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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1923

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Evangelicals and Revision.

EVANGELICAL opinion on Prayer Book Revision is gradually consolidating, and there seems every reason to hope that by June next, when the matter will come up in the National Assembly for serious discussion—perhaps even for decision—Evangelical leaders will be able to state the Evangelical position with the knowledge that they have behind them a solid, compact and united body, ready to consider favourably every change that is calculated to increase the efficiency of the Church of England or to enrich its worship, but resolutely determined to resist every proposal that can be regarded as altering, or seeming to alter, its doctrinal balance. We put the point in this alternative form because we note that Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., who was one of the most active members of the Revision Committee, definitely stated in the address he gave on March 13 at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, that "there had not been the slightest intention of modifying in any way the doctrine of the Church." He went on to say what had been done. "It was true that changes had been made to make the service more acceptable to those holding the High Church doctrine, but that had been done by setting up an area within which truth could be found rather than by attempting to express a precise definition" (*Times*, March 14). We are a little puzzled to know the precise meaning of this somewhat enigmatic sentence, but the one definite point in it seems to be that changes have been made to ease the position of High Churchmen. We cannot be expected to take serious note of what was or was not "intended" by the Committee. It is enough that the proposals be judged by themselves, and although in this connection Lord Hugh Cecil attempted to justify the three changes which have excited

controversy ("unreasonably" as he thinks, but let that pass), the fact remains that by a very large body of instructed Church-people these changes are viewed with the greatest apprehension because they regard them as "modifying" in a fundamental way "the doctrine of the Church."

Reintroduction of the Mass.

We propose to show the very serious character of the proposed "modifications" and for this purpose we avail ourselves of the special contribution from a valued correspondent, who writes as follows:—

"It is the Mass that matters." This has been the conviction of English Churchmen since the Reformers "called the laity into the Chancel." The Mass denotes sacerdotalism—for by the words of the officiating Minister the Bread and Wine undergo a change that makes present, in, with or under them, the Body and Blood of Christ. The Mass denotes a sacrifice that re-presents to God the Sacrifice made once and for all on Calvary for the sins of the whole world. The Mass by reason of the localized Presence of the Redeemer in, with, or under the consecrated Elements, makes logical and inevitable Adoration of the Reserved Sacrament. Exposition and Benediction, which are legitimate developments in the Roman system, date from the doctrine of the localized Presence taught by Roman theology. We are children of the twentieth century. We cannot cut ourselves adrift from the ages that have passed. Symbols remain symbols by reason of their associations, and we cannot free ourselves from their meaning. The Revision proposals in the Report of the Committee of the National Assembly authorize the use of the chasuble by the consecrating Minister at Holy Communion. The chasuble is the vestment with which the Roman priest on his ordination is vested ceremonially, when he receives authority to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. It is the badge of his priesthood. It symbolizes his sacerdotalism. Those who have introduced the chasuble into the Church of England plead that they are priests of the same character as those of Rome and wish to display the continuity of the priesthood by the vestment they wear. We cannot remove the accepted meaning of the chasuble by asserting that it means nothing!

By virtue of his office as priest the consecrating Minister at the Lord's Table is able, according to the teaching of Rome and

Anglo-Catholicism, to bring the Presence of our Lord to the Elements. When this is done our Lord is presented sacrificially to God. In our Communion Office, Communion immediately follows the Consecration. We communicate in the atmosphere of the Upper Room. When the communion ends we ask God to accept our Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving. It is said that this is a direct reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass offered by the Minister. In our present Office the structure of the service and the history behind it, as well as the use of the phrase elsewhere in the Prayer Book, show that no such meaning is intended. In the Revision proposal the phrase "our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving" occurs after Consecration of the Elements and before Communion. Sacerdotal writers have contended that this must be done in order that the doctrine of the Sacrifice in the Communion Office be plainly taught, and it is to satisfy this contention that the alteration of the position of the Prayer has been made.

Reservation is proposed to be permitted only for the Communion of the Sick, but if the Elements have with them the localized Presence of the Redeemer, it is impossible to compel those who hold this belief to abstain from worshipping the Sacramental Presence in the Elements, from passing to such services as Benediction in which the Sacramental Presence blesses the faithful and from adopting the modern developments that are associated with the permanent localized Presence in the Sacrament. It is noteworthy that the Prayer Book forbids the removal of the consecrated Elements that are unconsumed in the course of the service from the church, and Reservation is condemned in the Articles of Religion.

The Effect of the Three Changes.

Taking these three changes together (our correspondent concludes) it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Revision proposals transform the doctrine of our Communion Office into the doctrine of the Roman Mass, which we repudiate not because it is Roman, but on account of its opposition to the teaching of Holy Scripture, the doctrine of the Primitive Church and the plain and manifest meaning of the formularies of our own Church. If we in any way are a party to sanctioning officially this teaching within our Church, we destroy the doctrinal basis of our Prayer Book and open the door wide for the introduction of a service indistinguishable from the

Roman Mass in English. By so doing we draw apart from Non-Episcopal Christendom, depart from our historical standards and undo the work of the Reformation which restored Scriptural teaching to the Church and made us one in our participation of the Lord's Supper with the Apostolic Church. The National Church League is prepared to oppose in every legitimate manner the proposed changes in the Communion Office and appeals to all loyal and peaceable sons of the Church to stand by it in its determination to prevent the re-introduction of the Mass, in any shape or form, into the authorized Service Book of the National Church.

The Spirit of Charity.

Lord Hugh Cecil urged upon his hearers that they should face revision "in the spirit of charity towards their fellow-Churchmen," and as his address was given in a church associated with the High Church movement, we may express the hope that they who are seeking to press upon the Church these three proposals will, in "the spirit of charity," refrain from insisting upon changes to which the great body of Evangelical Churchmen conscientiously object. It should require no great effort on their part, seeing that there has not been the slightest intention of doctrinal modification. But it may be that Lord Hugh Cecil had in mind the objectors to these changes when he made his appeal. In this case he followed Bishop Welldon who, speaking at the Durham Diocesan Conference, counselled the Evangelical Party to accept the present scheme of revision "in the interests of Christian charity." We do not know on what ground Bishop Welldon feels himself entitled to make such an appeal. Evangelicals have never shown themselves to be wanting in Christian charity whenever questions of this kind have come up for decision. Indeed it is almost a commonplace to observe that, actuated by a charitable spirit towards those who differ from them, they have often been too ready in the past to adjust serious differences by compromise. But in the matter under discussion compromise is impossible: matters of vital principle are concerned, and Evangelicals cannot and will not surrender their heritage. They are sons of the Church of England—Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant—and they do not forget their ancestry nor at what tremendous cost freedom was won for them in the sixteenth century. What would Bishop Welldon have us do? Does he desire that we should stifle our

consciences and accept " as a condition of peace " proposals which are fraught, as we believe, with the greatest possible danger to the Church of England ? The issues at stake are far too grave for that. They are not concerned with secondary but with primary matters —matters which affect fundamentally the position of every Evangelical member of the Church of England. " Charity " is a most excellent virtue and we trust that its gentle spirit will ever characterize our discussions, especially in the difficult months before us, but it can only be exercised aright in so far as it is balanced by an unmistakable loyalty to Truth.

Words of Warning.

We venture to suggest that in this matter the Bishop of Durham is a safer guide than the Dean of Durham. It is impossible to mistake the gravity of the warning uttered by the Bishop when, at his Diocesan Conference, he spoke on Prayer-Book Revision. He showed clearly enough that he, at any rate, appreciates the full meaning of the present crisis :—

It seemed to him (he said) that the fundamental issue at stake was the character of the Church of England. They inherited a tolerant tradition, but tolerance that went to the length of self-contradiction was all one with apostasy. They had to keep in mind the whole English Church, for the Prayer Book was, to use the language of the last Lambeth Conference, " the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice." They prided themselves as English Churchmen on being members of a tolerant Church, that was, a Church which included many types of Christian discipleship, and was patient with many vagaries of religious opinion. But they were English Churchmen—not Roman Catholics, or Greek Orthodox, or Lutherans, or Congregationalists—and that character indicated that even Anglican tolerance had its limits. A Church which spoke with two voices on matters of fundamental belief ; which attached no real authority to its own standards of doctrine ; and exacted no effective obedience to its own discipline ; which presented one version of itself to Constantinople, another to Edinburgh, and yet a third to Rome, was in no genuine or serviceable sense a Church at all. It could not be properly identified with the Church of England which, for nearly four centuries, had delivered to the English people in the Prayer Book its own version of the Catholic Faith. He was not very hopeful about the future. There was a spirit of arrogant unreason in some quarters which might justify the gravest apprehension, but there were also reasons for thinking that the general body of English Churchmen, both lay and clerical, were beginning to perceive the real gravity of the issues at stake. He pledged himself to work for such revision of the Book of Common Prayer as should be (in the words of the Preface to the existing Book) " well accepted and

approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England," (*Times*, March 12).

Here we have a statement, as forcible as it is lucid, of the real issues with which the Church is confronted, and in the light of its warnings Evangelical Churchmen would be false to themselves, false to their traditions and false to the love they bear towards the Church of England, if they did not oppose, by every legitimate means open to them, any and every proposal which is calculated, however unintentionally, to alter " the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice."

The Assembly and Revision,

In view of the misunderstanding which exists in several quarters concerning the position of Prayer-Book Revision in the National Assembly it will be convenient to state the facts. At the Spring Session (Jan. 29–Feb. 2) the Archbishop of Canterbury stated from the Chair that the House of Bishops had introduced the Measure containing the proposals of the Committee, and that it would be sent to the Chairman of each of the three Houses with a request that it should be considered by those Houses on the stage of general approval. Thus it would come before each of the three Houses and would then come back and be submitted to the Assembly for adoption or rejection. If the motion for general approval were rejected by any one of the three Houses that would bring the matter to an end for a year. The only one of the three Houses that has yet voted " general approval " of the Measure is the House of Clergy, which held a separate sitting of very short duration during Assembly week. Before the motion was put the Dean of Canterbury and others asked to what it would commit them, as some of them very distinctly " disapproved " of several of the proposals. The Dean of York (Vice-Chairman) replied that it was merely a formal matter equivalent to the reception of the Measure, and on this understanding the motion was agreed to. But Lord Hugh Cecil, a past-master in all matters of procedure, says such a motion means what it says, and is the equivalent of a motion for the Second Reading of a Bill in Parliament, although it does not preclude anyone who voted for it from afterwards moving to omit or amend any sections of the Measure to which objection is taken. The House of Bishops will meet on April 16 to discuss the Measure on the general approval

stage, and is contemplating the possibility of a two-days' sitting. The House of Laity will meet for the same purpose on April 25 and is also proposing a two-days' sitting if need be. The notice calling the meeting of the House of Laity is accompanied by a Memorandum signed by Lord Parmoor (Chairman) and Lord Daryngton (Vice-Chairman) urging every member to attend, and saying that " the Meeting affords an opportunity for all the Members of the House to give evidence of their deep sense of the responsibility which attaches to the House as a constituent part of the National Assembly of the Church. The occasion is of great importance. The attitude of the House of Laity may, through God's grace, afford a notable witness to the motion of the new spirit inspired by the institution of the National Assembly of the Church." With the House of Laity so fully recognizing the importance of the matter, and the House of Bishops ready to devote two days to its consideration, it is difficult to believe that the House of Clergy will be content with the resolution it passed " formally " in January last. It may be hoped it will be called together for a full consideration of the proposals before the next meeting of the National Assembly.

