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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1920.

THE MONTH.

The Response.

THE response of Nonconformity to the Lambeth Appeal on Reunion has, with very few exceptions, been of a distinctly encouraging character. It is true, of course, that no official reply has yet been made from any of the Free Churches, for no opportunity has yet arisen for a corporate consideration of the Appeal, but the comments of individual ministers, many of them holding distinguished positions in Nonconformity, show clearly enough that they have caught the spirit of Lambeth, and that they are desirous of reciprocating to the full the aspirations of the Bishops towards a closer Christian fellowship. And this is a great gain, for when men of widely diverse views seek to know each other better in the fellowship of the Spirit a long step has been taken towards the removal of misunderstanding and, with that, the removal of barriers which have hitherto blocked the way to a realization of Christian unity. But we should be deceiving ourselves if we did not acknowledge that, at least so far as Reunion at home is concerned, it is still the day of small things. The spirit of separation in the past has been too strong and too deep to be suddenly cast out; but a new thing has happened and is happening —men are coming to view their differences with a fresh vision; they are approaching their problems with a fresh purpose; they are animated by a fresh spirit. We thank God, Who maketh men to be of one mind in a house, for this gracious beginning—so full of encouragement, assurance and hope—and we pray that He Who has begun the good work may so move in the hearts of men that His blessed purpose for the unity of His Church may be fulfilled in His own time and in His own way. For this we must labour, for this we must pray.

The Difficulties.

But there are many difficulties to be overcome, and much patience is needed. If the Lambeth Appeal is approached in the old spirit and with the memory of old recriminations still in heart and mind, we readily admit that there is in it much that is open to discussion and to disputation. One or two writers of distinction have taken up the position that it still offers no real basis of agreement, and that the old difficulty of the acceptance of episcopacy still remains even though it appears in a new dress. As an illustration of what we mean we quote a passage from the letter of the Rev. Archibald Fleming, D.D., the well-known minister of St. Columba's (Church of Scotland), Pont Street :—

> It is when the Lambeth Encyclical proceeds to utter and require a shibboleth in the region of Church Order that the trouble begins. That shibboleth is the " historic episcopate " (a phrase which in itself seems to many of us to embody a *petitio principii*). And episcopacy is postulated not merely as being, on the whole, in the view of the Conference, the most workable system of government and organization. Had that been all, the Bishops would surely have said to their non-episcopal brothers—Come, and let us discuss this point together ; not—Come, but you must regard that point as beyond dispute. As the Bishop of Zanzibar—one of the authors and signatories of the Encyclical—puts it, in a widely circulated statement explanatory of its sense, the Bishops (*suavater in re, fortiter in modo*), " gently " but firmly require us to bring our several " groups " " within the historical episcopal Church " ; and " to present their ministers for episcopal ordination." How much farther does this take us than we had reached before ? It is but the old prescription, offered by Rome to Anglicanism, offered by Anglicanism to us—the prescription of reunion by absorption.
>
> The position is not improved, except in the seeming, by the Bishops' suggestion that this reordination (or " recommissioning," to use the new, less ingenuous vocabulary) should be reciprocal. The minister of either Church is to be " recommissioned " according to the forms prescribed by the religious body into whose territory he proposes to make occasional or permanent incursion. Is it to be thought that in practice many Anglican clergy would submit to this process—at any rate, at the hands of any of the Reformed Churches ? But even if it were so, the " reciprocity " of the arrangement would be empty and fallacious. For Presbyterians never question the validity of Anglican orders (any more than did Anglicans those of Presbyterians in the classic age of Anglicanism). We feel as sure of their validity as we do of that of our own ; and that is putting it pretty high. There is, therefore, no reciprocity except in the sense that giving something for nothing is reciprocal. In Scotland we should have no scepticism to express, and no questions to ask regarding Anglican orders. On the other hand, we certainly should wish to inquire about that to which we do attach an anxious and traditional importance—academic and theological attainment.

We refer to this passage in Dr. Fleming's letter because it is typical of the difficulties which will have to be faced when the several

churches come to closer quarters with the Lambeth proposals. But the difficulty is not insuperable; nor is it greatly to be feared. Given the right spirit it may be faced in the full assurance that it can and will be overcome. We do not regret that Dr. Fleming has raised it; we do regret, however, the tone he has seen fit to adopt in his letter; and the covert sneer in the last sentence of the above quotation is distinctly unworthy of the man and of the great position he occupies.

Lambeth and Episcopacy.

The Lambeth Appeal stands by itself, and he who runs may read. It is its own interpreter, but if any interpreter be really needed the Bishop of Zanzibar is not quite the one we should choose. Bishop Waller, of Tinnevelly, is a much safer guide. In his article in the *C.M. Review* for September on "Lambeth and Reunion" he gives an extremely interesting glimpse of the working of the mind of the Reunion Committee; and in reference to the question of the Ministry he writes:—

> We did not repeat the Lambeth Quadrilateral, too often taken to be a statement of terms on which the little Anglican Church will unite with a neighbour. We tried to see the structure of the one great Church of Christ. And then we thought of our own trust committed to us. And we pleaded that, as a bond of unity alike with East and West, the universal episcopate would supply the universally recognized ministry. The history of 1800 years seemed to show no other institution suitable. But it was a constitutional episcopate we wanted. No papacy, no prelatical order would be the bond of union we sought. A council presided over by a bishop, but a council in which clergy and laity had their proper voice—a council representative of the Body of Christ and endued with His Spirit—that was our vision. Could we do or offer to do anything to show our real sincerity in the ideal? Opinions were divided, but the thought prevailed that ministries were sometimes unacceptable because doubts were felt about the universality of their recognition—and so the offer was made that if all other obstacles to union were happily surmounted, not one of us would scruple to take part in receiving afresh a commission or recognition, if that were needed to reassure doubtful minds, and we pleaded that others would do the same. We felt that no one dare claim to be a minister of the whole body unless he were called of God, commissioned by Christ, and recognized by all. In our divided state how can this general recognition be secured? It is not a magic gift, it is a grace given to the whole Body. And if any part of the Body had doubts would not all those who had heard the call to the ministry be ready to allay those doubts by receiving whatever recognition seemed to be lacking to complete the fellowship?

Viewed in this way, even the most difficult passages of the Lambeth Appeal are given an interpretation not inconsistent, but in the fullest harmony, with the spirit of true Christian fellowship.

A Country Parson.

The Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Church and Rural Life has given great offence to country clergy by reason of its strong criticisms upon what is judged to be the failure of the Church in country districts; and certainly its ill-balanced statements, its unmistakable lack of special knowledge, and its conspicuous want of sympathy with the burdens the country clergy have to bear have deprived what ought to have been a peculiarly useful report of any real value. We make this reference to the Report, however, not for the purpose of criticising it, but for the purpose of introducing a delightful pen picture of what a country clergyman may be and what we believe many of them are. It is drawn by Canon S. R. James, of Worcester, and is a picture of his own father, the Rev. Herbert James :—

My father was a country parson nearly all his clerical life—ten years in Kent and forty-four years in West Suffolk. In Suffolk he had a parish, or rather a double parish, with a population which gradually diminished from about five hundred to less than four hundred. It was about four miles by two miles in size, with two villages and widely scattered cottages besides. During the whole of his time there he was in close touch with all his people, Church-folk and Nonconformist alike, and he was regarded by all, or almost all, as their dear friend. I attribute this result to the following causes :—

First, his one object in life was to bring his people to Christ.

Second, his own example was absolutely consistent ; he walked with God, and he knew it and felt it.

Third, he constantly visited every one, four or five afternoons in the week being given to this work, and his visits were timed to suit their convenience, not his own.

Fourth, he took the most amazing trouble over his sermons. He was naturally a fluent and eloquent speaker, but he invariably prepared his sermons with the utmost care—he never trusted to the inspiration of the moment; his words and phrases were carefully chosen beforehand and his notes were full, though I think he seldom referred to them in the pulpit. At the same time, he was a learned theologian and a constant reader of what was new and good in all kinds of literature. So he was always showing forth new aspects of the Christ Whom he loved and preached.

Fifth, he never failed to spend a morning every week at the school, and to teach the children, which he did with infinite tact, patience, and sympathy.

Last, but not least, he was a man of prayer. His children and friends can never forget how, day by day, he communed with God at family worship, and in what beautiful words he laid all cares and troubles before our Father. And every day after lunch he and my mother prayed together for the forty-four years of their married life.

It is long since we have read anything more beautiful. Well may his son add: "If all country parsons were to devote themselves as he did to knowing their people in their homes and so leading them to Christ, we should hear very much less of empty churches and disappointed clergy."

As Others see us.

The seaside work of the Children's Special Service Mission is emphatically Evangelical in its purpose and character. It has been carried on with unfailing success for a long number of years, and it has to its credit the warm-hearted testimony of many hundreds of young people who have received from it spiritual benefit. Now comes testimony from another quarter. The *Church Times* of September 10 published an article by "Nomad" descriptive of these services which, in spite of its surface criticisms, must be taken as a real tribute to their value. The services to which he referred were held every afternoon opposite his hotel. Ordinarily, he says, he would not have regarded these doings with particular interest. "The hymns were not lovely"; "the prayers at times were of the intimate order"; "there were crudities in abundance"; "there was undenominationalism of the most embracing kind"; and yet "there was something to learn from these meetings":—

> The young men knew how to talk to children. One of them was a genius. He held their attention with rare skill. His was the artistry which conceals art. In the truest sense he carried the children with him; that is to say, he kept them thinking parallel with his thought. As he proceeded he dropped little questions, which were at once answered. He told stories which were relevant, and he was wise enough in one case to tell the story in the actual words of the master of letters who wrote it. He gripped the psychology of it, and he let the lesson tell itself. He used humour sparingly and tellingly, and himself laughed at his own little jokes. Sometimes he pulled himself up as though it were he and not his audience whose attention had to be re-directed to the line of thought. "Now—let me see—where was I?" A dozen little voices piped out a dozen suggestions—all to the point, all indicating that they knew where he was, and that they knew all the time that he knew where he was. It was an exercise in subtlety. There was no vulgar colloquialism. He did not talk down to the children. He carried them with him, and amid all the distractions of the open air, of the bathers passing, of the little restlessnesses incidental to an uncomfortable position on the sands, their attention was held closely for twenty-five minutes.

It set the writer of the article wondering. "What if this had been a Church gathering! What if the spirit of adventure could lay hold of us and we went forth with *our* message! Have we not laymen in abundance who would be ready for the work? Are not these children, listening to carefully modified half-truths, the children to whom the Church's full heritage of truth is their due?" His wonder increased when he met one of the most brilliant writers of our day. "I like that man," he said, "I come every day to hear him. It doesn't matter about what he says, but the atmosphere

of hopeful trust which he spreads." "The sudden truth had come home," the writer concludes, "that in conveying the Church's message to the yearning people we were not using all the powers we possess. . . . The young man in the green blazer used all his skill and his zeal for a cause which was only half a cause. Have we the like skill and zeal for the full truth?" But "skill and zeal" are not everything; indeed apart from the message they are of little value. It is the message which tells, and we think that "Nomad" would find that the message *his* young men would proclaim would fail in its appeal if it did not possess spiritual power. The success of the seaside services is to be found in the fact that they tell of a living Christ with nothing between.

The Fall of Man.

A great flutter has been caused by the sermon preached by Canon E. W. Barnes before the British Association at Cardiff. It is not the first time that the historical accuracy of the early chapters of Genesis has been challenged, nor is it likely to be the last. But the critics are no nearer proving their contentions than they were fifty years ago; and until these are proved the faithful will continue to rest upon the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture, which for them remains unshaken and unshakable. Nevertheless, we greatly deplore the publication of such sermons in the popular press, which is not the place where such deep questions as those raised by Canon Barnes can adequately be discussed. The comments of ignorant and disaffected writers, whether in the news, the correspondence or the editorial columns, are often most painful to read, and are sometimes positively offensive; and the result of it all is to give "the man in the street" the impression that the Bible is an untrustworthy book and that its believing exponents are untrustworthy guides. Can this make for righteousness or faith? Canon Barnes has denied a fact—the Fall of Man—which is confirmed by human experience; and when he goes on to tell us that we must abandon "the arguments deduced from it by theologians from St. Paul onward," we are left wondering how much, or how little, of the Gospel story, as received by the Church for the last nineteen hundred years, is to be left to us. If St. Paul were not accurate in his presentation of the Gospel, where shall we look for its correct interpretation? It is this aspect of the question raised by Canon Barnes which is so serious and so dis-

quieting; and it has not received the attention it deserves. It is to be regretted that in the discussion which ensued in the secular press upon the publication of the sermon, no leading Churchman of position entered the lists on the orthodox side; it was left to General Booth, the Head of the Salvation Army, to champion the cause, and right well he did it. Such views as those propounded by Canon Barnes must, he said, "seem positively revolting" to large sections in the Church of England as well as in other Churches. The denunciation is strongly worded, but the occasion was one which demanded vigorous treatment.

Death of Dr. Sanday.

The death of Dr. William Sanday, in his seventy-eighth year, removes from us a distinguished Biblical scholar and critic whose works, it must be recognized, whether we agreed with his conclusions or not, were always marked by reverence as well as by candour. With advancing years, unfortunately, he moved farther and farther away in some respects from the old position, and in his last book he distinctly abandoned his neutral attitude on miracles and championed the view that the abnormal element in miracle could be explained without being taken as literal fact.

Parochial Church Councils.

It cannot be too strongly urged that the Parochial Rolls of the various parishes should be kept up to date, and that new parishioners should be enrolled as soon as they are qualified. Every parish should, therefore, be fully equipped with literature on this subject, and we mention again the papers issued by the Church Book Room. First, the Declaration as to Qualification, with form for non-resident electors, which is supplied at 2*s.* per 100, the same without the form for non-resident electors 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100, or cards simply arranged for the card index system at 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* per 100 respectively. Then there are the Electoral Roll Sheets at 3*s.* per 100, Electoral Roll Books, arranged alphabetically or specially ruled and headed, with particulars as to qualification, etc., which are supplied from 6*s.* upwards. For general distribution the papers *The Ladder of Lay Representation in the Councils of the Church of England*, and *The New Constitution of the Church of England*, which are supplied at 2*s.* per 100, and the paper on *Parochial Church Councils* at 1*d.* each are recommended. Further, all members of the Parochial Church Councils will find it necessary to refer from time to time to the Constitution of the New Assembly and the Councils which have been called into being by the Enabling Act. The sixpenny pamphlet by Mr. Albert Mitchell, which contains the text of the Act and Constitution, with an introduction and numerous explanatory notes, will be found of service.

THE SIXTH LAMBETH CONFERENCE, 1920.

By the Rev. Thomas J. Pulvertaft, M.A.

I.

IN endeavouring to estimate the meaning and authority of the "Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with the Resolutions and Reports" of the Lambeth Conference, it is necessary to detach the mind from the "glamour of the Conference," and to grasp clearly what the Conference was. All who were brought into personal contact with the Bishops in 1908 and 1920 observed a striking contrast in their outlook and estimate of their position. In 1908 the Pan-Anglican Congress gave them a distorted view of the Anglican communion as a great world-force. They had been hearing of its work in all parts of the globe, of its unique position and opportunities and "Passing Protestantism—Coming Catholicism" was the motto driven home on many platforms by prominent speakers. It was not a matter for surprise that as the Conference following the Congress proceeded, the weight the Bishops believed to be attached to their opinions grew in their own minds, and their friends noted a certain autocratic manner which gave the appearance of the conviction "when we speak, the last word has been said." The Anglican communion was, in their opinion, the key communion of the world, and its influence and authority would bring other Churches into line with its declarations. In 1920 the exact opposite was the case. Humbled by the experience of the past six years, convinced of the need of a union of all the forces within the Kingdom of God uniting for the spread of world righteousness and realizing that the Anglican Communion only represents a fraction of the spiritual forces at work throughout the Christian world, they faced the problems submitted to them in the consciousness that they are members of a great Brotherhood, and that the appeal to personal authority or united wisdom must be abandoned in favour of the presentation of sound reasoning, brotherly sympathy, and a call to self-denying service. No document ever issued by any Ecclesiastical Assembly has been less dogmatic. It breathes the spirit of Christian freedom, it brings everything to the touchstone of the Law of Christ, and shows a humility that is as genuinely felt by the reader as it was experienced by all who came into personal contact with the Bishops or heard

from them accounts of the tone of the Conference. This in itself marks a great step forward. The men of God met as Fathers in God, not as ruling Prelates. They took counsel as to the mind of God and sought to do His will in all things.

