life our forefathers lived when they made Britain what it is to-day, and handed down the glorious heritage, which must surely slip, unless we amend our ways, from our nerveless fingers to-day."

An important memorial has recently been laid before the Committee of the Colonial and Continental Church Society by the four Evangelical clergymen who went out last year to South Africa in connection with the Mission of Help. They urge the imperative necessity of calling the attention of the Evangelical Church public to the great openings in South Africa for Evangelical clergymen, and also the danger of the Church out there becoming more and more a Church of one party if Evangelical Churchmanship is not at once strengthened and extended. They therefore suggest that there should be special funds set apart for particular needs, and every effort made to interest Evangelical Churchmen in the great opportunities now awaiting them in South Africa. This memorial indicates the true line of policy. In the past, as most people know, there have been difficulties in the way of Evangelical

clergymen settling in South Africa, but those difficulties no longer exist, for there are openings and a hearty welcome in many places to-day. Unless we pour into South Africa the pure Gospel of Christ as we have received it, we shall find our colonists becoming more and more estranged from the Church of England, and even from Christianity itself. We hope this memorial will receive the immediate and earnest attention it deserves.

Several significant pronouncements have been made during the last month on the question of Suffragan Bishoprics. The Bishop of Lichfield, in accepting the resignation of the Bishop of Shrewsbury, announced that he did not intend to appoint another Suffragan, and the Bishop of Worcester has been speaking very pointedly against the attempt to solve the problem of the proper provision of Bishops in England by the appointment of new Suffragans. These utterances are all in the right direction—namely, that of increasing the number of Diocesan Bishops, and reducing to a minimum, if not altogether discontinuing, the suffraganate. The Bishop of Manchester's statesmanlike proposals for the subdivision of his great and unwieldy diocese into three is another indication of how Church feeling is moving; while the proposals of the Bishop of St. Albans for the subdivision of his diocese with that of Ely are yet another testimony to the true policy for our Church. Episcopacy can only justify itself in the last resort by its practical power as the leading factor in Church life, and we are at present a long way from the realization of the true advantages and benefits of Episcopal government in the Church.

The Birmingham Diocesan Conference showed itself fully alive to the grave and pressing question of indiscriminate baptism. The original proposal was that it was "contrary to Christian principles to baptize infants unless there is a reasonable prospect that they will be brought up to understand the meaning of their Christian vocation"; and although the resolution did not pass in this very definite form, the Conference decided that it is "of much importance that in all cases the clergyman should take all possible care to see that provision is made for the Christian training of the child." On more than one occasion during the last few years the Bishop of Birmingham has deprecated indiscriminate baptism of infants, and thereby showed that he is fully alive to one of the most serious difficulties in parochial life, as well as one of the gravest problems affecting the Christianity of our land. Infant baptism in the view of our Church is always and

inextricably associated with direct Christian influence and instruction, while it is well understood that our Church is opposed to the *opus operatum* theory of sacramental efficacy. We hope this resolution of the Conference will have very great weight in the country.

Notices of Books.

The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

A book by Dr. Sanday always raises great expectations, and these hitherto have never been disappointed. Nor are they likely to be with this work, for it is one of the very first order and importance. Those who possess or have read his earlier work on the Fourth Gospel will be particularly glad to have his latest views on the same profoundly important theme. This book represents eight lectures delivered in New York and Oxford in the autumn of last year. The first lecture surveys recent literature and reviews the situation in regard to the Fourth Gospel as it was just two years ago. The five different schools of critical thought are vividly and even fascinatingly brought before the reader, and the discussion will be of special service to those who through ignorance of German are not able to keep in touch with the various and varying theories of German criticism, and to understand their precise relations to one another. The second lecture treats of critical methods, and it is not too much to say that it is an education itself in the methods and errors of modern criticism. Its characterizations of German methods, its keen analysis, its unsparing yet always courteous criticism, are perfectly admirable. Dr. Sanday insists upon a firm footing on the ground of history as the only true way of solving the problem of the Fourth Gospel. Succeeding lectures discuss respectively "The Standpoint of the Author"; "The Pragmatism of the Gospel"; "The Character of the Narrative"; "The Doctrine of the Logos"; "The Christology of the Gospel"; and its "Early History." It is impossible for us to notice a number of points that arise out of these lectures. Suffice it to say that no one can afford to overlook this newest aid to the study of the great problems connected with St. John's Gospel. The book is full of delightful self-revelations and *obiter dicta*, while the author's conspicuous fairness, and possible over-anxiety to allow the very best to his opponents, are manifest on almost every page. The last lecture contains a suggestive and valuable "Epilogue on the Principles of Criticism," which should be studied by all who wish to know the lines and limits of true criticism, whether of the New or Old Testaments, for Dr. Sanday's words seem to be as applicable to modern Old Testament criticism as to the special subject of the Fourth Gospel.

