

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

March, 1911.

The Month.

**Prayer-Book
Revision.** It will be observed by our readers that this month's number of the CHURCHMAN is largely devoted to the urgent question of Prayer-Book Revision. Canon Beeching's forcible appeal, and the comments on it in the section of the Magazine that is reserved for "Discussions," can hardly fail to rouse the keenest interest. These contributions, however, will tell their own tale. We wish, in this place, to call attention to the existence of the General Committee for Promoting Prayer-Book Revision. It is a very large one, and is thoroughly representative. The names of those who form the Elective Committee, as well as the list of those who have become members, afford abundant proof of this. An "Explanatory Note" sent out by the Committee makes it clear that they are most anxious to maintain this representative character, and have "no thought of seeking to advance any merely sectional or party interests." The Committee has been formed under the conviction that the issue of the "Letters of Business" has given to the Church an opportunity which it would be wrong, as well as difficult, to shirk.

**Work of the
Committee.** A most useful feature of their work is the publication of a series of brief leaflets, in which the various objections that are advanced against *any* scheme of revision are handled—in our opinion—in a very convincing manner. As specimens of the objections, we note

the following :—That the matter may be left entirely in the hands of the Bishops ; that we must avoid going to Parliament ; that we must not risk a schism in the Church ; that a Supplement would give us all that is necessary ; that the Prayer-Book is better as it is, without any alteration at all. In addition to the discussion of these detailed points, it is shown in the most cogent way that what we want is a Prayer-Book for the needs of to-day. The Prayer-Book has undergone revision at various earlier stages of its history, and there is, therefore, no *a priori* objection to a further process of revision, provided that sufficient reason can be shown. Those who wish to inform themselves as to the nature and work of the Committee, and to receive for their own reading the various leaflets issued, can do so by application to the Secretary at 65, Banbury Road, Oxford.

The pronouncement recently made by Dr. Knox as to the usage of the Eucharistic vestments in the Diocese of Manchester is a matter of common knowledge. There has followed a letter from the Archdeacon of Rochdale, informing the Bishop that

“ The feeling exists among those who hold ‘ moderate ’ views upon matters of ritual (and they comprise by far the larger section of Churchmen in your Lordship’s diocese) that the pronouncement is unduly severe on another section of Churchmen, especially as the Ornaments Rubric is under discussion of Convocation by the direction of the Letters of Business.”

The Bishop, in his reply, devotes himself mainly to the matter of the churches into which vestments may be introduced after the publication of his letter. He points out that to introduce vestments into churches which are now being built and consecrated is, in effect, to prejudice the issue which the Convocations at present have before them. It is to avoid any such prejudice that he is taking these steps. He puts his finger on the root of the trouble when he points out that the vestments are introduced without consulting either himself, as Bishop, or the patron of the benefice, or the parishioners. The spirit of anarchy and wilful self-assertion that inspires incumbents to such

high-handed flouting of all authority is one of the most ominous and deplorable symptoms in the present condition of the Church.

The suggestion made at the Islington Meeting by Canon Hay Aitken, that an interchange of pulpits between Anglican and Nonconformist ministers is desirable, and would tend to promote unity, has been discussed, from many sides and at great length, in the *Westminster Gazette*. A survey of all the correspondence leads to the conclusion that Nonconformist ministers in general would welcome the proposal; while Anglicans, with certain eminent exceptions, are totally averse to it. Under these circumstances we are—for our own part reluctantly—driven to admit that the time is not yet ripe for any such project. Two points in particular are worthy of consideration. The first is, the peril of premature and ill-considered action. For ourselves, we hope for, and are prepared to work for, not only unity, but reunion. We believe that the missionary effectiveness of Christendom to-day is more hindered by its damaging disunity than by any other obstacle. With this conviction, and these hopes, we hesitate to advocate a project which, while commending itself to the few, would evoke from the many such a storm of acrimonious hostility that any hopes of Christian reunion would be blasted and ruined, perhaps for many generations.

The other point is this. What is needed at the present time is not the introduction of a new practice, but the cultivation of a better spirit and the more adequate use of existing opportunities for combined Christian work. A paragraph in Sir George White's letter expresses this clearly :

“It is a question of spirit—there are clergymen who treat their Free Church brethren as equals, and recognize in them brother-workers with whom they can cheerfully co-operate; there are a large number who patronize ‘these Dissenters’ in connection with certain work, but in a spirit of aloofness, whilst there are, I fear, a large number still who regard them as schismatics and the people to which they minister as not a Church.”

It may be that Churchmen have not always a monopoly of unbrotherly spirit. But until we understand better the nature of the Catholic Church and our heritage in it ; until we cease to speak of "Dissent" in our parishes as though it were a species of malaria, and to regard its exponents as social aliens ; until we have learned to take our stand, not with reluctance and inward misgivings, but with whole-hearted conviction, on some such common platform as that afforded by the Bible Society ; in a word, until we use, in the spirit of Christ, our existing opportunities for intercourse and co-operation to the full, it will be useless even to dream of an interchange of pulpits.

The whole correspondence on this difficult subject has been conducted with ability and with great frankness. One contribution, however—that of Archdeacon Wilberforce—seems to us to stand out conspicuously, both for courage and for clear realization of the essence of the matter in question. As it may not have come under the notice of our readers who do not happen to see the *Westminster Gazette*, we feel that we are doing a service in transcribing the whole of it for their benefit. The passage comes in a sermon preached at St. John's, Westminster. Speaking of interchange of pulpits, the Archdeacon says :

"I have longed for it ; I shall not live to see it, but some of you younger ones will. I believe that the highest interests of the nation are involved. I have personally had to suffer for my convictions. The severest ecclesiastical censure has in times past fallen upon me for preaching in Nonconformist chapels. I believe that under certain obvious restrictions the interchange of pulpits between ministers of different denominations would break down sectarianism, awaken the slumbering Christ-Spirit, and bring about the realization of the ideal Church. A very estimable but ecclesiastically hide-bound member of the Anglican Church asks a direct question that must be answered : 'Are the ministers of other denominations in this country schismatics ? Would it not be an utter contradiction to pray, as we do, to be delivered from all schism, and then to come to St. John's Church and find a leading schismatic in the pulpit ?' But what is schism ? Schism is breaking away from the unity of the body of Christ. If schism means the conscientious separation from any visible Church, I ask, From which Church ? Which of the visible Churches does not consider all the others not in communion with itself guilty of the sin of schism ? The Holy Catholic Church

is in its essence a spiritual and indivisible body, wholly independent of its external manifestation and government, with regard to which there may be, and ought to be, an almost unlimited divergence of opinion and practice without any rupture of true spiritual unity. The real Church, the body of Christ, may be said in its essence to resemble the internal fire of the earth, one undivided glowing mass, finding its way to manifestation by means of many volcanoes. Many people believe that our Lord Jesus Christ will visibly return to this earth and call to Himself His Church; do you really imagine that it would only be members of the Church of England that He would call? Would He call St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey, and turn the City Temple and Westminster Chapel out to gnashing of teeth? Don't you think He would call a number that no man can number of all nations, saints who have realized their true relationship to God? Are not you guilty of schism if you consider those who do not walk with you to be outside the fold of the Church? Hundreds who are illustrious for learning, piety, and devotedness have been, and are, in Dissenting communions; do you deny that they are in Christ? If you do, how do you account for the manifold fruits of the Spirit which they exhibit? If you do not deny it, then to be in Christ is surely to be in the Holy Catholic Church. He only is a schismatic who ceases to be united by faith to Christ, and the idea that the sin of schism against which you pray in the Litany means separation from the visible communion of the Church of England, when weighed in the balances—well, it is ridiculous; it may without loss be consigned to the limbo of the exploded fallacies of the past. When we pray in the Church of England Litany against schism we ought to have in our minds, not Dissenters, but the separations of our own Church, the religious partisanship so common among ourselves, our being divided into factions under party names, with representative newspapers stirring up internecine warfare. That is schism of the body, that is wounding the heart of Christ, that is rending the seamless robe of the Lord Jesus."

The
 Aftermath of
 Islington.

The Islington Meeting this year has given rise, as was almost to be expected, to a long correspondence in the columns of our contemporary, the *Record*.

The discussion has centred round the question of Higher Criticism. Some writers have condemned, some have upheld, the normal critical position. In the main the discussion has been carried on with reasonableness and good feeling. We do not propose to follow it here in any detail. One thing has clearly emerged—viz., that men who are indubitably entitled to be regarded as loyal and earnest Evangelical clergymen have been found on both sides. This, at any rate, suggests that Evangelicalism is not to be determined by our attitude to the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. This inference we believe

to be true. We hold no brief at the moment for or against the critics. In the main we are inclined to a conservative attitude, or, at any rate, an attitude of suspended judgment in relation to many of the claims of criticism, but we are loyal to the properly safeguarded right of private judgment. If a critic is loyal to Article VI., and does not wantonly fly in the face of Article XX., we are not disposed to inquire too closely as to his views on the composite character of the books of Samuel or the authorship of some of the Psalms. If he holds the traditional teaching of Evangelicalism on the Doctrine of Conversion, on the Atonement, and on the Spiritual Life; if he believes the Sacraments to be means of grace, and not mere channels; if he believes the Bible to be the revelation of God to man, final and complete for this dispensation, we would welcome him, despite his criticism, as an Evangelical in the truest sense of the word. We want unity, and we want liberty. We shall never gain the former if we needlessly limit the latter; and we cannot believe that that limitation is needful which excludes every adherent of the Graf-Wellhausen theory.

"Ne Temere." The Papal Bull on mixed marriages has caused considerable discussion in Ireland and not a little in England. The Church of Rome has decided that a mixed marriage in a Protestant place of worship is no marriage, and has apparently acted upon its decision in one case at least to the breaking up of a home, with much consequent misery. We are told that this particular action will not be repeated. Perhaps the outburst of feeling that it aroused, culminating in a monster meeting in Dublin, with the Archbishop of Dublin in the chair and the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church amongst the speakers, has made repetition impossible, at least for the present. An attempt has been made to belittle the matter on the ground that the feeling aroused is inspired by party politics. But surely it raises an issue which must not be lost sight of. We recognize the right of the Church of Rome to legislate for its own members. We recognize the right to discourage mixed

marriages; we claim both these rights for ourselves. In connection with the Royal Commission upon Divorce, we may be compelled presently to emphasize the former right. But we are entirely at one with the resolution of the Dublin meeting, which demanded that there should be secured to those who have been married in accordance with the law of the land freedom from interference from clergymen, or others, of any denomination whatsoever, that may lead to a violation of the marriage contract. If the Belfast story is true it is disgraceful. In view of the names of those present at the Dublin meeting, we cannot but believe that it is true. We have no political ends to serve here, but we do hope that Englishmen—Churchmen and Nonconformists alike—will not allow this incident to pass into oblivion because they are afraid of its political effect. The attitude of the *British Weekly* does seem to suggest some such danger in the case of that representative Nonconformist journal.

Rescue Work. At a private Conference of Rescue Workers held last October, a paper (to be obtained free on receipt of a stamp from Miss James, Hampstead Way, Hendon) of pathetic interest was read by Miss E. Macdougall. The writer tells a terrible story of misery and ruin, and pleads for certain changes in the administration of the law. The subject is a difficult one to discuss in a public print, but we have ventured to refer to it here because we believe that the care of these little ones, ruined by the evil passions of men, is of the highest concern to the Christian Church, and we venture to commend this paper to any of our readers who work amongst the fallen, and to any who have a share in the administration of the law. We venture to quote Miss Macdougall's words, and to leave them with our readers:

“‘What is written in the Law? How readest thou?’ We gain a wider view of our duty in this matter through those simple, strong words of His. ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.’ ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour.’ If these words were strong in the hearts of all men there would be no need for a discussion upon the ‘Administration of the Law.’ It is woman’s work—

by our own lives of loyalty to these two Laws—to influence man to be strong and true.

“Our Lord was asked to criticize the administration of Moses’ Law, when the woman who had broken a part of it was brought to Him. We remember his attitude. No criticism of the Law, or of the offence, but those simple, piercing words which stirred effectually the consciences of those present ; and then the power of His silent stooping down.

“As rescue workers we can do little to alter or set right what seem to us evils in administration, but we can ponder silently the high ideals of Christ’s Law, and give expression to our thoughts by using constantly the petition :

“‘That it may please Thee to bless and keep the magistrates and judges, giving them grace to execute justice and to maintain truth.’”

Discussions.

In calling attention to the “Discussions” which are inaugurated on p. 226 of this number, we may take the opportunity of indicating the conditions by which this section of the magazine will be governed : (1) The space is set apart for conference and discussion, not for letters. The CHURCHMAN has no correspondence column ; hence, any contribution, long or short, will take the form of a signed article, and not of a letter. (2) The discussion will be strictly limited to matter that has appeared in the CHURCHMAN, either in the same or the immediately preceding number. (3) The writer of the article on which comment is made will be entitled to a reply. Then the discussion of that particular topic will end. (4) The Editors will gladly welcome the free expression of varied forms of opinion. They merely reserve for themselves the usual editorial right to decide what shall, or shall not, appear in this, as in other parts of the magazine. They also disclaim responsibility for opinions that may be expressed by various writers in the course of future discussions.



The Permissive Use of the Vestments.

BY THE REV. H. C. BEECHING, D.LIT.,

Canon of Westminster.

BY the courtesy of the Editors I am allowed the opportunity of trying to explain somewhat more clearly than I have at present succeeded in doing why I am an advocate of a permissive use of the Eucharistic vestments. I am in entire agreement with the writer of the "Month" in the January number of the *CHURCHMAN* when he asserts that there is a party in the Church of England which is working for a Counter-Reformation; but I cannot draw his conclusion that a toleration of the vestments would help that movement forward. I believe it would have the opposite effect. The Counter-Reformation party is at present a small one, though well organized and led, and it is certainly very active in the Press. It is clever enough to speak always in the name of the "Church of England," as though there were no other legitimate view except its own; and most persons have something better to do than to expose its pretensions. But nothing would tend so certainly to throw the moderate High Churchman into the arms of these extremists as the definite refusal, when the issue is fairly raised, to allow him what he has all his life considered as a legitimate privilege. At present the two parties are divided in policy. Speaking roughly, the leading High Churchmen are on the side of Prayer-Book revision, the Counter-Reformation man is against it. That difference means something, and readers of the *CHURCHMAN* should note the fact and seek for the explanation.

I agree, further, with the writer I have quoted in the opinion that the vestments are not desired by anybody on any mere ground of sentiment, much less because they are supposed to be altogether without significance. The Report of the Committee of the Canterbury Upper House upon the Significance of the Vestments is frequently misrepresented. The learned Bishops who made that Report did not decide that the vestments had no

significance, but that they had none *in themselves*. Consequently, their significance has to be determined by their use. The greater number of those who use—or wish to use—they take, I believe, the view expressed by Cranmer in the First Prayer-Book of the Reformed Church, that they are the “vesture appointed for the ministration” of Holy Communion; and I would urge that this is their true and only necessary significance. They form the historical dress of the minister in that celebration. If this be so, the symbolism attached to them, if any, will vary according to the particular doctrine of the Eucharist held by those who wear them: it may be Roman, or it may be Lutheran, or, again, it may be Anglican of any school. For unless it can be shown that the sacramental doctrine of the Church in England has not varied since this “vesture” was first worn in our island, there is no particular view of Eucharistic doctrine which the vestments, as used here, can be held to imply.

It is sometimes argued that as long as the use of the surplice—and the surplice alone—is authoritatively sanctioned in the Church of England we have a security for the maintenance of the Evangelical position. One wonders sometimes at the shortness of controversial memories. How long is it since the use of a surplice in the pulpit, instead of the accustomed black gown, was regarded as the very negation of Evangelical doctrine? Within living memory a surplice upon a choirman has been known to rouse as much blind fury as to-day is roused in some quarters by an alb upon a server. There is, in fact, no inherent Evangelical significance in a surplice. The Puritans with whom Hooker contended did not distinguish between the surplice and other vestments, and rightly, because they were equally in use in the Roman Church; all belonged to the “leaven of Antichrist.” Hooker quotes Cartwright as saying that “Popish apparel, *the surplice especially*, hath been by Papists abominably abused; that it hath been a very sacrament of abomination; and that, remaining, it serveth as a monument of idolatry.” If, then, we have ceased to find the surplice “dangerous” and “scandalous,” is it not time that we ceased to apply these

epithets to the other vestments? Obviously the best way to empty these vestments of any "scandalous" significance would be to adopt them universally, as the surplice has been adopted—and this may come in time—but even now it ought to be conceded that the Evangelical position can neither be secured by a surplice nor imperilled by a "vestment or cope."

A further argument against any implication of Papistical doctrine in the Eucharistic vestments may be drawn from the attitude of the Caroline revisers of the Prayer-Book in 1662. No English Churchmen can with less justice be accused of Romanizing tendencies. Their leader, Bishop Cosin, whose influence can be traced in the entire revision, was so anti-Roman in sympathy that he disinherited his only son for joining that communion; and it is significant that to-day the party of the Counter-Reformation speak of him with scant respect.

But these revisers, in reinserting the Elizabethan Ornaments Rubric, did not repeat the reference to the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, which is generally supposed to have overridden it; and if, in so doing, they did not look forward to a time when the ancient vestments should be revived, their conduct is inexplicable. It has been suggested, for example, that, as the Edwardine books were scarce, the revisers may not have known what vestments they were prescribing—a remarkable suggestion, considering the fact that Cosin's "Notes on the Prayer-Book" survive, and have long been accessible in print. Or, again, we are told that it is impossible to imagine that the framers of the 1662 rubric intended to impose upon the clergy the obligation of wearing the Edwardine vestments, for the simple reason that they took no pains to enforce it. So far, I should agree. But when it is further argued that between "imposing" and "forbidding" there is no middle way, it is forgotten that the rubrics were drawn up, not by lawyers, but by divines, who might wish not to lower what they considered the ideal standard, though they were content in practice with something less. This certainly was Cosin's view of the state of things in Charles I.'s reign. In one of his collections, upon

the words "such ornaments as were in use in the second year of King Edward VI.," he notes as follows :

"In that year, by the authority of Parliament, was this order set forth, in the end of the service-book then appointed. At Morning and Evening Prayer, the administration of baptism, the burial of the dead, etc., in parish churches, the minister shall put upon him a surplice; in cathedral and collegiate churches, and in colleges, the archdeacons, deans, presidents, and masters may use the ornaments also belonging to their degrees and dignities. But in all other places it shall be free for them whether they will use any surplice or not. The Bishop administering the Lord's Supper, and celebrating the Sacraments, shall wear a rochet or alb, with a cope or vestment; and he shall have also his pastoral staff. And before the Communion, upon the day appointed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the priest having on him an alb, with a vestment or cope, shall stand at the altar, and where there be many priests and deacons, so many of them as be needful shall help the chief minister, having albs or tunicles upon them.