This spirit is reflected in the documents that constitute their deliverance. They have no binding authority on the various independent Churches of the Anglican communion, but they have a moral authority of the highest class. This authority is not the consequence of their adoption by 252 Bishops—although that gives them a claim on our most respectful consideration. It comes from their temper, their appeal, and their evident desire to put into words what God has taught them in their dependence on the Holy Spirit. This makes the Conference an influence outside our own communion to an extent that has not been shared by any of its five predecessors. The Anglican communion in this volume is presented as one among many Christian movements and communions, that has a duty to all, and reflects in itself the spiritual forces that exist outside its ambit. But we and those who read the Report are bound to study it as the mature deliverance of a deliberative Assembly that weighed every word and put into its pages the common opinion, or, to express it in mathematical language, the Greatest Common Measure of agreement that could be reached in 1920. It represents what all could accept, taking the various parts as contributory to the whole. There are ambiguities and apparent contradictions that will come to light in our examination, but we are convinced that the spirit enshrined by the expression of the mind of the Conference is one which will permeate the Anglican communion and the Christian world that is not hide-bound by an ecclesiasticism that is foreign to the mind of the Master. This ecclesiasticism kills the spirit, by exalting the institution which ought to enshrine, not destroy, the teaching of Christ in its blessed freedom and power to reach the hearts of all men. We may expect to find the most striking parts of the Report interpreted in a fashion that will surprise the "plain man," but the glosses will be removed in the course of time, and the real force of the document will assert itself in spite of the attempts to throw its parts out of focus. The Encyclical Letter, which was adopted at the closing meetings of the Conference after the Resolutions had been passed, gives the directive orientation to the interpretation of all its proceedings. The Bishops looked back on their work. They

had in their minds all that had been done. They knew as those outside cannot know the cross-currents that flowed—the "*non possumus*" attitudes that had to be faced, and either had to be avoided by omission or compromised by ambiguity or apparently contradictory deliverances. They discovered that they had been consciously or unconsciously governed by the idea of fellowship. "To a world that craves for fellowship we present our message. The secret of life is fellowship. So men feel, and it is true. But fellowship with God is the indispensable condition of human fellowship. The secret of life is the double fellowship—fellowship with God and with men." This ruling idea presents itself all through the volume. We find it on every page, and "The foundation and ground of all fellowship is the undeflected will of God, renewing again and again its patient effort to possess, without destroying, the wills of men." "And so He has called into being a fellowship of men, His Church, and has sent His Holy Spirit to abide therein, and that by the prevailing attraction of that one Spirit He, the one God and Father of all, may win over the whole human family to that fellowship in Himself, by which alone it can attain to the fullness of life." When the thought underlying these sentences is borne in mind, we shall find a recognition of the fellowship of men in God as the main element in the minds of the assembled Bishops, and we shall discover over against that, limitations to the fellowship which must be interpreted as either in accord with or contrary to the declared mind of God. By dwelling on the positive side of declarations we shall in all probability be more in the main stream of the Conference thought, than by insisting upon the exceptions and limitations which from time to time obtrude themselves on our notice. It can never be forgotten that the Conference was a Conference of Christian Bishops governed by the teaching of Christ and accepting "the Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith." That is the one permanent limitation that should govern Christian thought and outlook. The brotherhood of the sons of God in Christ is the aim of fellowship that attains the Christian ideal, and the Bishops fully recognize this regulative fact.

Let us now turn to the groups of subjects considered by the Conference in the order of the Resolutions. Naturally the wider brotherhood of man first demanded attention. They looked upon a

world " full of trouble and perplexity, of fear and despair, of disconnected effort and aimless exertion."

That world consists of peoples segregated into nations Christian and non-Christian. All feel the effects of the shock of devastating war, with its aftermath of social disturbance and uncertainty as to the future. All ought to know that the greatest of their interests is international peace. All realize what war means. But the memories of risks run that should have been avoided, and of dangers incurred that should never have had to be faced, lie fresh upon them. The conflict between international regulation and national independence is experienced in all peoples. The small nations know that they can alone hope for continued existence as long as they live with the good will of the great States, and trust themselves to the world as a whole rather than to the promises of their powerful neighbours. The Conference urges on all citizens of all nations to promote international comity and good will, and to secure expression for these by an increased recognition of international law and custom. It sees that this, the kingdom of peace and good will can only come through the acceptance of the sovereignty of our Lord and Saviour, and through the application of His law of love. The League of Nations is commended, and steps should be taken by the whole Church to urge its principles on the whole world. Germany and other nations should be admitted as soon as conditions render admission possible. Injustice to indigenous or native races must be sternly opposed by the League, and " the tenure of land, forced labour, and the trade in intoxicating liquors, and also the morphia traffic in China " are singled out as needing special attention. The final Resolution, recognizing the inter-relation of nation, calls upon all Christians to do their utmost to relieve the sufferings of the peoples in Europe and Asia who are now bearing the effects of war devastation and social distress. The Report of the Committee is a well-balanced utterance, and makes a special appeal to the Press, which has in its power either to maintain or discourage international hatred. Many will be surprised to learn that the opium evil in China has been revived in the form of morphia-taking. There can be no doubt as to the mind of the Committee. As an organized effort for the overcoming of moral evils in distant lands " the League of Nations with its mandatory principles is the very ally for which, in the past, we have looked in vain."

The relation of Christians and Christian Churches to one another was the chief subject under the consideration of the Conference. The events of the past twelve years made it essential that the Conference should consider the problems from a fresh view-point. The world has not stood still, and the Anglican communion has become impressed by the isolation of itself and the needs of a clearer understanding of its position. "The war and its horrors waged as it was between so-called Christian nations, drove home the weakness of the Church with the shock of a sudden awakening. Men in all communions began to think of the re-union of Christendom, not as a laudable ambition or a beautiful dream, but as an imperative necessity." "The preparations for the World Conference on Faith and Order had not only drawn attention in all parts of the world to Christian unity, but had led to discussions in many quarters which brought to light unsuspected agreement between the leaders of different communions. The great wind was blowing over the whole earth." But the greatest urge had come from the Mission-field where, in the presence of heathendom and non-Christian systems, the divided forces of the Cross could not effectively prosecute their divine mission. The Christian world at the base might be able to wait and live on in traditional environments—missions could not do this. The time was ripe for unity. The duty of bringing it about between those who are one in faith and outlook was an imperative necessity. The 1908 Conference had appointed a Consultative Committee, which had met to consider its Kikuyu problem, and the Archbishop of Canterbury had issued his opinion on the subject. The main points considered by the Consultative Committee were interchange of pulpits, the reciprocal communicating of converts in Anglican and non-Episcopal Churches, and the justifiability or otherwise of the Joint Communion Service of the members of the Conference. The Committee approved interchange of pulpits duly safeguarded, the relaxation of the Confirmation principle in admitting unconfirmed non-Episcopalians to Communion, and deprecated the communicating of Anglican adherents at non-Episcopal communions as inconsistent "with the principles of the Church of England." It also pronounced the joint communion, as inspired by the laudable motive of charity towards those from whom we are unhappily separated, but grievously hurtful to charity among ourselves. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his pamphlet "Kikuyu," practi-

cally accepted the findings of the Committee, and the principles at issue were referred to the Lambeth Conference that has just been holden.

The strongest Committee that ever sat at Lambeth considered reunion. Men of all types were represented, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York. The Committee met as a whole and also in two groups, one dealing with the relation of the Anglican communion with Episcopal Churches—the other with non-Episcopal Churches. "As their work proceeds, the members of it felt that they were being drawn by a Power greater than themselves to a general agreement. Their conclusions were accepted by the Conference under the same sense of a compelling influence. The decision of the Conference was reached with a unanimity all but complete. It is embodied in our appeal to all Christian people." This appeal is the interpretative document on the subject of reunion. The Committee had written before the quotation given from the Encyclical was penned. "We cannot insist too strongly that the Resolutions which we now submit must be read and understood in the light of the ideal and principles which are set forth in the appeal which we have asked the Conference to issue. Taken by themselves, they would inevitably misrepresent the warmth of desire and strength of hope by which we are animated. They must be regarded as counsels which the Conference may rightly be expected to give to the authorities of Churches in the Anglican communion who desire to be guided aright in their efforts to set forward the cause of Christian unity." The Resolutions that follow were proposed by the Committee section that dealt with non-Episcopal Churches. They have been accepted without alteration by the Conference as a whole. They must be read with the appeal and interpreted in its light.

When this is done it will be seen that we have made an immense step forward. We have long believed that the two greatest needs of the Church to-day in facing reunion are a right conception of the Church and a true view of the validity of ministries. Many champions of reunion felt that this would arise in the process of discussion, and should rather be discovered as a conclusion from deliberation than set forth as a goal to be reached. Lambeth judged otherwise, and has told us very clearly in the appeal what its convictions are. "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ,

and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body." "The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ. "Within this unity Christian communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled. This means an adventure of good will and still more of faith, and nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church."

"We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith, and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief.

The Divinely instituted Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."

The Lambeth Quadrilateral becomes a Triangle, and the Conference argues that the Episcopate, exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, will prove to be the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. The Christian family will have its Father in God, and the Conference looks forward to the day when, through the acceptance of the Episcopate, "we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of Eucharist in which as one family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the One Lord our worship and service." This is a crucial passage—every word of which must be well weighed, and is the source of the apparent contradictoriness of the wording of some of the Resolutions to the spirit of the appeal. Doubtfulness of mind as to the character of the unpledged grace of

the ministries of non-Episcopal Churches possessed the thought of some of the Bishops, and they therefore wish to safeguard against the consequences of this doubtfulness. The Bishops propose—

> We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.
>
> It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through Episcopal Ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.
>
> In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

The spirit of the appeal is truly Christian. There is no halting charity in its wording. It raises the whole Anglican position to a new plane, and breathes the promise of spring to all who look forward to the harvest.

The Resolutions, in so far as they emphasize the appeal, need not be considered by us, but the practical steps on the vital subject of inter-Communion require attention. No one can object to the regulations for the interchange of pulpits under authority, or to the instruction that forbids the refusal of Communion without the Bishop's sanction beforehand to a baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table—unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful. But we are not sure as to there being an accepted interpretation of the statement which forbids Bishops from questioning the action of "any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicant of the non-Episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme" read in connexion with the declaration "Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation must

necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which, in the Bishop's judgment, justify their admission thereto. "Tot episcopi tot sententiæ" will solve the difficulty. Taking all these Resolutions together, practical difficulties of admission to Communion in our Churches will not arise to any great extent.

"Is commissioning by a non-Episcopal Church equipollent to ordination?" is asked by non-Episcopalians when they read. "In accordance with the principle of Church Order set forth in the Preface of the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican Churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been Episcopally ordained: and that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith." Is this an explicit prohibition of Anglicans receiving Communion in non-Episcopal Churches, or does it simply imply that Anglicans generally should communicate in their own Churches and receive the Communion from their own ministers, but may occasionally receive the Communion from the hands of those non-Episcopally ordained? To many it is as illogical as un-Christian to maintain that grace is conveyed by the non-Episcopally ordained to the members of non-Episcopal Churches, but is so doubtful that it cannot be pledged to members of Anglican Churches. Differentiated grace is abhorrent to Christian men, and this Resolution passed to satisfy the "doubts" of some members of the Conference.

A "common ministry" cannot be considered applicable to the whole body of Christians as long as Rome will not acknowledge Anglican orders. We are convinced that the Conference did not mean to question the validity of the ministry or the grace of the Sacraments of non-Episcopalians, and its general approval of the proposals during a time of transition, although silent concerning the continued right of the non-Episcopally ordained to administer Communion in congregations that have not possessed an Episcopal ministry, implies that it casts no slur upon the validity of the Communion in these Churches. The freedom granted to local Churches to plan reunion is an important step which will facilitate developments in many lands.

T. J. PULVERTAFT.

(To be continued.)

LIFE AND WORSHIP IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE.

SIDELIGHTS FROM ADDISON'S "*SPECTATOR*."

BY THE REV. G. S. STREATFEILD, M.A.

ADVISEDLY I write *Sidelights*, for it was no part of the *Spectator's* intention to supply his readers with a treatise on the life and practices of the Church. There is much which is not even alluded to on which we should like to know the opinion of Addison and Steele. How glad we should be to know what Addison thought of the use of the Athanasian Creed in public worship! We may surmise that he would have anticipated King George the Third, who forbade its use in the Royal Chapels; but we do not know. We may wish that there were essays on Church discipline, or on Church patronage, and its manifold abuses, which were rapidly reaching a climax when the *Spectator* was written. The writers might have enlightened us with respect to the Societies connected with the Church of England, especially the Propagation Society and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which were then starting on their beneficent careers; how we should have appreciated an essay on the relations of clergy and laity! And surely Addison missed his opportunity of affording his readers both good sense and entertainment in ignoring the wrangles of the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation, whose voice was so soon to be silenced for nearly a century and a half. On Church architecture, indeed, Addison's view is well known, for he has given us very good reason for believing that he followed the fashion in thinking with Sir Christopher Wren that the great cathedrals of the middle ages were "vast and gigantic buildings, but not worthy of the name of architecture"; for we cannot forget that many of his contributions to the *Spectator* are disfigured by sneering allusions to the Gothic style of building.

The business of the *Spectator* was that of the critical observer. He went about with his eyes and ears wide open to report what he saw and heard. Church-life, like every other branch of life, was the subject of observation and criticism; and, from what we read in the

pages of the *Spectator*, we gain some insight into the ecclesiastical and religious life of the period.

It may be well to start with the thought that in the pages of the *Spectator* we are listening to the voice of confirmed, though not violent, Whigs. The days of Richard Steele's fanatical Whiggism were yet in the future; Addison could not have been violent if he had tried. As Whigs, then, we find them expressing a very cordial aversion from popery, which, in those days of the Pretender, was of necessity bound up with the hopes and intrigues of the Jacobite. Accordingly, we must not be surprised to find that Addison is inclined to make the worst rather than the best of the papist. Thus, he condemns the Roman Catholic religion as "one huge, overgrown body of childish and idle superstitions." Having made this sweeping statement, he proceeds to pour ridicule on the Roman priest's love of dress. The Jesuits in more than one of his essays have to bear the full weight of his ridicule and displeasure.

The Act of Toleration (1689) had to a great extent removed the disgrace of persecution and intolerance from our statute book, but the day of full toleration was still somewhat distant when Addison wrote, for there were Acts still in force against Roman Catholic and Unitarian, and it is pleasant to find him supporting with his powerful pen a liberal policy towards those from whom he differed. "In that disputable point of persecuting men for conscience' sake, besides the imbittering their minds with hatred, indignation, and all the vehemence of resentment, and insnaring them to profess what they do not believe, we cut them off from the pleasures and advantages of society, afflict their bodies, distress their fortunes, hurt their reputations, ruin their families, make their lives painful, or put an end to them. Sure, when I see such dreadful consequences rising from a principle, I would be as fully convinced of the truth of it, as of a mathematical demonstration, before I would venture to act upon it, or make it a part of my religion."