N.C.L. Action.

The National Church League has shown that it is thoroughly alive to the dangers of the situation, and by courses of educative lectures, the dissemination of sound literature, and in many other ways, is seeking to arouse Church-people to the gravity of the position. The series of six lectures on " Prayer-Book Doctrine and Prayer-Book Revision " is most helpful, and a full outline of each lecture is published by the League, and clergy will do well to obtain copies that they may instruct their people on these lines. The titles of the Lectures are as follows: (1) The Prayer Book: Its History and Teaching; (2) The Prayer Book and Holy Scripture; (3) Prayer Book Teaching on the Atonement and the Sacrament of Remembrance; (4) The Prayer Book and the Mediatorship of Christ; (5) Repentance and Pardon; and (6) The Resurrection and the Christian Life. The " Brief Summary of the Main Proposals on Revision " has been referred to previously in these columns, and it may again be commended to clergy who desire to put into the hands of their people a clear and succinct statement of the scheme of revision. Another excellent pamphlet (8 pp.) is " Prayer Book Revision from an Evangelical

Point of View," by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, who points out the grounds of objection to the three features of the scheme explained above, and adding a fourth—the various suggested Prayers for the Dead—to which Evangelicals take exception. The closing passages of the pamphlet convey a grave warning:

Evangelicals and the Church at large should realize that the ideal of the "Anglo-Catholics" is not comprehension, but the ultimate acceptance of their position. Evangelicals glory in the comprehensive character of the Church of England, they do not look for a meticulous uniformity of ritual or of opinion. The very essence of their position is freedom, and recent happenings within their own ranks are clear evidence that Evangelicals will never be found all of one pattern. And because of this, they not merely tolerate but welcome within the borders of the Church of England those who are regarded as Broad Churchmen and High Churchmen. The only limit which Evangelicals have sought is the limit of a frank and honest acceptance of the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England. But it should be clearly understood that comprehension is not the ideal of Anglo-Catholicism. This is stated without any ambiguity in *The Church Times* of October 20, 1922. The leading article of that date was opposing the idea of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses seeking the patronage of Bishops, and goes on "For after all, their (*i.e.*, the Bishops') ideal is different from ours. It is no secret. They are quite frank about it. This ideal is comprehension, not Catholicism. Anglo-Catholics are merely one party in the Church, and as such are to be tolerated like other extreme parties. *This is something entirely opposed to the belief of Catholics* who claim that they only are loyal." The same point of view is given even more vigorously in a leading article in the same paper on June 16, 1922. It is their stated "that toleration is extended to us on the supposition that we will extend the same toleration to Protestants and Modernists. Things may be different when it is found that Catholics have not lost their missionary zeal, that they believe that they alone are loyal members of the Church of England, and that *they are not willing to lie down with Protestants and Modernists in the same bed.*"—These quotations could be paralleled with others and they leave us in no uncertainty about the present issue.

These and other publications dealing with the question may be obtained at the Church Book Room, 6 Grosvenor Mansions, 82 Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.1.

Cheltenham Conference.

It is significant of the growing sense of importance of the Prayer-Book Revision question that the Cheltenham Conference will, this year, be held on May 23, 24 and 25 in order to discuss it in good time before the Summer

Session, in the hope that its findings may not be without their weight of influence upon the discussion in the Assembly. The Conference will consider the subject under the following headings: "Alternative Uses and Home Reunion"; "The Holy Communion: (*a*) The Doctrinal Basis of our Present Service, (*b*) The Doctrinal Basis of N.A. 60, and (*c*) Consequences of the Adoption of N.A. 60"; "The Revision that is Needed: (*a*) Illustrated by N.A. 60, (*b*) Not Provided by N.A. 60"; "Changes in Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany, etc"; and "The Occasioned Offices." The list of speakers is by no means complete, but those who have already promised to speak on Revision are the Rev. Canon Oakley, the Rev. J. J. R. Armitage, the Rev. G. W. Briggs, and the Rev. T. W. Gilbert. The Rector of Cheltenham (Canon H. A. Wilson) will preside, and the Rev. the Hon. W. Talbot Rice will give the Devotional Address on "Spiritual Revival." We hope to print all the principal papers in the next issue of THE CHURCHMAN.

THE LAYMAN'S HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By G. R. Balleine. London: *Longmans Green & Co.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

We welcome the Third Impression of Mr. Balleine's excellent, vivid and most readable work on the History of the Church of England. The book has been valued wherever it has been read, and we are not surprised that a famous public school has placed it among its text-books, for it gives the story of the Church as illustrated by the history of a parish, and the changes caused by the vicissitudes of religious life in the kingdom. Mr. Balleine has the rare gift of combining accuracy with brightness, lucidity with charm. He tells us just what we need to know, and we follow, step by step, the fortunes of the Christian community in Durford, and Monksland, its daughter Kentish parish. What is the secret of the appeal of this volume? It lies in its genuinely human interest and its power of making us feel that the Church is a real home for the faithful, and that men and women throughout the centuries possessed the same fundamental hopes and fears, shared the joys and sorrows that we know to-day, and considered the worship of God to be the chief duty incumbent upon them. Religion not ecclesiasticism is the motive of the book, and the beautiful illustrations are a triumph of selection as well as an introduction to the many-sided activities of the Church. No one who knows this book can refrain from recommending it to friends, and the friends who read it will be grateful for the introduction to its stirring pages. It is a triumph of straightforward historical writing.

A STUMBLING-BLOCK TO THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

By the Ven. G. M. MacDermott, M.A.
(Archdeacon of Norwich.)

THE Church of England is busy with reform. Reform connotes clearing the way for progress. In no direction is progress so vitally necessary as along the path to the reunion of all Christians in the one Body of Christ. "That they all may be one . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me" (St. John xvii. 21). We are expecting the world to believe that Jesus is the Christ, sent by the Father, when we are not fulfilling the condition laid down by our Lord. Our Lord prayed that His disciples might be a united Society, not, indeed, uniform, but joined in a visible unity observed by all the world. Apart from our Lord's words, it is obvious what a striking appeal to the whole world would be made if the six hundred millions of Christians were one. Wars between nations, civil wars, class wars, labour and employer wars: how we long for peace and a spiritual home where war is impossible! How it would draw all men to Christ if peace and brotherhood were found in a united Christendom! Our missionary work is stultified by our divisions. We are not a "city set on a hill that cannot be hid," nor are we the "light of the world" (St. Matt. v. 14). We Christians live in cities on a hundred hills of varying heights—many strongly fortified against other little cities. There is no one clear white light of radiance so pure and penetrating that all the dark places of the earth are shown up. A hundred or more flickering torches of varying intensity, partly illuminate and partly mislead the wayfarer. We wonder why the Kingdom is so long in coming in fullness, why men everywhere do not accept the "good news," yet the blame for the delay is, chiefly, with ourselves. When we are one, then, and not before, may we expect the world to believe that God sent His Son because He so loved the world and would have all come to Him and be saved.

Now, we of the Church of England, seem marked out as the Church of the Reconciliation. We have never ceased to be Catholic, yet we shed many accretions which disfigured the Catholic Church at the Reformation. No doubt, we cast off some things, too, which

it would have been better to retain. But it cannot be gainsaid that we are in touch with other branches of the Catholic Church, as well as with our Nonconformist brethren. It is on behalf of the latter, however, that I plead for a more cautious use of terms when speaking of the Holy Communion. I venture to say that a real stumbling-block is being placed on the path to reunion with our fellow-Christians in this country, and in the United States of America, by the careless and uncatholic terminology of many clergymen of our community. Words are the coins of thought. If a monetary transaction is being carried out, and a pound is treated as twenty shillings by one party, but only as 17*s.* 6*d.* or 10*s.* by the other, there is bound to be dispute. "Define your terms" is a sound precept; and when this is done we deprecate such remarks as "we cannot be bothered with theological niceties"; "terminological exactitude is tedious and belittling," etc.

Now, misuse of terms arises chiefly in connexion with two points of Eucharistic doctrine, viz., the Presence of Christ and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

I. *The Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion.* There are two of the thirty-nine Articles which are germane to the consideration of Our Lord's presence in the Sacrament. (Italics are ours.) Article I says: "There is one living and true God . . . *without body*, parts or passions." Article IV says: "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and *there sitteth, until He return to judge* all men at the last day." In view of these statements, ought we not to avoid such teaching as this, "Christ is present under the forms of bread and wine just as He was present in His human body, when He trod this earth in Palestine?" Is it not misleading to say that "after the words of Consecration, the Presence is on the Altar"? or, to talk of "A Presence of our Lord in the consecrated elements, quite apart from the act of communicating"? I quote other passages:

"A local spiritual Presence in the consecrated elements."

"He left a special presence of His Body and His blood on the Altar to be the food of our souls."

"Christ is truly present in the Bread and Wine."

"My Body and my Blood will be truly there . . . that Body in which you will see Me ascend to My Father."

"If the Sacramental veil of Bread and Wine were lifted you would not see the natural body as it hung upon the Cross, but that *same* body in its supernatural glory as it is now at the right hand of God."

These quotations are taken from sermons, writings, articles, pamphlets of leading clergymen (including a Bishop) whose names need not be given. It is difficult to know exactly what such terms are intended to convey. One writer says "no human mind can grasp it," and we readily acquiesce! Contradictions are, indeed, beyond our power of comprehension!