"These ornaments and vestures of the ministers were so displeasing to Calvin and Bucer, that the one in his letters to the Protector, and the other in his censure of the liturgy, sent to Archbishop Cranmer, urged very vehemently to have them taken away, not thinking it tolerable that we should have anything common with the Papists, but show forth our Christian liberty in the simplicity of the Gospel.

"Hereupon, when a Parliament was called in the fifth year of King Edward, they altered the former book, and made another order for vestments, copes, and albs not to be worn at all; allowing an Archbishop and a Bishop a rochet only, and a priest or deacon to wear nothing but a surplice.

"But by the Act of Uniformity [*i.e.*, 1559] the Parliament thought fit not to continue this last order, but to restore the first again; which since that time was never altered by any other law, and therefore it is still in force at this day. And both Bishops, priests, and deacons, that knowingly and wilfully break this order, are as hardly censured in the Preface to this book concerning ceremonies as ever Calvin or Bucer censured the ceremonies themselves."¹

In another place, on the words "as were in use," he says :

"And then were in use, not a surplice and hood, as we now use, but a plain white alb with a vestment or cope over it. And therefore, according to this rubric, *are we still bound* to wear albs and vestments, as have been so long time worn in the Church of God, *however it is neglected.*"²

I quote these passages partly for their value in showing what Cosin probably had in mind in drafting the present Ornaments Rubric, but more especially because they show that the man whom Fuller called "the Atlas of the Protestant religion" desired the use of the Eucharistic vestments in the

¹ Cosin's Works, vol. v., p. 439.

² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

English Church, and did not regard them as significant of Roman doctrine. His words "as have been so long time worn in the Church of God" give exactly the plea for the retention of the ancient vestments in the Church of England as it presents itself to the minds of most High Churchmen to-day.

My last reason for wishing for a permissive use is a very practical one. The use is desired by large numbers of faithful and loyal Churchmen. In some 1,500 churches it has already been adopted. Of course, it will be said that to condone disobedience in one case is to provoke it in others. I do not think the maxim applies in this particular case, because the circumstances are exceptional. There have been judgments given by the highest Court both for and against the High Church reading of the Ornaments Rubric. On the one side there are the decisions in *Liddell v. Westerton* and *Martin v. Mackonochie*, and on the other, those in *Hebbert v. Purchas* and *Clifton v. Ridsdale*. And though in the *Ridsdale* case the Court was a strong one, yet it was not unanimous; and the opinion is largely held that if the question of the vestments had been argued over again in the Bishop of Lincoln's case, the Privy Council might have reversed its judgment on that, as on other ceremonial points. There seems, then, at the present moment an opportunity for removing a "stone of stumbling" from the path of Christian brotherhood in the Church of England, of which all who love peace should take advantage. I would only add one thing more. If the Evangelical party cannot agree to allow the policy of a maximum and minimum use, have they an alternative policy for getting back to a condition of law and order in the Church? Do they expect to convince the High Churchmen, or do they propose to prosecute them?



Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

VII.—THE ENGLISH DIOCESES.

THE instructions which Gregory the Great gave to Augustine for his guidance in the establishment of Christianity in Britain seem to show that he was hardly aware of the differences between the Teutonic tribes which had settled in the island ; and perhaps he was imperfectly informed as to the wide difference between these immigrants and the original inhabitants. He appears to have regarded them all as one nation. He writes to Augustine of "the English," "the Church of the English," and "the Bishops of Britain" (Bede, "H. E.," i. 27, 29 ; *cf.* 30). He enjoins a very simple scheme as to episcopal jurisdiction. Augustine is to ordain twelve Bishops, who are to be subject to him, with the Bishop of London as their Metropolitan, and the Metropolitan is in future to be elected by his own Synod, and to receive the pall from Rome. Augustine is also to ordain a Bishop for the city of York, who is in turn to ordain twelve Bishops to serve under him as Metropolitan, when he has received the pall from Rome. This first Bishop of York is to be subject to the authority of Augustine, to whose care all the Bishops of Britain are committed ; but after the death of Augustine the Bishop of York is to be in no way subject to the Bishop of London. In other words, England is to be divided into two provinces, each governed by its Metropolitan, one at London and one at York, and each province is to have twelve episcopal sees. So long as he lives, Augustine is to be supreme, but after his death the northern province is to be entirely independent of the southern Metropolitan.

The scheme is simple and symmetrical, but it was made in ignorance of the circumstances, and it was never carried into effect. Even now, the Archbishop of York has far less than

twelve suffragans, and there has never been an Archbishop of London. The fact that there were not twenty-four territorial divisions, nor any civil divisions that could conveniently be subdivided into twenty-four, was perhaps enough to cause Gregory's scheme to fail. There were not twenty-four kingdoms, or twelve, or six, but seven to be considered. And, besides this, there was the fact that the different kingdoms had been converted to Christianity in different ways from different sources; and although the essentials of Christianity were everywhere the same, there were considerable differences of form, which might easily harden into schisms and render a uniform organization impossible. Roughly speaking, Roman missionaries had converted Kent, Essex, East Anglia, and part of Northumbria. Scottish missionaries had converted Mercia and part of Northumbria. Northumbrian missionaries had converted Wight and Sussex. And there was much confusion and difficulty until Theodore of Tarsus organized and consolidated the whole.

Meanwhile, the ecclesiastical divisions had taken a form very different from that which had been projected by Pope Gregory: local institutions proved stronger than papal injunctions. The dioceses, for the most part, followed the divisions which already existed between the different kingdoms. To such an extent was that the case, that where our knowledge is imperfect, as it often is, the limits of the one are a fairly safe guide to the limits of the other. It may happen that in some instances we know the limits of the dioceses, without being sure about the civil divisions. In such cases the limits of the ancient dioceses are a good guide to the limits of the ancient kingdoms and principalities. And this historical feature is not confined to England. In other countries also the ecclesiastical map frequently follows the civil ways, not only in its original construction, but also in its subsequent modifications.

Here the Scottish Church in Ireland and Scotland, from which some of the missionaries who converted the English came, hardly comes under consideration. Bishops there had originally no territorial jurisdiction: they were Bishops of tribes

rather than of districts, and they were little more than officials for performing certain episcopal functions, such as ordaining. It was the heads of monasteries that had jurisdiction. The head of a monastery might be a Bishop, but his being one did not increase his jurisdiction. There is, however, this much of illustration to be obtained from the Keltic Church, that when, in a later age, divisions of the nature of dioceses were formed, they were in the first instance coincident with the tribal boundaries.¹

The ecclesiastical organization in Gaul is closely analogous to that which prevailed in England, but there we have to deal with cities rather than kingdoms. The episcopal seat was placed in the chief city belonging to the tribe, and the jurisdiction of the Bishop coincided with the jurisdiction of the city. To a considerable extent this ancient principle still holds good, or, if there has been modification, it has been of a simple kind: a large diocese has been divided, or two small ones have been united. Virtually, the principle is the same as that which originated English dioceses—viz., that ecclesiastical divisions should depend upon earlier civil divisions. And the same principle holds good in Germany also, but there it is less easy to trace it than in France, because the changes in the civil divisions have been more numerous.

It would be interesting to consider to what extent the English dioceses have been determined by the shires, the limits of which have changed very little for many centuries. But the shires themselves are of later date than the period which we are considering. The fact with which we are concerned is, that the original jurisdiction of the English sees was determined, not in accordance with the arrangement prescribed by the Pope, but by the limits of the already existing kingdoms. Each kingdom, it was thought, ought to have its Bishop with as much reason as it had its King. We have seen how quickly experience proved that one Bishop was quite inadequate to the work that had to be done, and how Theodore of Tarsus set

¹ C. Plummer, "*Vitæ Sanctorum Hiberniæ*," i., p. cxiii.

himself to work to break up the larger dioceses, and how, at a later day, Bede urges Egbert of York to work for an increase in the episcopate. Nevertheless, the principle that civil boundaries are to be the guide in determining episcopal jurisdiction seems to be kept in view. It is, perhaps, true to say that this principle was never formally laid down: it was possibly adopted almost as a matter of course. Boundaries were wanted for a new purpose; boundaries already existed for an old purpose, and they would serve the new purpose very well; then why think of anything different?

Theodore of Tarsus was, perhaps, the last instance of a foreigner obtaining one of the principal sees. Not till a later day does that become an abuse and a grievance. At first it was neither: it was a necessity. The infant English Church was unable to walk alone: it must for a time be guided by pastors brought from outside the nation, for there were no Englishmen capable of holding such responsible posts. But as soon as the English Church was able to walk alone, it was allowed to walk alone, and it continued to do so. After Theodore of Tarsus had done his work, the clergy of the English Church were almost always Englishmen, at least for some centuries. And it is surely a mistake to regard this fact as evidence of the weak and temporary character of the work of Augustine. If the Bishops of his succession quickly died out, we may regard that as evidence of the success of his labours. It is one of the greatest triumphs of missionary effort to be able to train up a native ministry, independent of the original source. When Central Africa has a ministry of its own, and requires no more Europeans to supply it with clergy, will that be evidence that the Universities' Mission has been a failure? Whatever estimate we may form of the results of the mission of Augustine, we must not place the rise of an independent English clergy to its discredit.

There is yet another particular in which the scheme set forth by Pope Gregory has not been fulfilled. That London has never become a Metropolitan see, and York has never had

twelve suffragans, has been already pointed out. But, besides this, the northern Metropolitan has never been wholly independent of the southern one, for York has always been in a subordinate place to Canterbury, especially in the period previous to the Norman Conquest. Only once, and for a very short time, was the dignity of Canterbury impaired and its jurisdiction very seriously curtailed; and then it was not York that gained by the temporary degradation of the see of Augustine. Offa, the vigorous and victorious King of Mercia, whose conquests had almost reduced the seven kingdoms to three—Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex—and seemed likely to reduce them to one, had an ambitious ecclesiastical policy, which was no doubt intended to strengthen his political position. That he was regarded, even on the Continent, as a power to be reckoned with is shown by the fact that Pope Hadrian I. thought it worth while to write to Charlemagne and tell him that he did not believe the rumour that Offa wanted Charlemagne to help him to depose the Pope. Hadrian calls Offa “King of the English nation,” and says that he has received ambassadors from him. And Offa evidently had influence at Rome. He seems to have thought it an unfortunate circumstance for his kingdom that neither of the Metropolitan sees lay within it. Jaenbert, or Jambert, was then Archbishop of Canterbury (767-791), and, like Offa, was a man of strong character. It was some years after the monks of Canterbury had elected him to the vacant see that Offa began his conquest of Kent, in which struggle he was opposed by the Archbishop. When Offa’s success was complete, and Jaenbert had become by the law of conquest his subject, Offa determined to have a Metropolitan see in the kingdom of Mercia. The see on which he fixed was Lichfield, and he desired to make the Bishop of Lichfield a Metropolitan, with jurisdiction from the Humber to the Thames. To this scheme Pope Hadrian gave his consent. He may have thought Offa was a person whom it was worth while to gratify, or he may have acted on the principle, *Divide et impera*; two rival Metropolitans would more easily be kept under Roman

influence than one with undivided jurisdiction. And it is possible that he really thought the plan a good one on its own merits. He certainly gave it his sanction. In 786 he sent two legates to Offa, and after hearing his views, one of them, George, went on a visitation tour to York, and with Archbishop Eanbald held a council at which Alcuin was present. The other, Theophylact, visited Offa's dominions. Somewhat later both legates attended a council at Chelsea, which, for obvious reasons, is called in the Saxon Chronicle "the contentious Synod." Such seems to have been the order of events, but there are chronological and other difficulties. In spite of the strenuous opposition of Jaenbert and his supporters, sanction was given to the promotion of Lichfield to be a Metropolitan see, to which was assigned authority over seven dioceses in Mercia and East Anglia, while Canterbury was left with only five—viz., London, Winchester, Rochester, Selsey and Sherborne. Higbert, the Bishop of Lichfield, was to continue to hold the see under these new conditions, but he had to wait until he received the pall from Rome before he could assume the new title. This evidently arrived in 788, for in that year he signs one charter as Bishop and another as Archbishop; and in 789 there is again a Synod at Chelsea, which is presided over by Archbishop Jaenbert and Archbishop Higbert. Offa, in gratitude to the Pope, promised an annual tribute to Rome of 365 gold mancuses, one of which, with *Offa Rex* on it, is still in existence.¹ It has been thought that this tribute was the origin of "Peter's Pence," but that is by no means certain. It is more probable that the *Romefeoh*, or *Romescot*, did not originate before the reign of Alfred or of his son Edward, and it is in connection with Edward that the word *Romefeoh* first occurs: Bede never mentions it. When 830 Saxon silver pennies were found in Rome some thirty or more years ago, they were with high probability assumed to be a remittance of Peter's Pence. Of Alfred there were 3; of Edward, 217; of Athelstan, 393; of

¹ A silver *mancusa* was equivalent to thirty silver pence; a gold one was worth nearly ten times as much.

Edmund, 195 ; which gives one some idea of the time when this remittance was sent. Be this as it may, Offa's tribute to Rome did not secure the permanence of his new archbishopric. After about sixteen years (787-803) Higbert had to resign ; Canterbury recovered its rights, and there never again was an Archbishop of Lichfield.

In what has been said above no account has been taken of the diocesan divisions which may have existed in Britain before the conversion of the English. It may be doubted whether there were any. What we know of the Keltic Church in Ireland and Scotland would lead us to the conclusion that the British Bishops had no dioceses in the strict sense of the term. But the signatures of the British Bishops at the Council of Arles in A.D. 314 rather point in the other direction. What is certain is that we do not know what the limits of episcopal jurisdictions, if they existed, were. The conquest by the English invaders obliterated all such divisions, and civil divisions took their place—the civil divisions which served to determine the limits of the English dioceses when they arose.

Stubbs ("Const. Hist.," chap. viii.) has pointed out what a blessing it was that the English Church was thus prevented from inheriting any traditions from Romano-British Christianity, such as those which had infected the Christian Church in France and in the Rhineland. Our insular position probably contributed to this happy result. There was nothing of Roman imperialism mixed up with our ecclesiastical organization. Bishops in England were not compelled, as they often were in France, to accept the position of civil magistrates and other secular offices, and they were rarely local potentates, as German Bishops often were. This feature in English ecclesiastical organization is illustrated by the places which were selected as episcopal sees. Sometimes, no doubt, the chief town of the kingdom was chosen, and this was specially likely to be the case at the outset, when the conversion of the King led to the conversion of his subjects. In the cases of Canterbury, London, York, Rochester, and Winchester, we have the chief

town as the seat of the Bishop. But Dunwich, Elmham, Selsey, Sherborne, Lichfield, Hereford, and Hexham were villages. So also were Crediton, Ramsbury, and Wells—the sees created by Edward the Elder. Perhaps Lindisfarne may be taken as another example ; but that may have been chosen because, like its parent, Iona, it was an island, rather than because it was not a centre of population. In this way English Bishops escaped a great deal of political entanglement. They did not become Dukes or Counts, and were able to keep free from Court intrigues. This was less true of the two Metropolitans than of the rest ; for the fact of their having jurisdiction in several kingdoms brought them necessarily into secular relationships with civil rulers, and sometimes into rivalry with them. First Canterbury and then York assumed the right to coin money, and the pieces bore the Metropolitan's name and likeness. In the great find of silver pennies at Rome, mentioned above, there were six of Plegmund, Archbishop of Canterbury. The promotion of Higbert to be Archbishop of Lichfield and his resignation or deprivation (both of them apparently for political reasons) are rare examples of anything of the kind. In short, by being outside political struggles and remote from Courts, they were able to do spiritual work in a more spiritual manner ; and when they did act as counsellors to Princes, or intervened as peacemakers between combatants, they were able to do so without being at once suspected of being influenced by party motives. A few centuries later the influence of the world upon the Church had increased, and England had to reconcile itself to the fact that not only were its Bishops obliged to be statesmen, but that sometimes the secular office caused the spiritual office to be neglected and almost forgotten.



The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

BY THE RIGHT REV. J. W. DIGGLE, D.D.,

Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

THERE are few notes of the character of a Christian Church and of its real relation to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ more clear and unmistakable than the value which it attaches to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. In all the Churches this value is esteemed inestimable and beyond all reckoning. No true Church and no true Christian can depreciate either the one ministry or the other. All are practically agreed upon the necessity of both ministrations, as well as upon their inculcation by Christ Himself, their historic catholicity, and the power which, through the Holy Ghost, they have exercised in the vivification, the edification, and the nourishment of the faithful in all ages.

But while all Churches are agreed upon the priceless value of both the Word and the Sacraments of the Gospel, there is a quite vast divergence of opinion as to their relative value. Some Churches overestimate the Word in relation to the Sacraments; others overestimate the Sacraments in relation to the Word. Some underrate the ministry of preaching, others the ministry of the Sacraments. In some the sacramental ministry overtops the prophetic ministry; in others the prophetic overshadows the sacramental. In the Church of England, with which I am now chiefly concerned, neither ministry is overshadowed or overtopped by the other; both receive, in loyalty to Holy Scripture, their due and full recognition. At the same time, the authorized formularies of the Church of England leave no room for doubt to which of these two ministrations precedence is given. Quite distinctly, and without possibility of doubt, the Church of England places the ministry of the Word before that of the Sacraments. Wherever in the Prayer-Book the phrase "the ministry of the Word and Sacraments" is used, the Word always comes first, the Sacra-

ments second. Nowhere is this order reversed. When a man is ordained to the diaconate, a New Testament is delivered to him by the Bishop, saying: "Take thou authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to preach the same if thou be thereto licensed by the Bishop himself." Part of the functions assigned to him is the assisting of the priest in Divine service, and especially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof, and, in the absence of the priest, to baptize infants. But the stress of the whole office for the Ordering of Deacons is laid on the ministry of the Word. Except in the instances just referred to, the ministry of the Sacraments is not mentioned, whereas that of the Word is again and again emphasized. No man, says the Preface, is to be admitted to the office of deacon unless he be "sufficiently instructed in Holy Scripture." He is to be replenished with the truth of Christ's doctrine. He is to give himself continually to prayer and the ministry of the Word. One test of the worth of his ministry, as of that of St. Stephen, is the increase of the Word of God. He is solemnly interrogated as to his unfeigned faith in the Canonical Scriptures, and is pledged diligently to read the same unto the people, as well as to frame and fashion his life and that of his family (the possibility of his being married being postulated) according to the doctrine of Christ. His special commission is to read and preach the Gospel. In studying this office, either by itself as a separate document or in its historical relation to the unreformed offices preceding it, no one can fail to realize the relative weight attached by the reformed Church of England to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments respectively.