Complete Index to the Expositor's Bible. By S. G. AYRES, B.D. With Preface by W. ROBERTSON NICOLL. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 7s. 6d.

Those who possess a complete set of the "Expositor's Bible" will be very grateful for this Index, which is indeed "complete" and exhaustive. Its value, moreover, is greatly enhanced by the inclusion of a General Preface by the editor, Dr. Robertson Nicoll, and two articles of Introduction to the Old and New Testaments by Professors Bennett and Adeney respectively. Dr. Nicoll's contribution consists mainly of a powerful plea for the Divine authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture; and we are especially thankful for his strong emphasis upon the well-known fact that, when Biblical criticism has done its utmost, and has given us the last results of critical analysis, there is still a problem. "Divide the Bible as you have it into innumerable shreds, painted differently. What then? You have not explained the living combination" (p. 11). Drs. Bennett and Adeney give clear and full information and guidance as to present-day thought on the Old and New Testaments; and though we are not able to accept their general position or endorse all their opinions, they have much to say that is of value to all students. This volume is indispensable to all possessors of the "Expositor's Bible."

The Church's One Foundation. By W. ROBERTSON NICOLL. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6d.

We are glad to see this popular and cheap edition of a well-known work by the editor of the *British Weekly*. It deals in a characteristically able and fresh way with the great problems of present-day criticism as they affect the person of our Lord and the authority of the New Testament. We read these pages with interest and profit as they appeared originally in the *British Weekly*, and they have since done good service in book form. Now that they are available in this popular edition, they will have a largely extended sphere of usefulness, and do still greater service to the cause of truth. It goes without saying that Dr. Nicoll's work is thoroughly well-informed and, in the truest sense of that apparently inevitable term, "up-to-date." The delightful combination of scholarship and spiritual experience is just what is needed in a work of this kind.

Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke in the Acts. By HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D. New Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 5s.

A new edition of a work published a few years ago. It divides the Acts of the Apostles into sixty portions, intended for private study and instruction in church. The particular interest of this volume lies in the fact that it is an attempt on the part of a pronounced High Churchman to see in the record of the primitive Church all the characteristic features of what is generally called Catholicism. Dean Luckock says that one element of the value of the Book of the Acts is that "we find in its pages frequent reference to such essential features of Ecclesiastical Polity as . . . Apostolic Succession . . . the Daily Celebration of the Holy Eucharist

. . . Synodical Action" (Preface, p. ix); and he goes on to state that "it is the fact that we are able to trace all these back to the first age, which gives such tremendous importance to the book" (Preface, p. x). The Dean's success in discovering what he desires in the Book of the Acts will be variously judged according to the presuppositions of the reader. In our view he entirely fails to substantiate his general position. It is impossible not to feel doubtful about arguments which proceed almost entirely from assumption. Thus we read that, during the great forty days after the Resurrection, our Lord "doubtless explained how, in the exigency of fresh and increasing requirements, a subdivision of the ministerial office would become necessary" (p. 17). And Dr. Luckock insists upon the principle that our Lord delegated to the Apostles a concentration of all ministerial functions for the time being, for, as he frankly admits, otherwise there is no answer to those who reject Apostolical Succession, and urge that the episcopate was raised by elevation from the presbyters (p. 17). An ecclesiastical system which is thus built on silence and on assumptions, of which there is absolutely no proof, surely stands self-condemned. Wherever Dr. Luckock is concerned with non-controversial and purely spiritual and practical topics, he has much to say that is helpful and suggestive. Apart from his peculiar and extreme Anglican standpoint no one can read this book without spiritual profit.

