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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

November, 1920.

THE MONTH.

Reunion within.

THE Bishop of Chelmsford's proposal in his Presidential Address at the Southend Church Congress on October 19 is attracting much attention, and will probably form a topic for acute discussion for many months to come. Properly to understand it, there must be a full recognition of the Bishop's own personal point of view. He is a convinced, sincere and attached Evangelical Churchman. As he himself said in his Address, he speaks as " a pronounced Evangelical, and one who is not ashamed of its full significance ; " and to him " the quiet simplicity of the Communion Office approaches more closely the dignity of the Upper Room than does the full ceremonial of St. Peter's of Rome." But he sees in " our Lord's breadth and tolerance " the spirit which must be that of His Church to-day. It is this spirit which is dominating the desire for Reunion with our " separated " brethren, but that, the Bishop thinks, will be retarded " if our own unhappy divisions continue." The Anglo-Catholic Congress, which revealed " a cleavage so great between the Episcopate and a great body of Church opinion " that " no message of recognition and goodwill " was sent to it by the " Episcopate," has brought matters to a head, and the Bishop, with characteristic courage, faces the question: " What is to be our course of action with regard to what are known as Anglo-Catholics ? " He thinks there are four policies before us. The first is that of *repression*, which he thinks can be dismissed from consideration. The second is *toleration*, but that rests on no settled principle, and " has led to one of drift with disastrous consequences." The third is *expulsion*, and this the Bishop explains more at length :—

This implies that the whole of the Anglo-Catholic party should be asked to leave the main body and form a "group" by themselves in the reunited Church, and thus their relation to the central body would be exactly on the same lines as that of the Wesleyan or Presbyterian group. Much might be said for this, and if no other way out of our troubles can be found, it may ultimately be the solution, but personally I should deplore it. At a time when all other bodies are coming nearer to us, for the clergy who were ordained by our side, and by whose side we made our first Communion as priests in the Church of God, to part from us would be nothing less than a calamity, and one which I pray God may never take place.

This third line of policy deserves more consideration than the Bishop gave it. As defined in his Address it presents a wholly new thought. "Expulsion" has generally been understood to mean expulsion from the Church of England. The "group" theory is novel—at least to us—and we should have liked the Bishop to discuss it more fully, but he refrained from doing so, apparently because he has another remedy for the present distress. What is it?

"Whole-hearted" Inclusion."

It is revealed in his fourth policy, which he calls "the policy of whole-hearted inclusion." We must quote his proposal in full:—

This is a policy by which the gulf which exists should be bridged, and that the members of this great party should cease to be tolerated but recognized as loyal members of the Church. Here is a group of men, many of whose opinions are absolutely at variance with my own, but whose loyalty to their Lord cannot be questioned. A friend of mine, a strong Evangelical of a conservative type, after attending the Anglo-Catholic Congress told me that at times he thought he was at Keswick. Could any finer Evangelical message be delivered than that which Father Stanton gave at St. Albans? Said this Anglo-Catholic: "Be an Anglican, Roman or Nonconformist, be what you like as long as you are Christ's and Christ is yours for ever and ever. That is the point, that is the kernel, that is the Eternal Salvation." It is no exaggeration to say that hundreds, if not thousands to-day are living in touch with their Lord through his ministry, but that ministry practically never received any recognition from the Church which had ordained him priest. The Church produced John Wesley and Charles Pusey, and both were priests within her fold. She persecuted and hindered both in their ministry. How long is this policy to continue? The question is this, Is there room in the Church of Christ for the Anglo-Catholic Congress and for the Islington Conference? If there is, is there room in the *Church of England* for both? If there is not let us say so and let one depart, but if both are to exist side by side make it possible for both to be happy in their spiritual home."

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this proposal. It is one of the most sensational pronouncements ever made from

the Presidential chair of the Church Congress. We were fully persuaded that the Bishop of Chelmsford would not be content with an Address on conventional or traditional lines, full of meaningless platitudes, but we were not prepared for anything quite so startling as this.

But how?

The Bishop is not the man to propound a scheme until he has thought it out thoroughly; and in this case he has worked out his plan in detail. "How is this to be accomplished?" he asks, and he begs that his plan be considered not in sections, but as a whole. He says, in the first place, that there must be a revision of the oath of Canonical obedience, and of the "Declaration of Assent," for "both are ambiguous." Then, secondly, "the position of the Bishop must be more clearly defined." He favours the restoration of Diocesan Synods in every diocese, with an appeal to a fully constituted Provincial Synod. In the third place he claims that Canon Law must be restored to a position of respect. "It should be possible to draw up a new and authoritative set of canons, based partly upon the heritage and precedent of the body of Canon Law and partly upon the primitive Catholic principles of the New Testament." Finally, there must be reform of Ecclesiastical Courts, for Courts, when set up, "should be of such a character as to secure general acceptance for their decisions." This, in brief outline, is the Bishop's scheme. It is sufficiently comprehensive and, without in the least degree committing ourselves to its acceptance in whole or in part, it may safely be said that it deserves, alike for the personality of its author and for the reason which has prompted him to make it—the restoration of unity and peace within the Church—the fullest and most careful consideration, and that, we are persuaded, it will receive from Churchmen of all schools of thought and not least from those who, like ourselves, rejoice in the name, with all that it implies, of Protestant and Evangelical Churchmen.

"The Person of Christ."

The general subject of the Church Congress was "The Living Christ and Problems of To-day," and it was fitting that the first session should be devoted to a consideration of "The Person of Christ." Those, however, who expected that the papers would be of a devotional character,

giving a spiritual uplift to this great assembly of Churchpeople gathered from many different parts of the country, must have been woefully disappointed. Canon Mason's paper, which led the way, dealt with "the Person of Christ in relation to God," but it was almost wholly directed to a criticism of the Dean of Carlisle's recently published Bampton Lectures on the Atonement. He declined to accept the Dean's theological position, and set out his reasons for disagreement. The subject does not lend itself to brief treatment in a note, but Canon Mason had no difficulty in showing that belief in the unity of the two Persons makes room for a deeper view of what the Atonement means than the lecturer was willing to admit. "Words," Canon Mason went on, "like ransom, sacrifice, propitiation—words like bearing our sins, the chastisement of our peace, are all figurative, but I cannot think that there is no reality to which they correspond. It is not by believing even the most correct, the most spiritual interpretation of them, that we are saved, but by the death, the willing death itself, crowning such a life and leading on to such a victory." The next paper was read by the Dean of Carlisle, who suggested that "even till quite recent times the Church at large has not fully grasped and appreciated the doctrine which it formally professes as to the real humanity of Christ, and that in most popular religious teaching it is not appreciated yet." The final paper was read by Dr. R. J. Campbell on "The Temporal Setting and Eternal Significance of the Teaching of Christ," and he followed his own characteristic lines. We cannot but regret that no definitely Evangelical speaker was associated with this subject. How different would have been the treatment of it by such a leader as the late Bishop of Durham.

The Church in Australia.

So little is known in this country of the constitution of the Church in Australia that we are bound to make room for the following most interesting letter from Archdeacon Davies, of Sydney :—

I am writing to draw attention to a serious mistake on p. 380 of the July issue of the "CHURCHMAN." I refer to this statement: "The Church in Australia cannot move except with the concurrence of the Church in England."

The constitution of the Church in Australia has been for some years under investigation by a Committee of the General Synod. I am breaking no confidence as a member of that Committee when I say that the statement I have quoted is simply not true of the Church in Queensland, New South

Wales, West Australia and Tasmania, and probably also of the Church in Victoria and South Australia.

The circumstances differ in detail in each State, but, generally speaking, it is true that the Church in each State has voluntarily bound itself to conform to the Book of Common Prayer as the standard of worship and the Thirty-nine Articles as the standard of doctrine. The Bible is definitetly mentioned as the sole rule (i.e. supreme authority) of faith.

If the Church in Australia desires to draw up and authorize a new form of worship, all that is really necessary is to have an Act of the State Parliament passed in each State to safeguard Church property. But, in fact, the first step is to give more real authority to the General Synod, as at present each Diocese is free to accept or reject any determination of General Synod, and such determinations become binding only when accepted by all the dioceses. A change in England does NOT become *ipso facto* automatic in Australia, though the natural custom is to follow English precedents. But in a wide range of action the Church in Australia has already complete freedom and has exercised it in matters of organization, finance and general management of affairs. The Church in Australia enjoys a measure of self-government that is far in advance of what the Church of England enjoys under the Enabling Act.

I think I have said enough to show that the statement I have criticized is open to the criticism that I have made. I may add one point more. In 1912 the Diocesan Synod of the diocese of Sydney passed an ordinance authorizing the various abridgments and modifications allowed under the English Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872. This is only one instance of many that could be given of independent action by the Church in Australia and that go to show that it is not true to say that "the Church in Australia cannot move except with the concurrence of the Church in England." The Church in Australia could do what it likes at any time it wishes merely by getting Acts of Parliament passed in the respective States without asking anyone's leave or taking account of anything done in England.

DAVID J. DAVIES.

First Fruits in Southern Sudan.

It was announced in the Monthly Statement presented to the General Committee of the Church Missionary Society on October 13 that particulars have been received of the first Confirmation held at Malek, in the Hongalla Province of the Southern Sudan, nearly 1,000 miles south of Khartoum. Work was commenced among the pagans of the Southern Sudan in 1905 at the invitation of Lord Cromer, and the missionaries have had a long uphill struggle, experiencing many discomforts and discouragements. Bishop Gwynne reached Malek about mid-April and on the Third Sunday after Easter confirmed two Dinkas and two Acholi teachers. The Church was filled with more than one hundred and forty Dinkas who followed the service with great interest. The Bishop writes: "It was a striking scene and a red-letter day for the Dinkas. After fifteen years of uphill work amongst a people as difficult as any to reach, in a

climate which would try the strongest, here were the first-fruits. . . . The heart was lifted up in gratitude to God, that through the persistent and enduring courage of His servant—in spite of the strongly fortified positions of ignorance and savagery, in the stifling atmosphere of heathenism—a stage at last has been reached and a strategical point gained from which the missionaries of Christ may go forward to greater victories in the extension of the Kingdom of God." Bishop Gwynne also held a Confirmation at Yambio, about twenty miles from the Belgian Congo frontier. The Government has conceded about 500 acres to the Mission, which has nearly all been cleared. The central block of buildings, made entirely of native materials, are most beautifully decorated with Azandi matting of black and white. The Holy Table, the choir-stalls, and all the wood-work are made of mahogany, and the whole building will accommodate 400 people. There are two houses for foreign missionaries, a school, a workshop, and an office. On each side of a broad way, between avenues of palms, mango and flowering trees, are the plots of the students of the school, or of the natives employed by or attached to the Mission. There are in all about 140 pupils, men, women, and children. Bananas, pawpaw, mango, and pineapples are grown so easily that these people support themselves entirely and are no expense to the Society. They attend prayers every morning after roll-call, the adults proceed to their work while the younger men and boys have compulsory school, opportunity being given to the adult men and women to attend during their rest-hour at mid-day, and of this they avail themselves with real eagerness. There is also a flourishing school for girls and women, five of whom are catechumens.

THE SIXTH LAMBETH CONFERENCE, 1920.

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

II

THE Anglican Communion is not in communion with all Churches that are Episcopal. This interferes with the ultimate realization of the Divine Ideal of the one Holy Catholic Church, into which all the divided groups of His faithful people must bring what they have of glory and honour, and which cannot be made perfect till all its parts are drawn together in Him. The Church of Rome, the numerically largest of Episcopal Churches, stands for rigid dogmatism and stiff ecclesiasticism that impose unlawful terms of communion on those who join its ranks. The Report of the Committee, while endeavouring to discover some means of approach to Rome, and to find some clues that may give hopes of better things, concludes: "It is obvious that no forward step can yet be taken; but the facts thus referred to may help to create in the future a very different position." The Archbishop of Canterbury says the position is "hopeless," and the Conference as a whole passed no Resolution on the subject. May we not conclude that it is waste of time to consider what Rome will think, or say, when we deal with the wider question of Reunion? Rome will be much more likely to change her attitude when she recognizes that the Churches of the Reformation are drawing together into a visible unity, than she is when she contrasts their divisions with her own calm assumption that "*securus judicat orbis terrarum*"? The passing of a dream that had no foundation is recorded by the silence of the Resolutions on the Roman Church.

The position of the Orthodox Eastern Church is different. During recent years by common suffering we have been drawn closer to several of its branches. We understand one another better, although much must be done before intercommunion is established. The Lambeth Conference received in full session a Greek Deputation that sat and gave information to the Committee. The members did not sit in the Conference; they did not communicate at the Conference Communion Services—for we believe that an Orthodox Churchman is open to censure if he communicate in the

Anglican Church. Co-operation in matters of Social Reform is urged, and the Committee believes that we are steadily moving towards the goal of ultimate Reunion. The appointment by the Archbishop of Canterbury of an "Eastern Churches Committee" is welcomed, and it is hopefully expected that similar Committees appointed in Athens and Constantinople will help forward Reunion. Sympathy is expressed with the persecuted Churches lately under the rule of the Turk, and the Resolutions declare that whatever errors concerning the Incarnation may have been held by them in the past have now ceased to exist. Friendly relations should be maintained with these Churches, and opportunities be afforded for occasional intercommunion when assurances of their faith are given and the desire for closer relations is expressed.

The barrier between us and the Church of Sweden no longer exists, and intercommunion now is established. It is recommended that at the first joint consecration, by the Anglican Bishops and the Swedish Bishops, that more than one of our Bishops should take part, "as an evident token of the restoration of closer relations between the two Churches" Not unnaturally, in spite of the desire for closer relations with the Old Catholics, especially in Germany, Switzerland and Austria, the consecration of Bishop Mathew is regretted, and in the case of any of the Ministers ordained by him or other "episcopi vagantes" it is recommended that they should be conditionally re-ordained by supplying whatever may have been defective according to Anglican use. A similar resolution was passed concerning the ordination of the Ministers of the "Reformed Episcopal Church" who may wish to become Ministers in the Anglican Communion. Reunion with the Moravians —that heroic missionary Church—is postponed, until Deacons cease to celebrate Holy Communion and to administer Confirmation. It is clear from more than one passage in the Report that the Conference Committee lays great stress on Confirmation by laying on of hands, "as an outward sign of grace given in Confirmation." Careful readers of the Report will find in it occasional proofs of conflicting opinions. But, if there is to be ultimate unity in Christendom, we all must be prepared to see at first some things we dislike. We cannot attain uniformity, even if it were desirable, but the Spirit of God will guide us through our diversity to deeper and fuller truth. For our part, we are convinced that Reunion

with the vigorous non-Episcopal communions will bring to the Anglican Communion a scriptural outlook, and a spirit of freedom from mechanical traditionalism, that will greatly benefit our Church. So long as there is no conflict of fundamental principles God will give to a reunited Church the vision of Truth that will draw its members closer to Himself. After all, that is what we really need and crave to possess in a Church that fulfils His will.

Missionary Problems.