Addison leaves us in no doubt as to his attachment to the Church of England as by law established. "I look upon it as a peculiar happiness, that were I to choose of what religion I would be, and under what government I would live, I should most certainly give the preference to that form of religion and government which is established in my own country. In this point I think I am determined by reason and conviction; but if I shall be told that I am

actuated by prejudice, I am sure it is an honest prejudice; it is a prejudice that arises from the love of my country, and therefore such a one as I will always indulge." In the mind of Addison the union of Church and State was a sacred thing fraught with blessing to the whole community.

By the time that the *Spectator* was given to the world the Puritan regard for the Lord's Day had, in theory at least, and in a modified form, triumphed over the laxity encouraged by authority in the earlier part of the seventeenth century. Sunday wakes had been abolished, the Book of Sports was a dead letter, and no one seemed to regret the disappearance of the Laudean Sunday. If, in the fashionable world, the disregard for the Lord's Day was undisguised, a better example was set by the large and influential middle class. Addison's thoughts on Sunday are very pleasant, if not deeply spiritual: "I am always very well pleased with a country Sunday, and think, if keeping holy the seventh day were only a human institution, it would be the best method that could have been thought of for the polishing and civilizing of mankind. It is certain the country people would soon degenerate into a kind of savages and barbarians, were there not such frequent returns of a stated time, in which the whole village meet together with their best faces, and in their cleanliest habits to converse with one another upon indifferent subjects, hear their duties explained to them, and join together in adoration of the Supreme Being. Sunday clears away the rust of the whole week, not only as it refreshes in their minds the notions of religion, but as it puts the sexes upon appearing in their most agreeable forms, and exerting all such qualities as are apt to give them a figure in the eye of the village. A country fellow distinguishes himself as much in the Churchyard as a citizen does upon the change, the whole parish politics being generally discussed in that place, either after sermon, or before the bell rings."

Addison proceeds to take us inside the sacred building, and places before us the entertaining picture of Sir Roger de Coverley in his parish church. Sir Roger, who has already evinced his interest in the spiritual welfare of his neighbours by gifts of hassocks and books, and by hiring an itinerant musician to train the village choir, is the central figure of the worshipping people. He keeps the congregation in good order: "he will suffer no one to sleep but himself, and if by any chance he has been surprised into a short nap at ser-

mon, upon recovering out of it, he stands up and looks about him, and if he sees anybody else nodding, either wakes them himself, or sends his servant to them. The sermon ended, nobody presumes to stir till Sir Roger is gone out of the church. The Knight walks down from his seat in the chancel between a double row of his tenants, that stand bowing to him on each side, and every now and then he enquires how such an one's wife, or mother, or son, or father do, whom he does not see in church, which is understood as a secret reprimand to the person that is absent." This and much more that is amusing: it may be that there is a spice of exaggeration and caricature in the sketch that Addison draws; but the picture admirably illustrates Mr. Courthope's remark, " the features of surviving feudalism have been inimitably preserved for us in the character of Sir Roger de Coverley."

We are naturally interested to hear what *Spectator* has to say about the preaching of his day. We have not read far before finding that Archbishop Tillotson is his ideal. Preaching was never the power in the eighteenth that it had been in the seventeenth century. The written discourse had taken the place of the spoken sermon, and a philosophy of morality was superseding the Gospel of redemption. From Addison's hearty approval of Sir Roger's practice we may infer that he had spent weary hours in listening to sermons that did not commend themselves to his critical faculty. Sir Roger's own practice is described in one of the Coverley papers. " ' At his (i.e., the domestic chaplain's) first settling with me,' says Sir Roger, ' I made him a present of all the good sermons which have been printed in English, and only begged of him that every Sunday he would pronounce one from the pulpit.' As Sir Roger was going on in his story, the gentleman we were talking of came up to us; and upon the Knight's asking him who preached to-morrow (for it was Saturday night) told us the Bishop of St. Asaph in the morning and Dr. South in the afternoon. He then showed us his list of preachers for the whole year; where I saw with a great deal of pleasure Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Saunderson, Dr. Barrow, Dr. Calamy, with several living authors who have published discourses of practical divinity." After listening, on the following day, to the words of the Bishop of St. Asaph and Dr. South, Addison thus delivers himself: " I could heartily wish that more of our country clergy would follow this example,

and instead of wasting their spirits in laborious compositions of their own, would endeavour after a handsome elocution, and all those other talents that are proper to enforce what has been penned by great masters. This would be not only more easy to themselves, but more edifying to the people." *Spectator's* most serious criticism of the preaching he hears relates to its lack of animation and emotion. He institutes a comparison, or rather contrast, between the English and the foreign preacher. "Our orators are observed to make use of less gesture or action than those of other countries. Our preachers stand stock still in the pulpit, and will not so much as move a finger to set off the best sermons in the world." This lack of vivacity and accompanying gesture, it is urged, mars the effect of the best sentiments on the ignorant and illiterate. Voltaire passes much the same judgment on English preaching. "Discourses," he says, "aiming at the pathetic, and accompanied with violent gestures, would excite laughter in an English congregation. In the pulpit they affect the most unornamented simplicity. In England a sermon is a solid, but sometimes a dry dissertation, which a man reads to the people without gesture, and without any particular exaltation of voice."

And if you go to Westminster Hall (where the judges then sat) and listen to the rhetorical efforts of the bar, you will find the same characteristics. "How cold and dead a figure in comparison of these two men (*Spectator* has been alluding to Demosthenes and Cicero) does an orator make at the British bar, holding up his head with the most insipid serenity, and stroking the sides of a long wig that reaches down to his middle! The truth of it is there is often nothing more ridiculous than the gestures of an English speaker; you see some of them running their hands into their pockets as far as ever they can thrust them, and others looking with great attention on a piece of paper that has nothing written in it; you may see many a smart rhetorician turning his hat in his hands, moulding it into several different cocks, examining sometimes the lining of it, and sometimes the button during the whole course of his harangue. A deaf man would think he was cheapening a beaver, when perhaps he is talking of the fate of the British nation. I remember when I was a young man, and used to frequent Westminster Hall, there was a counsellor, who never pleaded without a piece of pack-thread in his hand, which he used to twist about a

thumb or a finger all the while he was speaking: the wags of those days used to call it the thread of his discourse, for he was unable to utter a word without it. One of his clients, who was more merry than wise, stole it one day from him in the midst of his pleading, but he had better have left it alone, for he lost his cause by his jest."

Addison has a characteristic allusion to the fashionable practice of introducing tags of Latin and Greek into the sermon. Such quotations were held to distinguish the scholarly from the illiterate preacher. "I have heard of a couple of preachers in a country town who endeavoured which should outshine the other, and draw together the greatest congregation. One of them being well versed in the Fathers, used to quote every now and then a Latin sentence to his illiterate hearers, who, it seems, found themselves so edified by it that they flocked in greater numbers to this learned man than to his rival. The other, finding his congregation mouldering every Sunday, and hearing at length what was the occasion of it, resolved to give his parish a little Latin in his turn, but being unacquainted with any of the Fathers, he digested into his sermons the whole book of *Quæ genus*, adding, however, such explications to it as he thought might be for the benefit of his people. He afterwards entered upon *As in præsenti*, which he converted in the same manner to the use of his parishioners. This, in a very little time, thickened his audience, filled his church, and routed his antagonist."[1]

In No. 539 *Spectator* vents his indignation against a juvenile cleric who had ventured, in the pulpit, to improve upon Tillotson, an unpardonable offence in the eyes of Addison, in whose judgment Tillotson stood for all that was sound, rational and edifying. A correspondent of the *Spectator* has been to church, and has heard a sermon preached by "a young gentleman that looked as if he was just come to the gown and a scarf." The sermon was Tillotson's well-known composition on evil speaking, but was so altered that it was difficult to recognize the Archbishop's handiwork. The young gentleman "made so many pretty additions, and he could never give us a paragraph of the sermon, but he introduced it with something which, methought, looked more like a design to show his own

[1] *Quæ genus* and *As in præsenti* were the first words in collections of rules in the Latin Grammar then in use, compiled by William Lilye, to which Erasmus and Dean Colet contributed, and of which Cardinal Wolsey wrote the preface.

ingenuity, than to instruct the people. In short he added and curtailed in such a manner that he vexed me; insomuch that I could not forbear thinking that this young spark was as justly blameable as Bullock or Penkethman, when they mend a noble play of Shakespeare or Jonson." [1]

Spectator is greatly dissatisfied with the reading that he hears in church. This dissatisfaction is expressed in a long and circumstantial letter from an imaginary correspondent, who suggests that the inability of the clergy to read as they should proceeds from " the little care that is taken of their reading while boys and at school, where, when they are got into Latin, they are looked upon as above English, the reading of which is wholly neglected." It would be well if the clergy would attend a reading class, and the writer advises that an instructor might be found in the Vicar of St. James's, Garlick Hill. This was one Philip Stubbs, afterwards Archdeacon of St. Albans.[2] If the clergy will only take him for their model, " those who are afraid of stretching their mouths, and spoiling their soft voices, will learn to read with clearness, loudness and strength. Others that affect a rakish, negligent air by folding their arms, and lolling on their book will be taught decent behaviour, and comely erection of body. Those who read so fast, as if impatient of their work, may learn to speak deliberately. There is another sort of persons whom I call Pindaric readers, as being confined to no set measure; these pronounce five or six words with great deliberation, and the five or six subsequent ones with as great celerity: the first part of a sentence with a very exalted voice, and the latter part with a submissive one: sometimes again, with one sort of tone, and immediately after with a very different one." These various types of readers will do well to receive instruction from the Rev. Philip Stubbs, and so may learn the " art of reading movingly and fervently, how to place the emphasis, and give the proper accent to each word, and how to vary the voice according to the nature of the sentence."

[1] William Bullock, b. 1657 (?) d. 1740 (?); William Penkethman, d. 1725, popular actors of the day.

[2] Philip Stubbs, born 1665, died 1738, began his public career as Rector of Woolwich. For some years he held the combined benefices of St. James's, Garlick Hill, and St. Alphege, London Wall. In 1710 he became Rector of Launton, near Bicester, and, in 1715, Archdeacon of St Albans. He drew up the first Report of the S.P.G., was a Fellow of the Royal Society, and a competent antiquary.

Spectator has but little to say as to the structure of the liturgy, but he gives as his reason for perferring set forms of prayer to extemporaneous utterance, or "conceived prayer," as it was termed, that the worshipper is thus saved from the extravagance of fanaticism and the vagaries of eccentricity.

G. S. STREATFEILD.

(*To be concluded.*)

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.

IX. LABOUR PROBLEMS AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Texts: "Whatsoever is right I will give."
"Thou hast made them equal unto us" (St. Matt. xx. 4, 12).

[Book of the Month: Parables of the Kingdom,[1] by Swete=S. Other reff. Plummer's *St. Matthew*=P. Bruce's *Training of the Twelve* =B. David Smith's *In the Days of His Flesh*=DS. *Expositor' Greek Test.*=EGT.]

Odd to hear labour criticizing an employer for overpayment, and declaring against equality. But unless something bigger than Law and better than contracts animates either employer or employed, there will always be trouble. This was St. Peter's fundamental mistake in xix. 27. It is dealt with in xix. 30; xx. 8, 12, 16. The subject of St. Matthew's Gospel is God's Kingdom as ushered in and made possible by Christ. But this is full of possibilities of misunderstanding. "*The Kingdom of God* is the *imperium* of God, and not the area or the people over which it is exercised" (S. 6). "It is purely spiritual and ethical, a sovereignty exerted over men's hearts and lives by the Divine Spirit swaying the human spirit and co operating with it" (S. 7). "It is really complex in

[1] Prof. H. B. Swete's *Parables of the Kingdom*, published by Macmillan, 7/6 net. All Dr. Swete's work carries the mark of industry, reverence and insight. This book is excellent, and expository preachers will be glad to have it and to utilize it.

the highest degree, entering into all the departments of human life" (S. 7).

We are considering a single parable, but it forms one of a group, the Judæan Parables. These differ much from the Galilean.

1. THE FRAME-WORK. "It is not the history of the beginning and growth of the Kingdom that we are now to see represented, so much as its relation to the Jewish people, its spirit, its ethical character, its requirements, its issues" (S. 66). "The scenes are taken, not from the outdoor life of nature, or the road-side or lake-side or the cottage home, but from the social life of the time, the relations of the upper classes to the lower, the master to his slaves, the owner to his labourers, the host to his guests" (S. 65). "Jesus is no longer addressing great mixed crowds of peasants and fishermen by the shore of the Lake. His audience consists of the . . . members of His inner group, or His fellow-guests at the tables of the rich, or the scribes and priests of Jerusalem" (S. 65). "In the Galilean parables corn-growing and fishing are the predominant employments. Those on the other hand which were spoken on the way to Jerusalem or at Jerusalem, when they speak of vegetation, make the cultivation of the vine and the fig the chief feature; for the hills of Samaria and Judæa were largely planted with these fruit trees, the hills of Judæa, at least, affording little soil suitable for the growth of cereals" (S. 98–9)

2. THE PICTURE. It is a scene in a vineyard: circumstances varied. "The owner of a vineyard might either work it himself, or let it to a farmer ("husbandman") who paid in kind. The latter case is contemplated in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Matt. xxi. 33 ff.), the former here" (S. 99).

So the owner begins his day with a visit to the village square, and engages gangs of labour at various periods. "With the first batch who came from sunrise to sunset he made the usual terms—one silver denarius for the day. It was the traditional daily wage of Palestine, for its equivalent, the Greek drachma, is paid by Tobit (Tobit v. 14, [15]), and as such it is accepted without reluctance. With the rest no bargain is made; only that they should receive *whatsoever is right*, which would probably be understood to mean the *aliquot* part of a denarius" (S. 99–100). With some he makes a contract. Others he asks to trust his judgment. At the end of the day he gives the same payment all the way round, and

there is a disturbance from the men who had a contract. " Superficially their complaint was not without reason " (S. 100). Yet when we look deeper we get larger views. For " as to the householder's fairness, there can be no question. He kept faith with those who made an agreement with him, and he was the sole judge of what the work of the others was worth to him. Time was precious, and labour became increasingly valuable as the day went on " (P. 273). He is just in the widest sense without any pettiness of judgment. But his largeness is disconcerting to small men. " How can this somewhat arbitrary proceeding on the part of the master be said to resemble God's dealing with men in the Christian dispensation ? " (S. 100).

3. THE INTERPRETATION. It is clear at once that here is no excuse for shirkers. " The parable takes no account of those who deliberately postpone entering God's service. All the labourers came as soon as they were called " (P. 273). This disposes of St. Peter's notion that there must be " some superlative reward in the coming Messianic Kingdom for the first disciples " (S. 102).

(*a*) *There is something larger than arithmetic.* " The parable was designed, in the first instance, to correct the mercenary spirit of the Twelve. If they worked for wages . . . they would be accounted mere hirelings " (DS. 366). " Its own moral is that God does not love a legal spirit " (EGT. I. 256). " So viewed, it has a manifest connexion with Peter's self-complacent question " (EGT. I. 256). " The great outstanding thought set forth is this, that in estimating the value of work, the divine Lord, whom all serve, takes into account not merely quantity but quality ; that is, the spirit in which the work is done " (B. 264). " A small quantity of work done in a right spirit is of greater value than a large quantity done in a wrong spirit. One hour's work done by men who make no bargain is of greater value than twelve hours' work done by men who regard their doings with self-complacency " (B. 266).