Similarly with the Ordering of Priests. The same proportion is here maintained as in the Ordering of Deacons. Priests are to be replenished with the truth of Christ's doctrine for the edification of His Church. In the Epistle chosen for the Ordinal the title "priest" does not occur, as, indeed, it occurs nowhere in the New Testament as a distinctive designation of Christ's ministers. But the ordinand priest is reminded in the

Epistle of the early titles of the ministers of Christ's Gospel. Some were apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers. And the work of the ministry of all, whatever their title, was the building up of the Body of Christ in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. The dignity and excellency of the priest's office is declared especially to be to teach and to feed the Lord's family. And forasmuch as the doing of so weighty a work cannot be compassed except with doctrine and exhortation taken out of Holy Scriptures, and with a life agreeable to the same, the ordinand priest is most earnestly admonished how studious he ought to be in reading and learning the Scriptures. The means whereby he may wax riper and stronger in his ministry, he is told by the ordaining Bishop, is by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures, and by continual prayer to God the Father, by the mediation of our only Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost. Not a word is said in this charge to the ordinands of either of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, the omission being due, as we shall presently see, not to any disparagement of these Sacraments, but to the Church's clear and definite determination to give precedence, both in order and value, to the ministry of the Word.

Next after the Bishop's solemn charge in the Ordinal comes the solemn questioning of the ordinands. Here also the Church of England follows the same line, still further emphasizing the ministry of the Word before proceeding to make any mention of the Sacraments. "Are you persuaded," asks the Bishop, "that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?" To which the solemn reply is rendered: "I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's help." Again: "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and

drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word? . . . Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same?" And again the like answer in the form of solemn adjuration and sacred oath. What could be more manifest than that the reading of Scripture, the study of Scripture, the teaching of Scripture, loyalty to Scripture, and obedience to Scripture, are the prime and principal obligation of every priest of the Church of England, according to the solemn promises made at his ordination? However important and worthful other functions of his office may be, all are second and subsidiary to this. In the Church of England prophetic duties are the first and most obligatory of the priest's vocation. No evidence could attest more definitely and more convincingly what the Church of England means by the term "priest." She never means by "priest" a sacerdotal officer, a hierarch, a sacrificing agent. In all her formularies the term is used either in contradistinction to that of deacon or bishop, or else as equivalent to presbyter—*i.e.*, elder or minister—whose paramount and permanent vocation is the proclamation of the Word. This Word is the key to the kingdom of heaven. By the key of this Word the kingdom of heaven is opened or closed. No other key can fit the lock of the heavenly gate. The Word on earth is the revelation of the Will in heaven; so that whatsoever this Word of God, this Holy Scripture, shall loose on earth is loosed in heaven, and whatsoever this Word on earth shall bind in heaven is also bound. Never according to the will and commandments of men, but always according to the will and revelation of God, do binding and loosing proceed.

Not until these great truths have been set forth unmistakably does the Ordinal make any mention of the Holy Sacraments. Thus in the Church of England the ministry of the Sacraments is conditioned by, and made dependent on, the ministry of the Word. The faithful dispenser of Christ's Sacraments must first be a faithful dispenser of Christ's Gospel. None but faithful dispensers of the Word can be faithful

dispensers of the Sacraments. Not, indeed, that the validity of the Sacraments depends either on the fidelity of the dispenser or on the lineage of his ordination. Such a supposition would make the Sacraments to be the Sacraments of men, or the Sacraments of a Church—poor things verily—whereas in truth they are Sacraments of the blessed God Himself, Divine ordinances, grand and glorious beyond all computation. But it is the Word behind and within the Sacraments which imparts to them their power and splendour. Take away the Word and what are the Sacraments? A house without foundation, a body without a soul, a well without water, a husk without a kernel, a sign without meaning, an instrument without force. Apart from Christ—the Incarnate Word revealed in the Written Word—the Sacraments are nothing. With Christ, in Christ, through Christ, they are great and strong. And Christ is infinite mercy, boundless love. He will not, therefore, suffer His Sacraments to be deprived of their efficacy or defrauded of their power by the unfaithfulness of their dispenser. So long as the recipient is faithful, Christ will sacramentally bless. The infidelity of the dispenser will surely recoil as a curse on himself, but will neither kill the Sacrament nor rob the faithful of its benediction. Where both dispenser and receiver are faithless a Sacrament is the condemnation of both. Where the dispenser is faithful and the receiver faithless the administration is worthy and acceptable to God, the reception unworthy and charged with doom. Where dispenser and receiver alike are faithful there is unsearchable blessing for both. But it is always the Christ Himself from whom the blessing flows upon the faith, whether of recipient or dispenser; and the Sacrament is the sacred pledge of that blessing, the Divinely appointed channel through which it descends. Thus it is the very height of the power of the Sacraments, the crown of their glory, that they should be attached dependently, yet vitally, to the Word of God. Far from being a weakness to the Sacraments that they are secondary to the Word, their incorporation with the Word is the source of their strength. Put the ministry of the

Sacraments first and that of the Word second, and both lose their meaning and forfeit their power. It is only when the Sacraments are built upon the Word, and the Word assigns their authority to the Sacraments, that the Sacraments become not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but also certain witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us.

And as with the Sacraments, so also with the assurance of pardon. No priest can pardon sins committed against others ; for none can pardon an offence save those against whom the offence has been committed. A cannot blot out the sins against B, nor B the sins against A. This is true of all kinds and degrees of transgression. A crime against the State can only be pardoned by the State ; a trespass against a community, whether ecclesiastical or civil, can be remitted only by the community ; an injury to an individual can only be forgiven by the individual injured ; a sin against God, God alone can forgive. Sometimes an evil word or deed is a compound of evils, being at once a crime, an injury, and a sin. Then, in as far as it is a sin, God alone can forgive it ; in as far as it is a trespass or a crime, only the community ; in as far as it is individual injury, only the person injured. But in no case can an extraneous party, an outside person, forgive a wrong.

Often, indeed, the forgiveness is transmitted through a channel appointed for that purpose, as when the penalty for a crime is remitted through a Secretary of State, or the pardon of an injury conveyed through the agency of an intermediary friend. But whether effected mediately or immediately, the sole authority and power to forgive rests only with those against whom the wrong has been done. So is it with sin. God alone can forgive sins. But authority and power to convey and announce God's forgiveness are sometimes delegated to others. Thus Nathan, who was a prophet and not a priest, was authorized to proclaim God's pardon to contrite David ; thus also hath God given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the

absolution and remission of their sins. And, like Nathan, this they do in their capacity of prophets rather than priests. But it is God Himself, and God alone, who pardoneth and absolveth the truly penitent and unfeignedly believing sinner. All that God's ministers can do—yet this is much in the way of comfort and assurance—is to proclaim God's pardon and transmit His absolution.

But on what grounds, we ask, can God's ministers claim their grand prerogative to discharge this sacred function of proclaiming pardon, this blessed right of assuring peace to broken, contrite, believing hearts? Clearly not on the ground of their ordination alone. Of itself and by itself ordination cannot possibly confer such momentous powers, such glorious privileges. To contend for this would be to contend for an absurdity, which might easily degenerate—has, indeed, not seldom actually degenerated—into an infamy. Often in the Church's history ordained ecclesiastics have blessed those whom God hath not blessed and cursed those whom God hath not cursed. Ordained ecclesiastics blessed the Inquisitors and cursed their victims. Does anybody, not a bigot, suppose these blessings and curses were ratified in heaven? Ordained ecclesiastics decreed the decisions of the Council of Trent. According to these decrees a large part of Christendom, and that not the least intelligent or the least spiritual part, is still smitten with anathema. What man outside the Church of Rome deems these anathemas to be anything else but sounding brass or boltless ecclesiastical thunder? We know for certain that God has not confirmed these anathemas in heaven, inasmuch as He is constantly pouring down ever-increasing benedictions on the anathematized.

Or to take another instance: A young man may be ordained to the priesthood in the Church of England at twenty-four years of age. At such an age his knowledge, whether of the ways of God or the ways of men, is probably not extensive. He could easily be deceived by a false and emotional penitence, easily diverted into a cold frame of mind by a stammering and

reserved, albeit an entirely sincere, contrition. In the former case he looses the sin; in the latter he binds it, owing to his inaptitude for spiritual diagnosis. Who will say that such a priest's blundering is ratified in heaven? Such a contention would be an insult to heaven; as we know, it rightly is a butt of scorn on earth. Even rigorous sacerdotalists perceive this peril, and make confessors only of men of mature age and ripe experience. But if the power to loose and bind be a matter of ordination only, a virtue inherent in the priestly office, why this precaution? A priest is as much a priest at twenty-four years of age as at forty-two, and if his authority to forgive and remit is an unconditioned attribute of his ordination, it is just as valid in the callow, fledgeling priest as in the priest of full-grown knowledge and discerning wisdom.

The Church of England nowhere in her authentic formularies professes to confer such unconditioned powers on her priests. She does not interpret the sayings of her Lord after the manner of the scribes and Pharisees, who through their traditions made the Word of God of none effect. Her Lord is the Word of God, the Divine Logos, the Reason of God. To interpret His sayings irrationally is to sin against the Divine Reason. The Gospel is not a letter, but a spirit; not an edict, but a revelation. Christ said He was a Door, a Vine, that His body was bread, and that wine was His blood. There is no difficulty whatever in understanding what He Himself meant by these sayings. In themselves they are as bright and clear as the Light of the World could make them. There was no darkness, no doubt of any kind, in the minds of the first disciples of the Lord as to the heavenly revelations conveyed in these utterances. To them these sayings were as a lamp on a lamp-stand. It was the scribes and the Pharisees, the priests and rabbis, who put the lamp under a bed of obscurities, under a bushel of literalisms. In contempt they first asked the question, "Will this man give us His flesh to eat?" Centuries afterwards superstition caught up the literalist cry, and proclaimed, amid clouds of baseless metaphysic and delusive rhetoric, "We can

give this Man's flesh for men to eat," thus affording another illustration of the universal law that literalism in religion always drags superstition at its heels.

Similarly with the grand commission of the ministry of forgiveness. The literal interpretation of that commission may, as we have seen, lead men to conclusions revolting to reason and religion alike. How does this commission run? "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Taken literally, what do these words come to? To this: That a priest is a giver or withholder of Divine forgiveness; that heaven is bound to bind what is bound on earth, and to loose what on earth is loosed. This literal sense is the complete reversal of both reason and revelation. It places the will of God at the disposition of men, the mercy of God at the control of the mercy of men. It turns the Lord's Prayer upside down, proclaiming that the will of heaven is to be governed by the will of earth, and that God is to forgive where and when man chooses. Even Balaam knew better than this. He acknowledged his incapacity to bless unless in accordance with the blessing of God, or to curse without God's consent. It is so still. No priest can bind where God hath loosed, or loose where God hath bound. God is the only binder, the only looser, the only forgiver, the only retainer, of the sins of men. All that the priest can do is to declare who they are whose sins God has revealed He will remit, and who they are whose sins He has determined to retain.

But how can the priest know the mind and will of God in respect of forgiveness? He has no other possible means of knowing these things except from Holy Scripture. The ways of God are not as man's ways, nor His mind as man's mind, nor His will as man's will. High as heaven is above earth, so high are the thoughts of God above the thoughts of man. It is only on the wings of revelation that man can soar to the heights of God's mercy: only by prayer in the Holy Ghost that he can learn the depths of heavenly truth. His priestly efficiency is, there-

fore, in direct proportion to his knowledge of Holy Scripture and his growth in spiritual discernment. The personal absolution of an ignorant, prayerless priest is a worthless absolution. He knows nothing of the will of God, nothing of the mercy of God ; whatever, therefore, he declares about forgiveness is in no wise to be depended upon : it has neither force nor value. The mere enlistment of a soldier does not fit him to direct a war, to win victories or avert defeats. So the ordination of a priest does not of itself give the heavenly wisdom essential to absolution. The effective ministry of personal pardon is conditioned by the minister's knowledge and experience of the Word of God.

The Church of England makes this fact clear throughout her formularies. Learning and godly conversation she exalts into the place of a principal aptitude for the ministry, and learning she defines to be such studies as help to the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. Absolution, she teaches, is conditioned by repentance according to the Holy Gospel, and remission by unfeigned faith in the same Gospel. Hence the supreme importance of the people learning the Holy Scriptures as well as the priests, that they may know both whether their penitence and faith, as well as his absolution and remission, are in harmony with the Gospel. If a sinner is disquieted in conscience and requires comfort or counsel, he is instructed by the Church of England to go to some discreet and learned minister of God's Word and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution. But what if the minister be not discreet?—*i.e.*, not a man of spiritual discernment—what if he be not a learned minister of God's Word? Clearly the disquieted sinner can get no trustworthy counsel, no solid comfort, from such a man. He is a broken reed, an empty cistern. You might as well go to a doctor who knows nothing of medicine, nothing of surgery, nothing of the human frame, as to an unlearned and undiscerning priest who does not know his Bible and the heart of man. It is by the ministry of God's Word, proclaims the Church of England, that the benefit of absolution is conveyed and received. But the ministry of God's

Word, and therefore the benefit of absolution also, must be greatly affected by the minister's knowledge and skill in that Word, just as a doctor's prescription is affected by his skill in medicine. The more ignorant the minister, the less trustworthy his counsel ; the more learned and more godly the minister, the stronger and more sure his promise of absolution.

It is sometimes alleged that it is not the priest who absolves, but the Church behind the priest ; and therefore the validity of the absolution depends, not on the knowledge and illumination of the priest, but on the power and authority of the Church. Let us take this for granted, and what follows ? First, that even a Church cannot bind what God has not bound or loose what God has not loosed, else would that Church be stronger and more powerful than God. Secondly, seeing that a Church can only bind and loose in accordance with the will of God ; seeing also that Churches, like individuals, are dependent for their knowledge of that will upon revelation, and that Scripture is the clearest and fullest of all revelations, then it must needs be that those Churches are the best authorities for absolution whose doctrine and discipline are in closest accord with Scripture, and that no Church that does not teach and minister agreeably to the supreme authority of Scripture has any claim to spiritual authority at all. Thirdly, seeing that God the Holy Ghost is the Inspirer of Scriptural revelation, seeing also that God cannot contradict Himself, any Church doctrine or discipline not in harmony with Scripture cannot be a doctrine or discipline from the Holy Ghost. Fourthly, seeing that the test of doctrine and discipline for all Churches alike is their accord and concord with Holy Scripture, it is the manifest duty of all true Churches to demand from their clergy a good knowledge of Holy Scripture as a preliminary to their ordination, together with the solemn pledge that throughout their whole life they will make the ever-growing, ever-deepening knowledge of Holy Scripture their chief and permanent concern. If, then, only Scriptural Churches are trustworthy Churches, it clearly follows that only Scriptural ministers can teach the mind of trustworthy Churches. Ignorant

ministers may easily, without knowing it, teach contrary to the mind of their Church and the mind of God both in reference to absolution and other things; and, therefore, the Church's duty to the minister, as well as the minister's duty to the Church, requires for the sanity and effectiveness of his ministry a profound and spiritual knowledge of the Scriptures. Scriptural ministers are as needful to the exercise of the authority of Scriptural Churches as the Word of God is necessary to the validity of that authority. In reference to absolution, therefore, the matter stands thus: Whether the authority for the absolution be deemed the individual priest or the collective Church, it is indispensable in both cases alike that the authority behind both should be God Himself. And as it is only by the searching of the Scriptures that we can know whether an absolution has God behind it or not, the searching of the Scriptures is a paramount obligation for both absolvers and absolved.

(To be continued.)



Higher Criticism in its Relation to Orthodox Belief.

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER HENDERSON,

Assistant-Curate of St. John's, Oulton, Leeds.

THE questions which have been brought forward in recent years in connection with the scientific treatment of religious problems are such as frequently occasion perplexity to many who are most earnest in their desire to "square" accurate knowledge with loyalty to the fundamentals of the faith, the reason of such perplexity no doubt being that critical methods are very commonly believed to stand for vagueness and indefiniteness in the statement of Christian truth. And yet there is, perhaps, no more interesting and hopeful phase of present-day thought than that which can be traced to an intelligent appreciation of the light which has been thrown on the Scriptures of both Testaments by modern historical research—namely, the recognition of the fact that new discoveries in

relation to Biblical literature are no longer to be regarded as necessarily inconsistent with a belief and practice at once Christian and orthodox. Formerly, when difficulties arose in regard to such questions as that of Inspiration, there often appeared to be no alternative but a total acceptance or a total rejection of the old idea of revelation. On the one hand, there was a superstitious reverence for the letter of Scripture, and an unquestioning adherence to traditional views, simply because they were traditional; on the other, a practical atheism, or, at best, deism, which was mainly the consequence of what were regarded as hopeless inconsistencies and contradictions in the Sacred Records. The entire question of a revelation from God to man was made to depend on the manner in which the Bible appeared to stand the test of historical accuracy and literary consistency.¹

Nowadays the attitude of men's minds is changed. The authenticity of much that was so long regarded as the principal, if not the only, medium of revelation has been questioned, and the Scriptures shown to be a collection of works, often composite in their origin, and frequently lacking in unity of purpose. The main results of historical criticism are generally accepted as practically ascertained fact; and although the tendency of much of it has been necessarily of a destructive character, yet, instead of being characterized by a weakening of religious belief, as might at first sight have been expected, the period which has been marked by an apparent sapping of old foundations has, in reality, produced a theism of a more robust quality than has been evident since the Reformation. It may, indeed, be said that the hostility and indifference to revealed truth, which were so common a feature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, have all but passed away, and have given place to a general desire to understand the bases of religious belief, so that now, after continual shiftings from one extreme to the other, according as they have been influenced by new thoughts and new

¹ See an article on "The Old Testament before Modern Criticism," by Canon Foakes-Jackson, in the *Interpreter* for October, 1908.

discoveries. men are beginning to settle down to a steadier outlook, to be able to rise above the prejudices and influences of early education and associations, to take a moderate view of things, and to give them their true value. What was formerly the privilege of the learned is now, in great degree, shared by the many, and there are few persons of ordinary intelligence and education who have not read or heard something of the questions which have occupied the minds of those who, by long and patient study, are peculiarly fitted to analyze and gauge the varied intellectual phenomena of different ages and races, the combinations of thought which they have presented, and the effects they have wrought one on another. It is only by continued application and painstaking research that the mutual influence of Semite, Greek, and Latin can be discovered and made intelligible to ordinary minds; but no one can have read, even cursorily, certain well-known works of the last few decades without appreciating their value, and being impressed by the immensity of the task undertaken, as well as by the keen critical insight and marvellous impartiality of judgment which, for the most part, have been displayed.