The Real Presence. This term was, at one period, used to signify a corporal presence; while, at a later date, the same expression was used by those who were prominent in denying a corporal or material presence. Even now "real" conveys quite different meanings to different people. "Real" to most people signifies material: if you asked them whether a ghost, a spirit is real; they would reply "certainly not." On the other hand, to some of us the spiritual is the real, it is that which is not subject to change and decay; the spiritual is the lasting, the permanent and, therefore, the true reality. If this term "Real Presence" be used, it is most important to point out this ambiguity. It may, however, be stated that this term is not found in any of the Anglican formularies; and it is unknown earlier than the Middle Ages. We sympathize with those who wish to avoid the belittling of the Sacrament and, no doubt, the term "Real Presence" is used to prevent this disparagement. May we not also sympathize with those who can only see in it and kindred terms a suggestion of idolatry—of a refined and subtle form—but none the less dangerous? The attitude of an intelligent educated heathen to his idol is given by Mosheim in his *Ecclesiastical History* (Vol. I. p. 27), and it may be quoted as quite pertinent to the subject. Mosheim is referring to the various heathen deities and their worship. He says: "The statues or representations of the gods were placed in the temples and supposed to be animated in an incomprehensible manner. For the votaries of these fictitious deities, however destitute they might be of reason in other respects, avoid carefully the imputation of worshipping inanimate beings such as brass, wood and stone and therefore pretended that the divinity, represented by the statue was really present in it, if the dedication was duly and properly made." This

seems to be the doctrine of a local presence after proper consecration. One wonders whether some of the terms already referred to may not have originated owing to this craving for a tangible, visible vehicle which does not simply convey God, but also is that in which He dwells here upon earth. As regards the " Real Presence " in the sense of a *local* presence, a purely spiritual presence may be non-spatial, as we conceive space ; it is a gross mistake to conceive of Our Lord's presence in the Sacrament as localized or circumscribed by limits in any way. But, consider Articles I and IV (quoted on pages 3 and 4), God is " without body," and, therefore, our Lord cannot be present as God. " Christ . . . took again His body . . . and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into Heaven and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day." How can it be said, then, that if the sacramental veil of Bread and Wine were lifted you would not see the natural body as it hung upon the Cross, but that *same* body in its supernatural glory as it is now at the right hand of God ?

Transubstantiation. The philosophers of the Middle Ages thought that things consisted of substance and accidents. The accidents are what can be perceived by the senses (colour, shape, taste, chemical properties, etc.). The substance is a something which is supposed to remain when all the accidents are taken away and which yet makes the thing to be what it is. Hence arose the doctrine of Transubstantiation, i.e. that after due consecration of the elements of bread and wine the accidents remain, but the substance is changed into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood. The modern theory of matter is that it consists of minute centres of electricity ; the (so-called) atom is a little universe of electrons, or units of negative electricity circulating round a positive centre. The doctrine of transubstantiation, therefore, breaks down. It was based on error, and its history ought to be a warning to those who will persist in defining in cases where a reverent silence is the better attitude. (See Gore's, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 118–120.)

But, it will be useful to quote the words of authoritative teachers and scholars of various schools of thought.

Bishop Dowden in *Define your Terms*, an address on the Eucharistic controversy, said : " One thing is absolutely certain—it is no part of the doctrine of our Church that there is an adorable

presence of Our Lord's Body and Blood in or under the forms of bread and wine. Such language is undiscoverable in the doctrinal standards of our Church, and wholly unknown to the Church of the early Fathers."

Bishop Westcott (*Life and Letters*, Vol. II. p. 351) writes: "It seems to me vital to guard against the thoughts of the presence of the Lord in or under the form of bread and wine. From this the greatest practical errors follow."

Bishop Herbert Pakenham-Walsh, in Altar and Table, p. 41, writes: "It seems clear that the early Church believed in a sacramental presence of Christ, which was both real and spiritual and such that, while not discernible to the senses, it did not depend upon the faith of the individual, though it was revealed to faith. It was a presence so connected with the Bread and Wine that they hesitated not to call the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ, and yet they showed clearly that they did not regard the presence as material, as *localized, as a presence after the manner of a body.*"

Bishop Gore (quoted in the foregoing book, p. 42) says: "It is to be remembered that the Greek Fathers, when they use the words 'in' or 'under' the forms of bread and wine, are not thinking of space at all, as if they meant that the Body and Blood were included in the elements. They meant after the manner of a Sacrament. They would have shrunk from any formulated teaching of 'Christ made present on the Altar under the forms of bread and wine.'" (And see, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 90, 91.)

The Bishop of Norwich (in a letter) wrote: "There is no scriptural warrant for localizing the Presence, and the Presence is not independent of the service and of the use made of the Bread and Wine in the service."

Fr. Vernon Staley, The Catholic Religion, p. 255, wrote: "Our Blessed Lord is locally present in heaven, He is spiritually present in the Blessed Sacrament."

Those who desire to pursue the subject further should read *Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence*, published by the Church of England Book Society; or, *Waterland, on the Eucharist.*

We have dwelt at some length on this first point, because erroneous views of the Real Presence underlie the demand for the services of Benediction and Exposition of the Sacrament. Reservation of

the elements is desired by some so that in cases of serious sickness the Holy Communion may be administered without loss of time. But, no doubt, Reservation is misused by others for the purpose of adoration. As Bishop Westcott said, the thoughts of the presence in or under the form of bread and wine lead to " the greatest practical errors."

II. *The Eucharistic Sacrifice.* In St. Luke xxii. 20 we read: " This do in remembrance of Me," an accurate translation of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.* In the Septuagint, *ποιέω* is sometimes used to mean " sacrifice," but *only* if the *context demands it.* In the New Testament *ποιέω* is translated more than fifty ways and yet it never means " offer." In no translation of the New Testament, not even in the Roman Catholic Douay Version, is it ever translated in any other way in this passage except as " do." " Offer " is rejected by Roman Catholic Commentators, e.g. Aquinas, Cajetan and Estius, and English Catholics, such as Gore, Mason and Plummer agree. *Ἀνάμνησις* means " remembrance," not " memorial," for which we find *μνημόσυνον.* A memorial is something external which can be perceived by the senses; a remembrance is a mental state. Now, this passage ought not to be paraphrased incorrectly; it is misleading to say that it is equivalent to " offer this as a sacrifice, as a memorial of Me." And what shall we say to the following: " That morning they had accomplished one of the most stupendous actions of which man is capable; by Divine permission, by the aid of the Holy Ghost and by the interposition of the risen Saviour, they had offered before angels and men the sacrifice of the death and passion of the Redeemer " (from a sermon by a well-known preacher).

There is no need for other quotations. One comes across expressions which convey the notion that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a necessary addition to the offering of Christ upon the Cross; they imply that the redemption, propitiation and satisfaction made by our Lord is perfected by the sacrifice of " Masses." Against this error, we will quote from one who is a Churchman of a most advanced type: In Maude's *History of the Book of Common Prayer,* p. 131, " The Eucharist is a sacrifice because it is the means appointed by Christ Himself in order that the Church may plead the Sacrifice of Christ." Professor Burkitt, in *Eucharist and Sacrifice,* p. 22, says: " The congregation having confessed, been shriven, having

assisted at a due consecration of the bread and wine, and finally, having received their own portion, do then and there offer unto God themselves, their souls and bodies to be a reasonable sacrifice." We may speak of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, our alms, oblations or offerings, but to refer to the Holy Communion as a sacrifice, re-offering Christ to the Father in a way at all resembling, or continuing the Sacrifice on the Cross is surely placing a stumbling-block in the path of many of our own people and upsetting, to a great degree, to our dissenting brethren.

A learned divine once said that allowances must be made for the extravagances of devotional utterances; true, but dare we ignore the teaching of history? Words spontaneously bursting forth from the lips of one who passionately loves Our Lord may be passed over, no matter how much they savour of hyperbole We are not referring to these, but to the terms used in sermons, pamphlets and articles by preachers and teachers. The lamentable results of such or similar language were common in mediæval days, and because they lived in the midst of it and realized the source of the trouble, Cranmer and countless others perished by the most cruel torture rather than continue the use of this misleading terminology. Can such terms be used now without any practical errors following? All history is against such a complacent view. We are not thinking of the danger to our own people so much as the stumbling-block set in the way of reunion by terms which must be offensive to millions of Christians of other Communions. I wish to state clearly that I have the utmost sympathy with those who aim to teach our people to come to Church to make an offering of worship; I hold no brief for those who would treat the Sacrament as a mere form. The reality of spiritual things is a vital doctrine, especially nowadays. But when we endeavour to give sound teaching on these points, is it not a pity to use terms ambiguous, often misleading and certain to be a hindrance to reunion?

We are a favoured people, and in the forefront of our great blessings we should put the high calling to be the Church of Reconciliation. Our branch of the Catholic Church offers a common standing-ground for Christians of many kinds. It would be lamentable if, owing to the extravagant utterances and practices of some of our clergy, we should fail to achieve the very purpose for which, perhaps, our Church has been so long spared.

THE CRITICAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PENTATEUCH.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., formerly Donnellan Lecturer in Trinity College, Dublin.

THE chief lines of argument followed by the Critics of the Pentateuch are three. The first is based on the language. They argue that "the language of the four great documents which make up the Pentateuch is so different that they must have been composed by different writers. The difference of language extends to a very large vocabulary, so that each of the documents requires its own lexicon. And the differences are not differences of synonym; they are differences representing different centuries in the historical development of the Hebrew language." So writes Professor C. A. Briggs of New York.[1] The second argument is based on style. The differences in style of the different documents of the Pentateuch (they declare) demand not only different authors, but authors living at widely different times. The third argument is based on the historical situation. The historical situation of the several documents is different (they say), and the institutions they describe belong to different periods of history. The "four documents" are J, E, P and D. The style of the first is said to resemble that of the prophets of Judah, the style of the second that of the prophets of Ephraim, the third the book of Ezekiel and the Chronicles, and the fourth that of Jeremiah.

These four documents are spoken of as if they were absolutely distinct, and were characterized by such striking differences that they must be quite early discerned. It seems rather strange, then, to find professors like Prof. Bacon and Dr. Driver at variance in their analysis of a short passage like Exodus i.–xi., which contains 284 verses, of which 214 are assigned to the combined document JE. The question now arises how many of these verses belong to J and how many to E. In thirty-two verses of these little more than one in every six these professors differed from each other and their own former analysis as to which was E and which was J. Dr. Driver

[1] *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch* (Longmans, 1907).

remarked that "indeed stylistic criteria alone would not generally suffice to distinguish J and E." [1] Will it, then, distinguish P from J and E? Another point to be considered is that it requires a very minute and careful analysis to distinguish these four documents as they are said to have been arranged by the Critics. In Genesis 364 verses are assigned to P and 1,146 to JE. In Exodus 612 are P and 594 JE. In Leviticus 593 belong to P and 266 to earlier sources. In Numbers 995 are P and 288 JE. In Deuteronomy 10 are P, 41 JE, 908 are D. Such is Driver's analysis of the Pentateuch, which gives 2,574 verses to P, 2,069 to JE and 908 to D.