The Conference, as it was bound to do, declared that it is the paramount duty of the Christian Church to present the Redeemer to mankind, and earnestly appealed to men and women to volunteer for Foreign Service. As it was to be expected also, it had before it the two methods in which the Anglican Communion works in the Mission Field. Churches as such through their duly organized Synods undertake the duty of maintaining Missions. Societies, representing schools of thought or specially devoted to one particular phase of work, do for the Church what in the opinion of many it ought to do for itself. The Conference desired to see both systems maintained, but it is plain that the prevailing will of the Bishops is to bring Missionary Societies into closer relation with the governing Authorities of the Church. The supreme Synodical authority in some form or another should have control, but the Societies should act in such degrees of independence as the conditions of their efficiency demands. We may expect in the coming years an effort made to subordinate the Societies to the National Church Assembly, but it is hard to see how the organizations that have done so much for the Church can become in any sense departments of a central body. Due praise is given to the Societies for their co-operation in the establishment of "self-governing, self-supporting and self-extending Churches," but the better way is to centre their work in the Church, rather than in the Boards and Societies. A series of suggestions is made by which the Diocesan organization should be the authoritative body. Locally, a real share in financial control and general direction should be given, and the local indigenous workers should be granted widest freedom in developing their work on lines in accordance with their national character. This implies that national characteristics should be permitted to have a greater part in the growth of Churches

whose members will naturally be drawn from their territorial areas. The co-existence of racial Episcopates in the same territory is admitted to be a concession to the exigencies of facts, and the settlement of this problem is to be in the hands of the Province.

The Marriage law of the Church should be administered consistently, as far as possible, in all parts of the Anglican Communion, and the Report of the Committee deals in detail with perplexing problems that have arisen, and cannot fail to arise when Christianity makes itself a power in non-Christian lands. Governments are bound, in the opinion of the Conference, to refrain from imposing permanent obstacles in the way of the propagation of the faith, and freedom of opportunity should be given to all Christian men and women of all nationalities to fulfil the obligation of spreading Christianity. The Church cannot fail to rejoice in the increased sense of their dignity in converts as human beings, of their rights, as well as of their duties, and Governments should be glad of this even "though in civil life it raises new problems to be solved." Missionaries are exhorted to consider the responsibilities of the Government. They should adapt their methods as far as they consistently can to the Government policy. Governments should not show any discrimination against the Christian faith. Their officials should take care lest they may be betrayed into actions or sayings that may be construed into anything that dishonours our Lord. Christian sentiment deserves as much consideration as the sentiments centring in other faiths. Missionaries should refrain from being propagandists of commercial and political aims of their nations, as this lies outside their proper functions. The valuable work done by British and American Missionary Conferences is gratefully acknowledged. Such Conferences are destined to have important functions by fostering mutual good will, and by serving as a practical medium of communication between Missions and Governments in matters of General Missionary Concern.

Few will be found to question the wisdom of the Resolutions and Report on the Relation between Governments and Missions, but a very grave division of opinion will arise on the place the Prayer Book, as we know it, will occupy in the future. It is true that the Prayer Book in all details is not an ideal Service Book, under all conditions, and in all climates. As long as its doctrinal authority

is maintained there is no need for rigid uniformity, and the vision of a reunited Church forbids this being the ideal of the National Churches that will spring into being. The inherent Liturgical right of a Diocesan Bishop is subject to such limitations as may be imposed by higher Synodical authority. For our part, we are not so sure that any such inherent individual right exists, and are convinced that the Bishops are bound just as much as the Clergy by the Rubrics and laws of the Church's Service Book. The Conference believes that the higher Synodical authority "should not be too rigidly exercised as long as those features are retained which are essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion" What are these features? Are they mere matters of non-significant customs, or are they matters of the first importance?

The Conference, recognizing the many problems that will be raised, recommends "the appointment of a Committee of students of liturgical questions, which would be ready to advise any Diocese or Province on the Form and Matter of services proposed for adoption, and requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to take such steps as he deems best to give early effect to this Resolution." This means that we shall shortly have a Congregation of Rites, that will decide ritual and liturgical questions for the Anglican Communion—not with the ultimate authority possessed by its Roman prototype, but with an authority that may have very serious influence in determining the character of the worship of native Churches. It is a choice between the power of Provinces that may contain no liturgiologists to develop eccentricities and the controlling influence of a central body that may be looked upon as better informed, and less liable to be led astray by prevailing party views. If such a Committee be set up, it will of necessity have a very great influence on all Ritual Doctrinal questions—for the *Lex Orandi* is the *Lex Credendi*, and we hope that before any definite steps are taken the whole subject will be most carefully discussed. Its real character is not evident at first sight, and for our part we cannot imagine anything more likely to promote disunion instead of union than a conflict between the advice of the Committee and local wishes. If the Committee be a strong one—and we cannot conceive of its being anything else—it will be a kind of *Imperium in Imperio*—acting as a regulative influence throughout the entire Communion at home as well as abroad.

With new types of Prayer Books, we may find ourselves at any moment in the presence of a controversy concerning the orthodoxy or otherwise of a distant Church, and the pressure thus brought to bear on Home Revision would be very great if the Committee came to decisions which form the liturgical ideals of a party in our own Church. It is not strange that the Preface of the Ordinal should be considered of such primary importance that it must be maintained at all costs, and that the Book of Common Prayer—framed, as it is, on the devotional treasures of the past—should be scrapped? Are we somewhat suspicious when we see lurking in this proposal real dangers of the institution of non-communicating attendance as the customary worship at the central service of the Church? The sneers, all too familiar, at "glorified Matins," may bear fruit in their abolition, and through this Committee we may have a type of central service which is foreign to the character of the Prayer Book and fits in with the propaganda of a party in our own Church.

Studying the Resolutions and the Report on Missions we are thankful for the recognition of the place they have in the Church, for the advocacy of their claims by the Conference as a whole, and for the weighty language used concerning Missions and Governments. We see, however, in the attitude to Societies a danger to their continued existence, and in the provision for local Liturgies something more than adaptation of the Prayer Book to local needs. A step fraught with grave peril to the unity of the Anglican Communion may very easily be taken, if the proposals are not most cautiously developed, and the very reunion we wish to establish may be wrecked by the action of Provinces and the advice of experts. When we know the ecclesiastical complexion of some of the future Provinces, we cannot avoid seeing that the forces which in these Provinces have so largely contributed to the growth of non-Episcopacy may very easily find themselves made permanent in their orientation by new Prayer models that are not in accord with Anglican standards.

It is right that there should be greater freedom in the development of Anglican organization, even if such development may infringe on the traditional influence of Missionary Societies working in the Dioceses. The Conference recommends the formation of new provinces, consisting of four Dioceses at least; Houses of Bishops

are to be established with authority to consecrate Bishops, the *sedes* of the Metropolitan may vary according to local needs, and the Province shall have some voice in the choice of its Metropolitan. "Until a Missionary Diocese becomes largely self-supporting, and is self-governed by a Synod, the appointment of its Bishop should rest with the Province to which it is attached, after consultation with the Diocese, and in such a way as the province may decide." This is a new departure that may be the parent of great changes, for it removes from the Archbishop of Canterbury the right of appointment to many Missionary Sees. It is a venture of faith inspired by the right of "self-determination." "Each national and regional Church will determine its own constitutional canonical enactments." This naturally follows from the traditional Provincial authority of the Anglican Communion—founded upon the models of the early Church.

The Conference strengthened the Consultative Committee by the appointment of additional members, and by reorganizing its representation. A Bishop is appointed to this Committee for six years, and as he need not be a Bishop of the Body that appoints him, it is probable that more than the two English Bishops who will sit will be nominated. The Committee is purely advisory, and gives advice only when it is sought. Its first work will be the consideration of the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act with a view to their modification. It is hoped that the American Bishops will see their way to act on the Committee, for their absence makes the advice offered not nearly so weighty as it should be. There is no appearance in the Report or Resolutions of the creation of a Patriarchate of Canterbury. The whole tone of the Conference, judging by the character of all the utterances, is opposed to any such departure. The Anglican Communion must consist, unless its ethos is revolutionized, of a number of independent Churches subject to their own Synodical Authority—free to develop their life in accordance with local circumstances. They are free, and yet their freedom is limited by the *nexus* that binds them together, and prevents extravagant developments that would alienate them from one another. The Papacy is the centre of discipline—it is not the centre of a system that combines the freedom of the gospel with a passion for Truth revealed in Holy Scriptures as the ultimate standard. Its history demonstrates the dangers of central-

ization, and it is the genius of the English race to combine unity of spirit with local power of self-determination.

The Position of Women.

No subject gave the Conference more anxiety than the " position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church " It came again and again before the Conference as a whole, the Resolutions in this section contain the only figures of a Division, and already one of the Bishops has announced that in his Diocese the Resolution referred to will not be followed. The Conference was faced by facts that could not be avoided. Women have since 1908 leaped into publicity, and have shown their fitness for office in a way unanticipated twelve years ago. They have won practically the right to occupy every position open to men in public and private life, and the Church could not remain outside the movement of emancipation. More than any other institution the Church is woman's sphere. Whatever may be the case in other lands, in England at least three-fourth of our communicants are women, and an even larger proportion of our workers are drawn from the ranks of women communicants. The National Church Assembly has women sitting on it, and every Council in the Church can have women members. The Conference determined that all Councils and Assemblies of the Church to which laymen are admitted should be open to women on equal terms with men. In its opinion the time has come for the formal and canonical restoration of the Diaconate of women, which is the only order of the Ministry which has apostolic approval as far as women are concerned, and, in the opinion of the Conference, it is the only order the Church should recognize. Deaconesses are primarily intended to be a ministry of succour especially to women, and they are to be set apart for lifelong service without any vow or promise of celibacy, although individual deaconesses may pledge themselves " either as members of a Community or as individuals to a celibate life." Set apart by prayer and the laying-on of the hands of the Bishop, with a formula giving them authority to execute the office of a Deaconess in the Church of God, and by the delivery of a New Testament, they are practically analagous to male Deacons, but they are not to be allowed to assist the Priest in the administration of the Holy Communion. They can baptize

in virtue of their office "in case of necessity," a different thing from the irregularity but validity of Infant Baptism by women as we know it, and they are permitted with Episcopal and local approval to officiate at the reading desk and occupy the pulpit as a male Deacon is accustomed to do. Women who are not Deaconesses may on similar terms with laymen speak and lead in prayer in consecrated buildings "at other than the regular and appointed services of the Church."

The report of the Committee is a vindication of the Resolutions, and an exposition of the force and application of St. Paul's well-known restrictions on women preaching and teaching. "Our firm conviction is that the precise form which St. Paul's disciplinary directions took was relative to the time and to the place which he had actually in mind, but that these directions embody an abiding principle. To transfer with slavish literalness the Apostle's injunctions to our own time, and to all parts of our own world, would be to renounce alike our inalienable responsibility of judgment and the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free" The Committee has spoken with a deliberateness that is to its credit, and the Resolutions will not automatically come into operation. They will require in England the approval of the National Church Assembly, but they constitute a form of recommendation that cannot easily be disregarded.

One passage of the Report deserves special notice: "An analogy is bound to grow up between the lay readers who are men and the women who are entrusted with similar duties. In this context, therefore, we venture to put on record our opinion that the time has come when the regulations as to lay readers (whose devoted work we gracefully acknowledge) should everywhere be made more definite and precise; and in particular that it is urgently needful that everywhere the standard of men who are admitted to the office of lay readers should be raised." We do not quarrel with the recommendation which comes oddly in a Report on the Position of Women, but it may be due to a fear that if this be not done the male readers will be so inferior to the female that comparisons of an unfortunate character may be made. We are thankful to notice that the Conference did not overlook the duty of giving proper remuneration to women-workers of all classes.

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

(To be concluded.)

LIFE AND WORSHIP IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE.

SIDELIGHTS FROM ADDISON'S "SPECTATOR."

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

II.

FROM a letter published in No. 312 we gather that the use of extempore prayer was not infrequent in the pulpit. "There is another pretty fancy. When a young man has a mind to let us know who gave him his scarf, he speaks a parenthesis to the Almighty: 'Bless, as I am in duty bound to pray, the right honourable, the Countess'; is not that as much as to say, 'Bless her, for Thou knowest I am her chaplain.'"

A letter in No. 455 informs us that the clergy in *Spectator's* day, as in our own, had to remind their congregations that kneeling is the appropriate posture for prayer—also that the reminder may be given in such a way as to bring ridicule upon the preacher: "Mr. Spectator, I desire you would print this in Italic, so that it may be generally taken notice of. It is designed only to admonish all persons who speak either at the bar, pulpit, or any other public assembly whatever, how they discover their ignorance in the use of similies." The writer proceeds to give the following instance: "On Sunday last, one who shall be nameless, reproving several of his congregation for standing at prayers, was pleased to say, 'One would think, like the elephant, you had no knees.' Now I myself saw an elephant, in Bartholomew Fair, kneel down to take on his back the ingenious Mr. William Penkethman."[1] There is no doubt that what Cowper calls "the divorce of knees from hassocks" became increasingly general during the eighteenth century. Sir Roger de Coverley's gift of hassocks to encourage the congregation in the practice of kneeling leads us to infer that the posture, in the judgment of Addison, was not an unimportant detail of worship.

On the whole, *Spectator's* opinion of Church music is unfavourable. Addison expresses the wish that there were "the same application and endeavour to cultivate our Church music as we have lately bestowed on that of the stage." The oratorio, which

[1] John Pinkethman, a well-known actor; or, as often spelt, Penkethman.

owed its development, if not its origin, to Handel, was still a thing of the future, whereas the opera in England began its chequered and not very distinguished career in 1673. In a later paper a contributor to the *Spectator* speaks favourably of Church music. This contribution was not from the pen of Addison or Steele, and there is reason to doubt whether either of those two accomplished writers was a competent judge of musical efficiency.

Quiet country parishes, where the highest ambitions were satisfied by the metrical psalter of Tate and Brady, or Sternhold and Hopkins, were in danger of being scandalized by incursions from the realms of fashion. No. 205 contains a letter from a country parson, who confides his difficulty to the *Spectator*, and asks advice. Here is the letter. "Mr. Spectator, I am a country clergyman, and hope you will lend me your assistance in ridiculing some little indecencies, which cannot be so properly exposed from the pulpit. A widow lady, who straggled this summer from London into my parish for the benefit of the air, as she says, appears every Sunday at church with many fashionable extravagances to the great astonishment of my congregation. But what gives us the most offence is her theatrical manner of singing the psalms. She introduces about fifty Italian airs into the hundredth psalm, and whilst we begin 'All people,' in the old solemn tune of our forefathers, she, in a quite different key, runs divisions on the vowels and adorns them with the graces of Nicolini;[1] and if she meets with eke' or 'aye,' which are frequent in the metre of Hopkins and Sternhold, we are certain to hear her quavering them half a minute after us to some sprightly air of the opera. I am very far from being an enemy to Church music, but fear this abuse of it may make my parish ridiculous, who already look on singing psalms as an entertainment, and not part of their devotion."

A serious grievance is ventilated in No. 338, and here the stricture is aimed at the organ-loft. The organ had securely established itself before the end of the seventeenth century, and, although the puritanical element in the Church still raised a feeble protest, was now almost universal in the churches of the metropolis. *Spectator* remarks severely upon the usual practice on the stage of appending a comic epilogue to the most solemn of tragedies. He charitably (or shall we say sarcastically?) supposes that this is done with a

[1] A well-known operatic singer of the day.

view to sending the audience away in a cheerful frame of mind, but he highly disapproves of the practice. He continues: "what makes me more desirous to have some reformation of this matter is, because of an evil consequence or two attending it; for a great many of our church musicians being related to the theatre, they have, in imitation of these epilogues, introduced in their farewell voluntaries, a sort of music quite foreign to the design of church services, to the great prejudice of well-disposed people. Those fingering gentlemen should be informed, that they ought to suit their airs to the place and business; and that a musician is obliged to keep to the text as much as the preacher. For want of this I have found by experience a great deal of mischief. For when the preacher has often, with great piety, and art enough, handled his subject, and the judicious clerk has, with the utmost diligence, culled out two staves proper to the discourse, and I have found in myself, and in the rest of the pew, good thoughts and dispositions they have been all in a moment dissipated by a merry jig from the organ-loft." Most of us have known churches where this would be a word in season if pinned in the organ-loft.