It would seem scarcely necessary to observe how futile it is to pretend that the questions raised by what is known as the Higher Criticism are such as can be lightly brushed aside or conveniently shelved. Criticism is a fact of which account must be taken, and however opposed to preconceived devout sentiment some of its methods in the past may have appeared, nothing can be gained, while much may be lost, by ignoring what is on all hands admitted to be a legitimate subject of inquiry; and whatever the ultimate results may prove to be, so long as they have been arrived at by fair and scientific means, they will have to be accepted as just deductions of historical and literary investigation. Surely now it is time when it should be no longer true for any to say that "There is a general consensus among conservative theologians that when Christian history and doctrine are concerned, the ordinary canons of evidence lose their applicability; that the eyes must be accus-

tomed to a non-natural light, and look at the literature and the history of the early Church as if it were something that stood quite by itself, and out of relation to all else going on in the world.”¹ Never has it been more true that if the Bible is to retain its influence over the minds of intelligent men, no attempt must be made to fence it off from candid examination, for it must be shown to be—what in fact it is—not a book which puzzles men’s minds by involving them in endless difficulties when considered in relation to physical science and historic truth, but the record of a revelation given, not wholesale and ready-made, but “in multifarious parts and divers modes,” according as men have been able to keep pace with the gradually but ever-unfolding truth.

It has been sometimes asserted that the Bible ought to be treated, criticized, and examined “as any other book”; but even on the most “advanced” hypothesis it must be admitted that this is hardly possible, since it stands apart from all other books, and so cannot receive precisely the same treatment; and not only this, but as the various constituents of the Bible differ widely in character and purpose, they cannot be viewed from precisely the same standpoint—as, *e.g.*, prophecy differs from history—so, obviously, the high flights of the prophetic imagination cannot be submitted to the cold analysis of the historian. And particularly must a distinction of treatment be observed in regard to the New Testament, for although as *literature* it may be subject to ordinary literary tests, as *doctrine and ethics* it is on a different plane from any other collection of writings in the world; and inasmuch as it claims to be the revelation of a Divine Personality, it is impossible to place it on the same level as writings and visions which make no higher claim than to an interior light thrown on the human understanding.

It is further necessary to bear in mind that inspiration varies in degree as well as in scope and method, and that the demand for a special consideration of the New Testament is based on

¹ Professor Percy Gardner, “A Historic View of the New Testament,” Lecture I., p. 1.

the fact of its belonging to a superior order of revelation to that of any writing found in the Old Testament.¹ To the rationalist critic all the books of both Testaments stand on a common level as purely human documents ; consequently, judging by the same criteria, it will be an easy matter for him to detect in them inaccuracies and inconsistencies which appear to destroy in great part their historical, if not their ethical, value ; but, as a recent writer has well said : " To seek behind the inaccuracies of a record its essential spirit and truth there is requisite, not only a dissecting and accurate mind, but a sympathetic and perceptive temper ; and a presentation which is not evidently strong may be inherently convincing." ² So, no matter how high the standard of rationalist criticism may be intellectually, it will most certainly fail to do justice to a subject which it cannot approach in a sympathetic spirit, simply for the reason that it belongs to a sphere beyond the range of its experience. However true it may be that it is impossible to exclude subjective prepossessions, it would seem that the Christian records are more likely to receive their due at the hands of critics who, by their experience and appreciation of the Christian spirit, hold a key to their interpretation, than of those whose attitude towards them is necessarily more or less one of hostility.

But such prepossessions are not found in the Christian critic alone, for they are even more apparent in the non-Christian, inasmuch as the latter is evidently predisposed to the rejection of the miraculous element wherever it exists ; and it should be remembered that the question of miracles being one which properly belongs to philosophy, it is no part of the province of literary criticism to determine it, and, consequently, that those who, in the name of Higher Criticism, set themselves to discredit the miraculous, are really guilty of confusion of thought in that they do not distinguish between two different sciences.

¹ This is no modern view, but one which was held by many of the Fathers—*e.g.*, St. Augustine : " Sicut veteri Testamento si esse ex Deo bono et summo negetur, ita et novo fit injuria si veteri æquetur " (" De Gestis Pelag.," V., quoted by Bishop Gore in " Lux Mundi," Preface, p. xxi).

² " The Venture of Rational Faith," by Margaret Benson.

While, however, it seems reasonable to ask for some special line of treatment in the criticism of the New Testament, such a demand is not made with a view to shirking the conclusions which are the legitimate result of impartial investigation. On the contrary, those who have the interests of Christianity most deeply at heart will desire that the exact truth in regard to the documents should be made known; for Christianity is not to be served by the suppression of facts, but rather by courting investigation, so that the records may appear in their true light, and disencumbered of any "umbra" of unreality which the devotional sentiment of ages may have cast over them.

Of course, it must be expected that an admission of the claims of modern criticism will entail a certain revision of traditional views, and those who are willing to pursue the subject to its logical consequences must be prepared for difficulties and to unlearn much that they have hitherto regarded as essential to the idea of inspiration. And it is, perhaps, a certain uneasiness as to final results that has induced men of conservative temper to regard with suspicion a science which they fear may ultimately lead them beyond the limits of concession which, in their own minds, they have set for themselves. That there are grounds for some such fears it would be misleading to deny, for the tendency of modern critical research has been, in a certain sense, destructive. But then, destruction is frequently necessary as a basis of reconstruction, and where old foundations are found to be unstable it is well that they should be destroyed and make room for new ones, rather than that we should dwell in false security. Viewed in their true light, however, the results of Higher Criticism will be found to be in the highest degree constructive.

When one recalls the paltry and even childish expedients which were very commonly resorted to a generation or two ago in the endeavour to bolster up the then current views of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the wonder is, not that men of critical and logical mind were alienated from the Church, but that Christianity itself should have survived the treatment

it received at the hands of many of its most zealous apologists. When, some fifty years ago, we reflect that it was deemed essential to the maintenance of Christian truth to declare the literal, verbal infallibility of the Bible,¹ and practically to renounce all claim fully to understand it, all hope to solve its difficulties, it is with a sense of relief that one thinks of the position which has been won for us in these days, when it is possible, while holding fast to the great dogmas of the Faith, to welcome every real advance in critical science, to accept all that it can teach us in regard to the authenticity of the Sacred Books, and to view with equanimity controversies in which the authorship even of a Gospel is involved.

It is to this fact perhaps as much as to any other that the revival of religious belief is to be attributed. Men, instead of feeling themselves fettered by narrow and irrational views on the question of inspiration, are now able to accept the great truth of a revelation without being committed to the contradictions and inconsistencies which former views carried with them. The very history of the doctrine of inspiration, and the changes it has from time to time undergone, prove how theologians have striven to rid themselves of the intellectual difficulties which the old theories involved; and it is some comfort to remember that at no time has any definite statement as to the precise method and form, or even as to the nature and extent of inspiration, been made by the authority of the Church Universal. One reasonable conclusion from this significant fact may be deduced—namely, that on questions such as the authenticity and historical value of particular portions of Holy Scripture—which, after all, appertain to scholarship rather than to faith—a certain liberty of opinion is permissible, provided the general position is maintained that the Scriptures are, in a

¹ "The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme" (Dean Burgon, "Inspiration and Interpretation," p. 89. Lectures delivered at Oxford, 1861).

special sense, the medium of revelation, and are held to be Divinely inspired.

But here a difficulty arises, and one which there is no desire to underestimate. No definite theory of inspiration having been promulgated by the Church, what will be the position if, in the course of critical investigation, certain portions of the New Testament, which afford the only canonical evidence of some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, should be discovered to be interpolations, or in other respects to form no part of the original writings? That there are many portions of Scripture which actually have been, and many that may yet be, proved to be of later origin than the originals, and are consequently of doubtful authenticity, is matter of common knowledge.¹ But the idea of "canonicity" does not imply that all of the books of the Bible are necessarily the work of the men whose names they bear, or that questions of authorship and date affect their authority as portions of the Written Word. What *is* implied is that those writings have been received by the Church as forming essential parts of the body of truth which it was God's will should be transmitted to the world. It cannot be too strongly insisted that Holy Scripture is not in itself the revelation of God, but rather that it is the record of spiritual experience. It was given originally, not as objective data on which Christian truth is founded, but as subjective evidence in support of it. The revelation itself was given in the person of Jesus Christ, and it was He Himself who gave it to the Church, which He founded and ordained to be His witness. The Scriptures of the Old Testament had prepared the way for that revelation, those of the New being the record of the truths revealed, but which were already known to the Church before they were committed to writing. The New Testament Scriptures are, therefore, the result of the effect

¹ *E.g.*, those portions almost universally admitted to be "deuterocanonical," such as the last twelve verses of St. Mark, the stories of the troubling of the water (St. John v. 4); of the woman taken in adultery (St. John viii. 1, 11); of the Angel of the Agony (St. Luke xxii. 43, 44); the statement regarding the three heavenly witnesses (1 John v. 7); the second epistle of St. Peter; the Apocalypse, etc.

produced in men's minds by the revelation, and their evidential value lies in this, that they are the expression of the mind of the Church, and of the truths she had learned, not from books, but from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who is Himself her Source of Light and Life, at whose promptings and by whose inspiration the books themselves were written. It is because men have so long been accustomed to regard Christian faith as the outcome of the New Testament, and not the New Testament as the evidence of Christian faith already existing, that they tremble for the Truth when doubts are cast on the literary authenticity of passages of grave significance in their relation to the dogmatic statements of the Creeds. When literary criticism has had its say—even to the uttermost—it will still be found that the fundamentals of the Catholic faith are left untouched, and that, though the old notions of Biblical “infallibility” will have been discarded, the Bible itself will remain as an imperishable monument of the highest grade of human experience—the record of how God, working in and with the spirit of man, has led him from crude beginnings up to the loftiest conceptions of the Divine Being and of his relation thereto, until the fulness of the time was come when revelation in its final and most complete form became possible through the personal manifestation of the Eternal Word.



The Bible and the Printer.

BY THE REV. SELWYN BLACKETT,

Wareham Rectory, Dorset.

THE printing of a Bible is a triumph of the printer's art. Probably no other book is such a strain upon the compositor for painstaking accuracy. There are certain rules with regard to the arrangement of the letters and the stops which must be kept with the most rigid obedience, otherwise the book

is valueless. There is a Bible in existence which reads in Psalm cxix. 161. "Printers have persecuted me without a cause," instead of "Princes have persecuted me." But the following instances will show that the printers themselves have no easy task.

The word Lord occurs very often in the Bible, and is printed in three different ways in order to convey three different meanings—LORD, Lord, and lord. First, there is LORD with all capital letters; then Lord with only a capital L; and lastly, there is lord with no capitals at all. The printer must make no mistake, otherwise he may lead the reader into deadly error. The Jews were extremely unwilling to pronounce the sacred name of Jehovah. Leviticus xxiv. 16 says: "He that blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death." In the uncertainty as to what might be considered a blasphemous use of the sacred Name, they adopted the practice of not pronouncing it at all. In reading they substituted for it the word Adonai, or Lord. The Greek translators followed their example by substituting "Kurios," and the Latins "Dominus." The difference between Jehovah and Adonai in the original Hebrew is marked by the English printer by the use of different letters in printing the word Lord. Thus LORD, all capitals, expresses Jehovah; whilst Lord, with a capital L only, means Adonai. Psalm cx. 1 begins: "The LORD said unto my Lord." Our Saviour quoted this to the Pharisees when He wished to lead them on to see that David was here referring, consciously or unconsciously, to his coming descendant, who should be also his Divine Lord. The printers have marked the difference which the use of this passage by our Saviour shows to exist by printing all capitals for God the Father as LORD, and only a capital L for the second person of the Trinity. The printers of the Revised Version, however, have been instructed to print the second Lord without a capital L. The reason probably is that the revisers considered the adoption of a capital L savoured more of an interpretation than a translation.

The third spelling of lord is without any capitals. People have sometimes been shocked when they heard that "the lord commended the unjust steward" in Luke xvi. 8, as if God approved of dishonest practices. If they look at the spelling they will see that the printer carefully draws their attention to the fact that it is the steward's human master who cannot help admiring the cunning of his rascally servant. To make the matter still more plain, the Revised Version prints "his lord" instead of "the lord."

When it was announced, in 1881, that the Revised Version of the New Testament was about to be published, intense curiosity was aroused. At midnight, when the first copies were to be issued, the booksellers' carts drawn up in long lines against the kerbstones blocked the traffic in the neighbourhood of Paternoster Row. From America came the offer of £100 for a single copy in advance of the issue to the general public, but it was refused. It was arranged that the publication in America should take place at the same time as in England. The proprietor of a Chicago newspaper employed an agent in New York to obtain one of the first copies that were landed. He engaged the exclusive use of a telegraph wire, and telegraphed the whole of the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Romans, 118,000 words, the longest telegraph message ever sent along the wires, in order that he might print it in his paper in Chicago a few hours before the train could bring a copy of the new book from New York. The appearance of the revised New Testament created more astonishment and prejudice than its contents. The old familiar chapters and verses had disappeared. A Bible printed in paragraphs like an ordinary book—was not this an irreverent way to treat the Word of God? Gone also were all the headings to the chapters and at the tops of the pages; there were no dates, and no marginal references. The lapse of thirty years has not overcome the shock that the printers gave to the readers of the old familiar Authorized Version. Many devout people had come to look upon that particular translation as no translation

at all, but as the original, straight from the pens of David and Paul. There were many who sympathized with the man who said that the Bible that was good enough for St. Paul was good enough for him, and he wanted no new Bibles. My housemaid persisted in calling it the Reversed Bible.

But the printers have done us a real service in presenting us with a Bible in this revised form. All those familiar things which many regretted to lose are but man's additions to the Word of God. The New Testament was not divided into chapters and verses by those who wrote it. St. Matthew and the other Evangelists never thought of breaking up their story into chapters. We do not divide our letters into chapters; nor did St. Paul so divide his Epistles. The New Testament had been in existence for a thousand years before it was divided into chapters and verses as we now have it. It was in 1250 that Cardinal Hugo arranged the chapters, which all later Bibles have adopted. In the reign of Queen Mary the chapters were divided into verses. In Queen Elizabeth's time the printer first introduced italic letters to indicate where words had to be introduced which were not in the original Hebrew and Greek, but seemed to be required to make sense in the English translation.

In the reign of James I. the headings to the chapters and the pages and the marginal references first made their appearance. It was at the personal request of this King that notes of comment and explanation were omitted. However convenient for reference these chapter-headings may be, they are but man's additions to the Word of God, and the revisers explain in their preface their reasons for omitting them. "One consequence of the arrangement in paragraphs has been the omission of the headings of chapters, which for other and more important reasons it was thought advisable to abandon, as involving questions which belong rather to the province of the commentator than to that of the translator. With the headings of chapters the headlines of pages naturally disappeared also, and for the same reason." A Jew, reading these chapter-headings,

might justly complain that whoever wrote them had a prejudice against his nation, for when a prophet denounces the wickedness of Israel and Zion, and foretells judgment coming on them, the chapter-headings say "this means the Jews"; but when the same prophet describes the blessings that in future days shall come upon Israel and Zion, the chapter-headings say "this means the Christian Church." It is evident that Isaiah lix. and lx. are referring to the same people. The former chapter is a terrible picture of sins and their coming punishment, and is headed "the sins of the Jews." The next chapter is a glowing description of restoration and blessing, and is headed "the glory of the Church." All the curses for the Jews, and all the blessings for the Christians! Isaiah lxii. is all about Zion and Jerusalem, and is headed "The Office of Ministers in preaching the Gospel." In the Bible, Zion and Jerusalem always mean the places in Palestine known by those names. In two or three places a spiritual sense is given to those names as typifying the Church or heaven; but the writers who do this are always careful to make it quite plain that they are not using the names in their proper sense, by joining on some adjective such as the *holy* Jerusalem, the *new* Jerusalem, the Jerusalem *that is above*. These chapter-headings and John Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" are responsible in a great measure for the oblivion into which the prophecies of Jewish restoration have fallen. In the New Testament the heading to Luke vii. identifies Mary Magdalene with the woman that was a sinner, but the word of God makes no such statement. The printers have done good service in omitting these human and erroneous interpretations. The Revisers correctly regarded these headings as partaking of the nature of commentaries, and have left them out, lest the ordinary reader should regard them as inspired.

Probably the new method of printing the Psalter in the Revised Version came as a revelation to many. The old version took no notice of the fact that the Psalter contains five distinct books; but the Revised Bible heads the divisions with a title, Book I., Book II., and so on. It also shows that each

Book, except the last, ends with a kind of doxology, which probably was sung at the end of each Psalm in that Book, as we sing the *Gloria* at the end of every Psalm. The fifth Book does not end with a doxology, because the last Psalm is a doxology from beginning to end.

The punctuation of the Revised Version of the Psalter differs from that in our Prayer-Books. The title-page of the Prayer-Book says: "The Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches." This pointing, or punctuation, is not merely grammatical, but musical also, the first half of each verse being separated from the second half by a colon, not according to the sense, but in that place where the first half of the chant ends. The punctuation in the Revised Bible Psalter marks the parallelism of the Hebrew poetry, but takes no notice of musical arrangements. "Great care," say the Revisers in their Preface, "has been bestowed on the punctuation." This was necessary, for punctuation is expression, and a false punctuation may give a wrong impression. The Revisers' task included the weighing of every comma and colon, and the more critically their work is examined, the greater is our admiration for the printers of it.



Whence and Whither?

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

THE question of man's origin has been much discussed. The evolution theory teaches that, descended from the lower animals and connected by blood not merely with the ape but with the *amæba*, man only very gradually rose to the comparative dignity of a savage, resembling, though far lower than, the most bestial of modern barbarians. Through a process of æonian duration alone has he attained his present position in the world, as "heir of all the ages in the foremost files of time." Hence it is asserted that self-consciousness, the

idea of responsibility for his actions, conscience, the recognition of moral distinctions, the institution of marriage, and everything else that distinguishes man from brute, was very slowly evolved in man, and did not originally exist in him. Accordingly, from the ideas and practices of savages alone can we learn, it is said, what primitive man thought and did. Religion itself has thus been developed from ghost-worship, corpse-worship, fetishism, or even—as some still argue—from magic, until it has culminated in Christianity.