In the Secret of His Presence. By the Rev. G. H. KNIGHT. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 3s. 6d.

A very valuable help to the inner life, easily read, earnestly written, and obviously needed. Conditions here laid down are the essence of personal and social revival. One of the freshest and most suggestive of modern devotional books.

The Inner Chamber. By Rev. Andrew Murray, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 1s. 6d.

The counsels of a master in Israel. There is length, breadth, depth, and height in these pages. Soul growth will follow their study and assimilation.

The Eternal Life. By HUGO MÜNSTERBERG. London: Archibald Constable and Co. Price 2s. 6d.

This monograph springs from the graveside of a valued friend. It is full of deep thoughts, often beautifully put. Strong emphasis is laid on our freedom of will, "our timeless will-life," and the "eternal now." For much we are grateful, but we are not solaced.

Greatheart: Some Talks with Him. By a Pilgrim. Macmillan and Co. Price 3s. net.

Greatheart is a thoughtful companion. We need alertness to keep step. He is a heartening companion. He teaches us to extract honey from the sting as well as from the comb. A continuous flood of light from God's word will make his counsels assume their true value.

The Claims of the Common Life. By MANDELL CREIGHTON. Longmans, Green and Co. Price 3s. 6d.

These sermons, preached in the College Chapel when the writer was Fellow and Tutor of Merton, 1871-1874, will have their special value for all beginning life at either of our great Universities. An intimate knowledge of Oxford life is wedded to great plainness of speech; at the same time the utterances are marked by considerable tact. Bishop KNOX, of Manchester, remembers with gratitude some of the sermons. We could not wish them less ethical, but we think their application would have been more pointed had they been more Evangelical.

Counsel for the Young. By MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. Edited by LOUISE CREIGHTON. Price 2s. 6d.

These extracts from letters to young people are most illuminating. They show the character of the man, his love, sympathy, and large-heartedness. He thinks there is more to learn of people by thinking about them and writing to them than even by seeing them. The letters are egotistical in the best sense, and spontaneously full of wise counsel. We come across many a sparkling and epigrammatic turn of sentence. The selection does credit to the editor.

The Representative Men of the New Testament. By GEORGE MATHESON, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

Another of Dr. Matheson's delightful volumes of character-sketches. The supreme virtue of this author is that he makes his readers think. His novel interpretations arrest attention and often provoke opposition. And yet further thought tends to bring the reader back to Dr. Matheson's standpoint, and to a conviction that after all the author may be right. The present volume is not a whit behind its predecessors in interest, fertility, suggestion, and even audacity, and no one can read it without receiving intellectual quickening and spiritual inspiration, which can do nothing but good. We rejoice that this venerable author, in his time of retirement, is putting forth such truly helpful works, and we pray that his bow may long abide in strength.

The Church and the Times. By Rev. ROBERT FRANCIS COYLE, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

A volume of sermons by an American Presbyterian minister who has not hitherto been known in this country. They are the work of a strong, vigorous thinker, thoroughly Evangelical in teaching, intensely in earnest, and marked by genuine spirituality. The themes are by no means hackneyed, and are well worked out, aptly illustrated, and applied with great point and force. Altogether these are masculine sermons and well worthy of careful attention, especially by preachers.

A Yankee in Pigmyland. By W. E. GEIL. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

Mr. Geil is now well known in Great Britain as an effective mission-preacher and missionary advocate as well as the writer of several interest-

ing books. The present work describes a journey taken by him across Africa, from Mombasa to the Congo region, and it is certainly full of intense interest. The author describes various missions, such as those in Uganda and on the Congo, and also tells us his experiences of the Pigmies of the Forest. Here and there we could have wished the personal references modified or entirely omitted, but the book, as a whole, is full of freshness and power, and characterized by unique unconventionality on almost every page. Friends of foreign missions should have an eye on this useful repertory of up-to-date information. The photographs add considerably to the interest of the book.