Irreverent and careless conduct in church is a subject of frequent and severe comment in the *Spectator*. He takes great exception to the elaborate and frequent salutations given and received in the house of God. The vein in which the rebuke is couched may be exemplified by the following passage: "A dissenter of rank and distinction was lately prevailed upon by a friend of his to come to one of the greatest congregations of the Church of England about town. After the service was over, he declared he was very well pleased with the little ceremony which was used towards Almighty God, but at the same time he feared he should not be able to go through those required towards one another: as to this point he was in a state of despair, and feared he was not well-bred enough to be a convert."

In one of his papers Addison gives an account of the visit of four Indian Kings to the metropolis, and he takes the opportunity of drawing attention to this scandal. The royal sightseers attended a service at St. Paul's Cathedral, and thus describe their experience: "It is probable that when this great work was begun, which must have been many hundred years ago, there was some religion among this people; for they give it the name of a temple, and have a

tradition that it was designed for men to pay their devotion in. And, indeed, there are several reasons which make us think that the natives of this country had formerly among them some form of worship, for they set apart every seventh day as sacred; but upon my going into one of these holy houses on that day, I could not observe any circumstances of devotion in their behaviour. There rises indeed a man in black, who was mounted above the rest, and seemed to utter something with a great deal of vehemence; but as for those underneath him, instead of paying their worship to the deity of the place, they were most of them bowing and curtseying to one another, and a considerable number of them fast asleep." The "man in black," it may be observed, is contemporary proof of the use of the black gown in the pulpit.

Spectator contrasts the Church of England, in respect of behaviour in the house of God, very unfavourably with that of the Church of Rome. Steele puts his thoughts on this subject into the mouth of an imaginary correspondent. "Mr. Spectator, I write to you to desire, that you would again touch upon a certain enormity, which is chiefly in use among the politer and better-bred part of mankind; I mean the ceremonies, bows, curtsies, whisperings, smiles, winks, nods, with other familiar arts of salutation, which take up in our churches so much time that might be better employed, and which seem so utterly inconsistent with the duty and true intent of our entering into those religious assemblies. The resemblance which this bears to our, indeed, proper behaviour in theatres may be some instance of its incongruity in the above-mentioned places. In Roman Catholic churches and chapels abroad, I myself have observed, more than once, persons of the first quality, of the nearest relation, and intimate acquaintance, passing by one another, unknowing as it were, and unknown, and with so little notice of each other, that it looked like having their minds more suitably and more solemnly engaged; at least it was an acknowledgment that they ought to have been so. . . . I cannot help, upon this occasion, remarking on the excellent memories of those devotionists, who upon returning from church, shall give a particular account how two or three hundred people were dressed: a thing by reason of its variety, so difficult to be digested and fixed in the head, that it is a miracle to me how two poor hours of divine service can be time sufficient for so elaborate an undertaking, the duty of the place too

being jointly, and no doubt oft pathetically, performed along with it." The foregoing quotations are mere specimens of constantly recurring animadversions on irreverent behaviour in church.

Spectator in No. 236 strongly deprecates the presence of the whispering worshipper, that is, the audible repetition after the ministers of the prayers and other parts of the service. This grievance is expressed, as so frequently, in a letter from an imaginary correspondent, who complains of " the disturbance some people give to others at church by their repetition of the prayers after the minister ; and that not only in the prayers, but also in the absolution ; and the commandments fare no better." The letter concludes with the remark that " this religious inadvertency is a thing extremely offensive," but with the caution that it should not be severely dealt with, since it is expressive of genuine devotion. This aggravating trick is, perhaps, almost obsolete, but there are few elderly church-goers who cannot remember being irritated by the whispering worshipper.

The parish clerk was already an important functionary and was on his way to reach a still higher degree of eminence. It is the fashion to smile at the parish clerk of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but his associations and traditions are honourable. The parish clerks of London had been incorporated by Henry III as the Brotherhood of St. Nicholas. They had a hall of their own in Bishopsgate Street, with an anniversary, and a special service at St. Alban's Church. They have their place in the *Spectator*. In No. 372 we are introduced to a company assembled in a tavern near the Exchange,—" a precise set of men, with grave countenances, short wigs, black clothes, mourning gloves, and hatbands. We are prepared to hear that they are undertakers ; but, upon enquiry, *Spectator* learns that they are " a knot of parish clerks, who have taken a fancy to each other, and perhaps settle the bills of mortality over their half pints."

In No. 284 we have an entertaining account of the way in which a brazen-faced coquette so misbehaved herself in church, curtseying and making other familiar signs to a young baronet, that the clerk was fairly disconcerted and lost his nerve. " I had one day set the hundredth psalm, and was singing the first line in order to put the congregation into the tune ; she was all the while curtseying to Sir Anthony, in so affected and indecent a manner that the indignation

I conceived at it made me forget myself so far, as from the tune of that psalm to wander into the Southwell tune, and from thence into the Windsor tune, still unable to recover myself, until I had, with the utmost confusion, set a new one. . . . When I have spoken the assent to a prayer with a long Amen, uttered with decent gravity, she has been rolling her eyes round about in such a manner, as plainly showed, however she was moved, it was not towards a heavenly object." Here we catch the long, drawn-out, drawling Amen, often with a strong nasal accent, that some of us can remember hearing in country churches in the days of our youth.

We shall bring our subject to a more dignified conclusion by drawing attention to the educational work of the Church. The *Spectator* has more than one reference to the Anniversary Services of Charity schools, which were a marked feature in the ecclesiastical life of the reign of Queen Anne. Addison and Steele, both in the *Spectator* and in other writings, lavish much praise on these schools, a large number of which, in their lifetime, were established in London and elsewhere in connexion with the Church of England. Philip Stubbs, alluded to above, the elocutionist so heartily commended by Steele, established Church schools in no less than three parishes, namely, Woolwich, St. Alphege (London) and Bicester. In the fifteen years ending 1712 as many as one hundred and seventeen schools were set up in London and Westminster, providing education for nearly five thousand children. On February 6, 1712, Steele calls the attention of his readers to the fact there would be a school anniversary service on the following Sunday at St. Bride's Church.

We do not dwell upon the Societies for the Reformation of Manners established at the close of the seventeenth and the opening of the eighteenth century, because the work was not strictly that of the Anglican Church. It was an effort in which religious men of all persuasions united, nor would it be easy to exaggerate the beneficial effect resulting from it. At the same time, while bearing in mind the inter-denominational character of the work, it should not be forgotten that the movement owed its origin, and much of its success, to the influence of distinguished Churchmen, amongst whom may be named William Beveridge, who died Bishop of St. Asaph in 1708, and Dr. Anthony Horneck, preacher at the Savoy, and Prebend of Westminster, the most popular preacher of his day, who died in

1698. Commendatory allusions to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners are to be found both in the *Spectator* and the *Tatler*; by Addison in the former, by Steele in the latter.[1]

In closing these remarks, one is deeply conscious of the little real light that has been thrown upon the subject in hand, namely, the life and worship of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Anne. All that has been brought together from the six hundred and thirty-five essays, which compose the *Spectator*, deals with the external and superficial features of the Church and her mission. Nevertheless, to know what men like Addison and Steele thought of the Church to which they belonged cannot be without interest. Probably the most vivid impression left upon the mind is the failure of the Church to attain to her ideals,—the lamentable shortcomings, both in theory and practice, of the "Church as by law established"; the formality, the conventionalism, the unreality, the general lack of vitality, that crippled, if it did not paralyse, its influence and action. A worse time was before the Church as the eighteenth century wore on, and nearly a hundred years were to pass before the Church of England, as a whole, reached the nadir of stagnation and inefficiency. There is, indeed, no ground for self-congratulation; but it may be truly said that, during the last century, there has been a conspicuous revival of all that constitutes the life of the Church. Much, indeed, is open to criticism, and critics are unsparing, but if zeal toward God and practical interest in all that concerns the true welfare of man are of the essence of the Christian religion, the condition of the Church at the present time bears very favourable comparison with that of two centuries ago.

G. S. STREATFEILD.

[1] *Spectator*, No. 8; *Tatler*, No. 3. Steele not only commends the Society but speaks of himself as a member of it.

NEW METHOD IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT.

THE CLASS-ROOM REPUBLIC. By E. A. Craddock, M.A. London: *A. & C. Black.*

An interesting little book by an experienced teacher, who advocates a "new method" in School management, namely, the substitution of a Republic for the present "monarchical" system. Mr. Craddock tells us that the "conduct" of his experiments during the past two years has made them the happiest and most fruitful of all his teaching experience.

THE CASE FOR THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE.

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

IV.

The Provisional Tent of Moses.

In his work on Exodus (pp. 427f.) Dr. Driver tabulated the differences between what he calls JE's representation of the Tent of Meeting and P's. In the former it is a simple tent, in the latter a splendid structure; in the former it is outside the camp; in the latter it is inside; in the former it is guarded by Joshua, in the latter by a body of Levites; the Ark moves in the vanguard of the march in the former, in the latter in the midst of a great procession, etc. This evidence, however, seems to corroborate our position, that the former tent was a temporary one. Now there is an interval of some eight months between the command to construct the Tent of Meeting and its actual erection; i.e., between the forty days of Exodus xxiv. 18, after "the third month" (Exod. xix. 1) and "the first month of the second year, on the first day of the month," when "the tabernacle was reared up" (Exod. xl. 17.) In the meantime we read in Exodus xxxiii. 7: "Moses took the tent, and pitched it without the camp, . . . and he called it the tent of meeting. And it came to pass that every one that sought the Lord went out into the tent of meeting, which was *without the camp*. And it came to pass, when Moses entered into the tent, the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the tent, and (He) spake with Moses . . . And he turned again to the camp, but his minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tent."

The R.V. renders the verb in this passage (יִקַּח) "Moses *used to take* the tent, and to pitch it," making it a frequentative. Driver[1] says: "The tenses are frequentative, and describe what was Moses' habitual practice—no doubt, in E's view, during the whole time of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness," and "used to take" means "at every new encampment of the Israelites."

[1] *Exodus*, p. 359. See also *art.* Tabernacle, Hastings D.B. iv. 654, by A. S. Kennedy, "The tenses employed are intended to describe the habitual custom of the Hebrews and their leader during the whole period of the wanderings."

Then, of course, according to E, we are left to infer that Joshua remained in this tent during the whole time of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness. Is it at all likely or intelligible that the General of the Hebrews should be always so employed? The mistake lies in regarding this imperfect tense or the frequentative force of it as extending for so long a time. The LXX has simple aorists: "And Moses having taken (λαβών) *his* tent, pitched (ἔπηξεν) it without the camp." Driver himself in *Hebrew Tenses*, page 31, says this Hebrew imperfect may be rendered in English by the "historical present." [1] So we may interpret the passage: "And Moses takes the tent and pitches it." Note that the LXX says it was "*his* tent" (αὐτοῦ) in Exodus xxxiii, but "*the* tent" in Exodus xl, and here Rashi and other commentators regard it as Moses' tent. But it is not necessary to suppose that he actually with his own hands pitched it, no more than that he erected the large Tabernacle in Exodus xl. 18, where it is said "Moses reared up the tabernacle." Dr. McNeile regards it as "an ordinary nomad tent which Moses himself could carry and pitch outside the camp" (Num. p. 2). This seems absurd.

Driver objects to this tent being regarded as provisional. He says: "The same representation of the Tent of Meeting—outside the camp, seemingly also with Joshua as its guardian—is found in the Pentateuch even after the erection (Exod. xl) of the splendid tabernacle described by P; see Numbers xi. 16, 24–30; xii. 4, 5 (note especially 'come out' in ver. 4, and cf. Deut. xxxi. 14f.)".[2]

Is this statement accurate? we ask. It is repeated by Chapman and McNeile. But let us examine the passages mentioned to prove that we have in JE and P different representations of the same structure.

(1) Numbers xi. 16, 24–30. This is the incident of Eldad and Medad, and *is assigned to E*. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel and their officers, and bring them unto the tent of meeting, that they may stand there with thee." If this was the tent referred to in Exodus xxxiii. 7, which we have treated as a provisional tent, and which the

[1] See Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, p. 315, where the imperfect is used (*a*) "of constantly repeated actions," and (*b*) of "momentary actions on the same principle as we employ the present tense in lively representations of the past."

[2] *Exodus*, p. 427.

Critics regard as the only tent or tabernacle in the days of Moses, we are faced with a number of difficulties. The provisional tent was outside the camp, but this tent is not necessarily outside the camp. The Critics have laid stress upon the meaning of the Hebrew *yatsa'* (יָצָא),[1] in the case of Eldad and Medad, who "had not *gone out* unto the tent, and they prophesied in the camp" (ver. 26). The LXX simply renders "came to" (ἦλθον πρός). The same Hebrew verb is used in verse 24: "Moses *went forth* (ἐξῆλθε LXX.) and told the people the words of the Lord." Here it implies a central position, such as the Mosaic Tabernacle of P occupied. It cannot surely mean that Moses went *outside the camp* to speak to the people in the camp. The camp lay all around the Tabernacle, and at some distance. There is nothing inconsistent with that position in this narrative. Eldad and Medad remained in the camp. They did not go to the Tabernacle. The order to Moses regarding the seventy was "bring them unto the tent of meeting," not "bring them *outside*, unto the tent." The Hebrew verb (לָקַח) means "take"; the LXX. "thou shalt lead" (ἄξεις), not "lead *out*," which would have been used had this tent been outside the camp. In verse 30: "And Moses *gat* him into the camp, he and the elders of Israel," the Hebrew verb (אָסַף) is used which means to add or gather. It was used in verse 24: "And he gathered seventy men of the elders; and set them round about the tent." Now if we must render this verb in verse 30, "Moses *went back* into the camp, he and the elders," we must give it the same meaning in verse 24, and taking the verb *yatsa'* in the sense "come out" according to Driver,[2] we have this sentence: "Moses went outside the camp, and told the people the words of the Lord, and brought back into the camp seventy men." This would have the effect of putting the whole congregation outside the camp. And this is the logical result of the attempt to put this tent outside the camp. But if we regard the tent in the passage as being in the very centre of the camp, with a clear space around it, everything works out harmoniously,[3]

[1] This verb is followed by no preposition in Hebrew, but by a noun in aquasi accusative case.

[2] *Exodus*, p. 427.

[3] In Numbers xvi. 12. If the words are to be taken literally, one would imagine from Dathan and Abiram's answer to Moses, "We will not come up" (*na'aleh*, נַעֲלֶה), that Moses was still on a height. It would be more suitable that the camp should be erected round a rising eminence as a sort of *dun* than to have such an eminence close by, a vantage ground for foes.