Surely the Critics are bound to give some reason for such a cumbersome and unique literary phenomenon. Unto what shall we liken this grotesque documentary mosaic? It seems to us just as if the drafter of the Petition of Rights in 1628 were to incorporate in his document the laws and histories of King Alfred, the provisions of Magna Charta, and the Articles of the Reformation! Would it not have been more reasonable for the priestly scribes of Ezra's day to have published J, E and P in separate books like the historical books and Deuteronomy itself, which is almost entirely one complete work according to the Critics? They could quite easily have secured the Mosaic authority, for (according to them) later compilations and legislation by assigning those alleged separate documents J, E and P directly to Moses. We are entitled to demand why and wherefore legislation which is alleged to belong to the latest stage is set in the very centre of the Pentateuch and followed by what is said by the critics to be earlier. Surely this order would imperil that legislation. It would be bound to be superseded by that which follows it in position and order. To make this clear the Critics distinguish "three codes" in the Pentateuch. In JE we have a simple code, found in Exodus xx. 24–xxiii., "the Book of the Covenant," relating to morals. In Deuteronomy we have a more advanced code. And in the latter portion of Exodus, in Leviticus and in Numbers we have the final stage of the elaborate ceremonial known as P. These codes will be examined in another place. Here it is sufficient to observe that the order in which they are arranged, the latest legislation being placed between the first and second codes, contravenes the universally recognized rule that more recent legislation is not printed before but after the previous legislation it supersedes. We

[1] *Literature of the Old Testament*, 7th Ed., p. 126.

can picture the confusion into which the English courts of law would be thrown if the laws of England were republished in a new form and order, the laws of George V being inserted between those of Anne and George I, many of the latter having been modified, altered or annulled by later legislation. This analogy is an exact parallel to which the Critics assume in this case.

We shall now discuss the argument based on style which the writers of the Higher Critical School have used in the treatment of the Pentateuch, and we hope to be able to show that they have employed in the case of the Old Testament canons of criticism which could not be applied with any prospect of success to any known literary works. They assume, as we have seen, the existence of " two narratives of the patriarchal and Mosaic ages, independent, yet largely resembling each other." [1] The older of these, called J, said to be the work of a writer in the Southern Kingdom, is dated about B.C. 850; E is the work of a writer in the Northern Kingdom about 750.[2]

What were the older sources of information used by these unknown writers J and E who " cast into a literary form the traditions respecting the beginning of a nation that were current among the people ? " [3] Dr. Driver gives a short and meagre list, consisting of a few lyrical poems, a prose account of a battle with Amalek, the ten commandments, and a few legal ordinances.[4] Although we do not think it at all likely that the Hebrews, who were acquainted with the use of writing for at least four centuries before, would be satisfied with this, we shall pass on to Dr. Driver's description of the literary style of J and E. Considering that, according to him, they were the first literary men among the Hebrews, it is a pity nothing is known of them in history. Nothing, in fact, outside the critical theory, is known of them at all. Driver dwells long and lovingly upon the difference of their styles, just after he had with but too apparent difficulty attempted to explain its evident similarity ! He wrote :

" In J Abraham journeys through the district of Shechem and Bethel, and also visits Beersheba, but his principal residence

[1] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 116.
[2] So Wellhausen and Kuenen. Other Critics, Dillmann, Kittel, Riehm, regard E as the older.
[3] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 117.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

appears to be Hebron, afterwards the great *Judaic* sanctuary; in E he dwells chiefly in Beersheba (the sanctuary frequented by Ephraimites).[1] As compared with J, E frequently states more particulars; he is best informed on Egyptian matters. . . . The allusions to the teraphim worship and polytheism of the Aramaean connexions of the patriarchs are all due to him, as well as, probably, the notices of Miriam, of Joshua as the minister of Moses, and of the rod in Moses' hand. The standpoint of E is the prophetical, though it is not brought so prominently forward as in J, and in general the narrative is more objective, less consciously tinged by ethical and theological reflections than that of J. . . . In his (E's) narrative of Joseph the *didactic* import of the history is brought out. J, if he dwells less than E upon concrete particulars, excels in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light. . . . In ease and grace his narratives are unsurpassed. . . . His dialogues especially are remarkable for the delicacy and truthfulness with which character and emotions find expression in them. Who can ever forget the pathos and supreme beauty of Judah's intercession. . . . The character of Moses is portrayed by him with singular attractiveness and force. In J, further, the prophetical element is conspicuously prominent. Indeed, his characteristic features may be said to be the fine vein of ethical and theological reflection which pervades his work throughout, and the manner in which his narrative, even more than that of E, becomes the vehicle of religious teaching. He deals with the problem of the origin of sin and evil in the world, and follows its growth. . . . And in order to illustrate the divine purpose of grace, as manifested in history, he introduces, at points fixed by tradition, "prophetic glances into the future," as he also loves to point to the character of nations or tribes as foreshadowed in their beginnings. . . . It is a peculiarity of J that his representations of the Deity are highly anthropomorphic. He represents Jehovah not only as expressing human resolutions and swayed by human emotions, but as performing sensible acts."

These are a few extracts from a long dissertation on the differences of style and treatment between E and J in Driver's *Introduction* (pp. 110–114, 4th Ed.). Would not an ordinary person infer that there was a very marked difference between J and E? Would

[1] *Driver, Introduction*, p. 111.

he not be surprised if he found that there was considerable uncertainty among the Critics as what is E and what is J in many places? "The resemblance," writes Dr. Moore, "in matter, form, and spirit is indeed so close that where, for any reason, the criterion of the Divine names fails us, it is often impossible to determine with confidence from which of the two sources, J or E, certain parts of the composite narrative are derived." [1] Driver himself admits "in the details of the analysis of JE there is sometimes uncertainty owing to the criteria being indecisive"; and he says, "the similarity of the narratives, such as it is, is sufficiently explained by the fact that their subject matter is (approximately) the same, and they both originated in the same general period of Israelitish literature" (109).

According to Driver, "J and E were combined together into a single whole at a relatively early period of the history of Israel (approximately in the eighth century)." [2] This was done by a prophet of Judah who "conceived the plan of compiling a comprehensive history of the traditions of his people" after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C." [3] The unlikelihood of a prophet of Judah incorporating with the history of his own tribe the records of the Northern tribes with whom Judah had been at war for two centuries, and in certain places giving preference to E over his own record J is overlooked. The still greater unlikelihood of his being able to weave together two different records, one with an "Ephraimite tinge" and the other written from the standpoint of Judah, in so subtle a manner that the most subtle-minded of critics are unable to distinguish which is which in considerable portions of Exodus and Numbers,[4] is not even considered.

The greatest unlikelihood of all is that such a complicated document should obtain such authority within one short century; that Deuteronomy—according to the Critics a new work discovered about 621 while some repairs were being carried on in the Temple—should be so completely founded upon it that it could be described

[1] Art. "Genesis," *Enc. Bibl.*

[2] *Introduction*, p. 116, but in his *Exodus*, p. xi., he says: "Probably in the . . . early part of the seventh century B.C."

[3] *Enc. Brit.* Ed. xi., Vol. III., p. 851.

[4] Driver says of JE's narrative in Exod. xix., xxiv., xxxii.–xxxiv.: "Much has been written upon it; but though it displays plain marks of composition it fails to supply the criteria requisite for distributing it in detail between the narrators."—*Introduction*, p. 39. He says the same thing of Num. xi. and Num. xxiii.–xxiv. (*Ibid.*, pp. 57–62).

as the "Book of the Law" and the "Book of the Covenant" in 2 Kings xxii. and xxiii.; and that Driver could say: "The *laws of JE*, viz. Exodus xx.–xxiii. and the kindred section xiii. 3–16, form the foundation of the Deuteronomic legislation"; [1] and yet for all this dependence on JE that legislation should, according to the Critics, repeal their law respecting sacrifice, limiting the latter to one central sanctuary and abolishing local shrines.

To explain the concluding reference more clearly. In Exodus xx. 24, it said, "In every place where I shall record My name (or 'cause My name to be remembered') I shall come to thee and bless thee." In Deuteronomy xii. 5, there is one central sanctuary, viz. "the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His name there, even unto His *habitation* [2] shall ye seek." But why is this place not named? If this book first appeared in Manasseh's reign, why did it not mention Jerusalem, where the Temple had been standing for three centuries? Why was it left possible for the Samaritans to claim that the place was Gerizim? And "if the progress of religion demanded the unconditional abolition of the local shrines," [3] why does Deuteronomy nowhere mention even in condemnation these high places? Is not this the answer, that the central sanctuary had not then been selected? But when the tabernacle was at Shiloh, was not Shiloh the central shrine, the habitation or tabernacle of God which man sought? It would appear that the law of Deuteronomy was known even then.[4] Was not the ark itself a symbol of the unity of worship intended? It is mentioned in Deuteronomy. The theory of the Critics regarding JE and Deuteronomy is bristling with improbabilities.

To pass on now to P, the priestly narrative, Driver says: "The literary style of P is strongly marked. If JE—and especially J—be free, flowing and picturesque, P is stereotyped, measured and prosaic." The narrative, both as a whole and in its several parts, is articulated systematically. The beginning and close of

[1] *Introduction*, p. 75.

[2] The word *shekhen* only here in sense of habitation is a kindred word to *mishkan* tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 9), being derived from the same verb *shakhan* (שָׁכַן) to dwell.

[3] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 93.

[4] The unorthodox would not obey this law of the central shrine. Their disobedience does not prove the non-existence of the law, but their own unorthodoxy.

an enumeration are regularly marked by stated formulæ. The descriptions of P are methodical and precise." [1] We have to remember that there is not one P, but at least three P's, and that J and E have had many redactors, so that it is not like comparing the styles of Spenser and Shakespeare, but rather comparing the style of one composite work—say a hymnal—with a similar collection made four centuries previous. We also note frequently in the same writer occasions when he prefers a " free, flowing, and picturesque " mode of speech, and occasions when he prefers a " stereotyped, precise and formal " style.

The main argument of the Critics is that difference of style, vocabulary and diction proves difference of authorship. All our letters are not written in the same style or language: those we send to our sons at school giving them good advice, and those we write to the Income Tax Officer. A man's style varies, and his language varies according to subject, time and circumstances. The Critics appeal to long lists of words they have compiled as masses of incontrovertible facts, to prove that J is J and E is E, and P is P, and D is D. Now we can test this argument in a very simple way. Take the four great Epistles of St. Paul, Romans, Galatians, First and Second Corinthians—all written in the same year. There are forty-five words alone beginning with *alpha*, which occur more than once in Corinthians and Galatians, and do not occur at all in Romans. And there are seventeen words beginning with *alpha* which occur more than once in Romans and not once in Corinthians and Galatians, while most of the words found in all the four epistles are those in common use. According to the argument which the Higher Critics employ in the case of J, E, P and D, the writer of Galatians did not write Romans ! As for the argument for style, we may take Milton's works. Lycidas is an elegy written after the earlier style of Virgil in his *Bucolics*, and Paradise Lost, a splendid epic, written somewhat in the style of the *Æneid*. Both works cannot have been by the same author. Take also the two parts of Faust, which are entirely different in language, style and ideas, and both were written by Goethe.