Now, it must be admitted that the evolutionary theory has a charm of its own, all the more so because of its attempt to solve the problem of the origin of evil. Sin would thus be esteemed of little importance, for all sinful actions would be “merely” relapses to man’s “natural,” or original bestial or savage, state. Criminals would be accordingly “reversions to type.” But plausible as this may seem, it absolutely fails to stand examination. The “reversion to type” theory does not quite account for the forger, the drunkard, the grog-seller, the slave-driver. These can hardly be said to exist among the lowest savages. Nor can descent from the mere animal world explain the existence of unnatural vices, avarice, lying, blasphemy, slander, opium-smoking, and the ghastly murder of unborn children by their own mothers. These things do not exist among the brutes. With certain other sins a highly developed intellect is necessarily associated, and a corrupt civilization is required for their scene of action. Nor is there any evidence that man’s original state was that of the savages—of such savages, for instance, as those of Australia. Savagery tends to destroy the race, not to improve it. A well-known fact of anthropology is that, when a tribe has sunk below a certain level, all attempts to preserve it from extinction fail. If the savage state were man’s natural and original condition, he ought to flourish in it more than in any other.

Again, if we assume that the lowest modern type of savage best represents early man, we are met by the difficulty that the modern savage lacks both the germs of civilization and power

to develop them. Yet early man must have possessed these, for progress *has* been made, and civilization has arisen more than once. As Professor William M. Ramsay says :¹ "The primitive savage who develops naturally . . . into the wisdom of Sophocles and Socrates, or who transforms his fetish, in the course of many generations, through the Elohistic stage into the Jehovah of the Hebrews, is unknown to me. . . . I cannot invent for myself a primitive savage of such marvellous potentialities, when I find that the modern savage is devoid of any potentiality." As for the gradual evolution of conscience and the distinction between good and evil, there is no doubt that the modern savage possesses them. Like most men, his ethical ideas are far in advance of his conduct. He even distinguishes his deities into good and evil, benevolent or malevolent, and often neglects the former and dreads the latter. It stands to reason, too, that the recognition of moral distinctions must have existed in man from the very earliest times, for, as Dr. Tylor says, "Without a code of morals, the very existence of the rudest tribe would be impossible."²

As for religion, whatever theory may be accepted as to its origin, it is clear that it could never have come into existence if man had not originally possessed an aptitude for conceiving spiritual ideas, for rising in thought above the material, just as there evidently could never have arisen among us a science of astronomy had men not possessed eyes to see with. Schleiermacher is right, therefore, in holding that religion in man is founded on a special and noble faculty—namely, religious feeling—which is the direction of the spirit towards the infinite and the eternal. This is another way of saying that man, as man, has a *sensus numinis*, which is as real and far more important than any other of his senses. In fact, we may say with Plato and other wise men of the past that this tendency to *worship* is that which, above everything else, distinguishes man from brute.

¹ "The Cities of St. Paul."

² "Primitive Culture," vol. ii., p. 360.

This tends to enable us to estimate at its real worth the contention of some persons that man at his best will be entirely devoid of all religious belief, regarding religion as worthy only of the childhood of the human race. It is true that among some men who hold this view religion has sunk to the level of that of the fetish-worshipper; and they cherish as high and noble a faith in their "mascot" as he does, though hardly quite as logically. But anthropology shows that this is not an "advanced" state of mind. It betokens rather the atrophy of the higher spiritual nature through want of exercise. On the evolutionary theory it is "reversion to type," the type of the lowest savages.

Historically examined, religion always and everywhere, apart from revelation, shows a tendency to degeneration, and not to advance and improvement. Who can compare the religious conceptions of Ignatius Loyola with those of St. Paul? "The sublimer portions of the Egyptian religion," says Renouf, "are not the comparatively late result of a process of development. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient, and the last stage of the Egyptian religion was by far the grossest and most corrupt." So modern Hinduism, too, has sunk infinitely below the religion of the Rig-Veda; modern Buddhism is far inferior to the philosophy of Gautama. Hence it seems clear that, though the earliest men were clad in skins,¹ did not know the use of metals,² and had no modern luxuries, they were not savages, nor was their religion as low and degraded as that of their fashionably-dressed, mascot-cherishing descendants. In matters of religion there have been so many falls in historical times that it is not unreasonable to believe that one occurred in the case of the parents of the human species.

But whether we admit this or not, and whatever view we take of the origin of man, whether the evolutionary or any other, it is clear to the lowest intellect that man as he at present exists—whether considered as a fallen being or as one who has made great progress from a lower state of existence—is by no

¹ Gen. iii. 21.

² Cf. Gen. iv. 22.

means perfect. Euripides and Æschylus agree with Buddha and Confucius on this point. No reasonable being can fancy that man—*σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἀνθρώπου*—is now at best what he should be. However he came by them, he now normally possesses a conscience, a moral code, a universally diffused belief in some superior power or powers, in an after-life, in future rewards and punishments. If these are *developments*, it is evident that they have been developed in accordance with a Divine purpose, just as is the case with the growth of a tree or that of man's individual body or mind. As this is so, man is responsible for the use which he makes of his acquired or developed sense of responsibility, his conscience, his intellect, his religious convictions. If these faculties are not used aright, if they are not healthily exercised, they decay and perish, or, at least, are greatly enfeebled, as is the case with a limb or with any one of the five senses under like circumstances. To say that because the moral powers have, *ex hypostasi*, been acquired through development, therefore we are justified in dispensing with them and "reverting to type," is as reasonable as it would be to assert that because, without any hypothesis, we were once babies, and rather proud of being able to crawl, it is quite the proper thing for us to do so now, or to suck our thumbs, or to cry for the moon.

We must on any theory guard against the danger and not minimize the guilt of "reverting to type," if we use this *petitio principii* term in place of "sin." Such a "reversion" means at least this—that the individual guilty of it has fallen out of line, and is opposing that progress upon which the very existence of the race depends. It also implies that he has set himself in opposition to the eternal purpose, whatever it be, for which man as a race has been called into being. This is clear even on the evolutionary hypothesis, apart from revelation.

Hence, whatever be the facts about our origin, the duty of living up to our conscience and obeying the inborn moral law is not thereby affected. Our consciousness of guilt when this law is transgressed cannot be explained away, nor can our con-

sciousness of the existence of God and our *need* of Him. These and certain other basal facts in our nature may be denied, may be resisted, but they cannot be overthrown. We must face the facts and try to adapt our conduct to them, otherwise the result will be bad—not for the facts, but for ourselves. Just as one is crushed when he rashly defies the physical laws of the Cosmos, so must he be if he comes into collision with the moral laws of the universe. On the other hand, as by co-operating with physical laws man may advance in material civilization, so also, by becoming a fellow-worker “together with God” in the moral and spiritual sphere, he may make moral and spiritual progress. By this means he will be developing his higher nature in the manner in which both reason and religion teach that it is intended to be developed, not only with a view to harmonizing it with God’s will here, but also with that of preparing it for entrance into the higher state, which instinct as well as revelation informs us awaits man after death—unless perchance he unfits himself for it by here degrading and perhaps destroying, if that be possible, his higher faculties.

The existence of the moral and spiritual faculties in man, and their development and improvement in the best of men, are an indication, a foreshadowing, of a higher state than the present, one in which these faculties will have a wider scope for exercise—just as the faint budding of a tree in early spring is a prophecy of the glory of its summer.

In all things experience shows us that it is impossible to stand still. Progress there must be, or retrogression : and retrogression means decay and death. If, whether with or without revelation, man has here made any moral or spiritual progress, this progress must be continued here and hereafter, or all must end in ruin. There can be no question that the sin and misery of the world are out of harmony with the Divine Will. These must be overcome and finally abolished, if that Eternal Purpose¹ is to attain realization. Apart from revelation, it is hard to see how this is to be done ; but our experience teaches us that, as

¹ Eph. iii. 11.

Augustine¹ says, "Of our vices we make ourselves a ladder, if we tread the vices themselves underfoot." History shows that only through Christ, only through the power of the Holy Spirit, has this ever been done. Hence it is that in this twentieth century earnest and thoughtful men, who see how in all ages everything else has failed to raise men morally and to satisfy their spiritual yearnings, and how faith in Christ has produced the desired result in countless instances, are coming more and more to realize that, in the political and social as well as in the religious world, the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation.

Revelation alone makes clear the goal towards which the race is, or should be, tending. A recent writer² well says: "Man's work in life is to turn himself from the raw product into a piece of fine art. The Nikê of Samothrace in the natural state is but a lump of clay." This is true. But how much clearer and fuller is the teaching of St. Paul—that God's purpose for each member of the human race is he should attain, if he will, "unto³ a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." A higher ideal, a nobler model, a loftier aim, is unthinkable; and this, being the highest conceivable, is thereby proved to be the truest too.



The Temptation.

INTO the wilderness
 Driven was He,
 Into the Tempter's realm
 Driven for me;
 Filled with the Holy Ghost,
 Hailed by John's pilgrim host,
 Acclaimed by Heaven,
 Yet into Satan's lair
 Forth was He driven!

¹ Sermo iii., *De Ascensione*.

² R. Whiteing, "No. 5, John Street," Epilogue.

³ Eph. iv. 13.

Led by the Spirit pure
Far from God's light,
Led to the Tempter's door
Into the night,
Given up his prey to be,
Sin's darkest depths to see,
Sanctioned by Heaven,
Unto the gates of hell
Forth was He driven !

Who dare the curtain raise
From His temptation ?
Who dare its power appraise,
Its devastation ?
There in all points was He
Tempted and tried for me,
Yet without sin ;
But who can gauge the strife
Ere He could win ?

Was it for my poor sake,
Lord, Thou wast tried ?
My nature to partake
Hell was defied ?
Then when temptation's realm
Becomes my destined home,
Sanctioned by Heaven,
I'll cry to Thee for aid,
For Thou hast striven.

B. HERKLOTS.



Cardinal Vaughan.¹

BY THE REV. ARTHUR GALTON, M.A.,

Vicar of Edenham.

SIXTY years have gone by since a new Roman Catholic hierarchy was established in England by Pius IX., and that event was commemorated this year, with swelling joy, when the Westminster Cathedral was consecrated. Wiseman, the first Archbishop of Westminster, and the first Cardinal stationed in England since the reign of Mary Tudor, began his episcopate in a tumult of unpopularity, caused chiefly by the territorial names which Pius gave to the new Bishops. As is usual in England, the clamour was more about names than things. This may be due, perhaps, to the demoralizing and pernicious effect of party politics; but, whatever the cause, Englishmen are more prone than any other nation to pay or cheat themselves with words, in Pascal's phrase; and this is most true in their dealing with Roman Catholic affairs. A great fuss was made about empty titles, which meant nothing real, as they conveyed absolutely nothing to their owners; but no steps of any kind were taken by our Government, or suggested by the vociferous crowd, for the regulation and control of the Religious Orders: a matter in which every wise and firm Catholic Government has always insisted upon having the ultimate decision. The titles of a few Bishops matter nothing. The two questions on which the State and the English Romanists must fight, sooner or later, are the Religious Orders and the Schools; and in the meanwhile the State is giving every advantage to the inevitable foe.

Wiseman's Cardinalate was received with suspicion and fear, and with an abuse little worthy of a strong nation, which professes to be sensible and civilized. Manning's Cardinalate was accepted coolly: Newman's was acclaimed and welcomed as an international honour to one of whom his own nation was proud; indeed, it was more welcome to most Englishmen than to many Roman Catholics: Vaughan's was received with complete indifference by the general public; and if ever the Red Hat be conferred on Archbishop Bourne, it will be described as a recognition well earned by the tact and skill with which he has occupied his position. In itself, it will be taken as a matter of course, and as due to the See of Westminster; more than ever due now it can boast of so magnificent a Cathedral. The only surprise will be caused by its long and mysterious delay.

These various phases or changes in our national attitude towards Roman Catholicism are worth noticing, because many different conclusions may be drawn from them. One conclusion is that we are less insular and narrow than we were fifty years ago. We have realized what the Empire means, and of what elements it is composed. Instead of describing the white element in it by the tautological and inadequate phrase "Anglo-Saxon," we

¹ "The Life of Cardinal Vaughan," by J. G. Snead-Cox. London: Herbert and Daniel. Two vols. 21s. net.

speak more truly now of His Majesty's Anglo-Celtic subjects and dominions. And we have gone on to realize, in consequence, that the Roman Catholic question is an Imperial matter, and cannot be regarded as though it were merely insular and parochial. This enlarged view is chiefly responsible, no doubt, for the way in which the King's Declaration was handled by the Government, and voted by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Parliament. The change of temper is due, also, to a waning interest in theology, and to a growing dislike for sectarian quarrels. It may be owned at once that theology is not religion, and that quarrelling never can be religious; so far as this, we welcome broader and more charitable views. No man should be abused or scolded for his theological beliefs and practices. That is never the way to help him. Education is the only solvent for error; and *coups de liberté*, according to M. Briand's fine expression, are the only lawful and effective weapons to use against obscurantism and oppression. But it should never be forgotten that the Papacy is not only or chiefly a theological system; it may be that in theory, but in practice it is a social and political institution; and though we are willing that the theological susceptibilities of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects should be spread in every possible way, we still think that the logical consequences which flow from the Papal theories of jurisdiction and of universal predominance should not have been wholly overlooked, or omitted from the new form. Catholic States have always distinguished between the spiritual functions of the Papacy and the temporal claims of the Roman Court; and the liberties of Roman Catholics themselves are protected best, as our own are, when the indispensable sovereignty of the State is both asserted and maintained against even the shadow of encroachment. It is a pity that English Liberalism is always in a hurry, and is so incurably illogical.

These, at any rate, are not the faults of the Papal system, which is infinitely patient, is careful of the minutest detail, and shrinks from no logical conclusions to its premises. These qualities are all evident in the history of the See of Westminster. Since 1850 it has had four Archbishops, and we now have the biographies of three. They were all remarkable men, and they have all been fortunate in their biographers. Cardinal Wiseman was a solid and extensive scholar, of a kind now obsolete. His business was to reorganize and consolidate, and, as he kept to it, he never came very prominently before the public. He laid his foundations deep and quietly; and his unostentatious work has been well described by Mr. Wilfrid Ward.

Cardinal Manning was different. His best friends have never accused him of hiding his light under a bushel; from Harrow onwards, he took care that it should shine before men; and after his death, under the disguise of a biography, he left behind him one of the strangest and most illuminative autobiographies that has ever been written. It reveals to us, as no modern book has done, the secrets of the Roman Court and the inner working of the Papal system. If Newman's *Apologia* aimed at explaining his progress towards Rome, Manning's, whatever he aimed at, conveys to us the impression that he discovered his extreme Vaticanism was a mistake, and that he wished his confession of error to be public. It is impossible, reading between the lines, to draw any other inference. Manning's biographer, no doubt, was a dupe utilized by one of the most adroit personages who ever lived.

But whatever we may think of Purcell and his work, autobiography cannot be explained away, and there can be no appeal from personal documents, from a man's own statements, musings, and confessions. Purcell's compilation abides, as the explanation of a disappointed life, the revelation of a tortuous and mischievous bureaucracy.

Cardinal Vaughan's *Life* contains no such surprises and revelations. The great surprise, even for some of his own adherents, if we may believe Mr. W. S. Lilly, was that it should occupy nearly two thousand large octavo pages. "Surely half that number might have sufficed to tell the public all that it wants to know about a prelate who, no doubt, was full of zeal and devotion, but who has left no mark upon the world's history or the world's thought!" So says a most candid and interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century* for August. Mr. Lilly corrected his first thoughts when he had read the *Life*, and we agree entirely that his second thoughts were truer. The *Life* is not too long; it could not have been shortened without many serious losses; and, let us add, without any reservation, that it could not easily have been done better. Mr. Snead-Cox has not, perhaps, added a new classic to our English literature; he is an ex-journalist, not a stylist, a "lord of language"; but he has given us a most successful, interesting, and skilful biography. A mass of details, most of them trivial enough in themselves, are combined into a lucid and coherent portrait, which places the subject before us as a living personage. We know the man, and, what is more, we know his mind. Let us say, quite frankly, that there is a great deal in Cardinal Vaughan's mind which we do not like, that we are opposed uncompromisingly to the chief objects for which he lived, that we abhor the system for which he worked; but, nevertheless, we can admire the zeal and honesty of the man himself. "Fas est et ab hoste doceri": the zeal with which Vaughan threw himself, first into missionary work, and then into social and philanthropic work, is worthy of all praise. The methods which he used for the rescue of children, the spread of education as he conceived it, the crusade against drink, are worthy of both study and imitation. We have had too few great builders in our day, and assuredly Vaughan was one. He has enriched London with one of her most imposing buildings, which, as long as it remains, will be his own monument; but behind his material structure there was always the conception of a spiritual building, melodious, coloured, palpitating, a visible, audible, tangible witness to the unseen. One of the most practical of men, Vaughan was a mystic, with a vision which he was ever striving to realize. He was filled with the romance and chivalry of an earlier time. As much soldier as priest, he was more suited for one of the old military Orders than for the rather sordid and very dubious methods of contemporary clericalism.

In its personal aspect, then, this *Life* is a sound piece of work, and is well worth reading. Though it has no revelations, such as Manning's *Life* had, and as Newman's must have if the documents be published honestly, yet it contains far more that is valuable and important than would be gathered from most of the reviews. "I should have hesitated," says Mr. Lilly again, "to give some of the details which it contains"; and we can well believe it. Such reticence is natural, and Mr. Lilly observes it by not drawing attention to some of the very curious and suggestive revelations

which Mr. Snead-Cox has made so generously. *Vaughan's Life* shows us, first, the very un-English atmosphere in which English Romanists are trained, and from which most of them can never escape wholly ; secondly, it reveals, as no modern work has done, the sinister and overpowering influence of the Religious Orders in Rome, and the pitiful condition of a Romanist Bishop who is objectionable to the regular clergy ; thirdly, it tells us a great deal that is both interesting and illuminative about the condemnation of Anglican Orders under Leo XIII. In our review of the book we shall keep to these three points.