Moses simply goes forth from the " tent " " to address the people who are around the ' tent.' "

(2) Again, see Numbers xii. 4, 5, also assigned to E by the Critics, the dispute with Aaron and Miriam, verse 4 : " Come out ye three unto the tent of meeting. And they three came out. And the Lord came down in a pillar of cloud, and stood at the door of the tent, and called Aaron and Miriam ; and they both *came forth.*" Dr. Driver calls attention to this verb " *come out* " (*yatsa'*). We have already shown that it does not necessarily imply that the Tent of Meeting was outside the camp, as it would be impossible to adhere consistently to this meaning without falling into self-contradictions.

Aaron and his sister would have had to come forth from their own tents to go to the tent of meeting wherever it might be.

In neither of these passages is anything said about Joshua acting as " caretaker " of this tent. In Numbers xi. 28, he is there with the seventy elders as " the minister of Moses ; " in Numbers xii he is not mentioned.

(3) Deuteronomy xxxi. 14, 15. In this passage, also assigned to JE, Joshua is appointed to succeed Moses. " Call Joshua, and present yourselves in the tent of meeting, that I may give him a charge. And Moses and Joshua *went*, and presented themselves in the tent of meeting." Here there is another verb which does not mean " go out," but simply " go."[1] The Hebrew word to " present themselves " is the same word as is rendered " stand " in Numbers xi. 16 (*yatsabh* in Hithpael). There is nothing to show that this tent was " outside the camp," and this verse is a proof that Joshua was *not* the caretaker of it. It is also to be noted that the LXX has : " Call Joshua, and do ye stand at (στῆτε παρά) the *doors of the tent* of witness." As the LXX suggests, the Hebrew preposition (בְּ) might equally well be rendered *at* as *in* in Deuteronomy xxxi. 14—" present yourselves *at* the tent of meeting." See 1 Samuel xxix. 1 : " *at* the fountain " (בְּעַיִן) ; " *at* the gate " (בַּשַּׁעַר), 2 Kings vii. 17. There was nothing, then, in the behaviour of Joshua, who was an Ephraimite, or in that of the seventy elders who stood round the tent, contrary to the regulations of P, which apparently forbade a stranger or non-Levite from entering it, although they might stand at the door of the Tabernacle (Lev. i. 3 ; iii. 2 ; Num. i. 51).

[1] *Yalak* (יָלַךְ), ἐπορεύθη.

There is nothing in these three passages cited by Driver to show that this tent was outside the camp, or that it was a simple tent, or that Joshua was its caretaker. There is nothing inconsistent in what is said about it with what is said of the Tabernacle in P. Accordingly, these three passages do not show that " the provisional tent of Moses, of which Joshua was in charge, was in existence and use after the erection of the splendid tabernacle of P."

Strange as it may appear, there is one passage (Num. xix. 3) assigned to P by the Critics which distinctly implies that the Tent of Meeting—" the splendid tabernacle described by P and placed by him in the centre of the camp,"—was " outside the camp." The red heifer was to be brought without the camp ; there her body was to be burnt, and her blood sprinkled toward the front of the tent of meeting, and afterwards the priest was to come into the camp. Was this the tent of Moses of which Joshua was caretaker ? Why, then, is there no mention of Joshua, but only of Eleazar the priest ? " Ye shall give her (the red heifer) unto Eleazar the priest, that he may bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face." The unbiased critic will doubtless agree that the Higher Critics have not established their position regarding the provisional tent of Moses, and that the evidence produced by us against the theory of the post-exilic date of the Mosaic Tabernacle is stronger than the evidence produced on its behalf.

Finally, we have now to answer the principal objections of the Critics to the historical character of the Tabernacle, as we have it described in the Pentateuch. These are set forth by Driver in his work on Exodus,[1] and repeated by later commentators of his school. He writes : " For these reasons—the presumable absence of the skill and the means for constructing it, the divergent representations of it found in the Pentateuch itself, and the impossibility of finding a place for it in the early religion of Israel given in Judges and Samuel —it does not seem possible to regard the Tent of Meeting as described by P as historical " (p. 430). He regards it, then, as a physical impossibility for the Israelites at Mt. Sinai to have constructed or conveyed this heavy and costly fabric.

What evidence has he to prove the Israelites had not the necessary skill ? Is it sufficient to assert that the Hebrews were a " subject nation," " nomad tribes," whose " painful occupations were

[1] *App.* iv. 426–432.

the pasturing of cattle, and the forced labour of the corvée" (p. 427)? What proof is there that all the Hebrews were herds or brick-labourers? None whatever. Is it at all probable that among the men who built for Pharaoh the store cities of Rameses, now identified by the remains of a town and temple of Rameses II, and Pithom (Exod. i. 11), who lived in houses of brick (Exod. xii. 12), who presumably could make graven images (Exod. xx. 4), who were surrounded by Egyptian art of all kinds on every side, were none who had any skill in metal-work, joinery or embroidery, in which the Egyptians, as Dr. Flinders Petrie[1] has pointed out, excelled? Are we to believe that among the people, who have proved themselves one of the most brilliant and gifted in the world, were none who had any ability except to make a brick, carry a brick, and lay a brick? And indeed a skilful bricklayer is a man who can easily advance to higher things. Have any tried to build a wall, not to say a house, without ability, skill, training, measurements, designs or specifications? It would soon fall to the ground. Bricklaying may be coarse work, but it demands trained hands, eyes, and intelligence. The appointment of two artists—Bezalel and Oholiab, and others who were "wise-hearted," i.e., "possessed artistic aptitudes" (Driver), is a confutation of this statement. But the Critics assign this passage to P_3, so as to cancel its evidence!

Let us hear Dr. Driver again: "When the Hebrews had been long settled in Palestine, and had no doubt added something to their knowledge of Art from their contact with the Canaanites, Solomon hired Phœnician workmen to make all the metal furniture and vessels of the Temple. 1 Kings vii. 13f., 41ff." (p. 427). Even if Solomon did so, his action would have a parallel in the action of those who used to bring over Italian workmen to do the stucco work in their Georgian houses in England and Ireland. Could that be cited in the year 3000 as proof that the England of the eighteenth century—the England of Joshua Reynolds—was utterly ignorant of the fine arts?

But Driver appears to have here, as elsewhere, overstated his case. The Phœnician *workmen* turn out on investigation to be one man, Hiram, who had exceptional skill in one kind of metal-work. Does this prove that the Hebrews had no skill in other metal-work, or even in this? Suppose Driver engaged an American

[1] See *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt* and *Egypt and Israel.*

counsel for his case. Would that imply that there were no barristers in England, or that they were not equally good? His own opinion on this question would not affect the case on the point. And if he brought one counsel from America, would that justify a reporter, when writing an account of the case for the Press, in saying that the whole Bar consisted of Americans, as no Englishman was competent? And yet Dr. Driver reached a similar conclusion from a similar premise. It is not proved, then, that the want of skilled labour among the Hebrews would not permit of their executing so artistic a work.

We now come to the argument based on the lack of proper material. In the first place, we note that the timber used was the shittim wood which grows so plentifully in the region of Mt. Sinai. Next, that before the Israelites left Egypt they received jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and "utterly spoiled the Egyptians." Dr. Driver estimates the weight of gold used in the Tabernacle as one and a quarter tons; silver, four and a quarter tons; bronze, three tons.[1] Computing the number of families at 45,000 (double that of first born—Num. iii. 43), it would work out at nearly one ounce of gold, three ounces of silver, and under two and a half ounces of bronze per family. That would not mean a very great deal, and considering the aptitude the Hebrews possessed from the earliest days for acquiring such things, it would not be an excessive offering on their part to God. "Moreover," it is said, "it would be very difficult to procure the olive oil for the lamps, and the dyes—violet and purple from Tyrian shellfish, and crimson from an insect found on a particular kind of oak tree."[2] It is not stated that these things were procured in the wilderness. It is distinctly stated that they had brought them with them from Egypt. "Every man with whom was found blue and purple and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and rams' skins dyed red, and sealskins, brought them." (Exod. xxxv. 23[3] It seems strange that critics should commit such errors where a concordance would have saved them. This passage is referred to by the critics to P_s!

The Critics also allege that the descriptions are found to be marked by "*omissions and obscurities.*"[4] Driver enumerates six.

[1] *Exodus*, p. 427. [2] McNeile, *Exodus*, p. lxxxi.

[3] Assigned by the Critics to P_3 (!). It evidently upset their theory somewhat, therefore it must be much more recent even than P.

[4] Driver, *Exodus*, p. 426.

He says: "Nothing is said of the shape of the cherubim, the nature and position of the ledge on the bronze altar, the position of the border round the table of Presence-bread, the thickness of the solid gold mercy-seat, and especially of the thickness of the boards or 'frames,' or of the manner in which the hollow wooden case, plated with bronze, which formed the altar of burnt-offering, was to be used." His conclusion is that these "obscurities and omissions" indicate that the descriptions "are not the work of an eyewitness."

Now these six omissions could have been rectified by the addition of six verses. The directions for the construction of the Tabernacle occupy 179 verses (cc. xxv–xxviii, xxx). And because the writer who was able to give such a full account of other matters, omitted to give a few details which the Critics have seized upon as important, he was not an eyewitness! Would any journalist of 1918, who had given an account of Westminster Abbey, consider a critic of the year 2018 unprejudiced who would say that his account was not that of an eyewitness because he had omitted to give a full account of the coronation-chair, and of the size and kind of stone, or of the tombs of Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots, in the Abbey? It is nowhere stated that the description is, as Driver alleges, "the working directions upon which a fabric, such as described, could be actually constructed."[1] They are not as minute and precise as the ordinary specifications for a house. It is implied that they were supplemented by a "pattern" as design, which Moses mentions twice (Exod. xxv. 9, 40). The fact that the Critics do not understand the exact arrangement of the pillars and the hangings, a thing which could have been made clear by the sketch, cannot be said to be due to the inexactness of the writer. But if that writer had specified the distances between the pillars, and those distances would not work out harmoniously with the rest of the plan, then one might have said something about his inaccuracy. Whereas now it is our information that is at fault, and reasoning based upon imperfect information is never sound.

The weight of the Tabernacle is also an objection. "It is alleged that the Merarites have only four wagons assigned to them, evidently an altogether insufficient number."[2] Driver refers to Numbers,

[1] The Critic of 2018, knowing nothing of the removal of this stone during the war, would assert, like all these critics, that it had never been removed, because he did not happen to find a record of its removal.

[2] Driver, *Exodus*, p. 426. [3] *Exodus*, p. 426.

vii. 8, but he should have proceeded to the next verse : " But unto the sons of Kohath he gave none (i.e., oxen and wagons) : because the service of the sanctuary belonged to them ; they bare it upon their shoulders." The smallness of the number of the wagons is, after all, a proof of the honesty of the writer. He could easily have given forty, if he chose. A great portion of the furniture, etc., was carried by the Kohathites, and doubtless a great deal of the fabric was borne by the Merarites (see Num. iii. 31, 36).

Consequently we are justified in blaming our opponents for making mountains out of molehills. With one keen eye for anything that may help to establish their theory, they turn their blind side to all that is against it, e.g., the evident similarity to many Egyptian customs and arrangements in the structure and furniture of the Tabernacle. As one may see from such a handbook as Dr. Flinders Petrie's *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt*, the Egyptian was " completely master of the arts of combined labour, of masonry, of sculpture, of metal-working, of turning, of carpentry, of pottery, of weaving, of dyeing, and other elements of a highly organized social life." (p. 151). It is also evident from recent discoveries that there was much gold and silver and bronze in the Egypt of Moses' day, the period of the Nineteenth Dynasty. In his *Egypt and Israel* (p. 47f.) Dr. F. Petrie describes the remains of a large temple built in Sinai at Serabît al Khādem, by Egyptians, dating before the Exodus, showing small upright altars of incense, lavers for washing, etc. The Jewish altar of incense was the smallest altar, and stood before the ark (Exod. xxx. 27 ; xl. 5). For the laver, see Exodus xxx. 18. Burnt-offerings were also made in the high place at Serabît, as the pile of ashes shows.

It is also pointed out by Egyptologists that the Egyptians had sacred arks or chests for their gods, with figures of Maat or Truth spreading wings over at each end, giving point to such phrases as " Mercy and Truth are met together " (Ps. lxxxv. 10). An illustration is given by Dr. Flinders Petrie in *Egypt and Israel* (p. 62). This may have suggested the idea of the Cherubim with outstretched wings over the ark. The border of the high priest's robe, consisting of bells and pomegranates (Exod. xxviii. 33–34), is modelled after the Egyptian border of lotus flowers and seed-vessels.[1] The dignity of the priestly office, the linen robes of the priests, and the

[1] *Egypt and Israel*, p. 62.

mitre of the high priest are Egyptian. And the position and various divisions of the Tabernacle may also have been modelled after Egyptian temples, in which the Holy of Holies was at the west end and shut off by a vail.

As regards Shiloh, where the Tabernacle was placed for many years, it is interesting to know that its site is fixed with certainty, and Sir Charles Wilson in the *Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, 1873, pointed out a level court 77 feet wide and 412 feet long, in the " tell," which might have been prepared for the Tabernacle.

To sum up: We have shown that not one of the Critical objections to the historical character of the Mosaic Tabernacle would be accepted as valid evidence in a modern court of justice, and we have also demonstrated by lines of proof, literary, documentary and archæological, such as would be accepted as evidence in a modern court of justice, that the Mosaic Tabernacle of Exodus xxx–xl, instead of being one of the greatest fictions of the world, is one of its indisputable facts.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

NEW BOOK ON PRAYER.

IN TOUCH WITH THE THRONE: A Study of the Prevailing Power of Prayer. By Rev. Dr. James Little. London: *Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

During the testing days of the war, the power of prayer was manifested both at home and on the battlefield. Dr. Little hopes that, as events have now created a deeper interest in prayer, there will be fostered its regular, sustained exercise in the days to come. He views the present moment as exceedingly opportune to turn people's minds again to this subject; and his hope is that it will be given a larger and more commanding place in the life both of the individual and of the nation.

While we cannot quite consider Dr. Little as another Spurgeon, or as Luther *redivivus*, as Dr. Alexander Whyte does, we are glad of the opportunity to recommend heartily these twenty short chapters on Prayer. One sometimes thinks that there are so many books on the subject that there is scarcely room for another; but we can assure the reader that this volume justifies its publication. While it is not of a very deep character, it is most readable and very helpful.

Dr. Little has culled an enormous amount of illustrations from the lives of Christian saints and others. A small selection will illustrate this: Liddon, William Law, Henry Drummond, Spurgeon, Thomas à Kempis, Bunyan, Andrew Murray, Ambrose, Ruskin, George Meredith, William James, Dora Greenwell, etc. The chapter on Prayer and Missions is illustrated from the lives and labours of Hudson Taylor, William Carey, Livingstone, Brainerd, John G. Paton, Mary Slessor, etc.

From among the twenty chapters we may select a few which will illustrate in some measure the scope of the book: The Philosophy of Prayer; Prayer and Pentecost; Prayer and Bible Study; Prayer and Holiness; Prayer in Sickness and Sorrow; Prayer and the Second Coming of the Lord.

THOMAS KELLY: EVANGELIST AND HYMN-WRITER.

By the Rev. S. R. Cambie, B.D., Litt.