But according to the Higher Critics that is *impossible*. We can multiply instances so as to bring in every living and dead author, and by this very method used to disintegrate the scriptures we can

[1] *Introduction*, p. 122.

prove that Sir Walter Scott did not write his "Lay," nor Shakespeare his Sonnets, nor Driver his *Introduction*.

We have only to take up any historical work with notes. The text is always in a different style from the notes. Does this prove difference of authorship? It would also seem that Driver's own method of first making a broad general statement, and then entering into more minute detail in a succeeding paragraph, in his *Introduction to Old Testament Literature* furnishes a complete refutation of his theory. His ordinary type sections are in the flowing and rhetorical style; his small type sections are in the condensed and prosaic style. In his ordinary type sections he uses sesquipedalian and classical words which are not found in the small type sections. In the former he works out his own conclusions. In the latter he simply states the conclusions of others. In short, the differences in style, treatment and vocabulary between the two kinds of sections which follow each other systematically are so marked that Driver himself would be bound to conclude from his own canons of criticism that they were by different hands, and that the work of two independent writers had been combined by a later editor, just as JE were combined first by one editor, and then united to D by another, and afterwards with P by another. And yet we know this conclusion in the case of Driver's *Introduction* is absurd; therefore, we are entitled to argue that the canon of criterion from which this conclusion follows must be false. And when it so signally fails in the case of a recent work well-known to be a unity, can it be applied to works of so remote an origin with any prospect of success? Must not this argument based on style fall to the ground when it leads to such extraordinary conclusions in the case of a known work? Can we expect it to reveal the origin and composition of the Pentateuch?

Furthermore, the claim of the Higher Critics that they are able to apportion a certain portion of a chapter on Genesis or Exodus to the Elohist writer, and the next portion to the Jahvist, or P may be discounted by the difficulty we experience in correctly assigning the portions of any composite document, say the King's Speech, or of the novels of Besant and Rice to its own special author. In fact, we might take any graphic narrative in Shakespeare or Virgil and apportion it plausibly to different sources. An American writer, H. W. Magoun, takes at random Conington's rendering of

Virgil's *Æneid*, I. 723 ff.: "When the banquet's first lull was come, and the board removed, then they set up the huge bowls and wreathe the wine. A din rings to the roof—the voice rolls through those spacious halls; lamps hang from the gilded ceiling burning brightly, and flambeau fires put out the night. Then the Queen called for a cup, heavy with jewels and gold, and filled it with unmixed wine, the same which had been used by Belus and every king from Belus downwards, was filled. Then silence was commanded through the hall." This he shows yields two parallel accounts, analysing it after the principles of the Critics.[1]

A.

"When the banquet's first lull was come, they wreathe the wine. A din rings to the roof; lamps hang from the gilded ceiling burning brightly. Then the Queen called for a cup and filled it with unmixed wine. Then silence was commanded through the hall."

B.

"When the board was removed, then they set up the huge bowls. The voice rolls through those spacious halls; and flambeau fires put out the night. Heavy with jewels a cup which had been used by Belus and every king from Belus was filled."

Here we have two authors, A and B. Their idiosyncracies can be discerned at a glance. One is fond of wine—unmixed wine, the other is evidently a teetotaller; as his cup is probably filled with water. A belongs to a later age; for he describes lamps hanging from gilded ceiling; whereas B only knows of torches. There is a serious discrepancy also between the narratives, as A speaks only of a queen, and B states that the country has always been governed by kings. The later redactor has pieced together the two narratives just as the redactor JE put together the two narratives J and E in the Pentateuch. But it is plain that, like J and E, A and B did not supply the same sources of information! What would Virgil think of such an analysis of his lines? He would surely treat it with a bland smile of contempt. The fact that this principle of analysis can be applied indiscriminately to any long description or speech reduces it to an absurdity.

"The Hexateuch."

The question of style involves not only the Pentateuch but the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, which six books the Critics prefer to call the Hexateuch, for they regard Joshua as the work

[1] A layman's view of the critical theory. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1913, p. 383.

of the same authors and editors. Dr. Driver says: [1] "Its contents and still more its literary structure, show that it is intimately acquainted with the Pentateuch, and describes the final stage in the history of the 'Origines' of the Hebrew nation." The Higher Critics have united books which Jewish critics kept separate for reasons we know nothing of. The latter counted Joshua among the "former prophets." They described the Pentateuch as the *Torah* or Law. The Septuagint translators began their work with the Pentateuch. Josephus says the first five books were the books of Moses. The Samaritan Bible, which contains the first five books, does not contain Joshua. Ecclesiasticus (not later than 130 B.C.) speaks of the "Law, the Prophets and the Writings." St. Paul appeals to the Laws of Moses and the Prophets (Acts xxviii. 23). In St. Luke xxiv. 44, Our Lord refers to the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms. And there is no external proof to show that Joshua was ever included in the Law. The Critics, however, are not discomposed by external evidence. The evidence they build on is altogether internal, and not only that, but internal in their eyes, not necessarily in the eyes of others. Driver was nothing if not dogmatic on this subject. "The book of Joshua," he writes, "is not severed from the following books and connected with the Pentateuch, for the purposes of satisfying the exigencies of a theory, but because this view of the book is required by the facts" (p. 158).

Let us now hear the facts.

(1) It is "especially in the P sections," he said, that Joshua differs from the following books. Now in the first half of the book (chaps. i.–xii.) he only assigned 11½ verses to P; of the second half (chaps. xiii.–xxiv.) P constitutes 225 verses out of 306, rather more than two-thirds. Chaps. xxiii.-xxiv. have no P. This means that in the narrative portion there is no P, but in the chapters which deal with topographical descriptions and statistical details P is predominant, statistics being always a strong feature of P. But considering what these statistics relate to—the divisions of the land among the tribes—we are not surprised at their being different from what follows. There was no necessity to rehearse these divisions. There was no need to bring out a second Domesday Book in the reign of Richard I. No argument of any kind can be built upon the differences of these chapters from Judges, Samuel and Kings.

[1] *Introduction*, p. 103.

The subject-matter was enough to make them so. Are we to believe that these statistics were drawn up by the priests of the Exile 900 years afterwards? The very fact that these statistics are not given in Kings is a proof that they had been already given.

(2) Well, then, is P in Joshua homogeneous with the P of the Pentateuch? Apparently not. Driver gave a list of fifty words and phrases characteristic of P. Of these only eighteen are found in Joshua, and eight of the eighteen in chap. xxii. 9–34, the story of the tribes of Reuben, Gad and half Manasseh, regarding which he said, "the phraseology is in the main that of P"; but he felt compelled to admit the alternative that "the whole is the work of a distinct writer, whose phraseology is in part that of P, but not entirely." [1] In this, the principal and almost only narrative portion in the P section of Joshua, this P is not homogeneous with the P of the Pentateuch.

(3) We now come to the JE portions of Joshua. This is not the same JE of the Pentateuch either. Driver spoke of "the compiler of JE (or a kindred hand) utilizing older materials," [2] or "other independent sources," [3] which may not have been J or E at all.

(4) Finally, to come to D. He is not D at all, but D2, and "may be termed the 'Deuteronomic editor'" because he was "strongly imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy." [4] D2 is not "primarily interested" in "historical matter," but his aim is "to illustrate and emphasize the zeal shown by Joshua in fulfilling Mosaic ordinances." [5]

Accordingly, we have in Joshua not one of the sources of the Pentateuch, P, JE, or D in their purity, as the Critics allow, but in a hardly recognizable form, even to the Critics. And it is by these flimsy bonds that Joshua is connected with the Pentateuch. It is also to be noted that the subject-matter of these alleged sources is different, narrative (JE), statistics (P), and moralizing (D2). Now, is any man's style the same, or marked by the same characteristics, when he is writing a table of statistics, for *The Times*, an account of a holiday for a monthly magazine, or a homily to his son at school? Driver himself felt the difficulty of his own analysis. But yet he said it is "required by the facts." We have seen what the facts are,

[1] *Introduction*, p. 112, f. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 114. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 104.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 104. [5] *Ibid.*, 104.

and feel certain that all the exigencies of the case would be met by supposing the author to be one of the elders who was a companion and survivor of Joshua. Such an one would be keen to note and dilate upon the obedience or disobedience to the commands of Moses, and the success or failure that followed obedience or disobedience. He would give the narrative in a flowing style, and the divisions of the land in a businesslike manner.

All the external evidence is opposed to the Critics. And the internal evidence, on their own showing, cannot be pronounced to be in their favour. And in the face of all this, the attempt to incorporate the book of Joshua with the books of the Pentateuch, which seems to have no other object than to show the impossibility of Moses having written any portion of the Pentateuch, has met with no better succcess than would the similar attempt to incorporate the Domesday Book in the Saxon Chronicle of Alfred's day. Accordingly, we may say that the theory of the Critics so far from being " required by the facts," is formed independently of, and contrary to, the facts it is alleged to explain.

THE STORY OF OLIVER PLUNKET.

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

QUITE recently the Roman Church canonized Joan of Arc and Oliver Plunket. Of the former everybody has heard, but I rather suspect that few could tell much about the latter. I must confess that I had never heard of him before. When I discovered that his bones rest in the great Church at Downside, near my home—in the stately Abbey of the Benedictine Fathers who conduct Downside School, the Eton of the Roman Catholics—I became more curious. I felt less ashamed of my ignorance when I made fruitless inquiry of several who might be expected to know and I was comforted somewhat when one of the masters of the School, who courteously showed me over the Church, was obliged to admit that he himself knew very little about " Blessed Oliver " ! I returned to my library and renewed my search, with the result that presently I unearthed the story, and since others are possibly in like state, knowing nothing about this worthy, I will endeavour to give an outline of the facts concerning his career.

He was born at Lougherew, in County Meath, in the year 1629. At the age of sixteen he was sent to Rome and spent eight years in study for the Priesthood at the Irish College. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him and he was appointed Professor of Divinity in the College *De Propaganda Fide*, which had been established in 1621, mainly with a view to furthering the pretensions of the Papacy and assisting the Bishops of Rome in their plan to dominate the Church in other lands as well as Italy.