(*b*) *There is no part-possession of God.* " When we turn to the parable we find the last made first by being treated as equal to the first, and the first made last by becoming as the last in regard to the great reward " (S. 102). One reason for this is that " in eternal life there can be neither less nor more, for it is the presence and possession of God. Can it be that, in that day when the great reward is given, there will be found those who murmur against the owner of

the vineyard? Surely not" (S. 102–3). "This part of the parable, then, cannot find an exact counterpart in the Kingdom of God" (S. 103). "That spirit, if it could remain unchecked to the end . . . would produce discontent on the very threshold of Heaven" (S. 103). "No service that we can render deserves the infinite reward" (S. 106). "None will have less than eternal life, and none can have more" (S. 108).

(*c*) *No man who realizes his own failings will carp at others' success.* "The parable was designed to beat down the arrogance of the disciples. Did that sentence: 'It is my pleasure to give to "this last fellow" even as to thee,' never ring in the ears of 'the men who had been with Jesus' when, because he had been hired late, they denied the apostleship of St. Paul? And did the Jewish Christians never think of this parable when they despised the Gentiles whom the Lord had pitied and received into His service, making no difference between them and the Jews who had been hired at the first hour?" (DS. 366.)

(*d*) *The contrasts between the two types of labourers are constant and age-long.* "The first are the Jacobs." "The last are Abraham-like men." "The first are the Simons." "The last are the women with alabaster boxes." "The first are the elder brothers." "The last are the prodigals" (B. 267). "Self-esteem is a sin which easily besets men situated as the Twelve" (B. 268).

So it is always true that "wages" alone mean lack of life somewhere. It is the divine principle of the "gift" that means life, always (cf. Rom. vi. 23). The simple, the humble, the meek, these are the true inheritors, not the bargainers and the crafty.

"The meanest man in grey fields gone
Behind the set of sun,
Heareth between star and other star,
Through the door of the darkness fallen ajar,
The Council, eldest of things that are,
The talk of the Three in One."

(*G. K. Chesterton*)

HYTHE CHURCH AND ITS CRYPT.

By M. Adeline-Boulter-Cooke.

ON the Kentish shore there stands an ancient town—one of the famous Cinque ports which was bound to contribute ships and men to fight the King's battles, and received in return many privileges. Nowadays, the sea has receded, so that it is no longer a port or harbour, but the old town with its narrow streets, its steep ways up the side of the high ridge, its remnant of ancient houses, still retains its remarkable church, which only seems to have increased in interest and historical associations with the passing of the centuries. Picture a steep, steep path, or narrow way, running straight uphill to the entrance porch—a porch with a great flight of stone steps rising to the door of the church, very majestic and imposing, and rendered necessary no doubt on account of the ridge on which the church is built. Nobody can forget this wonderful first view of the parish church of St. Leonard, for it takes hold on the mind in an extraordinary manner. Over this thirteenth-century porch is a parvise, and this was used for the council chamber up to the year 1795.

Much of the church dates from the twelfth century, and includes the lovely Norman arch between the south aisle and transept, and a fine Norman door. The north transept was originally St. Edmund's Chapel, and we can see an aumbry and piscina, and what may have been an Easter Sepulchre where the Blessed Sacrament used to be placed on Maundy Thursday. Although the rood screen has gone, the stairs and doors still remain. A flight of steps, in a manner very reminiscent of Canterbury Cathedral, leads up to the beautiful thirteenth-century chancel with its triforium and clerestory sedilia and piscina, and the choir aisles, of which St. Katherine's Chapel is used for daily service, and the south choir aisle was originally the Lady-chapel.

Amongst other interesting details of this fine old church, naturally important as the parish church of a Cinque port, is an iron chest, which is supposed to have belonged to the Spanish Armada. It must have been quite difficult to open, for the key turns as many as eleven bolts, and in its construction much resembles a treasure chest in which King Philip of Spain is considered to have brought

over gold and jewels, and which is carefully preserved at Southampton. Curious, too, is the sixteenth century inscription to the memory of John Bredgman, Baily of Hythe. It is worth recording, though it is not particularly easy to decipher:

" Whilst he did live which heare doth lie,
Three sutes gatt he of ye Crowne.
The Mortmain fayer and Mayraltie
For Hythe this ancient Towne.
And was himself tha Baylye last,
And Mayer fyrsr by name.
Though he bee gone tyme is not past
To preasyse God for ye same."

But the great feature of the church is the so-called crypt and the extraordinary collection of skulls and bones which it contains. Not that it is in reality a crypt, but a part of an ambulatory or procession path. In the days before the Reformation, it was customary, upon great religious and ceremonial occasions, for there to be imposing processions round the church. These, however, must take place on consecrated ground, which was often difficult to arrange, as at the splendid church of St. Peter Mancroft, at Norwich, where the tower is at the limit of the space allowed, and arches have therefore been cut through it on each side for the procession to pass under.

The extreme steepness of the ground on which Hythe church is built, doubtless made the task of providing a processional path not an easy one. If we return to the porch we shall see a doorway on each side, which the flight of steps has rendered on the level of the churchyard. These doors enabled the procession to pass through the porch, and it then proceeded towards the entrance to the eastern crypt, or rather ambulatory, with a door at the north by which it emerged. The ground has altered a good deal, so that it is probable there were steps up to this ambulatory instead of going down somewhat to it as it is at present. When we enter, it is to see an extraordinary sight. For here are stacked on shelves hundreds of human skulls, while on one side is an orderly pile of bones.

What a mute sermon! what a lesson of that future about which we think so little! Many people visit this crypt, and the sight of healthy men and women in such surroundings brings very strikingly to mind the solemn text: " In the midst of life we are in death."

There are skulls and bones of men, women and children, representing some 4,000 persons. Some of the bones show—so authorities

say—that rheumatism was a common occurrence, and some of the teeth of the skulls tell that much harder and more common food was eaten at that time than is now; the bones also show that people were much shorter then they are at the present day. But how did these hundreds of skulls come here?

When churchyards were so small in mediæval days, it was often necessary, after a certain period, to remove the bones from the churchyard in order to make space, and these were reverently placed in crypts or chambers for the purpose, as at Norwich, where a special charnel house was built, and where mass was daily said for the soul of the founder, all the bishops of the see, and for the souls of those whose bones were carried thither. But the crypt at Hythe was not built for the purpose of an ossuary. It is noticeable that the piles of bones are stacked in such a manner that a walking way for processions was left, and this would not have been done if it had only been used as a convenient receptacle for the bones. After the Reformation, when such processions were no longer allowed, the north doorway was closed. It is apparent, therefore, that the bones were placed in position before the Reformation, and it is thought they were put here about the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The large number of these bones has been and still is a matter for much controversy and speculation. At one period it was thought they were the remains of those who had fallen in a great battle between the Britons and Saxons in 456, and that marks on the skulls pointed to wounds received in the fight. This theory has, however, been disposed of, and the marks were probably received when they were exhumed. The idea that the number is accounted for by the Black Death which swept over England has also been placed on one side, and the latest opinion, as far as we can gather it by what has been written on the subject, is that they were exhumed from the churchyard when it was required for more burials. There is, moreover, a very interesting point which, we understand, has not yet been finally settled. Many of the skulls are very different to the average skull of the Englishman of that period. Mr. Parsons thinks the explanation may be due to a special settlement at Hythe of the Vandals, which would account for the peculiarity. But this is by no means a definite statement, and there is, doubtless, a great deal more to be discovered about this difficult question.

M. ADELINE-BOULTER-COOKE.

THE CASE FOR THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE.

By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.,
formerly Donnellan Lecturer, Dublin University.

III.

[*Synopsis of previous chapters. In the March and April numbers of the* Churchman *this year the Mosaic Tabernacle was treated as a test case by which the Higher Criticism of the Wellhausen school, who treat this Tabernacle as a post-exilic accretion or invention, must either stand or fall. In the March number external proofs were given of the truth of the statements in the Pentateuch regarding this Tabernacle. Among the principal witnesses called were the Septuagint Version, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Greek Apocrypha. In the April number evidence of an internal character was adduced from Joshua, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, Jeremiah vii., xxvi., etc., all pre-exilic documents. In this and the following chapter the indirect evidence of the ark and David's tent of meeting and the provisional tent of Moses, on which the Higher Critical argument is largely founded, will be examined.—F. R. M. H.*]

THE ARK AND DAVID'S TENT OF MEETING.

WE now come to the evidence of the ark in Deuteronomy x. 3: "And I made an ark of shittim (acacia) wood, and hewed two tables of stone." Many of the Critics agree that D. is pre-exilic. Here we have mention made of the ark in pre-exilic days.

Wellhausen[1] admits that according to the Law, "the Priestly Document" P., the Tabernacle is the inseparable companion of the ark—"the two things necessarily belong to each other." He also admits that there are traces of the existence of the ark toward the end of the period of the Judges, and that afterwards this ark of Jehovah was deposited in Solomon's Temple. Now it is quite plain that the Tabernacle was intended to house the ark, and if the ark existed in those early times, there must have been a tabernacle made for it, as we find in Exodus xxxvi. and xxxvii. 1—passages which are post-exilic, according to the Critics.

We shall now call the priestly writers of Exodus xxxvi. and xxxvii. into the witness-box. We want to find out from them how they came to record the fact that both the wood of the ark and the boards of the Tabernacle were from the same shittim wood, or acacia tree. We grant the possibility of getting the information

[1] *Proleg.*, Eng. Trans, pp. 41, 42.

from Deuteronomy about the wood of the ark, but how did they come to report that the wood of the Tabernacle was of shittim wood? Were these writers not aware of the fact that the Tabernacle was modelled after the Temple? And that being so, the boards of the Tabernacle should have been like those of the Temple, even of cedar of Lebanon (see 1 Kings vi. 16). This is a notable error. It proves either that the priestly writers made a grievous mistake, or that it is a mistake to imagine that such priestly writers invented the Tabernacle.

The ark met with a dire misfortune in the days of Eli. It was taken by the Philistines, and afterwards restored to the Hebrews, to the house of Abinadab, at Kirjath-jearim, where it remained for a long time, in apparent neglect. It was evidently considered desecrated by its residence among the Philistines. The whole country was in a state of confusion during this period. But David, after his capture of Zion, determined to convey it in state to his new city. "And they brought in the ark of the Lord, and set it in its place, in the midst of the tabernacle (tent) that David had stretched for it; and David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord. . . . He blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Hosts. And he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, both to men and women, to every one a cake of bread, and a portion of flesh, and a cake of raisins" (2 Sam. vi. 17–19).

There is a point to be noticed here. When it is said that Moses or David did a certain thing in connexion with the Ark or the Tabernacle, why is it taken literally in one place and not in the other? The principle is well known that in such cases the doer is the person who orders the thing to be done. *Quod facit per alios facit per se.* When it is said that "General Haig brought the cavalry into action," does it mean that he was the cavalry officer who executed the movement? When it is said in Exodus xl. 18, "Moses reared up the tabernacle, and laid its sockets, and set up the boards thereof, and put in the bar thereof, and reared up its pillars. And he spread the tent over the tabernacle, and put the covering of the tent above upon it," does it mean that Moses did all this himself? If so, he must have been an Hercules in strength. But the Higher Critics do not assert this. In fact, they have built an opposite kind of argument, a rather perverse one from their own point of view, upon this passage in Exodus. (See Driver's *Exodus*,

p. 426.) They argue that the transport supplies for the Tabernacle and the court was not sufficient—" only four wagons." But the Scripture says the " Kohathites bore it upon their shoulders " (Num. vii. 9). In this passage in Exodus (xl. 18), assigned by them to P., the Critics do not complain that " the priests and Levites are conspicuous by their absence." But they are not mentioned, and if we are to interpret the passage as they interpret parallel passages, we must infer that Moses performed this superhuman task of erecting the Tabernacle himself, and of doing so whenever required. See Exodus xxxiii. 7 : " Now Moses used to take the tent, and to pitch it without the camp, and he called it the tent of meeting." This tent, of which more anon, is described as " an ordinary nomad tent, which Moses could himself carry and pitch outside the camp." [1] There is no need to say that he carried it himself, when he had a strong young man like Joshua to help, and the priests as well. But this the Higher Critics do not allow. Again, in the case of David's tent, they assume that " David himself erects a tent for the ark," and observe " the priests and Levites, even on this solemn occasion, are, as before, conspicuous by their absence." [2] So they would assume that because the priests and Levites are not expressly mentioned in 2 Samuel vi. 17 f., they were absent. David, then, is left to erect the Tabernacle himself, offer the sacrifices himself, and give a portion of bread, flesh and raisins to every individual, man and woman, with his own hands—another superhuman feat ! Might one add that there is no need when reporting a Church Service to say " the clergy were present."

By the way, one objection to the Mosaic Tabernacle was that it was not large enough to accommodate all the host of Israelites standing before its door (Num. x. 3), as that would make a procession sixty miles long. This was Colenso's objection, which can be answered by saying it was a large and representative gathering only that is implied. But would not the same apply to David's tent erected to house the ark for a time ? " And he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, both to men and women, to every one a cake of bread, etc." How could " the whole multitude of Israel " stand before the tent ? And yet the Critics do not find fault with this tent, or question its existence. How could he with his own hands give his gifts to each one ? If any

[1] McNeile, *Numbers*, p. 2. [2] Driver, *Exodus*, p. 429.

occasion demanded the presence of priests and Levites, surely this was one, to offer the sacrifices, to marshal the people, to distribute the gifts. And when Solomon offered a thousand burnt offerings at Gibeon (1 Kings iii. 4), "the priests and Levites are again conspicuous by their absence": they are not mentioned. So Solomon perforce had to do the work of at least two hundred men himself. That is the conclusion the Critics compel us to draw. Now let us turn to what is, according to them, the priestly account of this Tabernacle in 2 Chronicles i. 6: "And Solomon went up thither to the brasen altar before the Lord, which was at the tent of meeting, and offered a thousand burnt offerings upon it." Are we to infer from this that the Chronicler, writing about 330 B.C., long after P. had been drawn up by the priestly scribes, was not aware of the existence of priests and Levites, for we may say in the words the Critics use regarding 2 Samuel vi. 17, "the priests and Levites even on this solemn occasion are, as before, conspicuous by their absence." [1]

This method of employing an argument or not employing it, whenever it suits their purpose, convicts those who so act of inconsistency, and proves that they are not restrained by scruples in their attempt to make the Scriptural records conform with their foregone conclusions. Repudiating passages that are against their theories as "interpolated," "glosses," or "not genuine," and putting an unnatural strain and an illogical interpretation upon others, may be the methods adopted by the Higher Criticism, but they are not sanctioned by logic, nor are they the methods of science. How would the study of psychology, medicine, surgery, electricity, advance, if such methods were followed?