ALTHOUGH, as we shall see, some of his hymns are well known, it is probable that comparatively few people know much about Thomas Kelly. As his name indicates, he was an Irishman, born in Dublin on July 13, 1769—that is to say, nearly a hundred years later than Dr. Isaac Watts, and about fifty years later than Charles Wesley. His father—also Thomas Kelly—was a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, and the son in due course entered Trinity College, Dublin. After taking his degree he went to London to read for the Bar, and entered the Temple. His conversion, however, led to his abandoning the legal profession and he was ordained in 1792. He now came into touch with the revivalism which was then making itself felt, and caught its spirit. Eloquent, cultured and fervent, his preaching attracted large numbers of thoughtful people. Unfortunately, those were days when earnestness was at a discount, and the activities of Kelly and his friend Rowland Hill, brought down upon them the wrath of Dr. Fowler, the then Archbishop of Dublin, who inhibited them from preaching in his Diocese. This closed to him the pulpits of the Established Church, but of course it did not stay his witness. It was indeed an excellent advertisement, and Kelly became from that time a sort of free lance and enjoyed considerable popularity. He continued to minister for a time in Dublin, preaching in a building known as Bethesda and in a hall in Plunket Street. The ill-advised action of the Archbishop served to alienate him and his followers from the Church, and finally he severed all connection with it and gave himself up to itinerant Evangelistic work.

Henceforth it is a little difficult to locate him ecclesiastically. Soon after his secession we find him in close touch with the founder of "Brethrenism," but later on he seems to have struck out on a line of his own. Possessed of ample means he erected at his own expense preaching-houses in different places. The sect he thus formed died out eventually, but so long as he lived, and acted in the capacity of superintendent of the congregations, his popular

gifts and the attractiveness of his personality kept the Kellyites, as they were called, together. It is worth noticing that another Irish hymn-writer, John Walker, who was born in the same year (1769), had a very similar career, a Fellow of the T.C.D. and in Holy Orders, he, too, seceded and became head of a sect known as the Walkerites. This shared the fate of the Kellyites in a short time. Kelly's generosity, enthusiasm and humility won for him the admiration of many who did not at all agree with him. He does not seem at any time to have officially connected himself with any nonconformist body—he was one of those men who cannot easily be whittled down and fitted into a denominational candlestick,—and we find him, to the very last, maintaining friendly relations with Evangelical Christians inside and outside the Church. As he lived to be 85 (dying in 1854), he witnessed the uprise and development of what is known as the Irish Revival, had some share in it, and when too old to do much, rejoiced over what God had wrought.

He was one of a small group of men with whom my maternal grandfather, Jonathan Willington Walsh, of Walsh Park, Birr, who had in early life been in the Navy and had served under Nelson, came to be associated. This group included James N. Darby, at one time a clergyman, but who seceded and eventually founded the "Darbyites" or Plymouth Brethren, Joseph Denham Smith, a Congregational Minister, the Revivalist for whom Merrion Hall, Dublin, was built on the lines of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, and lastly, but not least, C. H. MacIntosh, better known as "C. H. M.", whose Notes on Genesis, Exodus, etc., attained a wide circulation. I believe the materials for these "Notes" were being gathered together when he was living in my grandfather's house, tutoring my uncles for the Army. He was certainly one of the earliest and ablest exponents of the principles of the "exclusive" brethren. Most of these men had gone to their rest before I was born, but I have heard my mother tell of hearing Thomas Kelly preach in the conventicle he had erected at Athy. Of "C.H.M." I have a very distinct recollection—a very alarming person I thought him—and I remember his once asking my mother, in my hearing, if she was a Churchwoman, and if she intended to bring me up in that faith. When she replied in the affirmative, he said, "I am afraid, Mary, you are in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity." I can-

not have been more than eight or nine, and I do not think I understood in the least what he meant (I wonder if he knew himself?), but I know I thought it was something horrible, and I am afraid that in my childish soul I hated him!

I could say much about the fruits of "Brethrenism" in that one family, but I forbear. Those who want to know more should read Mr. Edmund Goss's story in *Father and Son*. Mine would be a similarly tragic tale, though it is only fair, I think, to the memory of my grandfather to say that he severed his connection with the "Brethren" when J. N. Darby took upon himself to excommunicate Benjamin Wills Newton, who admitted Evangelical Christians of any denomination to the "Breaking of Bread." Thus began the division into two hostile camps—the "open" and "close" Brethren. It is a sad story of jealousy and ill-feeling and the feud has continued to this day. It is perhaps worth recording that B. W. Newton (another ex-Episcopalian clergyman, and a man of great ability), retired to Plymouth, where he established his great "meeting" which gave rise to the sobriquet "Plymouth Brethren." I hope I may be pardoned for this digression.

To return to the subject of this sketch. It is as a hymn-writer that Thomas Kelly will be best remembered. As the writer of the article on him in Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology* observes, his compositions have never received the consideration to which they are entitled at the hands of editors. To Victoria, Lady Carbery belongs the credit of having made more use of them than any compiler in recent years. His best known hymns are: "The head that once was crowned with thorns," "We sing the praise of Him who died," and "Through the day Thy love has spared us." These have found a place in practically every modern hymnal, and they belong to that class that may well be headed "Treasures." Mr. Ira D. Sankey included in *Sacred Songs and Solos* his charming hymn, "Look ye Saints, the sight is glorious," and several other collections have followed suit. He has left us a fine Easter Hymn:—

"Hark, ten thousand voices sounding
Far and wide throughout the sky,
'Tis the voice of joy abounding,
Jesus lives no more to die."

How often at Missionary dismissals have we sung:—

"Speed Thy servants, Saviour, speed them;
Thou art Lord of winds and waves."

This, too, we owe to him. There is an abundance of sweet consolation in his "Hark! a voice! it cries from heaven." Here is the second verse:—

"All their toils and conflicts over,
Lo they dwell with Christ above;
O! what glories they discover
In the Saviour whom they love!
Now they see Him face to face,
Him who saved them by His grace.

We have a beautiful hymn for a Vesper:—

"Of Thy love some gracious token,
Grant us Lord before we go;
Bless Thy word which has been spoken;
Life and peace to all bestow."

He boldly departed in many of his hymns from the ordinary metres—C.M., S.M., and L.M.—then so much in vogue, and was certainly not unsuccessful. The characteristic of his hymns is the delightful setting forth of the Glories of Jesus. Here, for instance, is the last verse of his hymn, "Who is this that comes from Edom?":—

"Mighty Victor, reign for ever;
Wear the Crown so dearly won;
Never shall Thy people, never
Cease to sing what Thou hast done.
Thou hast fought Thy people's foes;
Thou wilt heal Thy people's woes."

He wrote altogether 765 hymns, more than Dr. Wyatts, but fewer than Charles Wesley, who is said to have written 6,500! John Wesley, by the way, died in 1791, the year before Kelly's ordination, while Charles Wesley passed away three years before, so that it was only indirectly that his ministry was affected by the Methodist movement, but, like Watts and the Wesleys, he published several collections of hymns. The first of these, containing 247 hymns by various writers and 33 of his own, in an appendix, appeared in 1802. This was followed by another in 1804, which went through several editions, while a further collection of hymns hitherto unpublished, was printed in 1815, and finally all his hymns were printed in one volume in 1853. Lovers of hymns who are able to procure a copy will not regret the search for it which may be necessary.

S. R. CAMBIE.

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

IX. UNION IS STRENGTH IN THE PRAYER LIFE.

Text: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask for, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in Heaven, for where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them" (St. Matt. xviii. 19, 20).

[Book of the Month: Jesus as they saw Him[1] by J. A. Findlay=F. Other reff. Bruce's *Training of the Twelve*=B. *Expositor's Greek Test.*=EGT. Peake's *Commentary*=P. Plummer's *St. Matthew*=PM.]

All through this chapter Jesus is occupied with the alternative possibilities of the number two. The dangers of rival parties, the strife for supremacy (ver. 1); the child who is welcomed and helped, and the one who is hindered (vers. 5, 6); the two hands that work, one for God, and one for the Devil; the two feet that walk, one heavenward, one towards destruction; the two eyes that look, one at life, and one at death (vers. 8, 9; cf. v. 28, 29; vi. 22, 23); the flock safe, and the sheep strayed (vers. 12, 13); two brothers at variance (vers. 15–17; and see 21, 23); the two attitudes towards debt (vers. 23-37). And here, in the heart of the chapter, the Power and the blessing of Two, whether eyes, feet, hands, brothers, or whatever else, where prayer is united and Jesus is invoked.

1. The Power of a Man to Reinforce his Fellow.

"Unlimited value is assigned to the prayers of two *of them*, if they are in harmony. This passage strikes a note, it should be observed that is not heard even in the Third Gospel where such emphasis is placed upon the efficacy of prayer. Individual prayer 'in secret' is rewarded, but the common prayer of two lovers of their Lord and

[1] *Jesus as they saw Him*, Part III, St. Matthew. 3*s.* 6*d.* J. A. Sharp. The Epworth Press. Two parts already noticed in these columns. Mr. Findlay continues in the same fresh, helpful vein. This is a mine for every expository preacher.

of each other is invariably successful in its particular object—' about any and every matter concerning which they shall make request.' There is no such explicit statement anywhere else in the first three Gospels, though Mark xi. 24 perhaps approaches it closely, and it deserves our closest attention; there faith, here love, is said to be the condition of effectual prayer; compare Ignatius to the Ephesians, ' for if the prayer of one and a second have such strength ' " (F. 259). So also " the smallest possible congregation is certain to be heard when it unites in prayer " (PM. 54). It is an immediate offer of blessing. " Jesus deals in small numbers, not from modesty in His anticipation, but because they suit the present condition " (EGT. I. 241). And as Dr. Bruce says, " The promise avails for the smallest number that can make a meeting—even for two or three " (B. 207). It will develop into a larger matter by and by. It is " not the measure of Christ's expectation of agreement among His disciples, but of the moral power that lies in the sincere consent of even two minds. It outweighs the *nominal* agreement of thousands who have no real bond of union " (EGT. I. 240). But it will lead to the thousands notwithstanding (Acts i. 14; ii. 1, 46; iv. 24; v. 12. " one accord " as a Church principle, and see i. 15; ii. 41; iv. 4). " For we must not fancy that God has any *partiality* for a little meeting, or that there is any virtue in a small number " (B. 208).

This is of great importance in dealing, e.g., with Plymouth Brethren, whose principle only succeeds so long as their growth does not succeed! It is unworkable for two or three hundreds or thousands. It is harmony that is in Christ's mind. " He did not wish His Church to consist of a collection of clubs having no intercommunion with each other, any more than He desired it to be a monster hotel, receiving and harbouring all comers, no questions being asked. He made the promise . . . to encourage the cultivation of virtues which have ever been too rare on earth—brotherly-kindness, meekness, charity " (B. 208). So we consider

2. The Power of Love to make Unity of Diversity.

Christian music is not unison, but harmony. Not one note, or one idea, but love blending differences into perfection. " Harmony is so all-important to Christian prayer (' are agreed ' is a musical term; cf. Luke xv. 25, ' a symphony,' a closely related word) that the Christian must be endlessly forbearing with his brother " (F. 260).

" The agreement He requires of His disciples is not entire unanimity in opinion, but consent of mind and heart in the ends they aim at, and in unselfish devotion to those ends " (B. 208). " Mark xi. 25 implies, ' Where two of you are disagreed, nothing good is *possible* ' ; Matt. xviii. 19 asserts that where ' two of you are agreed, nothing good is *impossible* ' " (F. II. 121). " The promise made to consent in prayer comes in appropriately in a discourse delivered to disciples who had been disputing who should be the greatest. In this connexion the promise means : ' So long as ye are divided by dissensions and jealousies, ye shall be impotent alike with men and with God ; in your ecclesiastical procedure as church rulers, and in your supplications at the throne of grace. But if ye be united in mind and heart, ye shall have power with God, and shall prevail ; My Father will grant your requests, and I Myself will be in the midst of you ' " (B. 207). But of course this is not meant to stultify the workings of God's great laws, only to secure harmony with their principles. " The saying in Matthew does not mean that God is pledged to grant whatever any two persons agree to ask. His will is to grant what is best for them, and what two agree about is likely to be good, especially if Christ is with them " (PM. 255). " In the passage in Matthew there is manifestly a rising note ; we pass from power on earth (xviii. 18) to power with God (ver. 19) while in verse 20 heaven comes down to earth. With verse 20 should be compared 1 Cor. v. 4 and Matt. xxviii. 20 (' I with you ') " (F. 260).

3. The Power of Christ to Correct Loneliness.

Loneliness has been normally corrected by family life (see Gen. ii. 18 ; Ps. lxviii. 6). " The ' two ' of xviii. 19 become in xviii. 20 ' two or three.' Clement of Alexandria makes the delightful suggestion that the ' two or three ' are ' father, mother, and child ' ; notice how the third party slips in as the child becomes part of the home, almost without the parents' knowing it—he has not to pay his footing ; he is just there—and the presence of this welcome third party is not necessary, for it may be ' two *or* three,' but it helps wonderfully ; the ' two ' are the believing husband and wife " (F. 260). There is in a sense a compelling power in the united voice, which is not found in the single person. " Jesus adopts the O.T. idea of the mystic presence of God in Israel (cf. Joel ii. 27 ; Mal. iii. 16 ; and Pirke Aboth, iii. 8, ' Two that sit together and are

occupied in the words of the Law have the Shekinah among them ') " (P. 716). There is therefore a privilege which a soul may miss through no fault of its own. Suppose a man is alone, then what happens? We find a possible answer in a saying of Christ outside Scripture, " the saying found in the famous Oxyrhynchus papyrus and restored by Blass as follows: ' Wherever there are two, they are not without God, and where one is alone, I say, I am with Him '—so making the requisite two. Perhaps the most natural and satisfying explanation of the words which follow the sentence just quoted, ' Raise the stone, and you shall find me; cleave the wood, and there am I ' can be found in the suggestion that Jesus is here pronouncing His blessing on the lonely missionary, church-builder, and path-finder, parted by the very conditions of his pioneer work from Christian fellowship." (F. ii. 120).

> " ' Something we knew of what he first had felt,
> Who walked alone with God, and had no higher
> Of humankind to be a help to him.'"
> (*The Disciples*).

"It provides us with the counterpart of Matt. xviii. 19, 20" (F. II. 120). " This unwritten saying provides for the lonely soul, for ' where one of you is alone, I am with him,' said Jesus—He must have said it—and that makes two; in John xiv. 23 this pair—Christ and the Christian—becomes a trio, for where Christ is God is, and that makes three—' we will come to him,' etc." (F. 260). And if any one is lonely because his brother is holding aloof in anger, as in the context, then " mutual hindrance can be robbed of its power to hurt and thwart by mutual prayer; where the other will not or cannot pray with you, as Peter could not with his Master, you must pray alone, for the Lord will make the second; where He is one of the two, the third will not be long in coming in " (F. 304).

OUT TO WIN. by the Rev. Guy Thornton, ex-Chaplain to the New Zealand Expeditionary Force. London: *S. W. Partridge.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

This book contains one hundred new illustrations from real life, and is dedicated to all Christians who are out to win souls to the Saviour; and is intended to be a help to young Christians, as well as an assistance to workers of all classes and creeds, by providing them with experiences from the writer's own ministry. There are twelve chapters, which more or less group the spiritual conditions. The pages are always interesting and very often stimulating. There is no doubt as to the earnestness of the writer's zeal and simpleness of his purpose. These illustrations possess a quality which is not always evident in such collections: " No illustration found in these pages has been untested." May God speed the effort.