In the year 1560 the Bishops of the Church of Ireland finally repudiated the supremacy of the Pope, who in due course proceeded to appoint others, assigning to them the titles of the ancient sees. One Richard Creagh was the first of these titular prelates and was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh in April, 1564. Thus begins the history of the present succession of Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland. This Creagh had an eventful, chequered career. The Jesuit historian, Fitz-Symonds, must be held responsible for the wildly improbable and impossible story that this so-called "Archbishop of Armagh" was invited by Queen Elizabeth while a prisoner in the Tower of London to consecrate Parker to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Unfortunately for Fitz-Symonds, Parker's consecration had taken place five years before that of Creagh! With the latter we are not now directly concerned, and only mention him because he was the *first* in this new line—valid but irregular—of which Oliver Plunket was the *fifth*. In 1669 he gave up his work in Rome and returned to Ireland. It was not long before he found himself compelled to assert his rights, as Primate of Ireland, for the titular Archbishop of Dublin—Dr. Peter Talbot—was an ambitious, overbearing ecclesiastic whose pretensions Plunket was bound to repudiate and whom he courageously reproved for "intermeddling too much in the affairs of state, contrary to the Canons and orders of the Pope." Although we can only regard him as an interloper we cannot but admire the fine courage with which he maintained his usurped rights, and though we must often take Burnett *cum grano salis*, he was no doubt fully justified in describing Plunket as "a wise and sober" man.

It would seem strange that one who had given ample proof of his loyalty and of his intense dislike for anything in the way of political intrigue should be arraigned on a charge of high treason, but such is the cruel irony of fate. He was accused of being engaged

in a dark plot to land 20,000 Frenchmen at Carlingford, where, it was alleged, he had promised to join them with 70,000 men. Despite the fact that in some instances his informers were men of exceedingly doubtful reputation and questionable integrity, Plunket was apprehended and lodged in Newgate on December 6, 1679. He was allowed to languish in prison for nearly a year, and was then formally charged under seven counts. At first his trial broke down, but subsequently further evidence against him was manufactured somehow and eventually he was found guilty. It is a pitiable story. His papers and witnesses were in Ireland, and he was allowed five weeks from the date of his arraignment on May 3 to procure them. Unfortunately, when the day of his trial arrived they were not forthcoming. Moreover, his incarceration increased the difficulty of getting together witnesses for the defence, consequently he pleaded for an extension of five days. This was refused, the trial proceeded, and he was found guilty and condemned to death. He was hanged, drawn and quartered at Tyburn on July 1, 1681. He made a brilliant defence on the scaffold, protesting his innocence. Of this there can hardly be a question, and there is little doubt that this unhappy man suffered the extreme penalty for an offence of which he was innocent.

In prison he formed an intimate friendship with the Benedictine, Dom Maurus Corker, who admitted the Archbishop to the Benedictine Confraternity. In return for his friendship Oliver bequeathed him his body. Dom Maurus, released from prison on the accession of James II, exhumed the body of his friend, which had been buried in the churchyard of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and removed it to the crypt of the English Benedictine Abbey at Lambspring, in Germany, where it remained for 200 years. In 1883, Cardinal Gasquet, then Prior of Downside, having obtained the necessary consents, brought it back to England and placed it in a tomb in the north aisle of the Church at Downside. Thus ends the story of a terrible tragedy—a distressing instance of a miscarriage of justice which every right-minded man will deplore.

Incidentally it is worthy of notice that Plunket's controversy with Talbot ended in the Pope deciding in favour of Plunket. This made him Primate of Ireland in the line of the Pope's emissaries, the accredited agents of the modern Italian mission.

FIFTY YEARS OF THE DISESTABLISHED CHURCH OF IRELAND.[1]

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

FEW books that have been recently published contain more useful lessons for English Churchmen than Archdeacon Patton's brilliant sketch of the first half-century of the Disestablished Church of Ireland. The book is cheap, for it costs only five shillings, and contains illustrations that are in themselves worth the price paid. It is written in a bright crisp style with entire freedom from mannerisms and is decidedly one of those literary histories that are written to be read. Humour abounds in its pages, and a kindliness of spirit is found even when men and measures are severely criticized. It is easy to see that among leaders of the past Bishop Fitzgerald of Killaloe is the chief object of his reverence, and for Lord James Butler he reserves his sharpest fangs. Yet he mentions of the latter (quoting Archdeacon Sherlock) the courtesy shown Archbishop Trench by the most extreme of his critics. We miss in the book one document which is of outstanding importance as all the Clergy of the Church before ordination or assuming any office therein, have to approve and agree to its contents. The Preamble and Declaration prefixed to the Statutes of the Church of Ireland is the regulative document of the Church. It deserves quotation in full, for unless it is known to the reader much of the history of the Church of Ireland will not be understood.

I

(1) The Church of Ireland doth, as heretofore, accept and unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given by inspiration of God; and doth continue to profess the faith of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church.

(2) The Church of Ireland will continue to minister the Doctrine, and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the Three Orders of Bishops, Priests or Presbyters and Deacons in the Sacred Ministry.

(3) The Church of Ireland, as a Reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby affirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the Primitive Faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.

[1] *Fifty Years of Disestablishment*, by H. E. Patton. Dublin A.P.C.K. 5/-.

II

The Church of Ireland doth receive and approve, The Book of the Articles of Religion commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles, received and approved by the Archbishops and Bishops and the rest of the Clergy of Ireland in the Synod holden in Dublin, A.D. 1634; also the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of Ireland; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, as approved and adopted by the Synod holden in Dublin A.D. 1662 and hitherto in use in this Church. And this Church will continue to use the same, subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church.

III

The Church of Ireland will maintain Communion with the Sister Church of England, and with all other Christian Churches agreeing in the principle of this Declaration; and will set forward, so far as in it lieth, quietness, peace and love among all Christian people.

IV

The Church of Ireland, deriving its authority from Christ, Who is the Head over all things in the Church, doth declare that a General Synod of the Church of Ireland, consisting of the Archbishops and Bishops, and of Representatives of the Clergy and Laity, shall have chief legislative power therein, and such administrative power as may be necessary for the Church, and consistent with its Episcopal Constitution.

The importance of this statement cannot be minimised, and it is surprising that it finds no place in the Archdeacon's sketch. The writer well remembers how he and his brother candidates for ordination were sent to study it before signing the declaration, and we believe that this practice still exists in the Church. No man in its ministry can have any doubt of the doctrinal orientation of the Church, and the attitude it adopts on many subjects of acute controversy in the Church of England.

Deprived of its connexion with the State, despoiled of its revenues by the passage of an Act described as "most unhappy, most ill-tried, most ill-omened," the Church had in eighteen months to set its house in order. Financially the dangers were overcome by an act of faith on the part of the clergy who preferred the uncertainty of the future to personal gain in the service of God, and by the generosity of laymen for the most part connected with the land-

owning class. As a result of the wisdom of its leaders and the continued support of its people, the clergy of the Church of Ireland have been kept from want. They have had neither poverty nor riches but a sufficiency to maintain simple living among a kind-hearted people. Until the rise of prices came as the result of the war there might be struggle in the rectories—there was not the want with which we have become only too familiar in England. By reorganization and another great effort the clergy of to-day have been rescued from the plight in which they were placed by economic causes beyond their power to avert and have also Pension and Widows and Orphans Schemes that are financially sound. The story of the steps by which this end has been reached is lucidly set forth and can be easily followed by even the least intelligent of readers.

A demand came for Revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Stability had been secured for the framework of the Church by the action of bishops, clergy and people who recognized that unity was all important, and this could only be attained by genial feeling and hearty co-operation. Sixty-nine of the clergy protested against any Revision. One of them said that the inscription "Mangling Done Here" should be written over the door of the meeting place of the Revision Committee. Archdeacon Lee of Dublin in consequence of the acceptance of a motion in favour of Revision resigned from the body that passed the motion. Many of the Revisionists would have altered the doctrines of the Church beyond recognition. They were extreme Puritans who "uttered dreary jeremiads over the rigidity of those who preferred the doctrines of the Prayer Book as they were." It was a time of controversial eagerness. Men were fighting for what they believed to be matters of vital importance. For many years the struggle raged over the use of the Athanasian Creed. Many were the proposals and all excited heat. At last the Creed was printed without the English rubric, and was allowed —unlike in the American Church—to retain its place in the Eighth Article. Pusey and Liddon thundered that this involved the irretrievable loss of the place of the Church of Ireland in Catholic Christendom. Bishop Alexander who fought hard against this solution lived to say "the decision come to by the Church of Ireland upon the Athanasian Creed now strikes me as one of consummate wisdom." No changes of moment were made in the offices for Holy Communion

and Holy Baptism. The declaratory absolution was omitted in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, and the Ordinal was not altered.

To quiet consciences and to make plain the teaching of the Church a new Preface was prefixed to the Prayer Book, and the Ornaments Rubric was dropped—provision as to the dress of ministers and the furnishing of chancels being made by canon. The Preface has been bitterly attacked for its Protestant character. It stands as the official act of the body that sanctioned the Prayer Book and cannot be explained away. Two testimonies to the Revised Prayer Book from men whose ecclesiastical views are not those of the majority of Irish Churchmen may be quoted. Archbishop Alexander said: "It was quaintly said by an Irish prelate of a certain sermon that it did not 'contain enough gospel to save a fly.' Our Prayer Book has not admitted into its text enough anti-catholicism to drown an ecclesiastical midge." The Most Rev. Dr. Bernard, Provost of Trinity College, has given it as his opinion in reply to the remark "our Irish Preface, if not openly heretical, speaks with an heretical brogue," "I am afraid that we must plead guilty to our brogue; indeed none of us is ashamed of it, I should hope. For the 'brogue' is the distinctive mark of an Irishman's nationality, and we have always claimed to be a National Church, with a right to a 'brogue.' And the form which our 'brogue' takes in Church matters is not perhaps more offensive, after all, than the insularity which suspects heresy in every unfamiliar custom or phrase. No one is more deeply sensible of the shortcomings of the Irish Church than those who have the honour to serve her; the ideal is greater than the performance. But to suggest that she has fallen into heresy, or that she has protested herself out of her catholic inheritance, is to suggest what is, happily, untrue."

We may say that in the Canons dealing with the regulation of Divine Service and the Ornaments of the Churches and Ministers "the Church of Ireland has taken every possible measure to prevent the assimilation of the Communion Service to the Roman Mass." No one who reads them can have any doubt on this point. Their directions are clear, unambiguous and directive. When a Church knows its own mind it can make its position plain to all its members.