The Scientific Temper in Religion. By Rev. P. N. WAGGETT, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 4s. 6d. net.

A series of addresses delivered in a London church two years ago; and truly admirable addresses they are, as well in tone and temper as in substance and strength. The first, which gives the title to the book, strikes the keynote of the whole, and is marked by a strong grasp of essential principles and a winsome reasonableness of presentation. Even though we may not follow the author at every point, the book is a model of what apologetics of this kind should be. Its thorough equipment on the scientific side is not the least important and valuable of its merits. Altogether it is a book to be studied carefully, especially by the clergy.

The Blossom of Thorns. By J. R. MILLER, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 3s. 6d.

We have learned to expect a book every autumn from Dr. Miller almost as certainly as the autumn itself, and each year he provides Christian people with some simple, fresh, and earnest teaching on the spiritual life. While he does not sound the great deeps of the soul, he deals with the average life in a very suggestive and inspiring way. His is a truly gracious spirit, which cannot but communicate itself to his readers. Dr. Miller's stores of new verses for apt quotation seem absolutely inexhaustible.

The Small Coin of Love. By J. R. MILLER, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 1s.

Dr. Miller's Christmas booklet deals in a characteristically helpful way with kindness as "the small coin of love." The illustrations are by Harold Copping, and the booklet makes an appropriate souvenir of the time when God's loving-kindness to men appeared.

The Children's Morning Message. By AMY LE FEUVRE. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 5s.

The author of "Probable Sons" appears here in a somewhat new guise, for this is a book of daily readings for children and young people. The charming outward appearance of the book is a fitting accompaniment of the messages within. Fathers and mothers, and mothers in particular, will hail with delight this real help to their teaching and influence. The portions are quite short, very spiritual, truly simple, and fragrant with the ove of the Master. Our little people are to be envied the reading of such

a book, and even the grown-ups might do worse than use it. Those who want to know how to talk to children about religion would do well to consult this book.

Private Prayers for Schoolboys. By Rev. REGINALD FORD. London: Mowbray and Co.

These prayers are well suited to their purpose. They are short, Scriptural, and appropriate to the capacity and spiritual experience of boys. They may be warmly commended to the attention of parents and schoolmasters.

The Royal Bijou Diary for 1906. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. Price 3s. 6d.

A dainty little diary with spaces for engagements day by day, and quotations from masterpieces of literature. There are two or three different editions; the one before us has an embossed silver front side and is bound in leather. It would make a very novel and acceptable gift for Christmas.

Portfolio of English Cathedrals. Vols. XI. and XII. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Price 1s. net.

We welcome these two new numbers, and can only say again that the photographic reproductions are excellently done. They possess a clearness and sharpness which are very acceptable. The letterpress is brief, but sufficient, and altogether the portfolios will be a welcome addition to many a drawing-room table.

Religious Genius. By L. S. Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

Genius in the realm of religion is an interesting suggestion. Tracing the word to its root, we get the idea of life. God's life in man's soul is religious genius. This genius should be normal, but few come into possession of their birthright. An interesting distinction is drawn between religion which is based on faith and what for want of a better name may be termed effort. The former are the people of religious genius, the latter of religious talent. It is good to belong to the latter, it is better to belong to the former. The religiously inspired are then put under examination and told their faults. The writer has something to teach them. He has also himself something to learn of the "*work* of faith," the energizing power of prayer, and the Spirit-filled life.

RECEIVED.

Blackwood's Magazine, 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, Church of England League Gazette, Open Doors, Grievances from Ireland (No. 10), *The Journal of Theological Studies.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.—Gifts for Portsmouth and Gosport Seamen's Mission from "Gal. vi. 2" are acknowledged with many thanks.