MEMORIES OF CANON CHRISTOPHER.

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

(*Continued from* The Churchman *of October, p.* 570.)

[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.]

VIII. OXFORD: CENTRAL YEARS. (ii), 1871–1885.

Letters from Dr. Pusey.

ONE letter from Dr. Pusey deals with an important point in Mr. Gill's Lecture referred to in the correspondence with Canon Liddon, and it will be readily noted how markedly different Dr. Pusey's tone is from that of his advocate.

Christ Church, *Christmas Eve*, 1878.

I am distressed to see that in a letter to the *Oxford Times* you have endorsed Mr. Gill's accusation against me of subverting some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and first of the Atonement. I venture to enclose to you some prayers suggested to the dying, out of the prayer from which Mr. Gill took some of his accusations. There are very many more. In his earnestness to find matters of accusation against me, Mr. Gill must have overlooked them, although they are close to what he selected as ground of accusation. I send a copy of them to you that you may think whether he who suggested them would tamper with the doctrine of the Atonement. The writer from whom they are taken is one whom the English love as almost one with themselves, S. Francois de Sales. One "who tampered with the doctrine of the Atonement" would not be such a favourite with the English people as the author of *The Love of God*, *The Devout Life*, whom the English read, as if he had been one of us.

I venture also to send you a sermon which I wrote lately as a University sermon. With it, too, doubtless you would find much to disagree; but you would not say the one who wrote pp. 40–42 "subverted the doctrine of the Atonement." In my University Sermons (Vol. II), there are two written to maintain the doctrine of the Atonement against attacks then recent. I have just been reminded that after my Lenten Sermon, "Christ in you the hope of glory," one leaving the Church said, "No one can say he does not preach Christianity." Among my adapted books, one was *The Sufferings of Jesus*, the one great Portugese book, written by one who suffered much for Christianity in guarding the Portugese prisoners in Africa from apostasy.

With regard to the aspersion on which Mr. Gill founded his grave charge, I had no idea that any would identify it with *Our Lord's Expiation on the Cross*. Those for whom I edited the book would not. It did not occur to me that people would look at the book simply (as Mr. Gill has done), to pick holes in it, or to cull out stones to fling at me. Expiation (as you would see in Richardson's English Dictionary) is a word in popular use. Could I have foreseen that it would give offence to any one, I would have substituted

some other for it, and even now would cancel the pages and substitute another expression if it would do any good. In my own writing I have taken pains, since I began writing some forty-four years ago, to use terms which would not be misunderstood, avoiding terms which, though right and true, were taken in a wrong sense. Thus, I used the words "made children of God," rather than "regenerate," because people in those days attached the idea of actual conversion to regeneration.

ii. In former days I used to refer to the Homilies for the use of the word "Sacrament," of any but the two great sacraments. My doing so gave even more offence than the use of the term itself. Yet the Homily on Swearing speaks of the "sacrament of matrimony," and the Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments says, "Although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean, laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in absolution, as the visible sign in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are, and therefore absolution is no such sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. It does not deny, but rather implies, that it is in some sense a sacrament.

iii. It certainly was an oversight that I overlooked the words "extraordinary supererogation," not thinking that people would think that I admitted the phrase in a sense which would contradict the Article. I have now cancelled the page, though I fear that Mr. Gill would dislike the change, since he will have a stone less to cast at me.

And now in the time when the angels first sung at that Blessed Nativity of our dear Lord, "Peace on earth, goodwill towards men," do let us try to understand each other as well as we can. It has always been a joy to me to recognize the truths which your friends hold, and to feel how much we have in common. It is a hard battle which we who love our Lord have to fight with those who deny Him. At least let us pray Him for one another.

Yours faithfully in Christ Jesus,

E. B. PUSEY.

Since writing the above, I have determined to cancel all the pages in which the word "expiate" occurs, although Bishop Taylor uses the word "expiation" of repentance.

There is no record of a reply from Mr. Christopher, but he would assuredly reciprocate the spirit of the letter, which is an interesting illustration of some oft-quoted words of Dr. Pusey—"I have always had a great love for the Evangelicals." In fairness, however, both to Mr. Christopher and Mr. Gill, it can be shown from the statements of Mr. Gill's Lecture that the terms used by Dr. Pusey were clearly open to the Lecturer's condemnation, and it is therefore a great satisfaction that Dr. Pusey determined to cancel these pages. The wonder is that they were ever allowed to appear in a publication intended for Anglican clergymen. The references to Penance, Supererogation, and the doctrine of the Sacraments, are equally opposed to the obvious statements of the Articles. Like Canon Liddon, Dr. Pusey never attempted to vindicate his adaptation of a Roman Catho-

lic book to the English Church, while retaining some of the distinctive Roman errors. Mr. Christopher would have been the first to appreciate and respond to the tender and beautiful words of Dr. Pusey's closing appeal. While always fully recognizing the agreement between Evangelical and High Churchmen on such fundamental truths as the Trinity and the Deity of our Lord, yet Mr. Christopher never allowed this to interfere with his solemn protests against what he believed to be the errors of extreme Churchmen in regard to the position taken by our Church at the Reformation. Dr. Pusey, Canon Liddon and others of the same school were frequently urging the need of unity against Rationalism, and Evangelicals were never backward in expressing their own abhorrence of anything that tended to subvert the truths of the Deity and Atonement of Christ, but writers of the extreme Anglican school were often forgetful of the fact that by an inevitable rebound Ritualism is constantly productive of rationalistic errors against our Lord's Deity.

But it is interesting to notice that notwithstanding these severe encounters, the personal relations between Mr. Christopher and Dr. Pusey were not affected, as may be seen by the following beautiful letter from the latter, written, it will be observed, soon after the events and correspondence just recorded.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD. *Jan.* 1, 1879.

MY DEAR MR. CHRISTOPHER,—

I thank you much for your kind wishes and kind present, which I shall value as a testimony of your Christian charity. But pray do not write to me as "eminent," or yourself as "inferior." It pains me so who knows myself to be nothing.

As for reading your kind present, I have just now my hands very full. I was finishing some notes on a sermon on prophecy, by which I hoped to waken some out of their unbelief, and some on an old sermon on Everlasting punishment, when, on the one hand, I find myself appealed to by Dr. Farrar[1] in his sad, fierce book, on the other, attacked by Mr. Gill as subverting the Christian Faith. So you see I have enough on my hands for 78.

You write to me as if I were a Ritualist. I never was. But I think them the objects of an unjust persecution, founded on an unjust judgement. For if they had been altogether wrong about the ornament rubric, the Church of England would have misled them, by omitting "not" in the so-called ornament rubric.

However, this is only by the way.

I have been thinking what I would ask you to accept as a New Year gift from me; but I mistrust anything of my own. So will you accept a

[1] The *Eternal Hope* controversy.

volume of one, whose belief I shared in all things, but whose humble loving soul escaped rubbing people up, as I did somehow Mr. Gill.

With every good wish for this and all your coming years.

Yours very faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.

THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY.

Soon after the correspondence with Canon Liddon, Mr. Christopher sent him, as he had decided to do, a copy of Mozley's *Review of the Baptismal Controversy*, and received the following reply :—

DEAR MR. CHRISTOPHER,—

I am much obliged to you for sending me a copy of Dr. Mozley's *Review of the Baptismal Controversy*. I shall value your gift, although I have been more or less familiar with the book for many years, and have talked parts of it over with its author.

Of course, it is marked by the great ability which distinguishes everything that he wrote. But the method of explaining the language of the Baptismal Service by the theory of a "charitable hypothesis," appears to me to belong to that family of theological solvents, which is apt to do more destructive work than is at all intended by the writers who employ them for a particular purpose. You would be acquainted with theories of "accommodation," by the aid of which the great texts in the New Testament which, as we both believe, teach the doctrine of the atonement, are emptied of their natural meaning, by Socinianizing writers.

If Baptismal Regeneration is not the doctrine of the Church of England, the language of the Baptismal Service is very misleading for plain people. When administering Baptism, we are instructed to pray that "this infant, coming to Thy Holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual Regeneration," and that God would "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin," and then, when the rite is complete, to announce that "this child is regenerate." And we teach our little children to say that in baptism each one was made "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." It seems to me that the natural sense of this language will outlive the subtleties upon which the Gorham decision was based : and that, if the Church of England had desired to leave the matter an open question, or to deny the Revealed doctrine of baptismal grace, she would have done better to omit from her formularies passages which, to ordinary apprehensions, seem to affirm the doctrine more explicitly than does the corresponding language of the Church of Rome.

If, unhappily, I did not believe in Baptismal Regeneration, I should lose my faith in more than one Revealed Truth besides. The Rationalism which denies Sacramental Grace is the same Rationalism (only happily less consequent) as that which rejects the Atonement and the Holy Trinity ; and the arguments which enable it to achieve the one result are serviceable enough for the other. It is a great blessing that people do not see this, in very many cases ; it is better far to be illogical than unbelieving. But—truth has exigencies which are beyond control.

If, too, I rejected Baptismal Regeneration, and yet consented to use the Baptismal Service of the Church of England, I should not feel at liberty to denounce Ritualists, or any other persons, on the score of unfaithfulness to the *natural* sense of our formularies.

In saying this, I hope not to be thought insensible to the kind spirit which dictates, I am very sure, your New Year's gift.

Mr. Christopher always felt that Mozley's treatment was a more than sufficient answer to Canon Liddon's position, and he showed this by the circulation of extracts from Mozley's writings, in pamphlet form, under the title of "Baptismal Regeneration." The extracts had a remarkably large circulation, and were regarded as so important and convincing that they were subsequently reprinted and reissued by Canon Hay Aitken. The fact that the Gorham Judgment led the able Tractarian, J. B. Mozley, afterwards Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to examine the whole question, and to change his views, was something that Tractarians never really met, and the position, in spite of Canon Liddon's letter, is truly summed up by Balleine in his *History of the Evangelical Party.*

> Gorham was instituted to his benefice, and lived and worked quietly there until his death. The triumph of the Evangelicals on this point was complete. Not only had they convinced the judges, but they had convinced many of their opponents also. Archdeacon Manning, Archdeacon Wilberforce, and many other Tractarians, seceded to Rome rather than remain in a Church which was proved not to enforce the Roman doctrine of Baptism. On the other hand, one of the ablest Tractarians, J. B. Mozley, later the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, who was now editor of the *Christian Remembrancer*, which had succeeded the *British Critic* as the monthly organ of the party, was so impressed by the evidence brought forward that he entirely changed his opinions on this subject, and his *Review of the Baptismal Controversy* is still the ablest defence of most of the points for which the Evangelicals were contending (p. 227).

Canon Christopher all through his life laid the greatest stress on this question of Baptismal Regeneration, which he felt was the basis of all the errors connected with Ritualism. As an instance of this strong conviction, it may be mentioned that as late as 1910, when in his ninety-first year, he read Dr. Eugène Stock's volume of *Reminiscences* and wrote to the author pointing out the omission of all reference to Mozley's change of view. This elicited from Dr. Stock the following reply:—

> "I entirely agree with you I *ought* to have mentioned Mozley's recantation a most important event. My difficulty is, every page of the little book has to get in things that ought to be there, somehow, but my space was strictly limited! However, when I have to prepare for a new edition, I will sacrifice something in order to make room for the Mozley incident. I am grateful to you for pointing out my omission."

In sending me a copy of Dr. Stock's letter, of which the above is an extract, Canon Christopher made a further reference to the subject, which showed how important he felt it to be.

Church Association.

All through his long life in Oxford Mr. Christopher was connected with the Church Association, latterly as a Vice-President. This does not mean that he approved of everything the Church Association did, for it is known to some that he did not, but he never would allow such differences of opinion to lead to the severance of his connection with the Association. On the contrary, he continually upheld it as an organization which was founded for the express purpose of discovering the law of the Church of England, and of getting the Bishops to act in defence of the Church. He often pointed out that the Church Association was formed subsequent to the English Church Union, and for the express purpose of enabling the Bishops to know the exact legal position with regard to controverted points of ritual. Mr. Christopher was particularly fond of quoting certain words of the President of the E.C.U. before the Church Association took up legal proceedings :—

> The English Church Union only defended what the law of the Church of England ordered or permitted. Of course, there were some points in which the law was not very clear, but whatever the Courts of law should decide the English Church Union would of course be bound by.[1]

It is sometimes forgotten, when the Church Association is charged with "persecution," that the English Church Union put forth threats and made preparations before the Church Association took up legal proceedings.

A Cloud.

Mr. Christopher almost incurred the "woe" pronounced on those of whom all men speak well. But he did not quite escape, for in 1882 he suffered from a gross libel, which, however, only served to show the esteem in which he was held by all parties in Oxford. The result of the trial he had to institute in self-defence was a foregone conclusion. The person pleaded guilty at the Reading Assizes, and Mr. Christopher recommended him to mercy. As he had already been three months in prison, he received only three additional months' punishment. Unfortunately, the trouble did not cease with the trial, for scurrilous post cards came from time to time for years afterwards; indeed, up to the time of the person's death. One incident may be recorded as eminently characteristic

[1] The President of the English Church Union, at a meeting held in December, 1866.

of Mr. Christopher. When the trial was over and the Counsel were together in the Barristers' Room, he suggested thanksgiving to God for the result, and at once went down on his knees, followed by the members of the legal profession. One who was present humorously remarked to me that this was probably a novel experience for them! In Oxford there was a very remarkable sequel to the trial in the form of an address of confidence signed by almost all the leading personages of the University and city. In the long list of names are included the Vice-Chancellor, who at that time was Dr. Jowett, master of Balliol, all the Canons of Christ Church, Heads of Colleges, a large number of University Professors and Tutors, Graduates and Undergraduates, and people in the city, from Roman Catholics to Plymouth Brethren. The wording of the address was as follows:—

To the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, M.A., Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford.

March 10, 1884.

Reverend and Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned Graduates and Undergraduates of the University of Oxford, are desirous to express our deep sympathy with you at this time of sharp sorrow. We think it scarcely necessary to assure you of our undimished confidence and attachment—each year you have lived or ministered amongst us has increased our esteem for you. We are, dear Sir, Sincerely and affectionately yours,

If the printed list of nearly 200 names (besides a very large number of B.A.'s and Undergraduates) could be given, it would be seen to include the best known men in the Church and University from that day to this. No greater testimony could be given to the real worth of the man. In reference to this episode, the Dean of St. David's (Dr. Allan Smith) wrote to me the following reminiscence:—

Probably few men have surpassed Canon Christopher in the power of gaining the deep personal respect of his opponents. As a striking proof of this, on the occasion of a most scurrilous attack on his character, a testimonial letter was signed by almost every prominent member of the University (many of whom Canon Christopher had strongly opposed in his teaching and work), testifying most cordially to the unquestioned blamelessness and purity of his life. That printed letter I have carefully kept for nearly thirty years as, in my opinion, one of the most remarkable letters ever published in Oxford.

Twenty-Fifth Anniversary.

This part of Mr. Christopher's life may fitly close by a reference to the twenty-fifth Anniversary of his coming to St. Aldate's, when his parishioners and friends made him a presentation of a fine oil

painting of himself, together with a purse of 110 guineas. Those who have seen the painting in the Rectory dining-room will recall the coal-black hair, so different from the white hair of later days. Mr. Christopher was then, perhaps, at the height of his influence in Oxford. The inscription on the painting bore these words :—

PRESENTED, together with a purse of 110 guineas, to the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, M.A., Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford, by a large number of parishioners, members of the congregation, and personal friends, in recognition of his earnest and loving labours amongst them for upwards of five and twenty years. *January 1st*, 1885.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(*To be concluded.*)

CANON WILSON'S SERMONS.