There is no reason, then, to doubt the presence of priests and Levites on the occasion when David ordered his tent to be erected for the ark in his recently conquered capital, "the city of David." But why should he have prepared another tent if the Tabernacle was still in existence? This question is asked by Mr. Chapman, [2] and Driver answered it in this dogmatic way: "If this ancient and venerable structure had been in existence, David would hardly have erected a new and special tent himself for the ark." [3]

The country had been in an unsettled condition for some sixty or seventy years, ever since the ark had been taken by the Philis-

[1] Driver, *Exodus*, p. 492. [2] *Introduction*, p. 194. [3] *Exodus*, p. 429.

tines, and Hophni and Phinehas had been slain. After a time it was sent back by the Philistines. This is Driver's account of what followed :—

" After the ark was restored by the Philistines, instead of being taken to what, if it existed, must have been its only proper place, the Tent of Meeting of P., it was brought to the house of *Abinadab* near Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. vii. 1), *who*, though to all appearance an ordinary layman, *consecrated* one of his sons to keep it. (Where, it may be pertinently asked, were the priests of Aaron's line, who alone, according to Numbers, might touch the ark ?)."[1]

Our answer to this is that it is quite apparent that the ark was being conveyed back to its own tabernacle at Shiloh. It was brought by the milch cows straight from Ekron to Bethshemesh, and thence to Kirjath-jearim, lying on the direct road to Shiloh or Gibeon. At Bethshemesh it was received by Levites. " And the Levites took down the ark of the Lord, etc." (1 Sam. vi. 15). This verse is both in the LXX. and the Hebrew. Yet the Critics call it an interpolation. The irreverent conduct of the men of Beth-shemesh was punished. They send to the men of Kirjath-jearim to fetch the ark away. Why did they send there ? Because it was the next stage in the journey of the ark. Then these people came, and took it to the house of Abinadab " in the hill." We are not told that he was a layman. He may have been a priest. And it is not said that *he consecrated* one of his sons, but *they* consecrated, that is, the man of Kirjath-jearim, among whom there may have been priests. Here the ark remained for many years. Why, we cannot tell. It was probably owing to the destruction of Shiloh. " It was now, probably, that the destruction of the sanctuary of Shiloh referred to by Jeremiah (vii. 24 ; xxvi. 6, 9 ; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 60) took place."[2] And it was thought advisable to keep the ark " on the hill " of Kirjath-jearim, under the safe guardianship of Eleazar. Years afterwards[3] David, after taking Zion, desired to bring it to his city. But when doing so Uzzah was killed. And David was afraid of the Lord that day, and he said, " How shall the ark of the Lord come unto me ? So David would not remove

[1] *Exodus*, p. 429. The italics are ours. *Kidd'shu*, the word is plural, קִדְּשׁוּ Driver translates it as a singular !!

[2] Driver (*ibid.*).

[3] 1 Samuel vii. 2 says the Ark remained in Kirjath-jearim " twenty years."

the ark of the Lord unto him into the city of David: but David carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom the Gittite" (2 Sam. vi. 10). This was clearly not David's original intention, as Driver implies. Three months afterwards he took it into his own city. It is apparent that David wished to have the ark *for himself*, and his intention to build a temple for it is explained at length in the next chapter, 2 Samuel vii. In the meantime he erected a temporary tent for it. After all its vicissitudes and its captivity in Philistia, it may have been regarded with askance, or its possession may have been a cause of jealousy.

But what of the Mosaic Tabernacle in the meantime? It too had had its vicissitudes. It had been removed from Shiloh just before or just after the destruction of that place. We find it in Nob. At least its presence is implied in what took place there, 1 Samuel xxi. And afterwards it was at Gibeon, El-jib (five or six miles N.W. of Jerusalem), where Solomon made his great offering and had his dream. The existence of this Tabernacle is doubtless implied in 1 Kings i. 39; ii. 28, where we are told that "Zadok the priest took the *horn of oil* out of the tent, and anointed Solomon," and that "Joab fled unto the tent of the Lord, and caught hold on the *horns of the altar*." There are two things to be noticed here.

(1) With regard to the anointing oil, it was kept in the Tabernacle, also known as the Tent of Meeting. For the contents of the Tabernacle, see Exodus xxxix. 38: "The golden altar, and the anointing oil, and the sweet incense, and the screen for the door, or opening, (*pethaḥ*) of the tent, the brasen altar . . . the lamps and all the vessels thereof, etc." These things were not in the tent erected by David. See also Exodus xxxi. 11, where the candlestick with all its vessels, the garments for Aaron and his sons, and the anointing oil, and the incense for the Holy Place were kept in the tent of meeting. These were considered *the furniture* of the tent,[1] in Hebrew the same word as "vessels." When the tent of meeting is mentioned in 1 Kings viii. 3: "And the priests brought up the ark of the Lord and the tent of meeting, and all the *holy vessels* that were in the tent," the mention of the *holy vessels* shows the notice must refer to P.'s Tent of Meeting, the Mosaic Tabernacle, and not David's tent, which housed the ark for a time, but in which these vessels could not be treasured.

[1] *K'lê ha'ohel* (כְּלֵי הָאֹהֶל).

This last passage, of course, is fatal to the Higher Critical theory, and Driver states: "The notice, if authentic, cannot refer to P.'s Tent of Meeting" [1] on the ground that "if this ancient and venerable structure had been in existence, David would hardly have erected a new and special tent himself for the ark." Mr. Chapman,[2] seeing that it must refer to this Tent, treats the whole passage as a "scribal addition." Accordingly, we are justified in inferring that this oil was brought from the Tabernacle at Gibeon.

(2) With regard to the brasen altar, this was always in the Tent of Meeting, and could not have been in David's tent. The whole account of Adonijah's flight to the altar and his catching hold of its horns (1 Kings i. 50), and of Joab's similar flight afterwards to "the Tent of the Lord" (1 Kings ii. 29), and his station by the altar, whose horns he grasped, would be more in keeping with what we would expect if the Tent and its altar were some distance from the city. It was outside the city at Enrogel, which lies on the borders of Judah and Benjamin, that Adonijah gave his feast (1 Kings i. 9). It was here that David's spies hid during Absalom's revolt (2 Sam. xvii. 17). When Adonijah and his friends heard of the proclamation of Solomon, all his guests fled away, and Adonijah made straight for the altar. Now we can hardly believe he would have fled to the citadel of the city which was in the hands of his enemies, for that would have meant courting capture and death. But if the altar was at Gibeon, he would have had time to reach it before he was overtaken. Neither can we believe that after the death of David, when Adonijah made his conspiracy against Solomon and was seized, Joab would have rushed off to Zion, into the very arms of his foes. A brother conspirator, Abiathar, had been banished to his fields at Anathoth in Benjamin (1 Kings ii. 26), two and a half miles north-east of Jerusalem. And then we read "tidings came to Joab" (1 Kings ii. 28). Probably Abiathar on his flight from the city was able to send a messenger, or give the message himself to Joab, whose house was in "the wilderness" (*v.* 34), in the course of his own flight. It is most unlikely that Joab would have been in the city or ventured into it, when the cause of Adonijah was apparently lost, and the city was full of his enemies. Joab's

[1] *Exodus*, p. 429.

[2] *Introduction*, p. 194. "The reference here to the tent may be a scribal addition." He holds that this whole passage, vv. 1–11, has been largely interpolated.

house seems to have been to the north of Jerusalem, in what was then a somewhat wild country. From it he fled for refuge to the Tabernacle at Gibeon, and stood beside the brasen altar which was in it (Exod. xxxviii. 30), clasping its horns. Here Benaiah slew him, for a murderer was not protected by the altar (Exod. xxi. 14), and the word of the king was "that thou mayest take away the innocent blood which Joab shed from me and from the house of my father." The reference here is to Numbers xxxv. 33: "No expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." This is in P., as the Critics say, and therefore P. underlies the records of the Kings, and was, therefore, before Kings, not after, as the Critics assume. We also read that Joab was buried "in his house in the wilderness." Benaiah, who was ordered to bury him, would hardly have deemed it wise to have had his remains conveyed away to his residence if he had slain Joab in the citadel, as that would have seemed like giving a public funeral to a conspirator. But he might have done so, if Joab had lived near the tent of meeting at Gibeon.

Accordingly, these two references in 1 Kings i. 39, and 1 Kings ii. 28, are in favour of the traditional view, and not of the Higher Critical theory, with which they do not harmonise. *The tent of David was only a provisional abode for the ark, like the first tent of Moses,* which Joshua guarded for a time, until the tent of meeting was completed. The Critics deny this, and say that the "tent of meeting" mentioned in Exodus xxxiii. was the only Tabernacle that preceded the Temple of Solomon. The two different accounts in J.E. and P. are of the same structure, they assert. "It seems impossible to escape the conclusion that the Pentateuch contains two different representations of the Tent of Meeting."[1] It would be interesting to hear the evidence on this point from all the authorities concerned, who, on the contrary, seem *to favour* different *accounts* of *different tents* not different accounts of the same Tent or Tabernacle.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

(*To be concluded.*)

[1] *Book of Exodus.* (Driver), p. 427.

MEMORIES OF CANON CHRISTOPHER.

By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

(*Continued from* The Churchman *of September, p.* 514.)

[It may perhaps be permitted me to say that as Canon Christopher wrote to me many of his memories, the material now presented is usually very largely and sometimes identically in his language.—W. H. G. T.]

VII. OXFORD: CENTRAL YEARS. 1871–1885.

As time went on and Mr. Christopher became better known, his church was a centre and rallying point for Evangelical life and work in Oxford.

New Rectory.

Although he had been enabled to obtain for the parish a restored and enlarged church and new day-schools, the need of a new Rectory still remained, and to the provision of this in 1877 he directed his abundant energies. The house in North Oxford was far away from the parish, while the old Rectory in Pembroke Street had been declared by an architect to be incapable of further repair. The result was the erection of a new, large and commodious building, which not only relieved Mr. Christopher himself from the considerable outgoing for a private house, but, as he used to say, it would give his successor a house which would be commodious in case he were a man with a large family. His many friends again rallied to his help, and among them were both senior and junior members of the University. An appeal was circulated among clergy who had been in Oxford during Mr. Christopher's time, and elicited some remarkable testimonies to his life and work. While all these are deeply interesting, it is impossible to do more than refer to two or three: one by the Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Knox, then Fellow and Tutor of Merton College; one by the Bishop of Liverpool, Dr. Chavasse, then Vicar of St. Paul's, Holloway, and a third by Dr. Aglionby, Vicar of Newbold Pacey, then Curate of Christ Church, Hampstead. Junior members were not behindhand, for they subscribed the sum of £100, and accompanied the gift with an address which showed very warm appreciation of Mr. Christopher's work on their behalf. Among the one hundred and forty names appended to this address were some who have become well-known in the

Church since that day, including Canon Hay Aiken; Mr. (now Sir) W. F. A. Archibald; Mr. G. A. King, Master in Chancery; Rev. F. Baylis, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; Prebendary Brightman of Magdalen College, Oxford; Rev. A. R. Buckland, afterwards Secretary of the Religious Tract Society; the Bishop of Liverpool; the late Canon Yorke Fausset; Rev. H. G. Grey, formerly Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, and Mr. J. Wells, now Warden of Wadham College.

Luther and Protestantism.

As an illustration of Mr. Christopher's spirit in controversy, reference may be made to a letter of his which appeared in the *Oxford Times* for August 2nd, 1877. A serious charge of antinomianism had been made against the teaching of Martin Luther, and this elicited a statement by Mr. Christopher of Luther's doctrine and a plea for fuller and fairer consideration:

"Avoiding all the bitterness which too often has hindered the usefulness of Christian controversy, let me show what Luther's doctrine really was with regard to faith and good works and compare it with that of the Church of England.

"I trust that those who have misunderstood and, therefore, have misrepresented Luther, will be glad to read the following extracts from his great work on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. When he has so clearly expressed his meaning with regard to the relation between faith and works, it would not be fair and just, by means of other quotations separated from their context, to try and make out that his meaning is something else."

[Then follow several quotations to prove that good works were regarded by Luther as the essential fruit of faith.]

Correspondence with Canon Liddon.

Mr. Christopher's championship of things Protestant necessarily brought him into conflict with those in Oxford whom he believed to be "undoing the Reformation," and he, therefore, used every available means to counteract influences which he considered perilous to Scripture and Church teaching. Among these efforts were lectures delivered by prominent clergy and laity at which he usually took the chair. One of these was given by the Rev. T. Howard Gill, afterwards English Chaplain at Paris. Dr. Pusey had strongly recommended to the clergy of the Church of England the Abbé Gaume's *Manual for Confessors*, which he had adapted for use in the English Church. Mr. Gill's remarks with those of Mr. Christopher from the chair led to an interesting correspondence between

the latter and Canon Liddon who championed Dr. Pusey. Although the entire correspondence has not been preserved, the following letters give an adequate idea of what passed.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, November 27th, 1878.

It is a great grief to me that the Abbé Gaume's Romish book, the teaching of which I believe to be utterly subversive of the Gospel of Christ, should have been published by Dr. Pusey as adapted by him to the use of the English Church.

I respect Dr. Pusey for his age, his learning, and specially for his great and valuable work on the Book of Daniel, and, generally, for his opposition to scepticism, but if the dearest friend I have on earth were to publish a book subversive of the Gospel, and teaching " another Gospel which is not another," it would be my plain duty, in faithfulness to Christ, and in love to the souls of my fellowmen, to do what I could to help to expose this pernicious perversion of the Gospel. Mr. Gill's lecture, of which you shall have a copy next week, will prove to the Church that my description of the Romish book adapted to the use of the English Church by Dr. Pusey is a true one. . . .

It is a pain to me to give you pain, dear Dr. Liddon, who have shown a kind feeling in subscribing, as you remind me, to the schools of the very poor parish which half surrounds Christ Church ; and in other ways. But with the strong conviction which I have of the dishonour to the Gospel of Christ which the Romish teaching of the Abbé Gaume's Manual does, I have no choice but, at any cost, to take part in exposing this evil book. A dear friend of mine, a learned theologian of this University, who has a great respect and regard for Dr. Pusey, and a high esteem of his great work on the Book of the Prophet Daniel, and his other efforts against scepticism, was entirely opposed to such a lecture as Mr. Gill's being delivered, *until he had read the lecture* ; when he had done this, his view was entirely changed and he felt that duty to God demanded that it should be delivered at once, and printed for the information of the Church. I shall be greatly grieved, dear Dr. Liddon, if my having acted on a sense of duty to God lessens your friendship towards me.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, November 27th, 1878.

Nothing, I fear, would be gained, if I were to enter on the subject of the Lecture, at which you thought it well to preside ; or, on the very important question, as to how far Dr. Pusey does " subvert " either " the gospel " as taught by St. Paul and St. John—or—what you conceive to be " the Gospel."

What I venture to urge is this. If controversy be a duty, it ought, if possible, to keep clear of personalities. Your lecturer was not obliged to select Dr. Pusey's book as the text of his lecture. To do so in Oxford was to offer a public insult to the most distinguished Professor of Divinity in the place.

If Dr. Pusey had been an eminent Low Churchman, and had written a book to show that Baptismal Regeneration was a " lie of Satan ; " and, if, thereupon, Mr. Noel or some other clergyman had presided at a meeting at which a lecturer had exposed the *dishonesty* of Dr. Pusey's book, by showing, that as a minister of the Church, he was bound to say over every baptized child, without any qualification, " This child is regenerate "—you would, I think, have thought Mr. Noel's proceeding unjustifiable. The lecturer might have quoted Mr. Spurgeon as agreeing with him ; and might have said a great many sharp and exasperating, and, withal, true things at Mr.

Pusey's expense. But, in the opinion of all good men, who care for higher things than the indulgence of party passions, the proceeding would have been deplorable. It would have been felt that the question whether Baptismal Regeneration is a "lie of Satan" or an integral portion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ could have been better discussed, if the personal element were left out of sight.

But it is the *personal* element in controversy which attracts the many men who do not care very much about the solemn question of truth, or falsehood. It was the fact that *Dr. Pusey*, well known in Oxford, and living in the same street, had written the book which gave zest to the subject and commanded the attention of your audience on Monday, at the Town Hall.

I have known Dr. Pusey intimately for thirty-two years, and I do not affect to be indifferent to such a discreditable proceeding as that of Monday evening. I regret with all my heart that so good a man as yourself should be associated with it, upon whatever grounds; and I think it sincere to say to you what I have said, and shall say, to others.

P.S. . . . Dr. Pusey has no idea that I have written to you. I do not suppose that he has heard of the Lecture.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 2nd, 1878.