Herbert Vaughan was born in Gloucester in 1832. His father, Colonel Vaughan, of Courtfield in Herefordshire, represented a family which has always been Romanist, and of which the origin is lost in the fables of Welsh antiquity. His mother, a convert, was a Roll of the Hendre. Now, the English Romanists are proud, and justly, of their old families ; but their writers inveigh unjustly, and even absurdly, against the Penal Laws. Those laws were certainly justifiable. The Papacy declared war against Queen Elizabeth, and carried it on without any restraining scruple. Its adherents had to take the consequences of a state of war, and the Papacy itself is chiefly responsible for the fate of the victims whom it now canonizes, thus profiting by two worlds and two standards of morality. The Penal Laws may certainly be explained and very largely excused. We may lament their necessity, but we hold that no apology is required. Moreover, the laws were never pressed harshly against quiet and peaceable individuals. If they had been, not a single Roman Catholic landed family could have survived. They would have been taxed and worried out of existence. But, as we know, many did survive, and with considerable wealth. A score of great families witness, conclusively and solidly, against the perversion of our history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by modern Papal controversialists. Mr. Lilly points out that the Vaughans adhered to the Stuarts from Charles I. to Culloden ; and the owner of Courtfield, which he held in spite of his Romanism and Royalism, followed Charles Edward into exile, taking service with the King of Spain, still our great hereditary foe. In spite of all this, his son "found his way back to England, and was allowed to resume the family estates." Could there be a better confutation of the usual Romanist exaggerations about the Penal Laws and the "persecution" of Catholics, or a finer witness to the humanity and toleration of the English Government ? If a family like the Vaughans had been French Huguenots or Protestants of any kind in Spain and Italy, the fate of themselves and of their properties would have been very different. The Roman Catholics can't have it both ways. Either they must explain away the continuance and prosperity of their numerous old families, or they must admit that the current accounts of their "persecutions" are mythical. And Englishmen should be ashamed of so slandering their country in the interests of a foreign power, or even for theological purposes.

On the father's side, Herbert Vaughan belonged to those old English Catholics who differed in no respect from the Gallicans of the eighteenth century, and hardly at all from the English High Churchmen of those days. By his convert mother, he was imbued with those more extravagant Italian and ultramontane fashions which were introduced among the English

Romanists, to their surprise and mistrust, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, and which were spread so rapidly among them by recruits from the Oxford Movement. The Romanism of Faber was no more the Romanism of Lingard and of Alban Butler than of Lord Acton. From this early training Vaughan derived his passion for the comparatively new devotion to St. Joseph, and his exaggerated reverence for images. We read of his putting the brief of his episcopate into the hands, or at the feet, of several statues; and when he was trying to procure a house from an unwilling owner, he secreted a little image of St. Joseph in a cupboard. To this early atmosphere, again, he owed his entire and exclusive devotion to the Papacy. "His easy test of Catholic loyalty was always, and under all circumstances, to stand on the side of Rome. Instinctively in any controversy he would be for the Pope against all comers. To uphold and strengthen the authority of the Vicar of Christ was one of the guiding motives of his life." For these purposes, while he was Bishop of Salford, he acquired the *Tablet*, and he used it unscrupulously to support Manning and the definition of Papal infallibility. We say "unscrupulously," because "Vaughan deliberately set himself to strangle and suppress any and every utterance in favour of the Inopportunist Party." Newman, Bishops Ullathorne and Clifford, Acton, and the sober, moderate elements in English Romanism, had no chance of a fair hearing. So it was all over Europe, and thus the definition was carried. It is worth noticing that Catholic Emancipation was only granted in 1827 because the Irish hierarchy and the leading English Romanists declared officially that Papal infallibility was no part of the Catholic faith, but was merely a Protestant fable. It may be added that the encroaching and ever-centralizing Vaticanism which has followed the definition has lowered and weakened the episcopate, and is fast destroying Roman Catholicism itself. It is a cause of weakness, and not of strength, as all arbitrary government must be in the long-run. The older Catholic Press had been "distinguished for its tact, reticence, and conciliatory language." Under Vaughan's predecessor the *Tablet* became "one of the most offensive and virulent newspapers in Europe"; and Vaughan himself was not faithless to this evil tradition. His campaign for Papal infallibility was mere journalism, mostly scurrilous. Certainly theology and history were not on the ultramontane side. And of all the present "wounds of the Church," in Rosmini's phrase, numerous and mortal as they are, the clerical Press is undoubtedly the worst, and is assuredly the most disgraceful.

With regard to our second point, the relations between the Religious Orders and the Bishops, this *Life* contains a great deal of most important and unedifying information. The Orders are all-powerful at Rome, through their wealth and their international diffusion. The Jesuits boast that they always have the support of Rome, not only because they are the special militia of the Papacy, but because they have "been employed by the Popes all over the world for three hundred years to contend against and control Bishops who were troublesome to the Holy See." "The Holy See feels that their co-operation is necessary"; and so they had privileges and powers, of unknown extent, granted to them privately by individual Popes. Against this hidden and active influence Vaughan had to contend in an educational matter, which affected the finances of his diocese. He won his case, after

persistent efforts, and in spite of innumerable intrigues. Into the merits of the case we need not enter. It is sufficient to point out that no system can be healthy or permanent which is managed by such principles as are exposed in the whole affair. But we recommend more especially to the attention of those who may be interested the policy, actions, and correspondence of Father Gallwey, who was then the Jesuit Provincial in England. The matter is contained in pages 277 to 303 of the first volume. As examples of unctuous cunning Father Gallwey's letters would be hard to beat, and his actions certainly justify the traditional conception of what is meant by Jesuitism.

As to Anglican Orders, a great deal of light is thrown upon the proceedings of 1895 and the following time by these pages. In this matter we agree entirely with all that Mr. Lilly says, especially about Lord Halifax and his party. "Lord Halifax apparently forgot to mention that, although these things (the Romanizing practices of the E.C.U.), were taught *in* the Church of England, they were by no means taught *by* the Church of England, whose articles and formularies, to say nothing of her history, are a standing protest against them." Nothing could be truer or better said. Vaughan himself always spoke out honestly against the impossibility of corporate reunion, of terms or compromises between the Papacy and any dissentient body. By Papal principles there must be complete submission or nothing. Otherwise the Papal authority itself is bartered away. For our own part, we have always held that the Letter of our own Archbishops was a tactical mistake. Instead of arguing as they did, rather vaguely, they should merely have said, if the medieval conception of Orders be taken as the historical standard, then we agree with the Pope that the Anglican Church does not possess them, and does not want them. But, we would also point out, and we appeal to the various Ordinals in proof of it, that the Pope cannot destroy Anglican Orders after the nineteenth century without, by the same process, destroying his own Orders and all others before, say, the eighth or ninth century. He may choose whichever horn of this dilemma he prefers. In other words, the medieval standard and conception of Orders cannot be maintained in the face of history and antiquity; and Roman Orders must go with them, as well as the whole sacramental system which was inaugurated by Innocent III. and completed at Trent.

As to the exterior facts—namely, the wording of the ancient Ordinals—Mr. Snead-Cox agrees. But he still argues about the "intention": that the Anglican Reformers had no "intention" to make *sacerdotes*, sacrificing priests. Clearly they had not, and the reason is obvious; they took the ancient Ordinals for their model, and they found nothing in them about sacrificing and absolving, as these terms came to be understood after 1216. The conclusion is equally obvious. If the old Ordinals contained no forms which expressed these notions, it is clear that the framers of those Ordinals had no such intention either. Their purpose was the same as the purpose of the Anglican Reformers, which is precisely what we should expect. This argument from "intention" fails utterly when it is examined, and the supporters of Leo XIII. have no other. And so we may take leave of Mr. Snead-Cox and his book, congratulating him as a biographer, though not as a theologian. His publishers, we believe, are a comparatively new firm,

and they deserve all praise for producing so large and handsome a book at so reasonable a price.

It might be interesting to speculate about what would have happened if Leo had endorsed Anglican Orders. It is possible that some discontented Romanists in 1899 and 1900 might have drifted into the High Church ranks. Some fear of this was not absent, we believe, from Vaughan's mind. It is possible, as a knowledge of history spreads, that the present theory of Orders and of the Papacy itself will dissolve to a very large extent among intelligent Roman Catholics. The present Pontificate is straining Catholic faith and patience almost more than they will bear. Pius X. and his Secretary of State seem bent now upon repeating their French exploits in Spain. Modernism spreads, and must inevitably spread, in spite of all their efforts. The ever narrowing and more arbitrary centralization of Rome must either kill down all life in the Church, or must provoke the rebellion through which alone it can revive; while to tyranny and intrigue is added that sort of dissimulation which bound to the strictest secrecy all members of the Commission on Anglican Orders, and yet enabled Cardinal Vaughan in London to have daily reports of the proceedings in Rome. A similar story is told about Manning and the Vatican Council; and the procedure of a Papal Conclave is the property of the whole world. No system can survive so scandalous a divergence between theory and practice; and, by a just retribution, perhaps loquacious journalism will finish what an ambitious and unscrupulous despotism has begun.



The Missionary World.

THE financial year of several Missionary Societies closes on March 31. If ever there was a year when an unmistakable mandate to go forward would have been welcome it is this. The world stands open-doored, and the stimulus of the World Missionary Conference grows stronger month by month. Yet society after society, burdened with accumulated deficit of varying weight, or fettered by an inelastic income, is facing prospects indicating need for retrenchment rather than hope for advance. The S.P.G., though its income shows signs of increase, has been appealing for an extra £20,000. Friends of the C.M.S. are urgently appealing for £36,000 to clear off former deficits, whilst the Society itself is taking special steps to evoke prayer that the year's income may cover the year's expenditure. The London Missionary Society is weighted by

‘accumulated deficiencies amounting to nearly £40,000.’ The Baptist Missionary Society reports that “the present financial outlook is one of real gravity.” The Friends’ Foreign Mission Association records a series of small annual deficiencies, met so far from a fund now nearly depleted. The Moravians are hard pressed. The China Inland Mission, called to work on lines unlike the rest, gives in *China’s Millions* a statement on finance, including a table of moneys received, in Great Britain only, from 1903 to 1910. Last year’s income is slightly less than any of the others, so that, though the work has been steadily maintained and no suitable candidate has been declined, “the straitness in funds at times has, of necessity, called for self-denial on the part of members of the Mission.” The C.I.M., as ever, sounds the note of thanksgiving rather than of fear; indeed, all Societies meet their testing with humility and with faith. During this month, when a heavy strain is resting on the officials and committees responsible for finance at missionary centres, let us, who are their fellow-workers in the Church, uphold them with our prayers. The cost of their service is great—a cost unknown to those who deal with money in the sphere of earthly profit or loss. When an adverse balance-sheet means restricted spiritual work, it is the *heart* of the missionary financier which aches.

* * * * *

Again and again, from one standpoint after another, we ask ourselves why this strange thing should be. It touches not one organization, not one church only; it is a problem common to all. God has done the impossible—as man sees it—in opening the non-Christian world. He has taken up, not the isles, but the many-millioned nations, as a very little thing. Miracle is at our doors. Yet so far in the Church at home God’s widespread wonders are not wrought. That there are enough fit men and women to staff the Mission-field none doubts. That the Church has means enough for the task is not denied. Yet year by year of brief and priceless opportunity slips by without an adequate uprising and out-thrust. Are we, being ready, waiting for God to work? Or is He, who deigns to need us,

being ready, waiting for us? At His time, but not before His time, that which He is expecting must be done. Is His time now? That is the question of questions to-day. The answer comes to one and another in secret; but His Church is a body, and it must come to the body as a whole.

* * * * *

It seems as if the Church were passing slowly—so slowly—through the preliminaries to the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Gospel for the fourth Sunday in Lent, falling this year on March 26. Again we, the disciples of the Lord, see the great multitude gathered, sheep not having a shepherd, in a desert place. Again the responsibility is thrown by the Lord upon us—"Give ye them to eat." The appeal for the moment is not to the impulsive Peter or to the devoted John, but to the matter-of-fact Philip, and it issues from the Heart of eternal compassion, couched in terms of finance: "Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?" The question is answered in the sphere in which it is asked. Philip, precursor of missionary finance committees to-day, draws up an estimate and presents a deficit: "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little." There is neither sufficiency nor efficiency here. So far the Church has come to-day. The picture is exact.

* * * * *

Is the question we have been asking answered by the Voice from the hillside of Galilee? To Philip, then, was the question set "to prove him," as we are being proved. Nothing short of a calculated deficit in the face of a vast opportunity could call out what the Lord desired and still desires. "He Himself knew what He would do." *And He knows to-day.* When the pressure of intolerable impotence quickens each Andrew to remembrance; when the barley loaves and fishes of each little lad are revealed; when the command, "Bring them hither to Me," is heard and unreservedly answered, then the problem set in terms of finance will be solved in terms of consecration. The money question, whereby He has searched us, will drop out of

sight, and the Lord Himself will take, and bless, and break, and His disciples will distribute from His hands. Once more thought reviews the great world multitude. "The day is now far spent"; surely it is time "they did all eat and were filled."

* * * * *

Missionary finance concerns the Church as a body, but it has its individual and parochial aspect too. The law of sacrifice, always binding, is isolated for realization at this season of the Church's year. Not to gain merit, but because of that law, are we called to self-denial. It is essential for the disciplining of our souls to inner fruitfulness, and for that expansion of life which is conditioned by vicarious sacrifice. Lent prepares us alike for the fellowship of the Cross and of the Resurrection. Self-discipline is wellnigh a silent note in modern society. It needs all the more to be sounded in the Christian Church. Individual self-sacrifice lies behind many of the offerings which flow into missionary exchequers this month. There are tokens of congregational self-discipline and sacrifice too. The S.P.G. reports that two London parishes—one of them Canon Pennefather's—have decided to send out one of their clergy, and support him in pioneer work in Canada. The Rev. F. B. Meyer's congregation at Regent's Park Chapel have resolved to give one-tenth of every offertory to Missions, in addition to existing missionary collections. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field*, in recording this, notes that as a result "the offertory has gone up £3 a Sunday."

* * * * *

The Bible in the World—a magazine which is always inspiring—tells of a wonderful offertory given on behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society at the town of Médak, about sixty miles from Hyderabad, in the Nizam's dominions.

"At nightfall," writes the Madras Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, "the Christians gathered in a large quadrangle, under the starlit sky, to hear my address on 'The Bible in the Far East.' They looked and listened with keen attention as I tried to show them, with the aid of a magic lantern, how Christianity is winning its way in other lands as well as their own. . . . The collection was not taken at the evening meeting: the

next morning was set apart for that purpose. At nine o'clock we assembled in church—about a hundred and fifty adults and a hundred children, mostly sitting cross-legged on the floor. . . . We began with a hymn and brief prayers; then came the event of the morning. As far as collections are concerned, it was the event of my whole career in the service of the Bible Society. A Telugu lyric was struck up, and sung with zest to the accompaniment of that rhythmic clapping of hands which is characteristic of Indian singing. During the singing the boys and girls from the Mission boarding-school came forward alternately in groups of eight or ten, each one carrying a plate of raw rice, which had been saved by two half-days of fasting. Repeating the words, 'With joy we pour this offering at the feet of Jesus Christ,' they emptied their plates on to a carpet spread in front of the communion-rail. Lads from the industrial school followed, bringing the firstfruits of their labour—a few yards of *dangari* cloth suitable for towels and dusters. Then came, in small groups, catechists, teachers, divinity students, and the pastor of the church, with their wives and families, Bible-women, hospital nurses, missionaries. The local *padres* and I were kept busy throughout the service with trays, baskets, and brass pots, receiving the offerings, which included money, rice, eggs, fowls, and vegetables. A young Brahmin woman, a recent convert, laid a gold ring on my tray; small boys came up dragging live ducks by the neck; even the babes in arms were represented by a few *pice*. As each group presented their gifts a short prayer was offered, asking acceptance of the gift and blessing for the giver. In this way two hours passed, and the memorable service was closed with a hymn of thanksgiving. . . . Here was giving even to the point of blood, an offering wrung from the wages of months of toil. To my amazement and great joy, the collection, one-third of which was contributed by the missionaries and two-thirds by the native congregation, was found, when converted into money, to be no less than six hundred *rupees*, or forty pounds sterling!"

* * * * *

We pray that the Church as a whole may awake to duty. Meantime, we have ourselves. There is power whereby we may rise up with our whole possessions into the region of complete and rejoicing sacrifice, through the Name of Him who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor.

* * * * *

The Reports of the Edinburgh Conference are being one by one considered with care and deliberation by the Church Missionary Society. "No greater proof could be given," says the *C.M. Review*, "of the profound importance and unique value which the Committee attach to these Reports." It is significant that one of the oldest and largest Societies should thus demonstrate its readiness to avail of proffered help. Each

Report is being summarized; a series of resolutions, based upon the summary, is being adopted after discussion, and referred to various standing committees, to be given effect. The report on "Carrying the Gospel to all the World" has been first ably summarized by the Rev. Hubert Brooke. His paper, with illustrative extracts, and the resolutions of the Committee appear in the *C.M. Review*.

* * * * *

The whole set of resolutions (expressly said to be preliminary to others) are charged with a liberal spirit and show a desire to advance. Two points touching on foreign administration are of exceptional interest, as indicating readiness to readjust existing work. This is wise and courageous, for Societies are not apt, as a rule, to remember that ruts are as easily formed in the foreign field as at home. Much that passes as continuity of principle is only fixity of casually formed habit, and habit is stronger for good or for evil in work than even in the individual. The Committee appear to contemplate some form of response to special calls, which may strengthen fields with urgent opportunity at the expense of others, and they appeal to their missionaries for support. They further throw upon the governing bodies in the Mission-field responsibility for sending home "adequate reports . . . setting forth plans, problems, and requirements." The secret of wise missionary administration in the future lies here: the corporate work of men and women in the field is necessary if a broad policy is to be framed. It would be well if every missionary body were called upon to review the Edinburgh Reports, and send home recommendations showing how they bear upon local work.

* * * * *

Lord Curzon of Kedleston has been speaking—and speaking finely—in his Rectorial Address at Glasgow University on "East and West." While admitting that the moral influence of Christianity has been "immense," he hazards the opinion that "the East is unlikely to accept Christianity," an opinion which the *Times* surmises "will probably occasion considerable

controversy." In a leading article upon the Rectorial Address, the *Times* points out that "Lord Curzon is rather addicted to casting political horoscopes, and the practice is fraught with many pitfalls when applied to Asia." An illustration of this is afforded in the address itself. It is interesting to place Lord Curzon's well-known estimate of the possibilities of China some fourteen years ago beside his estimate of to-day.

1896.

"The continued existence of the yellow race may be regarded as assured. But that the Empire . . . is likely to falsify the whole course of its history, and to wrench round the bent of its own deep-seated inclination, simply because the shriek of the steam-whistle or the roar of the cannon is heard at its gates, is an hypothesis that ignores the accumulated lessons of political science and postulates a revival of the age of miracles."—"Problems of the Far East," pp. 341, 342.

1911.