CHRIST'S THOUGHT OF GOD. Ten sermons preached in Worcester Cathedral in 1919. By James M. Wilson, M.A., Canon of Worcester. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 5s. net.

Canon Wilson stands for Broad Churchmanship of the older school, and, if we do not always agree with him,—if we cannot endorse such views as those he holds on the Atonement, for example,—we can at least admire the lucidity and courage with which he states his opinions. He is up against the "childish anthropomorphic conception of God which produced and haunts some of our formulas and devotional language," and he holds that "it is destroying the credibility of the teaching of the Church." The view which Canon Wilson has given expression to in his Hulsean Lectures and in his little book, *How Christ Saves Us*, reappear in these pages. "Christ came not to save men from God's punishment, but from their own sins" (p. 42), but it remains true that in saving them from their sins He also saved them from the penalty due to those sins. No doubt Canon Wilson's views are a revolt against a crude method of stating the doctrine of the Atonement,—"the old thought of the method by which Christ's life and death saved us, and what He saved us from, was determined entirely by man's conception of God as a superhuman individual despot, angry at man's disobedience and threatening dire punishment" (p. 41). Perhaps the most useful sermon is the one on the Athanasian Creed, or the *Quicunque vult* as he very properly prefers that we should call it, since, as he shows, it is not strictly speaking a creed at all, but a canticle or hymn divided into verses pointed for chanting. In these sermons Canon Wilson is certainly at his best, and he has thrown a good deal of useful light upon the teaching of our Lord with regard to God, and he approaches the crooked and the straight, the difficult and the easy considerations, in a spirit of profound reverence. We are one with him in the conviction that "in a deeper and truer thought of God lies the one hope of the world; and where shall it be looked for except in Christ's thought of God? 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'"

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BISHOP MOORHOUSE.

BISHOP MOORHOUSE, of Melbourne and Manchester. By Edith C. Rickards. With portraits and illustrations. London: *John Murray*. 14*s*. net.

This is the biography of a great and a strong man, who presented an outstanding figure in Church life during the second half of the nineteenth century. The story is written by one who manifestly has a very high regard for the Bishop; and, like all biographies, it pourtrays its "hero" as almost flawless. The theme is great, the character to be delineated is strong, the period full of important "movements"; but the reader of this book, though fascinated by the record of a brilliant career and unique work done, puts it down with something of a sense of disappointment in the treatment. There is something missing. Such a life as that of Bishop Moorhouse should have been written by a man; for its outstanding feature was strength.

Born in Sheffield in 1826, James Moorhouse might naturally be expected to love the North, and be at home among its rugged, blunt and warm-hearted folk. An early mystic experience left a deep and lasting impression on his spiritual life. His first short curacy at St. Neot's prepared him for a unique ministry at Sheffield, under the Rev. Thomas Sale, among the working-men of the late "fifties." A Men's Institute was the centre of this, where valuable work along the lines of Christian Evidence and Scientific Thought was done. Plain speaking, hard hitting and patient continuance met with abundant results, and this experience left its mark, which was to be apparent years after in Melbourne and in Manchester.

London claimed James Moorhouse in 1859. His first sphere of labour in the capital was as curate under Canon Harvey at Hornsey. His vicar was like a father to the curate, and it was through the Canon's influence that Moorhouse was appointed, in 1861, Select Preacher at Cambridge—an honour never granted to a curate before. Once Canon Harvey told his friend, the Rev. Daniel Wilson, of Islington, what a wonderful curate he had in James Moorhouse, and received this advice, "Keep him in his place." "That's what I am always trying to do," was the answer, "for his place is in the pulpit, and mine in the reading-desk."

The promise of his early ministry was more than fulfilled in the years that followed, when Moorhouse was vicar of St. John's, Fitzroy Square, and afterwards of St. James', Paddington. While vicar of his first parish he was Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge, and while at Paddington he was Warburton Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn. As Chaplain in Ordinary he preached before Queen Victoria, and was a Prebendary of St. Paul's. The work at Paddington was so exacting that the new vicar had to re-arrange his habits, and this was his programme: "He would give up two evenings a week to social engagements; the others should be at his own disposal for study. So on those four evenings, after a simple dinner, he slept for an hour. Then, refreshing himself with a cup of tea, he would slip away to his study and work till between one and two in the morning." When he came to Paddington, Moorhouse found the custom of an evening celebration of the Holy Communion; and after adding early celebration every Sunday and one a month at mid-day, he was minded to do away with the evening Communion; but when he found that there were many in his parish who were unable to communicate at any other time, he altered his intention, and the late celebration remained. During these last eight years in England, before his ministry in

Australia, James Moorhouse exercised a wonderful influence in Paddington and beyond it, and came into intimate contact with many men of note.

No sooner had the offer of Melbourne come, and been accepted, than Lord Salisbury offered Moorhouse the Bishopric of Calcutta, which carried with it the office of Metropolitan of India. But his decision remained unaltered, and he left England in 1876, aged fifty, for his ten years' work in Australia.

The new Bishop threw his whole heart and soul into the work in his antipodean Diocese, and in championing the cause of religious education in the schools was accepted as the spokesman of all shades of Christian thought. The urgent problem of irrigation called forth his support, and he never failed to point out the neglect of this in the past and the pitiful consequences. Pressed, in a time of drought, to issue a prayer for rain, he said he would do so, but it would be of this form: "O Almighty God, we humbly beseech Thee to pardon us for our sinful waste and neglect of Thy bountiful supply of rain and waters, and give us grace to make better use of these Thy precious gifts in the years that are to come."

The Bishop was diligent in visiting his diocese and faced danger many a time in the discharge of his self-imposed duties. To his credit may be set down the work of building the stately Cathedral in Melbourne, which has taken the place of the church previously used as a cathedral—a building which Bishop Moorhouse unpolitely described as "squalid." From the material point of view, this was perhaps his greatest work; but from the spiritual standpoint, it would be difficult to find a more wonderful work than the new Bishop did by his weekly courses of lectures, which he delivered each autumn of the years he spent at Melbourne. The attendance grew and grew, until the big Town Hall, holding four thousand, was regularly filled. These lectures dealt sometimes with a book of the Bible, sometimes with a moral problem, sometimes with a supposed irreconcileable opposition between science and religion, and the people from far and near flocked to hear him, and his utterances were printed and circulated throughout Australia and New Zealand. The *Melbourne Punch* on one occasion depicted the Bishop with boxing-gloves on, and his opponents labelled "Jews," "Turks," "Infidels," and "Heretics," lying knocked out in various directions.

The call-back to England reached the Bishop in a remote part of Victoria —a telegram, by special messenger, sent by Lord Salisbury, offered him the Diocese of Manchester, vacant by the death of Bishop Fraser. The laborious duties of the past ten years had begun to tell upon a man so vigorous as Bishop Moorhouse, and at the age of sixty he felt constrained to accept the invitation to Manchester. He set forth his reasons in an address delivered at Melbourne, which he called his *Apologia pro fugâ meâ*.

From 1886–1903 the scene of the Bishop's labours was "the London of the North," where he proved himself a strong man and a capable leader. Some one once said to Bishop Stubbs, "There is that Bishop of Manchester running his head against a stone wall again," and Bishop Stubbs replied, "Oh! so much the worse for the stone wall." During the period of his episcopate, Bishop Moorhouse was the strongest force in the Northern Province. He strove to be a fair bishop, recognizing and rewarding merit wherever found in a man loyal to the teaching of the Church. "This is my standard. I have to take care that I do no injustice to any man who keeps himself within the limits and allowances permitted by the laws and constitution of the Church of England, whatever his private opinions."

He resolved to stop litigation, and in his seventeen years at Manchester scarcely a case came before the Courts. Himself a diligent student of critical questions, he deprecated the introduction of criticism into the pulpit.

As in Melbourne, so in Manchester, he sought to know every part of his

diocese intimately, and visited all the six hundred parishes more than once. He would give up a whole day to a parish, meeting clergy, district visitors, teachers and all other workers, visiting the schools, and holding meetings for all the parishioners who could be collected together, till he felt he had a full grasp of the situation. He noted everything—the housing conditions, proportion of rich and poor, relations between employers and employed, condition of the children, special temptations of the people, the helps provided towards an honest and good life.

Bishop Moorhouse was a keen advocate for the higher education of women, and held that women had a natural affinity for the ideal and the eternal. He championed the cause of the Church in three sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, when Cardinal Vaughan attacked it in 1894–95, and with regard to Nonconformists, he agreed with Dean Stanley in looking upon them as nonconforming members of the Church of England, and prophesied that "the day would not be far distant when there might be a real, if not a formal, union of all Protestant Evangelical Churches."

Increasing years and decreasing physical strength led the Bishop to resign his important work in Manchester, and he generously declined the retiring pension to which he was entitled, because his successor would need the full income of the see, and in order to give the Crown a wider range of choice in appointing a successor.

At his final sermon Manchester Cathedral presented a wonderful sight. "The people were standing up in the aisles of the nave, in the middle of the Choir, and all round the ambulatory, so that a passage had to be cleared for the Bishop to get from the nave to the pulpit; and one of his chaplains, who came immediately after him, noticed that as he passed many men stretched out their hands to touch his lawn sleeves as a last token of farewell."

The last twelve years were peacefully spent at Poundisford Park, near Taunton, a lovely Elizabethan mansion which the Bishop acquired, in view of the Blagdon Hills on one side and the Quantocks on another. Three years after the Bishop's resignation his wife was called Home—the faithful and inspiring companion of nearly forty-five years. During Mrs. Moorhouse's last illness, Miss Edith Sale, the Bishop's niece, took charge of the household, and on her death was the companion of her aged uncle. A closing chapter of this memoir is from the pen of this devoted niece, and describes the peace and quiet of those closing years of a truly great life. Invitations to speak and preach were refused on the ground that the preparation necessary was now too much effort, and we have the picture of an old man dipping into modern scientific and theological literature—like the *Interpretation of Radium* and *Foundations*—reading again with delight the familiar works of Dickens and Scott, being charmed with Conan Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes* and *The White Company*, or seeking relaxations that carried him back to his undergraduate days, as he worked twice through the examples in Bland's "Algebraical Problems."

In the spring of 1914 his bodily strength markedly failed, and on April 9, a year later, he passed to the Higher Life. As he lay waiting for the call Home, he was heard repeatedly murmuring, "Lord Jesus, forgive me"—committing in death his soul to the loving keeping of the Lord he had served so long and so faithfully in life.

C. E. W.

THE GREAT THEME.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST: An Examination of the Apostolic Belief and its Significance for the Christian Faith. By the Rev. John Mackintosh Shaw, M.A. (Edin.), Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, Nova Scotia. Edinburgh: *T. & T. Clark.* 9*s.* net.

The student who wishes to have a sound, scholarly and orthodox presentation of the great fact of the Christian Faith will find it here; and in days when the Truth is so ruthlessly whittled away, it is good to find such a work from the pen of a man in the front rank of scholarship.

This work is the outcome of requests made to the Publishers from different quarters for the publication in a separate book form of the article on the "Resurrection of Christ" in the recently issued second volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.* The opportunity has been taken to expand and amplify the original article at different points, with a view to greater clearness and explicitness of position. Especially is this the case with the chapters dealing with the nature of Our Lord's Resurrection Body.

"It is the writer's conviction that the 'reduced' or 'attenuated' Christianity which is the outcome of indifference to the bodily aspect of the Resurrection, not only does less than justice to Apostolic thought, but has serious consequences for our belief in the centrally determinative and constitutive significance of the Resurrection of Christ for our view of the world and life, and in particular for our belief in the ultimate subjugation of the entire material order to the purposes of spirit."

On the appearance of the article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, the *Times* Literary Supplement gave emphatic notice to the article as one that deserved the attention of New Testament scholars, and expressed the hope it might be republished in separate book-form, as had been done in the case of Dr. Sanday's article on "Jesus Christ." And, under the same circumstances, the Editor of the *British Weekly* described Professor Shaw's article as "the best and most comprehensive handling of the august theme which is accessible to the English reader. . . . The article is worth the price of the whole volume, and lends distinction even to its distinguished place." Such high praise is more than merited.

In days when "a somewhat new situation" faces us, and when in attempting to recommend Christianity to "the modern mind," many of the opponents as well as supporters of Christianity are denying or minimizing the bodily resurrection of Christ as a vital or essential part of the Christian faith, Professor Shaw expresses belief in the Resurrection "as the Apostles believed in it." He takes up every point and examines all with frankness, honesty and cogency; and the result is a treatise deep enough to satisfy the scholar, and simple enough to meet the needs of the average reader.

The line of argument is briefly as follows: The place of the Resurrection of Christ in the Apostolic Church is first stated: and then the Apostolic evidence for the fact of the Resurrection is adduced: (1) The primary evidence; (2) The documentary evidence, under two heads, The witness of St. Paul and of the Gospels. Then the Apostolic witness to the nature of Christ's Resurrection Body is weighed—(*a*) The Witness of the Gospels; (*b*) The Witness of St. Paul. Thirdly, the significance of the Resurrection of Christ for Apostolic Christianity is considered—(*a*) Evidential significance in respect of the Person of Christ, His Work, The Christian Hope; (*b*) Essential or Constitutive Significance for Christ Himself, Christian Life and Experience, the Consummation of the Kingdom of God. Finally comes an examination and refutation of attempted materialistic, or

semi-materialistic, explanations of the Apostolic belief: (*a*) Older Forms, e.g., The Swoon Theory, The Theft or Fraud Theory, The Subjective Vision or Mental Hallucination Theory, The Objective Vision or Telegram Theory; (*b*) Three Recent Forms, e.g., The Psychological or Psychical Research Theory, The Mythological Theory, The Spiritual Significance Theory, The "Supernatural-without-Miracle" Theory.

This full and frank consideration of so great a theme leads the author to declare: "It is in the light of these considerations that the physical Resurrection becomes credible, and even antecedently probable. It is not an isolated abnormal incident in an otherwise normal career. . . . But the Resurrection is the resurrection of Jesus, and, as such, an event at once with unique antecedents and unique consequences. Its context on either side is miraculous. It is the culmination of a unique human life—a life which was a moral miracle, constituting a break in human experience, and making such a physical miracle as the Resurrection altogether natural and congruous." Would that there were more modern theology on such lines!