. . . In the exercise of the like cordial frankness as you have so kindly claimed in your note to me, you must suffer me to point out that it is exactly that long and intimate affection for Dr. Pusey, to which you refer, that disqualifies you for sitting as judge upon my conduct. Had your relations to Dr. Pusey not been what they are, private feeling would not have usurped the place of a calm and just judgment, and you would never have suffered your pen to charge me with taking part (necessarily the principal part) in a "discreditable proceeding," and (as an accomplice) with "offering a public insult" to your friend.

You evidently forgot in the moment of writing that Dr. Pusey has within the last three months publicly invited criticism by two overt acts absolutely unparalleled in the history of our Church since the Reformation. He has adapted and published for use in our Protestant Communion a Roman Catholic *Manual for Confessors*. And when one hundred Protestant Bishops, in conference assembled, have solemnly and unanimously condemned the practice of habitual confession, Dr. Pusey has publicly challenged the correctness of their decision, or else the justice of their censure.

How, at such a crisis, a Protestant lecturer on the evils and unlawfulness of a stated practice of confession could (as you suggest) select any other book as the text-book of his lecture, I am utterly unable to conceive. How, under such circumstances, Dr. Pusey's friends can either suppose or wish that his recent volume should escape public criticism is equally unintelligible to me. And if so, is it really true that what would be natural and proper in any and every other town of England, is, however, improper and "a public insult" in Oxford? You seem to deprecate public criticism of Dr. Pusey's recent volume here in Oxford, on the ground partly of his distinguished position amongst us, and partly of his being resident here. . . .

You offer me an hypothesis, which is not only violently improbable, but absolutely impossible. I can, however, accept what you really mean with the fullest fearlessness, and unhesitatingly reply that if any eminent Low Churchman, really taught by the Spirit of God, having just put forth a book on which the eyes of the whole Church were fastened, were charged with having written contrary to Scripture, or to the formularies of the Church of

England, the desire of his heart and the language of his lips would be, especially if he resided in a University city, " Here, where I live, and have laboured and am known, let those who controvert my teaching, and charge me with unfaithfulness to the truth, come and make good their positions." With infinite sorrow, I can well conceive, would he deprecate as treason against truth, the mistaken affection of a friend, who would try to keep from the place a conscientious opponent by the suggestion that to be " personal " in controversy is necessarily identical with being " insulting."

It has escaped your notice that when you wrote about " the indulgence of party passions," you are borrowing wholly from conjecture, and in no degree from fact. And no less so when you volunteer the remark that the large attendance at the recent lecture was due to zest which expected personalities lent to the subject. The attendance at prior lectures of the Church Association in Oxford has been just as large. And I have known the lecturer as a valued private friend for many years, and can say honestly that he is not actuated by religious partisanship, does not deal in " sharp " or " exasperating " sayings at another's expense, and has no pleasure in those who do.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 3rd, 1878.

When I termed your proceedings in the Oxford Town Hall " discreditable," I was using the language of a highly educated man, who has no sort of sympathy either with High Church or Low Church principles, but who thinks that respect is due to age, and learning, and sanctuary, such as Dr. Pusey's.

Dr. Pusey *himself* would be the last person in the world to shrink from criticism. He has challenged those who may think it their duty to do so, to prosecute him at law. The Church Association, apparently, thinks it *safer* to hold him up to odium before a popular and necessarily semi-educated audience.

You will, of course, take your own line. If you think that the spirit of such lectures as that at which you presided is consistent with 1 Corinthians xiii., and is not rather calculated to produce in very many souls at least *four* out of those *seventeen* works of the flesh which are condemned in Galatians v. 19-21, all that I can say is that we read our New Testaments with very different eyes indeed.

One who was present at the lecture said that " Dr. Pusey was *well* groaned at." [Not correct.—A.M.W.C.]

With sincere regret, but without further hesitation, I must ask you no longer to consider me a supporter of your schools, or of any other works in your parish.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 6th, 1878.

Your last letter has disappointed me in more respects than one. I had hoped that my statement would at once draw from you a frank admission that you had been mistaken, and a frank withdrawal of the words which stigmatized my conduct as " discreditable." It is true, you tell me, that that term was not originally applied to me by yourself; but you make it too clear that you have adopted it *ex animo*.

Would it be difficult for me to meet with more than one " highly educated man, having no sort of sympathy either with High Church or Low Church principles," who would both think and say that your withdrawal of your annual subscription from the parochial schools of St. Aldate's is on your part to take a poor revenge for an imaginary wrong done by me to your friend ?

Would you accept his verdict? Would you deem it generous or just in me to adopt it?

I have referred to more grounds of disappointment than one, and this, your mode, I will not say of retaliation, but of protest, causes me more sorrow than that to which I have already alluded. I had supposed always that your kind subscription was a gift to our Master and to His poor, and have never imagined that it was personal to myself, or to be accepted by me as a stamp of your approval of my theological views, or of my conduct as a clergyman in Oxford. This entirely new view of your liberality forces me to consider how far I can, consistently with self-respect, or with that freedom to act according to the dictates of conscience which I am persuaded you value as highly as do I, retain your donation to the fund for supplying my parish with a parsonage. That house, while I continue Rector of St. Aldate's, will be personally enjoyed by myself. And if it is now irksome to you to have helped in maintaining the schools for the poor of St. Aldate's, it must be tenfold more painful to you to have had part in providing a home for its incumbent, of whom, to my sorrow, you now think and write so ill. It is, therefore, surely my duty at once to place the enclosed cheque for five guineas, the amount of your donation, in your hands. . . .

And now, in conclusion, dear Dr. Liddon, may I treat you with the freedom, of a Christian brother, and honestly express my regret that you should have levelled so gratuitous a sarcasm at the Council of the Church Association. To use your own words—Is it consistent with 1 Corinthians xiii.?

For the last twenty years it has been widely known that Dr. Pusey is absolutely safe from legal prosecution. He is not within the jurisdiction of any Bishop—and, as holding a post under letters patent, he is not amenable to the law ecclesiastical. Now in my judgment it would be just as generous, just as fair and righteous, and just as charitable for me to assert that Dr. Pusey, *knowing this*, challenges prosecution in insincere bravado, as for you to charge the Council of the Church Association with holding him up to popular odium and resorting to that as a "safer" course than appealing to the law to coerce him. As a fact, the Church Association had nothing whatever to do with the choice of the subject of Mr. Gill's lecture.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 7th, 1878.

Your letter obliges me to ask your permission to make two explanations.

In referring to the Church Association, I stated what I honestly supposed to be the fact. The handbills led me to connect the Church Association with the Lecture. And I never before heard that Dr. Pusey's position protects him against an action in the Church courts. Dr. Pusey, I am very confident, has no suspicion that this is the case. Had he believed his position to be legally unassailable, it would, in my opinion, have been cowardly of him to challenge other people to prosecute him, if they thought fit. If the Church Association has been advised by competent lawyers that the case is as you say, I unreservedly admit that my language was undeserved, and I beg to retract it. But the fact ought to be generally known.

If it were possible to continue my subscription to your schools without doing more than making an offering to Christ and His poor, I would thankfully do so. As it is, I shall transfer the subscription to a neighbouring parish. But such a subscription is inevitably a mark of sympathy, almost a vote of confidence. So long as I could think of you only as a self-denying worker among the poor, I gave it gladly; even though "the Gospel," as taught by the Low Church party, seems to me a very inadequate reproduction

of the Gospel as taught in the New Testament. But when you take the chair at such a meeting as that which was held the other day, you use your position as the parish minister of St. Aldate's for a purpose which my conscience tells me is very wrong. You oblige me to ask myself, how far I am right in continuing in any way to strengthen your hands.

But I hope you will allow me to return you your cheque. My feeling is in no sense retrospective; and I was bold enough to hope that my first letter might somehow have prevented your attending the meeting, and thus have saved me from all further difficulty. If I could do so, without seeming to hold out to you what you might think an unworthy motive, I would say that I would gladly continue or rather increase my subscription, if I could be assured that you would not use your position for such purposes as promoting attacks on aged and holy men, who certainly have had as full opportunities of ascertaining what the Gospel really is as any of their assailants. But I fear you would not allow me to say this; and I cannot, without insincerity, withdraw the epithet "discreditable" as applied to the proceedings in question. It represents, in my opinion, the least that they deserve in the way of censure; and I must once more say how pained I am that a man like yourself—whom I have always hitherto associated with the devotional and Christian rather than with the fierce and merely controversialist section of the Low Church party—should have been in any way mixed up with them.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 9th, 1878.

More than twenty years ago, before the formation of the Church Association, a small committee of theologians and lawyers met in London to consider the duty of prosecuting Dr. Pusey in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It seemed to them that from his, as the directing mind, the stream of doctrinal error, which has since risen to such a height, was invading the Church. Every one of his theological writings was carefully perused and considered, and a case was eventually laid before very eminent Ecclesiastical Counsel. The then movers were distinctly advised that, though much written by Dr. Pusey was so repugnant to the formularies of the Church of England as to ensure judicial condemnation, yet his peculiar position rendered him unassailable by any process of law.

His Canonry is only an incident of his Professorship which he holds under letters patent. The foregoing I have received from one of the lawyers concerned, but it is pretty widely known, and long has been so. The legal advisers of the Church Association and its Committee are conversant with these facts.

I am sorry indeed to seem obstinate, or to run the risk of wounding your feelings, but it will be a relief to me if you will kindly suffer my cheque enclosed to remain in your hands.

I am, I trust, above creating a sentimental grievance, or seeking to rub a blow into a sore. But humble and limited as are my position and influence compared with yours, if I forfeit my self-respect, I spontaneously throw away a force for usefulness which is Christ's gift to me. Would He have me accept, for my personal convenience and use, a gift, even from a brother who, after careful reflection, persists in designating my recent conduct "discreditable"?

I am well persuaded, dear Dr. Liddon, that at our earliest meeting in eternity, your first act towards me will be to express regret for having employed the term. . . .

I will only add that you seem to me not to realize the consequence of your denunciation of me: now, in reality, it amounts to this—that no Oxford clergyman may, while Dr. Pusey lives, call in question from his pulpit any

one of the Professor's doctrinal statements in connexion with his name. By reason of the respect due to his age and position—which I *ex animo* concede to him—he is to have, in your judgment, such absolute dominion over the faith and practice of his brethren in the ministry, that their congregations are to find them dumb whenever Dr. Pusey has spoken.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 10th, 1878.

I thank you for your interesting information on the subject of Dr. Pusey's legal position. It is entirely new to me, as it will be, I think, to Dr. Pusey himself.

I must, of course, accept, although reluctantly, your decision as to the cheque.

Indeed, you mistake my claim on behalf of Dr. Pusey. He has been criticized all his life, probably more persistently and more passionately than any other member of the Church of England. He has long learnt to do justice, and only justice, to human criticisms. He would be the last person in England to complain of anything that might be said about himself. But while I am, also, as far as possible from deprecating criticism of what he writes, I submit that it should be addressed to knowledge and reason, and not to passion. If, for instance, *you* were to write a book against what Dr. Pusey teaches on the subject of Confession and Absolution, it would be read by those who (having the Bible and Prayer-Book in their hands) entirely disagree with you, but with the respect which is due to your character. And the University Pulpit is much more at the command of those who dissent from Dr. Pusey than of those who agree with him; and, if his opponents can say anything that is theologically entitled to serious consideration, they are very sure to carry with them a very large number of minds. If I regret, I should not think of complaining of these methods of opposing Dr. Pusey; but the case is very different when a strange lecturer, announced as appearing under the auspices of an extreme party organization, addresses himself to a large number of well-meaning but half-educated people on a difficult subject,—as to which it is easy to rouse their passions, but with the real bearings of which they are, necessarily, almost entirely unacquainted—in the Town Hall. . . . Alas! the Church Association reminds me of nothing so much as of the Spanish Inquisition; and I have the same feeling of utter *moral* repugnance towards both these bodies. They work in the interest of different beliefs, and by different methods. But their animating spirit is the same.

Among the many things that I look forward to with thankful hope in another life, one is the surprise of all my Low Church brethren at finding out what the Gospel of our Divine Redeemer really is in its unmutilated grandeur, and, next, their utter wonder that they should ever (in perfect good faith) have denounced such a servant of Christ as Dr. Pusey, while on earth.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 14th, 1878.

You are well aware that I am President of the Oxford Branch of the Church Association, for this was on the bill on which you read my name, and the fact that I lately presided at a lecture connected with that Association, though the subject was not in any way suggested by it, was the occasion of our correspondence, yet in your last letter to me you write, though I feel sure that in doing so you did not intend any personal unkindness towards myself, "Alas! the Church Association reminds me of nothing so much as of the Spanish Inquisition; and I have the same feeling of utter *moral* repugnance towards both these bodies. They work in the interest of different beliefs and by different methods, but their animating spirit is the same."

You began your correspondence with me by referring to St. Paul's chapter on charity (1 Cor. xiii.), and you close it with an illustration of your own conception of Christian charity, in the saying that "the animating spirit" of a body of faithful Brethren in Christ, deeply attached to the Church of England, and to the Scriptural principles of the Protestant Reformation, is "the same as that of the Spanish Inquisition"! I *know* many of these brethren, and you, naturally, do not. I know that their animating spirit is that faithful love which is the fruit of Gospel truth, combined with a faithfulness to Christ which makes them abhor those deadly additions to the Gospel which gradually produced that idolatrous caricature of Christianity which we see in the Church of Rome, and which has been one of the great causes of infidelity on the Continent from which much has come to our own country. . . .

I observe that in the whole of your correspondence with me you never attempt to justify the Romish book which Dr. Pusey has given to our Church, but you seem to make the whole question, which concerns the health and usefulness of our Church for generations to come, a merely personal matter respecting your friend.

I shall praise God if at some future time you understand better the spirit of those who act on the belief that truth is the only foundation of real unity: and if you are brought to see that it is possible in obedience to God's command to contend earnestly for the faith against Romanizing errors and practices in our Church, without any trace of the cruel "animating spirit" of the Spanish Inquisition.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 17th, 1878.

1. When I read the public handbills from which I gathered that you were to preside at a meeting in which a strange lecturer was to abuse Dr. Pusey publicly, my first impulse was, to say nothing about it to yourself, to say what I thought of it in the Common Room of Christ Church or elsewhere, and, at some future time, to withdraw my subscription to your schools, without assigning any reason for doing so.

On consideration, I thought it a better course to tell you (as in your place I should wish to have been told myself) what a brother-clergyman thought of your proceedings. There was the hope that my remonstrance might have had some weight with you: though perhaps I ought not to have entertained it. As it is, my first impulse might have saved us both from a correspondence, which does not, I fear, help us to draw nearer to each other. To write to you at all, unless I was perfectly outspoken, would have been useless. And the result of my doing so speaks for itself.

2. You observe that I have not discussed the worth of Dr. Pusey's book. There is no occasion for me to do so. If it were *proved* that Dr. Pusey's book "subverted the Gospel," etc., etc., I should still hold the Meeting in the Town Hall to be discreditable, on the ground that it was combating religious error by an appeal, not to reason or knowledge, but to uninformed and inflammable passion. There would be other ways of dealing with Dr. Pusey, open to those who felt bound to combat him. There are books in which the revealed doctrine of baptismal regeneration [1] is denied by men, who—to the astonishment of dissenters like Mr. Spurgeon—still find it morally possible to use the Baptismal Service of the Church of England. This error seems to me to be quite as dishonouring to the work of Christ as the restorer of our fallen race, and quite as inconsistent with the plain

[1] Note on margin by Canon Christopher: "I will send him 'Mozley on the Baptismal Controvers'—AMWC."

meaning of Church of England language, as anything that Dr. Pusey has ever written can seem to you. Yet if a High Church clergyman were to preside at a lecture, given by some one else, in which the author of such a book was denounced, till his name was greeted with "volleys of groans" [1] (see *Rock*, Nov. 29th, 1878), I, for one, should think the proceeding discreditable, and I hope I should have the moral courage to tell my friends so. . . .