"The future of China in the next quarter of a century depends in the main upon the manner in which she works the new Parliamentary machine, if it be started, and on the degree to which it is found to have an astringent or a dissolvent effect within the Empire. If she can preserve her internal unity, and at the same time organize her forces for industry and commerce, she must become one of the greatest Powers in the world."—*Times*, January 26, 1911.

Perhaps, in days to come, the present statement of Lord Curzon concerning the prospects of Christianity in the East may be placed in a similar left-hand column, and a parallel modification be available to place in the right. G.



Discussions.

"THE PERMISSIVE USE OF THE VESTMENTS."

(*The Churchman, March, 1911, p. 169*).

THE moderation with which Canon Beeching pleads for a permissive use of the Eucharistic Vestments, and the obvious sincerity of his desire to contribute to the peace of the Church, give an appearance of ungraciousness to any attempt to examine critically the quotations and arguments contained in his paper. But it is very far from certain that the results which he anticipates would follow the adoption of his proposal, and it may not be amiss, therefore, to point out the disputable character of some of the statements upon which he bases his conclusions.

The question at issue is whether the legalization of the Vestments would or would not help towards a solution of the difficulties which beset the Church of England. Canon Beeching thinks that it would, his view apparently being that such a concession to the wishes of moderate High Churchmen would induce them to throw the weight of their influence against those who are assimilating the teaching and practice of the Church of England to that of the Church of Rome. It does not, we may observe, show a very exalted opinion of the loyalty of those for whom he speaks to suggest that the refusal of this concession would throw them into the arms of the extremists, and I am not altogether prepared to do them the injustice of believing that it would. There are High Churchmen who wear the Vestments without holding the sacerdotal doctrines generally associated with them, because they have quite honestly come to believe that Vestments are required by the law of the Church of England. If these men should be persuaded that they are mistaken on this point, they would without hesitation alter their practice. But the majority of those who wear Vestments are not of this class. They have adopted them because they attach a definite and important significance to them, and Canon Beeching deceives himself if he thinks their numbers are not large. The circulation of the *Church Times* as compared with that of the *Guardian* points in the opposite direction. The very fact to which Canon Beeching draws attention—that some calling themselves “moderate” are prepared to join hands with the extremists sooner than relinquish the Vestments—indicates to how great an extent they have already been permeated with their doctrines.

In truth, it is not with the really moderate men that our troubles have arisen, but with the extremists. The Vestments were introduced, not by the moderate men, but by the extremists; they have been forced upon parishes in spite of the remonstrances of worshippers, the directions of Bishops, and the decisions of Courts; and we have been told again and again, in the plainest and clearest language, that this was done on account of the doctrine which was attached to them. It does not, therefore, seem a reasonable contention that to concede this point would help to stay the Romeward advance. The Lambeth Judgment was supposed in the same way to offer the promise of peace, but the growth of Ritualism has been in no way checked by it. As a matter of fact, it has since proceeded at an accelerated pace.

The analogy from objections to the surplice in the pulpit or in the choir is hardly so strong as Canon Beeching supposes. It is easy to be wise after the event, and to say that the objectors might have reserved their protests for more important matters; but there is this to be said for them—that they feared the spread of a counter-Reformation movement, and their fears have, alas! been abundantly realized. Moreover, it has not been generally noticed that the five Bishops in their Report actually suggest that, since choirmen now wear surplices, a different dress should be adopted by the clergy—a suggestion which

shows that those who objected to surpliced choirs were perhaps wiser than they knew.

The claim is put forth on behalf of the Vestments that they are the "historical dress" for the ministration of Holy Communion. But in what sense can they be called historical? The history of the last 350 years and the agitation attending their late and partial revival show that the Vestments have not been the dress of ministration during that period. The history of the first 300 years of the Christian era shows that the clergy then performed their sacred ministrations in the ordinary dress of everyday life. And the history of the next 600 years shows that during the course of those centuries there were no distinctive Vestments reserved for Eucharistic use. The last-mentioned fact is important, since it is as a distinctive Eucharistic dress that the Vestments are being contended for. Thus we have only a period of roughly about 650 years during which the Vestments were employed as a distinctively Eucharistic dress, and those were the years which witnessed the full development of the doctrine of the Mass. It must be evident, therefore, that to describe the Vestments as "the historical dress of the minister in that celebration" (*i.e.*, Holy Communion) is a misleading use of terms.

A more important question arises when we come to consider the last revision of the Prayer-Book, in 1661-62. In Canon Beeching's opinion, it was the intention of the revisers to leave the door open for the ultimate restoration of the Vestments. But we may well ask, Where is the evidence of this? He speaks of the "reinsertion" of the Ornaments Rubric, but makes no reference to the fact that it was very materially altered. As it stood, it contained a perfectly unambiguous direction to the effect that "*the minister shall use in the church such ornaments,*" etc. These words were removed, as also the words which made a distinction between the time of the Communion and other times of ministration, and the words "at all times of their ministrations" were added. Had different vestures for different ministrations been intended, it should have been, as Canon Trevor pointed out, "at the several times," etc. There is no indication that any Bishop then on the Bench had the least desire for the Vestments, notwithstanding the passages from Cosin's earlier notebooks, quoted by Canon Beeching; certainly no Bishop ever wore them or required them to be worn. We have the Visitation articles of nearly every one of the Bishops of the time, and they all agree in enforcing the surplice, and only the surplice. Moreover, they demanded the surplice "in the ministration of the Sacraments"—a demand which, so far as the Holy Communion was concerned, would have been illegal, on the theory that the new rubric revived the use of Edward's First Prayer-Book. It is little to the purpose to speak of the impossibility of exacting the use of the Vestments when there was difficulty in obtaining that of the surplice. The leading nonconforming clergy were ejected, to the number of 2,000; and the authorities who secured the passing of the

Corporation Act, the Act of Uniformity, and the Five-Mile Act, were not likely to be lenient in their demands upon tender consciences. Had there been any cases of the Vestments being worn, or had even one of the Bishops required them, even though unsuccessfully, there would have been more to be said for Canon Beeching's theory that the Bishops desired them; but this complete and absolute non-use, and the uniform official enforcement of another and contradictory use, is as complete a refutation of it as in the nature of things we could have.

It may, however, be said that the "Notes" which constitute vol. v. of the "Works" of Bishop Cosin do furnish an indication that he at least believed the Vestments to be required by law, and Canon Beeching quotes from p. 42 a sentence to this effect. But he has overlooked a parenthesis at the end of the paragraph, where, in a later hand, Cosin has added: "But the Act of Parliament, I see, refers to the canon, and until such time as other order shall be taken." Canon Beeching gives a longer quotation from pp. 439-40, where it is also stated that vestments, copes, and albs "are still in force." Here, as in the former quotation, we should have been informed that these "Notes" are simply a number of quotations, comments, etc., in a manuscript book and interleaved Prayer-Books, which served as commonplace books. They were begun about 1619, when Cosin was only twenty-four years of age, and they abound in mistakes, as anyone who goes carefully over the footnotes furnished by the editor of the volume, Dr. Barrow, can see for himself. The editor, in his preface, says that they are to a great extent collections rather than original annotations, and warns the reader that the statements respecting ecclesiastical antiquities are derived from works which are of little or no authority, and cannot be relied on as matter of historical truth. Commonplace books of this character, never intended for publication, and dating from twenty to forty years before he became Bishop, are not exactly the sources to which we should look for the views of *Bishop Cosin* in 1662. It would have been more to the point to quote from his Visitation articles of that date, as expressing his mature opinions. In them he asks:

"Have you a large and decent Surplice (one or more) for the Minister to wear at all times of his publick ministration in the Church?"

And, after enumerating the various Church services, including the two Sacraments prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, he further asks:

"Doth he [your minister] all these without omission, addition, or alteration of any of them, using all the Rites and Ceremonies appointed in that Book?"

"Doth he alwaies at the reading or Celebrating any Divine Office in your Church or Chappel, constantly wear the Surplice, and other his Ecclesiastical Habit according to his degree? And doth he never omit it?"—*Report of Ritual Commission, 1868, p. 601.*

It is practically impossible to believe that, if Cosin then held the view that albs, vestments, and copes were among the rites and ceremonies appointed in the Prayer-Book, he would have demanded only the surplice and hood.

It may be observed by way of a conclusion, that we find the Vestments emerge as a distinctively Eucharistic vesture at the time when the theories which afterwards developed into Transubstantiation and the Mass were beginning to meet with popular recognition. When the Mass was abolished they were abolished with it, and, except for the brief interlude of Mary's reign, they disappeared completely for 300 years after the Reformation. When the Mass was reintroduced by the Ritualists the Vestments reappeared with it; and Lord Halifax, speaking for his party, has told us that they value the Vestments, other reasons apart, because they are a witness to the fact that the Lord's Supper is neither more nor less than the Mass in English! How, then, can it be supposed that to legalize the Vestments will not promote the advance of those who are introducing the Mass into the Church of England? As Bishop Butler said, "Things and actions are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be. Why, then, should we desire to be deceived?"

W. GUY JOHNSON.

The "Vestment controversy" is before us to-day in a new setting. For the first time in its recent history, it can be discussed without suspicion being aroused that one side or the other is disloyal to the authority of law. This change of setting is more than a cause for thankfulness; it is also, as I desire to point out, of profound importance in relation to the future conduct of the discussion.

In what does the change consist? In this: that whereas we have been busy disputing hitherto as to the meaning of an old law, we are concerned now with the terms of a new one. When in the past we have disagreed on the question whether the Ornaments Rubric authorized the use of the Vestments or not, our attention was concentrated, strange to say, on the endeavour to discover rather what had been considered good for our forefathers than what was now good for ourselves. This is not, of course, the whole truth, for it was usually held that the two goods must necessarily coincide. But the assumption was not argued, for, in fact, it was not in question; and thus the inquiry was focussed upon the past. On the other hand, the matter presents itself to us to-day in connection with the revision of the Prayer-Book, and hence it is considered on the hypothesis that here, as elsewhere, change and adjustment may possibly be needed. Thus, even if the whole Church of England could reach a unanimous opinion as to what our present Ornaments Rubric requires of us, that opinion would not be the only, would scarcely be the chief, factor of the result of our questioning at the present time. It would still remain to be

considered whether modern beliefs as to the significance, or value, or risk in the use of the Vestments coincided with those which prevailed in 1662.

Moreover, it cannot be denied that there is disagreement in many quarters as to the competence of the Privy Council to act as the highest tribunal of the English Church, and this division of opinion has helped to make past discussion fruitless and bitter. But the jurisdiction of the Privy Council is no longer a main issue; the focus of the investigation is shifted to the present; and therefore in our inquiry it is as unfair for those who wish for the Vestments to charge their opponents with mistaking the authority of the Advertisements as it is for the latter to charge the former with disregard for law. Even one who heartily believes that Vestments are permitted by the present Rubric may conceivably wish to see them unambiguously forbidden; while, on the other hand, one who heartily believes that they are forbidden may conceivably, without being guilty of lawlessness, wish to see them duly allowed.

The historical inquiry of late years is not, then, at present chiefly before us, as it would be if we were trying only to confirm or overthrow the Ridsdale Judgment. At the most it is only a part of our task. For we are asking, not whether Vestments were permitted in 1662, but whether they ought to be permitted in 1911.

On what ground shall we base our answer? We have the principle asserted in the Prayer-Book that certain ceremonies were therein retained "as well for a decent order in the Church . . . as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church . . . ought to be referred."¹ To this principle we shall probably assent. The Vestments ought to be permitted or not, according as they do or do not "pertain to edification."

Now, it may be conceded that the Eucharistic Vestments have not always been regarded as symbolic of doctrine which the Church of England repudiated at the Reformation. Any statement to the contrary effect is at once disproved by the undisputed fact that they were authorized between 1549 and 1552, and again between 1559 and 1566. So far, then, Canon Beeching is right in directing attention to the non-significance of the Vestments in themselves. But it follows from what has been said above that the question in this connection is not "Have the Vestments always symbolized non-Anglican doctrine?" but rather, "Do they do so to-day?"

On this point the view has been upheld in the *CHURCHMAN* that they do,² and the present writer shares this view. We may willingly admit, with Canon Beeching, that many persons desire the revival of the Vestments on the ground of their emphasizing the historic continuity

¹ Preface, "Of Ceremonies."

² See, for example, the January number, pp. 4, 5.

of our Church, and yet believe that in at least as many cases they are valued also for the help which they afford in popularizing a doctrine of the Church, the Ministry and the Eucharist, which the Church of England has set aside. So far as this is so, it cannot be claimed that they "pertain to edification."

The controversy, as between loyal Churchmen, is therefore as follows: Some persons, whose desire is to emphasize the historic continuity of the Church, wish for them; others, whose desire is to maintain purity of doctrine, are opposed to them. Canon Beeching has himself elsewhere¹ described these two classes as "those who wish to carry into the future as much as possible of the things of the past, and those who wish to test all things by the line of truth." But, surely, when the two tendencies are opposed, there can be no question as to which should prevail. The Reformation determined that once for all. The ancient practices of the Church were retained, in so far as they did not conflict with truth; but when any such conflict was involved, the practices were discontinued. From this rule, it is scarcely possible to think that anyone—High Churchman or Evangelical—would dissent. To suggest, as Canon Beeching seems to do,² that these tendencies can ever be allowed an equal footing in the Church of England, is to mistake altogether the fundamental principle of the Reformation.

Canon Beeching asks, in conclusion: "Do [Evangelicals] expect to convince the High Churchmen, or do they propose to prosecute them?" This seems to indicate that in his opinion the latter are not likely to give way. But is not this fatal to his contention that the Vestments are desired on historic grounds alone? Let it once appear that the opposition to them is due, not to a dislike for their witnessing to the continuity of the English Church, but only to a determination to adhere to our reformed doctrine, and it must be perceived that this opposition is made in obedience to a higher law than that which authorizes the desire for their revival. And we can hardly take the suggestion seriously that we should be willing to disobey the higher law because other people insist upon obeying the lower.

We have argued hitherto on the assumption that the Vestments have at least this in their favour—that they emphasize the historic life of the English Church. May we not ask, finally, whether it is, after all, a worthy notion of historic continuity which is shown by such an uncompromising devotion to externals? Is not the continuity of the Church seen best in its Apostolic doctrine and its Apostolic activity? Is not the proposed revision of the Prayer-Book itself an illustration of the truth that historic continuity must be sought in the inner life, and not in the outer form? And may we not reasonably appeal to High Churchmen—to those High Churchmen, at least, who, as Canon Beeching tells us, have no desire for a counter-Reformation, and value

¹ "The Desirability of Revision" (Prayer-Book Revision Series, No. 1), p. 19.

² *Loc. cit.* He is careful to add that to the operation of these tendencies a limit must be set by loyalty (p. 20); but in that case, how can "those who wish to test all things by the line of truth" represent only a party among Churchmen?

the Vestments solely from their historical significance—to give up their demand for a mere external symbol of that which we all alike value, seeing that, to our thinking, whether rightly or wrongly, it involves the greater question of fidelity to truth?

C. F. RUSSELL.

CAMBRIDGE.

“SUGGESTIONS TOWARDS REUNION.”

(*The Churchman*, February, 1911, p. 119.)

WITH reference to the questions raised in the article entitled “Suggestions towards Reunion,” it is of the utmost importance for us to know exactly what we mean by the term “Episcopacy.” Much confusion is caused by the failure to perceive that the word stands in our minds for two ideas that are quite separate and distinct—Apostolical Succession and Constitutional Monarchy. In fact, the functions of Episcopacy are twofold: there is the transmitting function, which stands for the preservation of the Apostolical (or legal and organic) Succession of Orders; and there is the governmental function, which stands for a particular type of ecclesiastical government and organization. These two functions may in theory be separated. In fact, in the actual practice of the Celtic Church they were (where the unit of organization was not diocesan, but tribal); and such a separation is necessary in the solution of certain problems of the present day. For the necessities of Christian Reunion do not require that Episcopacy, *as a system of government*, be forced upon Presbyterians or Nonconformists, but only that these Churches be given Catholic authority to *transmit* priestly Orders. It is not enough for Presbyterians to prove that their first ministers were in priest's Orders, lawfully derived from the Medieval Church; they must go on to prove that they had the power to transmit the same. The whole point of the Catholic position is that no man can exercise an authority or power never imparted to him. Accordingly, no ministry can be recognized as possessing Apostolical Succession (and thereby forming a branch of the one historic or Catholic Church) unless it derive its authority from men authorized to transmit authority. It would be quite immaterial as to whether those men were Bishops (*i.e.*, men possessing both of the functions distinguished above) or bishop-Priests (*i.e.*, men possessing only the first function). This consideration will show that the problem of the recognition of Presbyterian Orders stands outside, and beyond, the vexed question as to the origin of Episcopacy. For, were Churchmen to prove their own view of its origin, they would yet, before being able to condemn Presbyterian Orders, be obliged to face the possibility that the Presbyterian priesthood might prove to have acquired (by lawful delegation) the Episcopal power of transmission, while yet choosing to do without the Episcopal form of government; and, on the other hand, were Presbyterians to prove their assertion

that Episcopacy is a development from a system of bishop-Priests (priests with the power of transmission of Orders), they would yet have to prove that their own elders were priests possessing this power. When, therefore, without waiting for the Presbyterians to prove to us this latter point, Mr. Ferguson demands full "recognition of the ministry . . . of the Presbyterian Church," he is asking us to give up part of our Catholic heritage. For although, as he rightly points out, our Church has laid down no *theory* of the ministry, yet she has clung fast to the all-important *fact* of the preservation of full Apostolical Succession. We cannot, therefore, recognize Presbyterian Orders till it is proved that those Orders are in the line of the Apostolical Succession, unless we are fully prepared to accept the principle such action would involve, namely, that in default of the granting of Episcopal and Catholic authority for the exercise by Presbyterian ministers of the transmitting function, the action of the whole Presbyterian body acting corporately as a Christian Ecclesia is to be considered as granting sufficient authority and validity to such exercise, in view of the manifest blessing of the Holy Spirit shown ever since upon the work of Presbyterian ministries.

H. T. MALAHER.

"GAINS AND LOSSES."

(*The Churchman*, February, 1911, p. 89.)

BISHOP WALPOLE, in the February number, endeavours to confine the "Resurrection," in which all Christians believe, to "the just," and suggests that "the resurrection of the unjust" may not mean "anything more than their immortality" (p. 95). This is not the doctrine of the three Creeds, especially the "Quicumque Vult," which says that "*all men shall rise again with their bodies*"; and surely he must have overlooked the plain words of our Lord in St. John v. 28: "The hour is coming in the which *all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth*—they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment."