To-day the Church of England is agitated by proposals for Revision. In Ireland the doctrinal revisionists were intellectually and

theologically Puritans. Some of them might be called without offence Plymouthists in their attitude, for the teaching of John Nelson Darby, who was a Co. Wicklow curate, had then a hold upon many earnest minds. They failed in their object which they considered to be theological manifestation of the spirit of the Protestant Reformation in Public Worship. In England the party clamouring for doctrinal Revision wish to get behind the Reformation and to restore much that defaced and obscured the teaching of the Primitive Church. We are convinced that as in Ireland, so it may be in England, the main body of Churchmen will prove their attachment to the Church of their baptism by resisting successfully the proposed alterations that bring back the teaching of the Mass to the formularies of the Church. Revision in Ireland led to many a tough contest, but it left no rancour behind it, as the men who worked on both sides were at bottom one. There was no fear of a "split," or a secession on any scale worth mentioning. All were loyal children of the Reformation, and it was a struggle between those who were content with the heritage of their fathers and those who wished to go beyond it in a reforming direction. All accepted the Declaration which we have quoted, and when that was accepted there could be no great defection from the Book as it was used before Disestablishment. If English Churchmen understand what is at stake we believe they will be as successful in their struggle as their Irish brethren were in the seventies.

During the ten years that followed Disestablishment it might seem that a Church faced by such trying problems would spend all its time and energy in meeting new difficulties. It was not so in Ireland. Three cathedrals were restored. St. Finbar's, Cork, was without its spires. Two citizens offered £39,000 to erect them, and Bishop John Gregg said: "And now we will soon have our three towers erected and won't we sing Hallelujah Choruses then? And won't we sing triumphantly when we have these towers towering in the sky? But you must remember that won't complete the whole. Look at the carving in front we will have to do; but I hope, with God's blessing having done so well, we will do well in future." And well they did. St. Finbar's Cathedral is one of the most beautiful cathedrals in the United Kingdom. Very different in some respects it bears to our mind influences of the Spanish cathedral of Burgos—the greatest architectural gem of its kind in the

world. Dublin also saw Christ Church Cathedral restored at a cost of nearly a quarter of a million, and the work done by Mr. Burges in Cork was repeated in a very different style of architecture by Mr. G. E. Street in the capital. Those who have worshipped in its beauty, need not be reminded of its perfection of line and solemn dignity. In the West the Cathedral Church of St. Mary, Tuam, was restored and the Church of Ireland engraved on the skyline a stone record of its faith in its future.

But another work of a different kind was done that has left its mark upon the Church of England. It must be told in Archdeacon Patton's words. " Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, of Winchester, had moved at the Canterbury House of Convocation in 1861 that a new Lectionary should be provided. Convocation agreed and requested the Bishop to frame one. The Bishop wrote to his former curate, Dr. Trench, then Archbishop of Dublin, suggesting that he should undertake the task. But it was the first year of Disestablishment; the Archbishop's hands were already full; and unwilling to disappoint his friend Archbishop Trench requested one of his ablest clergy, Canon J. G. Scott, of Bray, to draw up the proposed Lectionary. Canon Scott, like his Archbishop, was busy in the work of reconstruction, and he in turn assigned the duty to his curate, the Rev. William Sherlock. Mr. Sherlock, admirably qualified for the task, framed the New Lectionary, which Convocation accepted, and thus it came to pass that a Lectionary, commonly in use throughout the greatest national Church in Christendom, under lawful authority, for many years, was the composition of an Irish curate." That Lectionary still has lawful authority among us and with the exception of the replacement of its Apocrypha lessons by the omitted chapters from the Book of the Revelation was the Lectionary adopted by the Church of Ireland.

After a period of comparative quiet Ireland entered upon " perilous times." " Agitation was rampant, and disloyalty was spouted from many platforms. Boycotting had come to stay and Dublin Castle was in constant guard against surprise." The poorer rural dioceses were in difficulties and the North of Ireland came to their rescue. England, too, gave help, and an important letter from the Bishop of Tuam was read at a meeting in support of a Church of Ireland Sustentation Fund in Lambeth Palace. Remarkable progress had been made in Tuam Diocese during the preceding twenty

years. Alas! a very different story has to be told to-day of the Western Diocese. The Church was passing through a very trying time. The landed gentry had been its chief support, and Dr. J. P. Mahaffy wrote: "It is the opinion of the best and most experienced authorities that before two years more have elapsed at least half the Irish gentry will be bankrupt." Like other prophets of evil he exceeded in his descriptions the darkness of the prospect. But he had not then any inkling of what would happen in the twentieth century when the landlords had disappeared and their houses were burnt to the ground. The Church did not lose faith. It went on with its work and proved equal to the task of meeting fresh situations with measures adapted to relieve the threatening evils. The dread of Home Rule was a very real fear to Irish Churchmen, and the Bishop of Derry (Dr. Alexander) expressed the views of most Irish Churchmen when he said at the Albert Hall of the Bill: "Morally, it is the great betrayal; logically, it is the great fallacy; religiously, it is the great sectarianism; socially it is the great break up; and imperially, it is the great break down." The Home Rule Bills were defeated, and it is now a matter of speculation what would have their effect been in Ireland had they passed. Irish Churchmen held their convictions conscientiously, and at Special Synod Meetings expressed them. It is useless even for the wisest Irishmen to pronounce any trustworthy opinion on the effect of their defeat on the development of the country. We know Ireland to-day, and the people who inhabit the island were as elusive of generalized description then as they are now.

During the years 1880–1900 Ireland took its place in the world politics of the Anglican Communion. The Archbishop of Dublin—Lord Plunket—was one of nature's gentlemen—a gentleman by birth, a greater gentleman by nature. No one who knew him doubted his gentleness and few were prepared for his courageous facing difficulties that he might have avoided. Described as a "true knight errant of the Cross of Christ" he had the sympathy of the best of the knights of old, but he never sought perplexities for their own sake. A young Englishman—incumbent of a Kingstown church—the Rev. H. E. Noyes, now Vicar of St. Mary's, Kilburn, brought to his notice the brave effort of Spanish and Portuguese Evangelical Churchmen to form native Churches and obtain full episcopal orders for their elected leaders. Lord Plunket, then

Bishop of Meath, was deeply interested by what he heard at the Lambeth Conference of 1878. He went to Spain and saw for himself what was being done, and to the day of his death in 1897 he was the chief champion and protector of the Reformers of Spain and Portugal. His apostolic journeys, his great and calm courtesy, and his self-forgetfulness in the advocacy of their cause brought him before the general public. He had a passion for freedom and a deep conviction of the reality of the spiritual movement in the Peninsula. He found humble men and women sharing his own faith, and he saw no reason why they should not have all the spiritual privileges he and his fellow Churchmen enjoyed in their own country.

Controversy arose in England, and the apple of discord was thrown into the Church of Ireland that was at first unanimously behind Archbishop Plunket. It is sad but true that practically all the divisions that have occurred in Ireland—and they were very few—have been the reflexion of English ecclesiastical movements. The Archbishop was determined if he obtained permission from the Irish bishops to consecrate Bishop of the Spanish Reformed Church Señor Cabrera, a man of striking personality, deep learning of the Spanish type, and undoubted piety. Accompanied by the Bishops of Clogher and Down and Connor (Drs. Stack and Welland) he consecrated Sr. Cabrera and an ecclesiastical uproar arose that astonished most Irish and English Churchmen. Lord Halifax wrote to the Archbishop of Toledo expressing sympathy with him on the intrusion of the British bishops. When Archbishop Plunket read this letter the writer of this article was with his Grace. He laid aside the paper and bowed his head in silence. For some minutes nothing was said and then the Archbishop looked up with tears pouring down his face. "To think that an English Churchman, in Lord Halifax's position, should write apologizing for the bestowal of spiritual privileges on fellow Churchmen, to the head of the traditionally most intolerant part of the Roman Church." His Grace said no more, but the incident left a never to be forgotten impression on the man who witnessed it.

The reasons for the outburst were soon apparent. Efforts for a rapprochement with the Roman Church were in progress, and the Spanish Consecration proved the occasion of a rupture. Cardinal Vaughan informed the Spanish Archbishop that Lord Halifax merely represented a portion of a Protestant sect in England. We

have no wish to re-open old controversies, but it is worthy of notice that the main burden of the complaint was that Archbishop Plunket had intruded in an ancient Catholic See and had set up altar against altar. How shallow this contention was, appeared plain when it was discovered that a very large proportion of the American Episcopate was condemned on that ground. The American Protestant Episcopal Church has since consecrated bishops for Brazil, Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands in all of which there already existed old bishoprics. What was at stake was something more than a mere matter of ecclesiastical order. The fundamental difference between traditional Anglican and neo-Catholic convictions came to the front.

In this chapter we have noticed a few minor errors—due to the confused writing of the period when no one unless an expert was able to distinguish between the truth or otherwise of the contradictory statements. On the whole it is a remarkably fair presentation of facts in perspective and is a tribute to the industry of Archdeacon Patton and his skill in disentangling facts from fiction. No Irish archbishop or bishop was a more fearless advocate for the Reformed Faith than Lord Plunket, and yet his statue is the only episcopal statue in a public place in Ireland. It was erected by subscriptions collected from all classes of Irishmen on a site provided by the Corporation of Dublin. It required something more than mere ecclesiastical greatness in Ireland in 1897 to produce this testimony to the character of a man who never did anything to seek the approval of the public, but followed his conscience whithersoever it led him. He added lustre to a great name, and was an inspiration to all who knew and loved his Christian simplicity and devoted service of his Saviour.

A visit from the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Benson) was paid to the Church of Ireland which made it its duty to give him the heartiest of welcomes. His Grace addressed a great meeting in Dublin and over the platform were the words, "Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant." With skill the Archbishop took the words as the basis of his speech, and showed how each one contributed an essential element to the character of the Church. His Grace reopened the cathedral of St. Brigid, Kildare, at a service which lasted three and a half hours. He said in his sermon: "It was with no eye to compromise that the Reformation took its

course: 'Truth, Truth,' was the morning star which guided its gaze to the sun. The spirit had no mind to break the thread of the Church's history. Witness in every hand the Prayer Book, and its clear-voiced preface on 'the wisdom of the Church of England,' that preface which you in your Prayer Book freely adopt and stand by." Leaving Armagh the Archbishop of Canterbury took the hand of Archbishop Alexander and smilingly kissed the archiepiscopal ring upon it, saying, "I salute the ancient See of Armagh." He visited Belfast, where he received the most cordial of welcomes, and two days after his departure he fell on sleep in Hawarden Parish Church. Archdeacon Patton tells the story of this historic visit with feeling and picturesque vividness.