3. You write of "deadly additions to the Gospel," etc., etc. I would rather treat such language as the product of strong feeling than as accurate representations of thought. For I, too, might write about "deadly mutilations of the Gospel," and might proceed to give reasons for my strong conviction that Low Church arguments against the grace of the Sacraments have paved the way for rationalistic rejection of the Atonement, and that Low Church denials of the authority of the primitive Church have undermined in many minds *known* to myself, all serious belief in the canon of the New Testament. But this would be a large subject. . . .

4. . . . I was careful to say that the religious theory which the Church Association upholds, and the methods which it is able to employ are not those of the Spanish Inquisition. The animating temper, whether of the Inquisition, or the Association, can only be judged from their proceedings. My conclusion is not disturbed by the fact which you mention, and which I *unreservedly* believe, that many of the persons concerned in managing the Church Association are, in their private capacity, very estimable indeed. Yet, surely also, among the Spanish Inquisitors, there were gentle and conscientious men, who yet sincerely believed that in persecuting the Spanish protestants to death, they were doing God service. They had at command gentle phrases which disguised from themselves the real character of their proceedings; and the good men of the Church Association talk, quite sincerely, I am sure, of "zeal for the purity of the Gospel," "ascertaining the law," and the like, while, in reality, they are filling the Church of England almost from end to end with hatred and uncharitableness which it is piteous to think of. . . .

How much I wish that in view of our immense dangers from the Church of Rome on one side, and from sheer unbelief on the other, we of the Church of England could learn to tolerate each other and to trust to God the Holy Spirit to teach us what is right, or to unteach us what is wrong, in our faith! It will, I fear, seem irony to you, if I say that Dr. Pusey *is* for a great number of minds, their one great stay against the claims of Rome—as for others, he is against the arguments of infidelity. If you could utterly discredit him, as a Minister of the Church of England—if you *could* "expell the unclean thing from our midst" [2] it would be a costly victory for the conquerors.

Dear Mr. Christopher, in view of another world, there are better things to be done here on earth than presiding at Lectures against Dr. Pusey in the Oxford Town Hall.

The way in which Mr. Christopher held his own against so redoubtable a champion as Canon Liddon is interesting, as is also the plain fact that no attempt is made to justify the book which Dr. Pusey issued. Even taking the broadest possible grounds it would be impossible to speak of it as loyal to Anglicanism.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

[1] Note on margin by Canon Christopher: "*Not* true—AMWC."
[2] A phrase of Mr. Gill's.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BISHOP GEORGE ALFRED LEFROY.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF GEORGE ALFRED LEFROY, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Montgomery, D.D., D.C.L. London: *Longmans & Co.* 14*s.* net.

Bishop Montgomery undertook this congenial task at the request of the relatives of the late Bishop of Calcutta, and has done his work excellently; presenting in a portable compass, and with an admirable taste of selection from a much larger mass of available materials, a fine portrait of a splendid character within the space of 260 pages. The reader has presented to him a pretty complete summary of a noble and devoted life, illustrated by extracts from letters written to relatives at home, as well as friends abroad; and the result is an inspiration to holy living, faithful service, costly sacrifice, and brave endurance for Christ's sake.

George Alfred Lefroy's life falls into three periods of nearly equal length, though the second and third almost equally divide the volume, and the first is disposed of in a few pages. The earliest period (1853–1879) carries the reader to Lefroy's ordination and departure for his life's work in India. The second (1879–1899) corresponds with his unique work in Delhi. The third (1899–1919) covers the period of his episcopate, first as Bishop of Lahore (1899–1913), and then as Metropolitan of India, and closing with his heroic death on January 1, 1919.

Bishop Lefroy was sprung from an Irish branch of the Lefroy family, and was born and reared in the Rectory of Aghaderg, in the Diocese of Dromore and in County Down, where his father, Jeffrey Lefroy, was Rector for fifty years. Lefroy's Irish nature betrays itself constantly in a love of the humorous, that must have saved him many a time when things went ill. His early life was spent in an old-fashioned Evangelical home, where the foundations of true and deep piety were well laid; and though in after years in India his lot was cast among those of another school of thought, the traces of his earliest up-bringing are discernible. Thus, in 1906, when Bishop of Lahore, he writes to the Rev. C. A. Gillmore, on "Confession": "I do not use Confession myself." "I do not believe it is the intention of the Church of England that it should be habitual." And, as Metropolitan, in 1913, after a joint service in the Presbyterian Church at Darjeeling, at which the minister, Dr. Graham, read the lessons, the Bishop anticipates probable trouble, and writes:—"I do not honestly feel that I have heard the last of it . . . especially in view of the great suspicion with which I am at present regarded by all the 'spikey' ones."

In 1853 his mother heard George Augustus Selwyn preach, and there and then dedicated her yet unborn babe to God, and for the work of the Church abroad. That babe was the future Metropolitan of India. George Alfred Lefroy went to Marlborough, and later to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he gained a First-Class in the Theological Tripos in 1878; and after graduating, he spent some time studying Hebrew and Persian. At Cambridge he taught in the Jesus Lane Sunday School, and helped the cause of the C.M.S. as a collector of small sums of 5*s.* from Trinity men. This last he found one of the most formidable experiences in his life. At Cambridge he came under the influence of Edward Bickersteth, and these two, with four others, formed the first six to start the "brotherhood" that became the Cambridge Mission

to Delhi. In June, 1879, Lefroy was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Ely and in November of that year he sailed for India.

For the next twenty years, Lefroy's life's work was in Delhi: first as a member of the brotherhood, and then, from 1886, on the removal of Edward Bickersteth to be Bishop in Japan, as Head of the Mission. This central period of his life was the great and unique work of Lefroy. He set himself to be an Evangelist, and spared no pains to do this work thoroughly. Recognizing that the hardest task committed to an Evangelist is to carry the Gospel to Moslems, Lefroy undertook the work with a will, addressed himself to the study of Urdú, and spoke and preached regularly in the Bazaars, and even in the Mosques—so that he became one of the outstanding authorities on missions to the Moslem world. So marked was his proficiency in his acquired tongue that he could express himself in the classical Urdù with as much facility as in English. "One day Lefroy was preaching by the side of a busy street in Delhi. His Mohammedan Maulvi opponent was holding forth to a large audience near by, criticizing the Christian doctrines. When Lefroy began to preach, one of the Maulvi's audience, a Hindu, exclaimed: 'Lefroy Sahib has come, and he is preaching. Let us go and hear *him*; he talks Urdú like one of us; in a former birth he must have been a Hindu.' The Maulvi's large audience melted away, until he was left alone addressing the air, and Lefroy had all to himself of that evening's preaching."

Endowed with more than ordinary intellectual capacity, Lefroy possessed the power of growth. But unquestionably the secret of his remarkable work lay in his being a man of prayer. He was an early riser. In Lahore his hour was 5.30 in winter and earlier in summer; and thus he had two hours for prayer and reading, before the 8 a.m. cathedral daily service. In a busy day, he sought guidance six times in prayer and meditation—quite early in the day, and again from 8 to 9 a.m.; at noon, and at 2 p.m., and at 7 and 9.30 p.m. God was ever as One near him, and he could turn to Him quite naturally, at any time.

Lefroy had unique opportunities of meeting Moslems in fair discussion in the mosques. Sometimes the audience would reach 1,000 men and over, and the discussion would last for three or four hours. In debate he was ever courteous and strictly fair. These qualities won for him unbounded respect from his opponents. For such occasions he found his knowledge of Arabic most useful, and sometimes incidents of thrilling interest would occur. In January, 1891, he writes: "I had two more meetings with the same disputant, one a very large one, over 1,000 men packed quietly and listening for three hours." A week later, he adds: "A splendid meeting . . . over 1,000 perfectly quiet for three hours. It is an absolutely new experience. Do pray much for us." Of another occasion he writes: "This week Haig and I have been twice, for nearly four hours each time, to a Mohammedan mosque, where we have found a Mohammedan priest and a certain number of his disciples ready and willing to have a really good talk over matters, and on sensible lines with Commentaries, etc., and really very nearly without prejudice and unfairness."

Turning to another side of the work in Delhi—Lefroy's practical sagacity marked him out as a man of affairs, so that it was quite natural that the citizens of Delhi should request his help on the Municipal Council. To this request he acceded; and writing in October, 1885, says: "There is talk of my being elected by the English residents as member for our ward! What would you say to me as Municipal Councillor? It is not certain however." But it came to pass; and two years later he can write, as a Municipal Commissioner, in connexion with the Jubilee of Queen Victoria, and refers to his co-councillors, Hindus and Mohammedans. Thus Lefroy lived in Delhi,

radiating influence for good, directly and indirectly, winning victories for his Lord and Master.

The third period of Lefroy's life commences with his consecration on All Saints' Day, 1899, as Bishop of Lahore, by the Metropolitan, Bishop Welldon, assisted by the Bishops of Bombay, Madras, Lucknow and Chota Nagpur. In the middle of his first sermon as Bishop on the evening of his consecration, in the cathedral, he suddenly ceased to speak English, and turning to the large number of Indians present, he poured out his soul in Urdú. The effect was wonderful. It was a serious responsibility that he had undertaken, since the Lahore Diocese contained within its limits by far the largest military establishment in India. Moreover, there was the responsibility of Simla, which in the summer is the residence of the Viceroy and of the Commander-in-Chief, and the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab—and thus was one of the most famous society resorts in India. But the new Bishop took up quite simply and naturally all his new duties, and set himself to deal bravely with the evils that he saw. The moral welfare of the soldiers was a matter of deep concern, and in earnest conversation and continued correspondence with Lord Kitchener he secured reforms that had beneficial results. Two sermons on gambling (which deserve the widest publicity), preached in Christ Church, Simla, in August, 1905, show Bishop Lefroy's courage and clear grasp of a difficult subject. With regard to the attitude of the British towards educated Indians, he took a strong line, and was filled with a great hope for the future of India as a Christian land. In 1906 he stated in a sermon, preached in Simla: "I feel as certain that India one day shall be indeed a Christian land as that I am occupying this pulpit this morning." It is due to the foresight of Bishop Lefroy and his old Delhi colleague, the Rev. S. S. Allnutt, that the New Testament Commentaries for Indian Christians, six volumes of which had been produced in 1919, were conceived.

A chapter is devoted to extracts from the Bishop's correspondence on spiritual, doctrinal and disciplinary matters. It is most valuable and interesting. The extracts deal with such matters as Confirmation, Joint Meetings, the Use of Churches, Evening Communion, Sponsors, Confession, the Virgin Birth (an excellent and well-balanced article of two and a half pages), co-operation in Religious Instruction with other Denominations, and such-like matters. All alike reveal a mind well-balanced and deeply convinced, but without a trace of narrowness.

It not uncommonly happens that a man is "spoilt" when he becomes a Bishop. But it was not so with George Alfred Lefroy. Let two witnesses suffice. A young subaltern described him as "a good, straight kind of Johnnie;" and one of the leading Mohammedans of Delhi, Mirza Rafi ud Din Beg, thus wrote of him: "When he became a Bishop he did not become puffed up, but kept up his old friendships with us, just as if he was a private missionary."

From about the year 1909, Bishop Lefroy entered on a period of physical weakness, which increased during his last ten years, so that, when in December, 1912, the invitation came to go to Calcutta, he felt compelled to place the matter before a board of three doctors, before accepting. Their decision was favourable, so he accepted, and was enthroned as Metropolitan on February 20, 1913. The problems in his new diocese were quite different from those of the Punjab, but the new Metropolitan tackled them with equal success—starting to "have a solid shot at the language" (Bengali) at the age of sixty, and though a martyr to the pain of his double infirmity, sciatica and arthritis, but with such success that in a month he was able to take the central part of Confirmation services in that tongue.

His first acts on entering upon his new office are quite characteristic of

the man—the purchase of a motor-car and a billiard-table—the former in order to demonstrate that he desired to be up-to-date, and his wish to come among the commercial community in Calcutta "as one of themselves." The latter, in order to make his house "a place of general resort" for the many young fellows from Public Schools and University. "Few things," he writes, "would attract them more than a billiard-table."

Bishop Lefroy strove to win full self-government for the Indian Church; and though his efforts to secure to the Metropolitan the title of "Archbishop" failed, yet he led the Church in India some distance towards self-government.

His physical sufferings increased rapidly towards the last, and in February, 1918, Bishop Lefroy was "anointed for healing by Herbert Pakenham Walsh." The result was not as had been hoped, and in the July he accepted an invitation from his old chaplain, Bishop Ferguson Davie, of Singapore, to try the treatment at some sulphur springs. The results were disastrous, and the Metropolitan returned from Singapore and Java to India seriously meditating resignation. This thought developed, and on December 25, he signed a formal deed to this effect, dated January 1, 1919. During this last week of earthly life, he gradually lost consciousness, but at times he ejaculated sentences such as, "Dear Father of Mankind, I only want to do Thy will: I just want strength to do it." And on January 1, 1919, late at night, his brave, true spirit fled.

Lord Curzon described George Alfred Lefroy as one who "had the zeal of a crusader, the heart of a woman, and the spirits of a boy." The Archbishop of Canterbury described him as a man of unique "continued enthusiasm and steadiness" . . . whose "deep Christian sanity" impressed him "time after time," who was his "ideal of a Missionary leader," and whom "in regard to our larger missionary polity I can truly say that I miss at every turn."

In a later edition a fuller index—particularly of the Bishop's letters—would make a valuable volume still more valuable. C. E. W.

JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, AND MOHAMMEDANISM.

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. By G. F. Moore, D.D., L.L.D., Litt.D., Professor of the History of Religion in Harvard University. Vol. II.: Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. (International Theological Library.) Edinburgh: *T. & T. Clark.* 14s. net.

There has been some delay in the issue of this Second Volume: the first volume appeared in 1913. The object of the work is to survey the history of the religions of civilized peoples, the religions of primitive peoples being left aside as too extensive for such a work as this. The first volume comprised the religions of China, Japan, Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, India, Persia (Zoroastrianism), Greece and Rome (including the religions of the Empire); the second volume takes up Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism—these three being naturally grouped together because of their close relation one to another.

The ideal which Professor Moore set before himself in this work was a high one. He recognized that mere accuracy without imagination and sympathy could at best give no more than historical material and not history. So he has done more than give a bare account of the origin and development of ideas and institutions. He has tried to put himself, so far as imagination can go, into the position and attitude of those who formed and entertained the ideas. The result is that he has presented to his readers a most interesting and entrancing work. Of course, in the developing of their history, these religions have undergone many changes, and there have arisen many wide

variations from the primitive type. In dealing with this " multifariousness," Professor Moore has tried not to digress, but to treat the variations from the point of view of the main movement.

While we admire Professor Moore's wide knowledge and clever presentation of his subject, we cannot at all agree with many views that he adopts. He gives far too an exchatological view of Christianity. He fails to give anything like an adequate presentation of the Resurrection of Christ and of its implications. We do not believe that the worship of Jesus as a divine Lord arose as Professor Moore states. Many will dissent from his presentation of Pauline Christianity in the guise of a mystery religion. In parts, Professor Moore's statement of facts is very defective: Moses is given practically no place in the account of Judaism; St. Paul's missionary journeys are dismissed in one sentence. Perhaps it will be well to illustrate. After stating that to the early Christians the three synoptic gospels must have seemed inadequate, Professor Moore says that an unknown author in Asia Minor produced a Fourth Gospel, which presented Jesus as the manifestation of an incarnate deity. He adds :—

" In accordance with this conception of the life of Jesus as that of an incarnate deity, he exhibits no symptoms of human weakness. The Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane has no place in this Gospel. No one takes his life from him: he lays it down of himself; he has power to lay it down and to take it again. The crucifixion is an exaltation; it is a return to the Father, and a resumption of the divine glory which he had with him before the world was. The last words from the cross are not the cry, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken Me?' (Ps. xxii. 2), as in Matthew and Mark, but 'It is accomplished!'"