G. F. W. MUNBY.



Notices of Books.

THE CONSTITUTION AND LAW OF THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES.

By Adolf Harnack. Translated by F. L. Pogson, M.A. Edited by H. D. A. Major, Vice-Principal of Ripon Clergy College. London: *Williams and Norgate*. Price 5s. net. Pp. i-xiv, 1-349.

Harnack's last book is not as brilliant and as lucid as his *St. Luke and Acts*, but it exhibits in equal degree the painstaking and whole-hearted devotion to truth which makes his work, as it made Hort's, so wonderfully

attractive. Again, we see the writer's mind in revolt from the doctrinaire hypercriticism of his compatriots, and steadily working on the critical side to a more conservative position. Again, we feel that this intellectual tendency is not unconnected with a religious earnestness which brings him into sympathy with his data. But, again, there is no trace of that advance from a low Christology, which one or two passages in "What is Christianity?" seemed to indicate to be possible. Indeed, the reader must be prepared for one or two painful sentences. Yet in a short but important note on the Trinitarian formula, we have the argument that the formula originated between A.D. 50 and 80 as an anti-Jewish product of the Christian religion, and a dismissal with contemptuous brevity of "Babylonian, Greek, or Kamschatkan triads" (p. 273). In the preface, Harnack writes: "In the Christian preaching at a very early period the Trinitarian confession came to the front and gave the new religion its distinctive stamp" (p. x), but unfortunately he ignores Dean Robinson's important argument (*Hastings, s.v. Communion*) for a subjective use of the genitive in "fellowship of the Holy Ghost." There are two long and interesting notes on the phrases "Gospel" and "Word of God."

When he turns to the main body of the work, the reader of the *CHURCH-MAN* will find himself confronted with a position which is from his standpoint of special interest. As he reads the criticism of Catholicism he will continually ask himself what the writer's position would have been if he had known intimately and from within a Catholic position which was not Romanist. His sense of Harnack's largeness of outlook and superiority to his environment will be confirmed when he reads the remarkable words with which the essay concludes: "Meanwhile the nations of Western Europe still live as Catholics or as Protestants. There is as yet no third course open. That they are the one or the other is still more important than the amount of philosophical and scientific enlightenment or the number of mechanical appliances which they possess. Luther has created this condition of things. In the meanwhile the nations are still waiting for a third kind of Church as the foundation of their higher life." Yet there is a Protestant Church in the West whose constitution and law Luther's influence hardly touched, and whose thought on matters ecclesiastical has influenced Harnack, for he quotes with approval Salmon's words: "If the original constitution of the Church was not the same as in the time of Irenæus, it must have been capable of an inner development to the later form." (In passing we observe that at this point also Harnack rejects Gentilic influences.) But if Salmon is quoted there is no allusion to one of the greatest masters of theology, Hort, who nowhere did better work than in this connection. That Harnack would not have found the English writer's thought wholly alien from his own is proved by a sentence occurring in the appendix which is devoted to the criticism of Sohm, and which proves the strength of Harnack's reaction from Lutheran individualism: "The social body is not the Church which exists for faith, but it is the form of its earthly realization, so far as it can be realized on earth" (p. 214). Ecclesiastical law, therefore, may be "a necessary means for the realization and accomplishment on earth of what the Church essentially is." Sohm's theory, which Harnack in these words rejects, is the philosophical expression of a way of thinking which is

largely prevalent on this side the Channel outside the Church of England, and is not without its influence among ourselves.

On the historical side, Harnack is less lucid (partly, it may be, because he is too brief), but he is always interesting. It is, of course, impossible within the limits of a short notice to mention, still less to appreciate and criticize, the countless points of importance which arise in the review of the Scriptural and early Patristic evidence. But while there is much which looks, or seems to look, the other way, there is the recognition of "the universal apostolic organization" (p. 59) and of a common law based on the practice of St. Paul and other missionaries to the Gentiles. The ideas approved in these sentences are of the greatest possible moment, and receive quite inadequate attention. They, at any rate, should have prevented the dismissal of Clement's appeal to the "command" of the Apostles as "a momentous fiction" (p. 94). In the reviewer's opinion Clement is appealing to a document which probably lay before Clement as he wrote (*cf.* "Layman's Ordinances"); and the appeal of Ignatius to the ordinances of the Apostles confirms the impression. But any such document or undocumented vein of generally accepted presumption must fall within the Apostolic period, and, at any rate, have some claim to represent the Apostolic "common law," the existence of which Harnack admits. The word "fiction" is far too strong. Moreover, at this point the evidence is not stated quite fully. The data are very puzzling, but there is at a very early date a vein of allusion which suggests a development of the idea of Acts i. 3. To this tendency of primitive thought Harnack makes practically no allusion. We must not omit to notice the extremely important *obiter dictum* of p. 64, that the John of the Epistles was "probably identical with John of the Apocalypse." Harnack, if we remember rightly, here substitutes "probably" for an earlier "possibly."

The translation is satisfactory, but we must express our very strong dissent from the opinion of the editor that no index was necessary. There are few books an index to which is more needed. The absence of it much diminishes the value of an important and useful work of reference. The note on p. 53 seems to be by the editor. If so, it ought not to have been printed in the text. The point is not unimportant. H. J. BARDSLEY.

THE GROWTH OF THE GOSPELS. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. London: John Murray. Price 2s. 6d. net.

A book on the Gospels by one of our leading archæologists naturally and necessarily calls for special attention, and though the book is small, it is decidedly valuable, whether we can agree with it or not. Dr. Petrie believes that "the fundamental question of the relation of the Gospels to each other must precede any exact understanding of their teaching." He also remarks that hitherto the dominant point of view has been "mainly literary and subjective, and hence it has been largely influenced by personal judgment" (p. 2). With this we readily agree. He believes that the discovery of the papyrus "has changed our mental atmosphere and realization of the subject," and "raises a new field of questions" (p. 3). Another point of interest is the opinion that the Churches before and soon after A.D. 50 needed Gospels, and that "it is impossible to suppose that they were left at that time without a written account of the principal events and teaching which they were

wishing to follow. Some generally accepted Gospels must have been already in circulation before A.D. 60. The mass of briefer records . . . must have been welded together within ten or twenty years by the external necessities" (p. 7). This opinion in the light of Sir William Ramsay's recent article on the subject is full of significance. Again, Dr. Petrie is of opinion that "a criticism which depends on a personal judgment will inevitably reflect personal variation" (p. 9), and he therefore posits the need of an impersonal criticism which depends upon general principles. Then comes his statement of the principles. He distinguishes between four kinds of criticism: Structural, Textual, Verbal, and Historical. He starts with what he calls "Structural Criticism," and he regards this as applicable to those episodes which are identical in all three Gospels. This he calls the "Nucleus," or common basis, on which the Gospel has been built (p. 14). Five other classes of material are then discussed in order, and he believes that in such a classification there is no room for personal opinion, but that the facts arrange themselves, and provide a firm platform for all subsequent historical discussion and personal judgment of detail (p. 17). How Dr. Petrie works out his thesis we must necessarily leave our readers to discover. But he believes that the Nucleus was compiled in Jerusalem quite early, and that all classes of later editions have Galilean detail. The Jewish element he would date about A.D. 40, and the Gentile A.D. 50-60. Mark and Luke, in his view, collaborated on additions to the Nucleus A.D. 54-60. Some may think that Dr. Petrie's view is unduly complex, but it is certainly deserving of careful study. He has given us a contribution to the study of the Gospels which cannot be overlooked.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

LETHABY OF MOAB. By Thomas Durley. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 6s.

JOHN G. PATON: LATER YEARS AND FAREWELL. By A. K. Langridge. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 3s. 6d.

LEPERS. By John Jackson. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 3s. 6d.

One of the happiest signs of the times—that there is so large an output of missionary books. We assume that they find readers: these three at least deserve to do so. It is a happy sign, too, that the missionary books of to-day are not mere collections of missionary stories, but that they grapple with missionary problems, and face missionary difficulties with real courage and hopefulness. Readers of John Paton's autobiography will be glad, indeed, to add these supplementary chapters to their library, whilst students of Bible lands and Bible times will be glad to study the Lethabys' work in Moab and the story of thirty-six years' work amongst those afflicted with that terribly symbolic disease which our Lord so often was pleased to heal.

THE PURPOSE OF GOD. By J. Llewelyn Davies. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This small volume of short sermons is designed to "illustrate the Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven which was announced by our Lord, and which, after being strangely overlooked by the Church, has been rediscovered in the New Testament, and is slowly breathing new life into the Christianity of our time." With this thesis many will be found to disagree, for there is little evidence that Evangelical preachers at any rate have failed to proclaim the

Kingdom of Heaven or to teach its ethics. Nor is there anything in these sermons of so striking a nature as to accord them any special place as the messages of a newer and better order. They are, however, good, cultured, and acceptable sermons, true to the Person of Christ, and stating His claims in language suited to the modern mind. Their outlook is broad, and their obvious sincerity will commend them to thinking people. The least convincing chapter is the Appendix, on "Life under Insoluble Problems," which states difficulties without giving much help toward the comprehension of their personal significance, or guidance as to the necessary attitude of heart and life toward them.

THE SON OF MAN. By Edwin A. Abbott. *Cambridge University Press.*
Pp. 920. Price 16s. 6d. net.

This is volume viii. of the series of Diatessarica, and beyond all question it is the most monumental work in Dr. Abbott's monumental series. It fulfils a promise. In 1909 he issued a small work called "The Message of the Son of Man," in which he put forward tentatively, and with a view to criticism, a new theory about the origin and meaning of that much-disputed phrase, "Son of Man." In this book he gives with extraordinary fulness and minuteness the evidence upon which his theory is based, and then applies the new meaning to all the relevant Gospel passages, which are conveniently classified for the purpose. The reader is constantly met with the marks, not merely of profound scholarship, but of originality and real insight, and again and again new and very suggestive interpretations are offered for familiar passages. Dr. Abbott does not apparently believe in the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel. He also doubts whether we Christians know nearly as much about what Christ said and did as we suppose that we do. Yet he holds that "St. John" is a much better authority for the mind of Christ than St. Mark. St. John's spiritual bias is nearer the truth than St. Mark's non-spiritual bias. For Jesus was "a zealot and a mystic, wholly absorbed in God and . . . in zeal for God's temple," which temple consists of redeemed humanity. Therefore Jesus was much better understood by Paul and John than by the Synoptists, and the two writers faithfully reproduce his thoughts. Hence "we may be consoled for having to give up our old confidence about the precise nature of some things that Jesus is alleged to have said and done if we can gain a new confidence about what Jesus thought." Now, we can find out what Jesus thought only by searching for every possible allusion, direct and indirect, obvious and concealed, understood or misunderstood, which the Gospels contain, to the Old Testament, the book which Jesus had studied for twenty years. It is interesting to find Dr. Abbott maintaining the importance of the Old Testament as against the Apocalyptic literature. He is very sceptical about most of the alleged New Testament parallels to Enoch, and he sides with Dr. Plummer against Dr. Charles in their recent controversy about the relative dependence of Matthew and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This principle applies particularly to the discussion of the "Son of Man." The phrase really comes from Ezekiel, and its content must be elicited by a study of the whole Old Testament from its beginning with Adam, but specially of the teaching of the Greater Prophets. Jesus wished to express the fact that He

had become one with humanity in all their weakness that He might be a second Adam and deliver them from the "griefs" and "iniquities" of which Isaiah speaks; and the work of the Son of Adam was completed when He could say: "Go unto *My brethren*, and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and to *My God* and *your God*."

THE BIBLE : A REVELATION FROM GOD. By Rev. George Henderson, B.D. Edinburgh : *T. and T. Clark.* Price 6d.

A small book with a great purpose. Mr. Henderson is not afraid of criticism, and he writes for those who fear it. He shows clearly and simply that in the light of all the criticism of to-day the Bible is still to be interpreted as a revelation from God.

TIM THE OWDACIOUS. By E. M. Green. London : *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

That the S.P.C.K. should publish such a book as this is indeed "owdacious." Tim is a little street-arab who is led to join a Bible-class. "Serving the King" is set before him as the great ideal. Will it be believed that this "serving of the King" is fulfilling the office of a server at Holy Communion? We are so often able to give unstinted praise to the story-books issued by the S.P.C.K. that we regret exceedingly to have to call attention to this most unsatisfactory book. Has it escaped the notice of the Committee owing to its smallness? We hope that this is the explanation.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF ST. JOHN. By the Rev. G. S. Barrett, D.D. A Devotional Commentary. London : *The Religious Tract Society.* Price 2s.

A new volume of the devotional commentary by one of the best-known and most honoured of Congregational ministers, whose earlier works have prepared us to look with interest and expectation for anything else from his pen. Readers will not be disappointed with what they find here, for they will obtain much to inform the mind and inspire the heart. This little work is so full of spiritual, evangelical, suggestive teaching that it will provide ample material for all those who use these Epistles in their "Moments on the Mount."

HOLINESS SYMBOLIC AND REAL. By the Rev. J. Agar Beet, D.D. London : *Robert Culley.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

The author tells us that this little book is a Bible study, and embodies the results of an effort to "reproduce as accurately and thoroughly as possible the conception of holiness held by the writers of the New Testament," Dr. Beet is "deeply convinced that one of the greatest needs of the present day is accurate grammatical scholarship directed to the aim of obtaining a broader and deeper comprehension of God's purpose of mercy to men." In this conviction we heartily concur. Research must always be the basis of any true spirituality. In fourteen chapters the entire ground of the Bible-teaching on holiness is covered, and we are glad to have this conspectus from the standpoint of modern scholarship. In the later chapters we observe with interest and appreciation several indications of an approximation to unity among holiness teachers. It has generally been thought that the teaching represented by Keswick and that which is associated with the Methodist Churches is irreconcilable. Perhaps Dr. Beet's little volume will help to show both Keswick and Methodism how the two Schools may be brought together. We commend this admirable little work to the attention of all Christian people, and especially to those for whom it was primarily designed—"Pastors of the flock of Christ commissioned by Him to feed and teach."

MESSAGES FROM THE THRONE. By Mrs. Harding Kelly. London : *Robert Scott.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

A selection of very simple talks on Bible stories, etc., suitable for use by district visitors amongst the poor, and by other Christian workers who find it difficult of themselves to make the Bible interesting or intelligible to those amongst whom they work. It will be found most helpful in this respect, being direct in its spiritual teaching, bright in its methods of expression, and consistently true to the Evangel of God's grace.

THE WORK AND POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By W. Muspratt. London : *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. net.

The writer is the resident Chaplain at Coonoor, India, and this small book contains a series of sermons preached there on the work of the Holy Spirit. They are very simple,

crude almost in some places, but on the whole are calculated to give a helpful conception of the work of the Comforter to those to whom they were originally preached, and to invest with new meaning for them the oft-expressed article in the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." They will prove of real use to ministers and Bible-class teachers who are anxious to give simple instruction to congregation or class on this all-important subject, and on this account alone we gladly commend the book to their notice.

HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS. By S. C. Lowry. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

A small collection of hymns and sacred verse, which will be valued for their spiritual message by those who like to have their own thoughts versified. For these hymns and poems are not profound, and their meaning is always to be found in the first reading—a quality which enhances the value of such a compilation for devotional use.

ST. PAUL IN DAILY LIFE. London: *H. R. Allenson.* Price 1s. 6d.

A selection from St. Paul's Epistles in the setting of the Acts of the Apostles arranged for daily reading throughout the year, in which period the book would be twice read through. The very words of Scripture alone are used, and their arrangement is carried out most carefully and well. A splendid "first thing in the morning" or "last thing at night" book.

THE COMPANION BIBLE. Being the Authorized Version of 1611, with the Structures and Notes—Critical, Explanatory, and Suggestive. Part II. Joshua to Job, with ten Appendices. Oxford University Press: *Henry Frowde.* Price 4s. net.

It is a misfortune that the principles upon which this book is proceeding are not reprinted from Part I. Its idea seems to be to print in one column the Authorized Version text, and in the other a close and sometimes fanciful and artificial analysis and some short explanatory notes. There is practically nothing by way of introductions to the books, but we gather that Job is pre-Mosaic. Ezra-Nehemiah affords the biggest surprise. Nehemiah is apparently identical with Sheshbazzar in Ezra i. 8; and Cyrus, King of Persia, is son of Astyages (=Ahasuerus) and Esther, and was trained by Mordecai and Nehemiah in the knowledge of God. Apart, however, from these somewhat revolutionary historical theories, the analysis may help towards getting a firmer grasp of the English text.

THE REJECTED KING. By Mrs. M. Baxter. London: *Christian Herald Office.* Price 1s. 6d.

A series of Bible studies on St. Matthew's Gospel. They will probably be acceptable to the general reader, though the exegesis is at times strained and fanciful. The combination of poor paper and small print makes the reading not a little trying.

Received: **THE ADVENT HOPE IN ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.** By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. A series of three lectures delivered in the Abbey last Advent. **ST. PAUL.** By F. W. H. Myers. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price, cloth 6d., leather 1s. A tasteful little edition of Mr. Myers' well-known poem. **NOW AND THEN.** By Arthur H. Leake. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 7s. 6d. Another and a somewhat complicated effort to explain the Apocalypse. **THE BIBLE AND WINE.** By Ferrar Fenton. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co.* Price 1s. net; cloth, 1s. 6d. An essay on the various texts referring to wine in the Bible. **OUR ENGLISH BIBLE.** By Rev. T. O. Bevan. London: *George Allen and Sons.* Price 6d. An interesting account of the Authorized Version. **SUGGESTIONS FOR A SYLLABUS IN RELIGIOUS TEACHING.** By G. B. Ayre. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. net; paper, 1s. 6d. net. A valuable book for all engaged in the religious education of children. **THE POWER OF THE CROSS.** By H. T. Dixon, D.D. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 1s. 6d. A series of addresses on the Seven Words, simply written, but emphasizing their spiritual message. **HER HUNDREDFOLD.** By Marion Stewart Weir. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 2s. 6d. An excellent story. **THE CLAVERLY CHILDREN.** By E. M. Robinson. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 2s. 6d. **THE DOLLY DIALOGUES.** By Anthony Hope. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 7d. **THE STRENUOUS LIFE.** By Theodore Roosevelt. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 1s. **THE TALISMAN.** By Sir Walter Scott. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 6d. **WHERE BLACK RULES WHITE.** By H. Hesketh Prichard. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 1s. **TALES OF MYSTERY AND IMAGINATION.** By Edgar Allan Poe. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 6d. **HISTORICAL MYSTERIES.** By Andrew Lang. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 1s.