C. E. W.

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRIAL UNREST

CAN CHURCH AND INDUSTRY UNITE? By David Carnegie. London: *Marshall Bros.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

This is the work of an enthusiast; it is also the work of a man with great experience, and a sound knowledge of industrial conditions. What he has to say, therefore, is worth attending to. Everyone admits that industrial chaos rules everywhere to-day; and it is useless to blink the fact. Everyone, with a tincture of understanding, knows that half-a-dozen competing panaceas are being offered, by means of which chaos may be brought into order. Sidney Webb, wrapped in the dreams of the idealist, thinks that the completely socialized State will be the beginning of the Millennium; Mr. Penty looks to the revival of Medieval Guilds as the best, and, indeed, only means of avoiding the Scytha and Charybdis of Capitalism and Socialism; the neo-Marxians believe in the Soviet form of government (or rather of misgovernment); a few, followers of Bakunin, preach anarchy. What has the Church to say to all this? For decades past she has been too often indifferent, sunk in apathy (some say); and now that, under the pressure, partly of fear, partly of conviction and renewed life, she is feverishly moving, she is surprised that she is not taken quite seriously by workers or secular economists. The Church is, says Mr. Carnegie, "in the balance." Yet she has a warrant for action, and her warrant is in the title deeds bequeathed her by the "Apostles and Prophets." Mr. Carnegie sees that only Christianity can get us out of the terrible impasse in which the world finds itself to-day. "Capital," said a wise man, half a century ago, "is having its day; Labour will have its day—and its vengeance." Now it is in the power of the Christian Church to blunt the edge of this vengeance; it is in her power—if the power be well and sympathetically applied—so to guide the thoughts of the present age as to bring them under the rule of Christian ethics. She cannot achieve more, for that is all that is needed; with less she dare not be content. Mr. Carnegie in his very useful little book, shows his readers some, at least, of the ways in which the Church of Christ may act to-day; Churchmen, of all grades and of all sorts of views, will do well to study his exposition. We are much impressed by his excellent chapter, "Education in the Homes." Probably the secret of success lies, for all Church workers and evangelists, in the homes of the people; make them pure, and sincere, and wise, and all else that we need will accomplish itself without serious difficulty.

But we must not forget that the business of the Church, though deeply

concerned with the material well-being of the people, goes beyond this. " Go thou and preach the Gospel " has wide implications, indeed. But we must never be satisfied with merely preaching a " progress " which is only a counterfeit of reality, if it be not based on national regeneration. National regeneration, however, depends on individual sanctification; and we must preach that *first*. First things must be put first, or the chaos will deepen. There are gaps in Mr. Carnegie's teaching which need filling. But, within its limits, this is a brave and wholesome book.

SEASIDE PARISHES.

PROBLEMS OF PLEASURE TOWNS. Edited by the Rev. F. Dormer Pierce, Vicar of Brighton. London: *S.P.C.K.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net. In paper cover, 1*s.* 6*d.*

This little volume is the outcome of a conference held at Brighton in February of last year, when a number of incumbents of seaside parishes met to discuss the problems which confront those who work in such places. Obviously they differ from those with which the clergy are face to face in places where the population is more or less stationary. The late Bishop of Lewes contributed the Introduction, and the first paper on " The spiritual atmosphere of the seaside parish," which—as he says—depends upon the influence of the Church and the civic authorities. Canon (now Archdeacon) Daldy of Bournemouth, and Archdeacon Hoskyns of Hastings, deal with ministry to the sick and convalescent, and Sunday at the seaside. The latter is treated on broad lines, and a note says that several speakers pointed out that it is useless nowadays to take a strict Sabbatarian line. Archdeacon Aspinall deals with Open-Air work and gives some account of the work carried on at Blackpool. There are useful hints by other contributors as to how those who come to amuse the public and the seafaring element can best be reached. Nor are the moral difficulties which are acutely felt, more especially in the larger places, forgotten or the important work of getting at the children. There are many seaside parishes, like Bridlington, Yarmouth, Gorleston, Southwold, Felixstowe, Clacton, Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton, Worthing, where Evangelical Churchmanship is well to the front, and we wonder why none of the incumbents of these places are represented among the writers of these papers. We miss, too, in the paper on Children's work, any reference to the splendid work of the Children's Special Service Mission which has been so fruitful both among young and old. Many of our leading clergy began witnessing for Christ at these services. However, saving this criticism, there is a great deal of useful matter in these pages.

THE GROWTH OF THE PSALTER.

THE HYMN BOOK OF THE CHURCH: OR, THE GROWTH OF THE PSALTER. By Frances Arnold-Foster. London: *S.P.C.K.* 8*s.* net.

The writer has taken a good deal of pains to make this book attractive to the general reader. The reverent way she handles her theme is in pleasant contrast to the method pursued by some writers. The conclusion of the higher critics are accepted, for the most part, but not of the extreme critics (e.g. Prof. Kennett and the late Dr. Cheyne), who have a curious fancy that all, or nearly all, the Psalms are Maccabean. And this in the teeth of tradition and of commonsense. It is strange that Miss Arnold-Foster makes no mention in her book of Prof. Robertson's admirable Croall Lectures on the Poetry and Religion of the Psalms, one of the most scholarly, devout, and sane books written on the subject. She relies largely on Briggs's edition of the Psalms (in the " International Critical Commentaries " series)—no

doubt a valuable work, but largely to be discounted because so frankly subjective in its outlook. After all, tradition does count for *something*. We are beginning to see this in secular history. What "critics" regarded thirty years ago as legendary or mythic in the histories of early Rome or—to go back further—of Crete, is now proved to have a real kernel of fact. So it will prove in the case of the Old Testament when once the spade of the archæologist has brought to light new material for the correcting of modern theories. Let us "amass our *facts*."

One of the best sections of this book deals with the Creed in the Psalms, and the reader will find much to instruct and delight him here. We may add that this little work is supplied with a good index.

FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

THE MESSAGE OF THE GOSPEL TO THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. By the Rev. R. W. Corbett, M.A. London: *Elliott Stock*, 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

This volume is in the form of twelve letters, which embody the substance of a course of addresses that summarized a ten years' course on the text of the New Testament. The intention of the writer is to distinguish "The rudimentary and mechanical interpretation of the Gospel of the Christian Church in its infancy from the vital and spiritual apprehension discernible in the Apostolic Tradition and Teaching: characterized by the Apostles as the mature and spiritual interpretation as in contrast with the primary, immature and natural." In the preface he indicates that as Natural Science is now discarding its rudimentary and *mechanical* interpretation of the universe for a *vital*, so simultaneously the Christian Church is being called to discard its rudimentary and mechanical interpretations of the Gospel for the spiritual. The author then proceeds to give point to his argument by an illustration drawn from Natural Science; the rudimentary conception, based on appearances, that the sun revolved round the earth, had to give place to the observed fact that the earth revolves round the sun. But in this illustration the "rudimentary conception" was wrong, untrue to fact. Is the reader to infer that the conservative and simple faith of those who read the Gospel and believe the story as it stands is wrong: and that the world has waited for the author, and such as he, to put them right?

The volume suffers from lack of lucidity; and if its message is to reach the twentieth century, as is the writer's hope, it will have to be presented in more simple style and language.

THE PRIMATE'S SERMONS.

THE TESTING OF A NATION. By Randall Thomas Davidson, D.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of Canterbury. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 6*s*. net.

This volume contains the sermons or addresses given at Special Services on Anniversary Days during the five years of war. There are fifteen sermons and four addresses: and there is not one that does not sound a high spiritual and timely note. The first "The Eve of a Great War" was preached on August 2, 1914, in Westminster Abbey, when it was "just conceivable still that for us in England the storm-cloud will roll by unbroken;" and the last were delivered in the Abbey and in St. Paul's, in May and June, 1919, in memory of the officers and men of the Oversea Forces, the Sailors, the Naval and Military Chaplains, who had fallen in the Great War. Between those limits we are reminded again of the solemn anniversaries of the Declaration of War; the great days of Intercession, when at the beginning of each New Year, the nation cried to God; the Armistice; the Day of Thanksgiving,

July 6, 1919, and other great occasions. Here are great and solemn words—words expressed with dignity, deep emotion and high spirituality. They are words which ought to be remembered, now that the prayers have been answered, the dangers averted, and the war won—lest solemn impressions be allowed to fade and a people, wondrously delivered by God, drop back into indifference—or worse.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA.

INDIA IN CONFLICT. By P. N. F. Young, M.A., and Agnes Ferrers. London: *S.P.C.K.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

In this little volume two experienced teachers analyse the new forces working so powerfully in present-day India. Nationalism is the key-word in India now, and we may discern its manifold activity everywhere. Indians are obsessed by political questions, and contact with Western civilization is leading to all sorts of confusion, intellectual and moral alike. There are signs that the supervision of education by the C.M.S. and other missionary bodies will shortly be relaxed, and that the Government will take education into its own hands. All this means that the great truths of Christianity will not have much chance of adequate presentation in Indian schools. Now we want to know exactly where we are in these most important matters; and Mr. Young's little book will help us to understand the facts. It deserves to be widely read and carefully studied. We should certainly like to see copies placed in the India Office; it is always well that the permanent officials should have some knowledge of the country they are dealing with, and that this knowledge should not always come through "official" channels.

THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS.

ANGELS SEEN TO-DAY. By the Rev. A. Maurice Elliott and Irene Hallam Elliott. London: *Robert Scott,* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

In the Introduction which Canon Masterman contributes, the readers are warned that "there will naturally be much in a book on such a subject as this in regard to which we shall not find ourselves altogether in agreement with the writers." This caution is fully justified; for while there is that in the little volume that interests and edifies, there are passages that are quite the reverse, and the closing pages purport to record facts which rival for sheer incredibility anything that appears within the covers of *Raymond.*

The authors divide their work into three parts. In Part I., after an introductory chapter on "The Holy Angels," there is an examination of New Testament evidence, and a collation from the works of modern divines of references to angels and their ministry. In Part II., after a chapter on Old Testament evidence, there is a return to the New Testament, and a chapter on "Remarkable Happenings recorded in Scripture and elsewhere." Part III. deals with "Soul-sight,—Soul-hearing,—Soul-travelling." Concerning this section the preface gives a cautious word: "The closing section of the book must stand on its own merits." For, truth to tell, it bears a close resemblance to what has been coming from the pen of Mr. Vale Owen!

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

DR. GRIFFITH THOMAS' Manual on the meaning of the Lord's Supper was referred to in these Notes last month, when it was announced that it was hoped the new and revised edition would be published early in October. The book is now on sale, price 2*s.* 6*d.* net, paper cover; 3*s.* 6*d.* net, cloth. It is valuable having regard to the proposals for the revision of the Service of Holy Communion.

A Sacrament of our Redemption.

In view of approaching Confirmation Classes, a sample packet of leaflets and manuals, published by the Church Book Room, has been prepared and will be sent for 1*s.* 9*d.* post free. It contains five courses of instruction for the use of candidates attending Confirmation classes: (1) *Class Notes*, by the Rev. Henry Edwards, Vicar of Gorleston, now in its fifth edition; (2) *A Soldier in Christ's Army*, and (3) *The Christian Disciple*, both by the Rev. Canon E. R. Price Devereux, Vicar of Christ Church, Woking; (4) *Strength for Life's Battle*, taken from addresses given by the late Canon Hoare, of Tunbridge Wells, and (5) *The Faith of a Churchman*, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton. These courses are issued at 2*d.* each, or 14*s.* per 100, net. A useful manual (2*d.*) by the Archbishop of Sydney, giving in a clear manner the meaning of Confirmation, and a number of leaflets suitable for distribution to the congregation before classes commence, to candidates when they come forward, and to the newly confirmed are also added. These include *About Confirmation*, and "*Be Strong—Be Glad*," a message to girls who have been confirmed, by Canon Grose Hodge; *Confirmation: a Letter to Candidates before Classes commence* and *What keeps you back?* by the Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley, at ½*d.* each, or 3*s.* per 100, net; *Will you join the Senior Division?* and *The Race of Life*, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, and "*The Life Beautiful*," by Canon Grose Hodge, at 9*d.* a dozen, or 4*s.* per 100, net; *Three Questions for Young Men who have been Confirmed*, by Canon Grose Hodge, at 1*d.* each, or 5*s.* per 100, net, and a card entitled *Your Confirmation* (1*d.*), being a letter to candidates, and three prayers to be used during the time of preparation; a sample set of Confirmation Hymns; a Confirmation Anniversary Letter, and Confirmation cards and labels.

Confirmation.

A list of books which can be recommended as Sunday School Prizes has been carefully compiled as a guide to those who are unable to call at the Book Room and select books from the shelves. The books in this list have been selected with a view to recommending to clergy and others, books which have merit and which avoid sacerdotal teaching on the one hand, and an anti-Church bias on the other. Every help will be given in the choice of books, and, if a list of the number of books required be sent, together with the age of the scholars and the prices to be paid, suitable books will be suggested or sent as desired.

Sunday School Prizes.

The Rev. G. R. Balleine has written a new Sunday School Lesson Book for the ensuing year entitled *Lessons from the Hymn-Book*. As he tells us in his Preface, "Children love singing. In Church and Sunday School they enjoy the hymns more than anything else. Yet apparently hymns are not often used as vehicles for instruction. . . . Yet here is an easy line of approach

Sunday School Lessons.

to the children's minds. Here are words that they know, words that they like, words that they will use again and again in future years, words, moreover, that are often full of doctrinal and practical teaching." The book that Mr. Balleine has provided us with this year will, we consider, answer its purpose admirably. The lessons are practical, and they contain doctrinal teaching. We agree with Mr. Balleine that there is no subject that a teacher ought to deal with in a year's lessons which cannot be discovered in the Hymn-Book; and, moreover, it will be found there treated in a definitely devotional way. The Lesson Book contains fifty-two lessons and fifty-two well-known hymns. The price is 2*s.* net. Those who have used Mr. Balleine's other Lesson Books will appreciate the new volume, as it is a companion to the former books, most of which we regret to say are out of print. *The Young Churchman*, in fact, is the only one now available. This book is still issued at 1*s.* 6*d.* net, and contains fifty-two lessons on Church life and worship, the aim being to give every young Churchman just that knowledge of his Church which is too often taken for granted. A new series of lessons entitled *In the King's Service*, a course of fifty-two lessons following the Church Calendar, by Q. Scott-Hopper, has also been published at 2*s.* in connexion with the Home Words Art Stamp system. The lessons are full, practical and up-to-date and commence with lessons on the King's coming, on what the King asks, and on what the King gives. A useful series of lessons on The King's Servants in all Ages is added. Similar lesson books which can be recommended, price 1*s.* each, are *Simple Lessons on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments*, and *Lessons on the Life of Abraham and Joseph*, by the Rev. N. F. Duncan; *Chats with my children on the Church Catechism*, by Sarah Brine, price 1*s.* net, and *Sunday School Lessons for Juniors*, by Canon Stewart, price 1*s.* net.

Sunday School Teachers.

A little book entitled *Talks to Teachers in Sunday Schools*, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D., Diocesan Inspector of Schools in Bradford, has been brought before us, and we recommend it very gladly. The book makes no pretence to be elaborate or exhaustive, or to add anything new to the science of education. The talks are simply a plain statement of the elementary rules of teaching for those working-class teachers of good intelligence but little leisure who mainly staff our Sunday Schools. The first chapter is devoted to "The Teacher," and the book goes on to give some guidance as to the characteristics of the various classes of children who attend Sunday Schools. Bishop Drury says in a very interesting Preface, "The modern results of child-psychology have not been sufficiently recognized in the past. Hence the need of knowledge of the children, sympathy with their individuality, and above all that intuition which is the fruit of love." Mr. Boughton has a good deal to say about the methods of teaching, and says it well. The book is published at 1*s.* 3*d.* net. Another excellent little pamphlet entitled *Points for Sunday School Teachers*, by the Rev. N. F. Duncan, Vicar of Crookes, Sheffield, is recommended. The price is 1*d.*, or 9*d.* per dozen. The pamphlet is practical and helpful, and we hope it will have a large circulation. Copies can be obtained from the Book Room.