No mention is made of the ample evidence in the Fourth Gospel of the human side of our Lord. And did not St. John record the saying on the Cross " I thirst " (St. John xix. 28), and the cry during the ministry " Father, save me from this hour " (St. John xii. 27) ?

Apart from such defects in view, this work will be found a valuable and most readable account of the three religions—Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism—all of which are carefully surveyed from the time of their origin down to their position at the present time.

THE MODERN VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT STUDY for Teachers and Students. By Rev. E. Basil Redlich, M.A., Director of Religious Education, Wakefield. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 6s. net.

Mr. Basil Redlich has made an attempt to provide for the new situation that will arise in view of the advanced teaching in schools to be set up under the Education Act of 1918. His aim has been to frame a popular handbook which will acquaint teachers with the general outlines of recent Biblical studies. He has done his book very thoroughly and well, and we have no doubt that his book will be very widely used, but we dissent absolutely from many of his positions.

The book is a frank and simple statement of the modern attitude towards the Old Testament. Mr. Redlich desires to dispel the popular notion of Inspiration as something mechanical. He has set out all the arguments for the composite authorship of the Pentateuch, taking, e.g., the stories of Creation, the Flood, the Plagues of Egypt, the Rebellion of Korah, etc. He wants teachers to have a firm grip of the modern view of the Old Testament.

We may give his summary of the reliability of the Old Testament stories (p. 246) :—

"The early narratives of Genesis—names and incidents are both unhistorical.

"The Patriarchal narratives—names partly historical and the incidents have some foundation of fact which is not always easy to discover.

"Moses to the Judges—names true in the main, and the incidents have a basis of fact which is fairly easily traceable.

"Samuel and Kings—names and incidents generally true, for some sources are unreliable.

"The Prophets, Ezra and Nehemiah—almost wholly reliable."

Mr. Redlich proceeds on the principle that the nearer the writers are to the incidents they describe, the more reliable are their records.

At the end of his book, the author gives hints on the teaching of Old Testament stories to children. He says that nothing should be taught to young children which may have to be undone in more advanced childhood, and adds that care should be taken not to let the children get an idea that God is vindictive. In the case of diverse accounts of an incident, both should be taught.

Mr. Redlich has tried to make his book as useful as possible to teachers. The volume is provided with cross-headings throughout, and a good Index appears at the end. The instruction is carefully reinforced by three sets of well-prepared Questions and Answers. At the end, Outlines of Lessons are given; but we regret that in these not sufficient prominence is given to the religious ideas. In the work itself the author examines in turn The Literature; The Conception of God; Prophecy; Sacrifice and Priesthood; The Poetical Books; the Messianic Hope; Canon of the Old Testament; Old Testament Science and Miracles.

Those who desire a complete and careful handbook to the modern view of Old Testament history and thought, will find in this work the best that they can procure, but we approach the Old Testament from a widely different standpoint.

BISHOP DUNN, OF QUEBEC.

ANDREW HUNTER DUNN, Fifth Bishop of Quebec. A Memoir by Percival Jolliffe. London: *S.P.C.K.*, *7s. 6d.* net.

This is a charming account of a faithful and diligent ministry, first of all in parish life in England, and then, for twenty-two years, in charge of the interesting diocese of Quebec. It is a book to inspire the parish clergyman whose lot is cast in an "ordinary" parish, to give him inspiration, courage and hope. The reader gets the impression of a man of God who was faithful in that which is least, diligent in his ministry, keen to win all in his parish for God; in no sense a brilliant preacher, but through and through sincere; and so, in due time, honoured of God and called to a most responsible post. The style of the Memoir is very simple, in places quite "chatty." The mind of the biographer is transparently sincere—his subject is his hero in real life. Bishop Macarthur, of Southampton, who succeeded Bishop Dunn in the London Ministry which he left for Quebec, pays a very high tribute to his predecessor's work—and is it not the successor who can, better than any other, estimate the work of a man's ministry?

The first part of the Memoir is concerned with England, and gives an account of the Bishop's early days, though the main emphasis is laid upon the fruitful and exemplary ministry at South Acton, of which the Rev. A. H. Dunn was appointed first Vicar in 1871. Every department in the parish was of deepest interest to the devoted vicar, who made a point of calling at every house in his fast-growing parish each year. His method of administration was autocratic—he financed everything himself—and the Bishop of

London once said playfully—" Dunn is a very good man except for one thing, viz., his cheque book. If any one had found it, and locked it up, it might have been better for the parish."

The story of the invitation to Canada—which Mr. Dunn regarded as a Divine command—is most interesting reading. It reveals a true heart that trusted God and went straight forward.

Part II—" Canada "—is the story of triumph over many and great obstacles. It reveals a man brave and strong: with high ideals as to Church efficiency and order—tactful, tender, persevering. In a diocese that had peculiar difficulties—being largely populated by French Canadians, with a shrinking British minority—the new Bishop achieved singular results. He never spared himself. His whole heart was in all he did. During the eventful years of his episcopate the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London visited Quebec. Bishop Dunn's charges were marked by sound common sense and a firm grip of the needs of his diocese, and his resignation in 1914 caused widespread sorrow. His great desire was to end his days in the old country, where a house had been secured for him at Benhilton. But this was not to be, for the brave spirit left its tenement of clay on the voyage home, and the *Hesperian* entered Liverpool with the flag half-mast high, and the Bishop lying in his last sleep vested in his robes. The body was interred in the beautiful churchyard of Benhilton, Sutton.

The Bishop was a distinct " High " Churchman, and a member for many years of the E.C.U., but this record of his life reveals a man who lived in the presence of God and served Him with more than ordinary sacrifice.

A SINGULAR WORK.

THE DIVINITY OF MAN. By Reginald Wells. London: *Macmillan & Co.* *7s. 6d.* net.

The author has written this work in a time of doubt. He was a vicar of agricultural and suburban parishes. He had experience, during the early days of the war, as a Chaplain on the Western Front. He has written his book as the outcome of a series of conferences which he held while serving as Chaplain in H.M.S. *Nelson*. But he has now retired from official position. He felt that some of his suggestions demanded a liberty of expression which was incompatible with stated adherence to the credal formularies of the Church of England. His private doubts about the correctness of his own position were affecting his bodily health, and were thus impairing his usefulness as a parish clergyman. He further felt that he ought not to force upon his superiors the duty of deciding whether his opinions came within the limits of orthodoxy. His resignation, he says, was voluntary: no episcopal decision was made; indeed, efforts were put forth to induce him to take six months' leave of absence from his parish for further thought and study. He says frankly that he has written only in a tentative way. He makes no claim to any depth of learning, but thinks that his simple contribution to thought may prove useful. " This book," he says, " is crude and immature. Possibly it is shallow. Certainly it is the work of an inexperienced youth—he is a contemporary of those who engineered the ' Life and Liberty Movement '—but it has this to excuse its publication that it aims at making human life divine."

This brings us to the author's position. He has entitled his book, *The Divinity of Man*, and his thesis is that the self that shows itself in man is God. " All that is real is God ! . . . if the self in man is real, it is God." Man has to recognize the divinity of himself. " The self in its perfection

is Almighty God." Of every action a man should say, " It is not I that did it, but the great I AM, Who is using my apparently separate existence as a means of asserting Himself over nothingness." What man will look for after death is not a separate individual existence, but ultimate union with God. As for a test of goodness or divinity, the only one which the author suggests is that of " durability and changelessness." He is prepared to call Jesus God ; but he thinks that the divinity of all men differs from the Lord's only in degree and not in kind. He is not really interested in wrangling about the credibility of our Lord's miracles. The difference between a good " Buddhist " and a good " Christian " he says, is only superficial. He wishes to see a new modern Church " of infinite breadth," a Church that will not demand of its teachers any preliminary assertion of theological opinions at all.

We have perhaps written sufficient to indicate how far the author has receded from the orthodox position. We would suggest to him that he begin again to study the historical Jesus and seek to find a firmer footing for his faith there.

RECONSTRUCTION IN RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

THE HOPE OF MAN : Four Studies in the Literature of Religion and Reconstruction ; being Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, as Select Preacher, 1917–19. By W. H. Hutton, D.D., Dean of Winchester. London : *Macmillan & Co.* 5*s.* net.

In these Oxford sermons on Reconstruction, an interesting method is followed. Dr. Hutton has gone to the field of religious literature, and has endeavoured to show that the problems confronting us to-day are not in their essence new, but have, from one point or another, been considered by thinkers of the past. In this way he has tried to make use of Cervantes, Rabelais, Pico, Augnotine, Hermas, Bœthius, and others. To meet the modern needs of the world, no new principles, says Dr. Hutton, are needed : all that we require is a fresh application of the principles of Christ. These he finds in the absolute omnipotence of God, the attracting power of Christ, the fellowship of man in a divine society, and the true hope of the future as resting upon this triple foundation. Hence he gives to us sermons on (1) The Almightiness of God ; (2) The Attraction of Christ ; (3) The City of God ; and (4) The Hope of the World.

In the first sermon, Dr. Hutton presents *Don Quixote* as a profoundly religious book : to him the religion of Cervantes was firm and faithful. To this he adds the great work of Rabelais, beneath whose coarseness Dr. Hutton sees the serious purpose. The two, he says, stood side by side in the thought of the omnipotence of God. In the sermon on " the Attraction of Christ," Dr. Hutton brings forward Pico della Mirandola, whom Erasmus considered one of the great glories of Italy. Pico gave his brief but brilliant life to the quest of a harmony of all knowledge through Jesus Christ ; he desired to show that all truth and beauty met in Jesus. On the " City of God," Dr. Hutton naturally presents Augustine. He adds reference to Sir Thomas More's work and his popular lectures upon Augustine's ideas.

The main call of Dr. Hutton with respect to Reconstruction is a call to reliance upon God as revealed in Christ. He points to the omission of God as a fatal error. The League of Nations, if it be merely political, will be on insecure foundations. With this call we all agree, and we are interested in Dr. Hutton's method ; but we do not feel that he is, on the whole, very convincing.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

MENTION was made in these notes in the May number of this magazine of the pending re-issue of Dr. Griffith Thomas' valuable manual of instruction for members of the Church of England entitled, *The Catholic Faith*, which is now published in paper covers at 1*s*. 6*d*. net, cloth limp at 2*s*. net, cloth boards 2*s*. 6*d*. net, and in cloth gilt, red edges, 3*s*. 6*d*. net. This manual has been in parts considerably revised and added to, and has an additional chapter on what is known as "The Principal Service" and the controversies which have raged round the Holy Communion Service. The book, which is divided into three parts—The Catholic Faith and Individual Life; The Catholic Faith and Church Life; and The Catholic Faith and Current Questions—will be found of very great use to all Churchpeople wishing to know what it means to be a Christian in association with the Church of England; what is involved in belonging to that body of Christians which is called by the title; and by what arguments they may be able to justify their position whenever required to do so. This manual represents an endeavour to answer two questions:—(1) What is the Church of England? (2) What does the Church of England teach? The answers to these questions are found, first, in the Prayer Book and Articles considered in their plain and obvious meaning. The fundamental principles of the Church of England are there indicated, and it is shown how these principles are expressed in the formularies of doctrine and worship, and what they imply and involve in the lives of those who are bound by them. It is also shown that the Prayer Book and Articles need consideration in the light of their origin and compilation, and in view of the circumstances which gave birth to their present form. The Church of England formularies are thus seen to be the direct outcome of great movements of thought and life in the English nation.

The Catholic Faith.

Another book by Dr. Griffith Thomas which has been out of print for some considerable time is now in the Press, and we hope will be published in the early part of October, price 3*s*. 6*d*. net. *A Sacrament of Our Redemption* is an inquiry into the meaning of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament and in the Church of England. It is scholarly, accurate, easy in style, and perfectly convincing as to the real teaching of the New Testament and the close adherence of the Prayer Book to that teaching. Upon the mind of the average reader the effect of a careful perusal of this volume will be the assurance that the doctrine of the Church of England upon the Holy Communion is so clear, so Scriptural, and so supported by scholarship, that it is impossible for Anglican apologists of Roman or Lutheran doctrine honestly to claim her support for one or the other. The author begins his book with an inquiry into the New Testament records, and follows this by a critical analysis, condensed and valuable, of the words of institution, and it is interesting to notice how the author supports his position by quotations from scholars whom he could not claim as being on the same side as himself within the Church. Passing from the words of Scripture, Dr. Griffith Thomas gives a skilful collation of the Liturgy and Articles which enables us to see at once how complete is the adherence of our Church to the position she lays down in her Sixth Article, and we are forced to acknowledge that there is nothing in the Prayer Book that is not

A Sacrament of our Redemption.

found in the New Testament, and nothing in the New Testament that is not found in the Prayer Book on this subject; its statements, standpoint and spiritual standard are identical. Not the least valuable part of this volume are the last three chapters. Having elucidated the teaching of the New Testament, Dr. Griffith Thomas examines in the light thus gained some of the teaching current and common among us upon the Lord's Supper. Its divergence from the standard of Scripture and Prayer Book is at once apparent. In its influence upon the reader this is perhaps the strongest part of the book; his mind has been prepared to weigh accurately the real significance of that teaching and its disloyalty to "the Sacrament of the Death of Christ."

The New Testament.

Some little time ago Sir Edward Clarke issued an edition of St. Paul's Epistles. Its object was to give "the Authorized Version amended by the adoption of such of the alterations made in the Revised Version as are necessary for correcting material mistranslations, or making clear the meaning of the inspired writer." He then promised that if his design met with approval he would bring out an edition of the New Testament on similar lines. From his experience in reading the lessons for many years past at the church of St. Peter's, Staines, he has found it useful to compare the Authorized and the Revised Versions, and, without wholly adopting the latter, to make such changes as are contained in it for the purposes indicated above. The Epistles met with such approval that shortly after Sir Edward published the whole of the New Testament in the same form. In the preface he refers to the desire expressed two years ago by some of the foremost English representatives of theology, scholarship and literature for an amended edition of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, and without claiming to have made the niceties of scholarship his own, he brings to the work years of special study of the English language as a medium of expression. English Churchpeople are wedded to the diction of the Authorized Version and have never taken kindly to the drastic alterations of the Revised Version. Sir Edward Clarke's edition provides the type of book that has long been desired. It retains for the most part the familiar phraseology of the Authorized Version, while in passages where the rendering of the Revised Version makes the meaning clearer or has corrected a mistranslation he has used its words. The edition is specially helpful in following the lessons in church, and we are sure that its usefulness will render it generally acceptable. These two books have had a large sale, and the remainder of the first editions are now being issued cheaply in order to secure for them a wide circulation. The Epistles are issued in paper covers at 1*s.* net, and the New Testament in cloth covers, stiff boards, at 2*s.* 6*d.* net, and in cloth limp at 2*s.* net.

The Psalms.

Sir Edward Clarke has also published *The Book of Psalms—The Prayer Book Version Corrected*, a delightful volume, which certainly gives the keenest pleasure to its readers and is an aid to the devotions of those who use "the only book of private devotion at our command which we are authorized to associate with Divine Inspiration." This book is also issued in a cheaper binding in paper covers at 1*s.*, and in stiff boards at 1*s.* 6*d.*