The last section of the book deals with the work that has been recently accomplished. Irish Churchmen in the South and West live for the most part isolated lives. No opportunity was given them of taking part in public life. In Ulster they are very numerous but they are for the most part working men, and in Belfast problems similar to those that arrest attention in Birmingham have to be faced. With a spirit of heart unity, North and South have ever been component parts of the one Church, and have worked together "bearing one another's burdens." Hand in hand they faced the changes and needs of a kaleidoscopic time, laid deep and well the foundations of plans that have borne fruit and are able to see rising in crowded districts new work and in the country where population diminishes schemes for using the man power to the best advantage. It is a tale of brave endeavour made in faith —a story of a gallant fight for maintenance of opportunities for feeding on the living bread in every part of the country. Very briefly Archdeacon Patton sketches the last two years and quotes the letter of the Roman Catholic bishops in proof of the ravages of internal strife. What was true in October, 1922, is much sadder truth now. "The words are dreadfully true; and inasmuch as 'the mansions' and 'country houses' and 'demesnes' referred to belonged for the most part to members of the Church of Ireland, the loss to Churchmen has been unspeakable. And there have been worse losses. The lives of loyal men have been taken. It would not be too much to say that the Church has lost more in these two years than in the preceding fifty years with which this volume is concerned. And yet amid it all, amid the deep con-

sciousness of such awful times, amid wofully depressing days, there is hope. A gleam of light is breaking through the darkness. The Provisional Government has begun well. It has shown a realization of Ireland's needs, and proved already its capacity for further service." We quote these optimistic words. Their commentary must be sought in the events that have happened since November, 1922. They were penned in that month.

We have only skimmed the contents of this fascinating volume that records the life of a Church whose contributions to Foreign Missions increased from £12,837 to £72,365. We have said nothing of the fascinating character sketches that adorn its pages and the humour which cannot be concealed by any Irishman who is racy of the soil writing about the deeds of his brother Irishmen. The present writer was privileged to enjoy the friendship of many of those whose names appear, and to be acquainted with the majority of the men mentioned as leaders. He can only say that the author has caught with an amazing fidelity the chief points in their outlook and has charmingly described their work. No one who wishes to know what Ireland at its best can be, should pass the book by as a mere ecclesiastical history. It is alive from its first to its last line.

Two impressions deserve stressing. The Church of Ireland has unity amid variety. It is a great mistake to say that men of differing types do not find themselves at home within its comprehensive borders. We may not always agree with the Archdeacon on the wisdom or unwisdom of certain events he describes, and it is possible to think that the Church has had more than its own share of internal struggles. No conclusion could be more unfounded. There is a common loyalty to the Church and a brotherliness that cannot be too highly extolled. Many years ago the writer had a prolonged discussion in print with Canon Travers Smith—the protagonist of the traditional Sacramental School in the Church of Ireland. He fell into an error of fact that would have called from most men the retort "*ab uno disce omnes.*" Instead of scoring a point, the Canon wrote to his young friend pointing out the error and ignored it in his published reply, dealing with the main argument of the letter that contained the blunder. This is one small illustration of the underlying friendliness that prevailed and still prevails in the Church of Ireland. Bitterness does not exist—differences are

recognized as honest convictions rightly held within the Church, for the sons of the Church of Ireland are loyal to its teaching.

Much has been said of the bad results of popular election to bishoprics in the Church of Ireland. A few years ago an Irish clergyman resident in England sat with half a dozen Irish bishops. He asked them " could they mention the names of those clergymen who ought to have been bishops since Disestablishment and had not been chosen by the Synods or the House of Bishops." Many names were mentioned, and after a long discussion it was decided that no really outstanding man *capax imperii* had been overlooked. The same question was put to a number of leading clergymen and the reply was identical. Readers of this book can judge for themselves of the wisdom of the choices made, but they must remember that Dr. Salmon more than once declined to allow himself to be nominated for the Episcopate. We thank God for what the Church of Ireland has been enabled in the Providence of God to accomplish, and heartily agree with the Archbishop of Armagh in expressing our happiness " in the discovery of a chronicler who does not lack the needful gifts " of telling the story of her activities during fifty years of Disestablishment.

FIFTY-SIX SHORT SERMONS. By the Right Rev. Gilbert White, M.A., D.D., Bishop of Willochra. London: *S.P.C.K.* 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

These sermons, " for the use of lay readers," have at least the merit of brevity, but beyond that there is nothing very remarkable about them; only a few of them rise above the mediocre. Many statements are, in our opinion, open to criticism. We wonder if the Bishop ever read Waterland on *ἀναμνησις*, and we never heard before that Protestants " think that anyone can found a Christian Church! " They believe that *the* Church was founded by Christ, and is something vastly bigger than the Anglican or any other community. Of course it is conceivable that they may be wrong and the Bishop right, but nevertheless, he need not misrepresent them! All New Testament references to judgment are apparently taken to refer to the Great White Throne. Used with discretion, however, lay workers will find some plain sermons on useful texts. Some one has said that a text torn out of its context is but a pretext! But the Bishop is not guilty of this: his texts are not mottoes, but the discourses aim at exposition.

EVANGELISM.

By the Rev. W. J. Limmer Sheppard, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Ripon.

I

EVANGELISM is in the air! At the Sheffield Church Congress the subject was "The Eternal Gospel," and the Archbishop of York, in the most notable utterance of the week, declared that the Church's first duty was "to evangelize itself." Conferences of Evangelicals are being held to consider the best methods of evangelistic work. The Anglo-Catholics declare that their Congresses held in various centres are the preliminary to an attempt on their part to evangelize England. The Church Army has set out to evangelize great centres by United Missions or Crusades, and to evangelize the rural parishes by route marches of Crusaders from a centre to various points. The Church Parochial Mission Society states that its work of last year showed "a substantial increase," while it "can discern growing indications of a widespread desire for a large extension of evangelizing work in the near future." The Free Churches are calling all their members to a great campaign of Personal Evangelism. Popular missioners, like Gipsy Smith, draw immense crowds, and report that in all parts of the country there is a spirit of revival. Evangelism is in the air!

Evangelism is clearly divided into two great branches. There is Public Evangelism, and there is Personal Evangelism. It is a great mistake to think, as some do, that the latter excludes the former, so that if we can get Personal Evangelism carried on, Public Evangelism will have no further usefulness. Rather, both branches of the work are equally valuable. But the practice of the two methods has not been equal. In our present Public Evangelism we have a revival, with developments, of the methods which almost ceased to exist with the declaration of war, but which are now once more coming into use. In Personal Evangelism it must be confessed that we have practically an almost untouched field of work. Let us, then, first direct our thoughts to the subject of Public Evangelism.

In Public Evangelism we again find a division into two branches of work, and again a striking inequality in the use of the two;

we may call these two branches, for convenience sake, the Ordinary and the Extraordinary, and in considering them I am simply confining myself to doing this from the parochial standpoint, not dealing with such special efforts as, for instance, the Church Army Crusades. How, then, is Evangelism to be carried into and carried on in our parishes?

(1) *By Ordinary Methods*, i.e., efforts conducted by the parish priest himself, without extraneous aid. It is this branch of the work which is, comparatively, so little used, and which in many cases, if not in all, is fraught with great promise of fruitfulness. Take such a method of Ordinary Evangelism as an after-service, following the usual Sunday Evening Prayer at which the sermon has been distinctly of an evangelistic character, with appropriate hymns, or, maybe, even the use of a Mission hymn-book. There are many earnest evangelistic sermons preached which lose most of their result because those stirred and impressed are immediately let go without any effort to reach them individually or to crystallize the otherwise fleeting impression into a definite and permanent act of decision. Let the choir be asked to remain in their places and sing a hymn after the Benediction, and all those of the congregation who choose be invited to stay for a brief period of drawing nearer to God. When those who so desire have left the church, let the choir come down into the front seats of the nave, so that the parish priest himself alone faces the people. Then let him talk, not preach, to those present with all the earnestness he can command, not at any great length, but specially addressing himself to the undecided. Then let this be followed by prayer, a short period of silence, and a hymn sung kneeling, during which let him try to bring any who need it to a definite act of decision in the way that best commends itself to him. And this again will frequently be followed by personal interviews, when, maybe, the last obstacles which lie between some soul and its Saviour will finally be removed.

Or take again the lantern service, held in church or school after the Sunday evening service, open to all adults over fourteen years of age, but children below that age carefully excluded (unless with their parents), these being dealt with in another way, as Evangelism in a mixed congregation of children and adults is an all but hopeless task. Owing to the semi-darkness it is better not to attempt to ask people to leave before an after-service, but simply to make

the appeal for personal decision to the whole congregation. It must be remembered that the address is not an explanation of the pictures, but the pictures are illustrations of the address. The signalling arrangements must be as noiseless as possible, and the slides most carefully arranged beforehand, as any confusion or mistake detracts immensely from the "atmosphere" of the service. A simple Mission solo, with four or five appropriate pictures accompanying it, is often most effective, but for this purpose no words should be upon the screen, hence clear articulation on the part of the singer is a necessity.

A Children's Mission, consisting of a succession of five or six lantern services on week-nights, for which Lent is an excellent time, has proved itself to be most useful. It is better not to throw these services open to all and sundry, at any rate in large parishes, or the lantern may attract an unruly mob, unmanageable in the dim light. It is preferable to confine the attendance to the scholars of the Church Day and Sunday Schools over seven or eight years of age, issuing tickets to be shown at the door in order to ensure this. It may be taken for granted that a disorderly children's lantern service does more harm than good. The crucial part of the children's lantern service, especially if held in a hall, is the assembling, as if the children are allowed to be noisy then it is very difficult to get that perfect stillness afterwards which is essential for the service itself. The best method that I know of solving this problem is to be present oneself when the first detachment of children arrives, and as soon as some twenty or thirty have assembled to begin to teach them to learn by heart some simple chorus or hymn, words first and then music. This provides a subject of interest for the half-hour of waiting, and allows the children to exercise their voices in an unobjectionable way. I always robe for these services, wherever they may be held, and request two or three minutes of absolute silence while I retire for that purpose. All this helps to create the right atmosphere before the service itself begins. Should the children cough much, let me urge the avoidance of a mistake which I made once—and only once!—in requesting the children to "cough and get it over." Every child of the thousand or more present considered it at once his or her duty to cough loud and long; my voice was drowned in the tumult, and it was some little time before I could get silence again!

The after-service for children is the most difficult of all. Above everything one desires to avoid unreality, and yet children are often far more ready to make their decision for Christ than are adults, and often quite as sincere. I may be perhaps forgiven for describing my own method in full. Assuming that I have five services, and that the age of attendance is limited to "over eight," I announce that an opportunity will be given to every one to attend one after-service, but that there will be an age limit each night. I explain that the after-service is only for those who really desire to accept Christ (or whatever phrase best describes the point of the previous appeal), and that, on this first night, only those over thirteen may remain. Then I ask all desiring so to stay to pass towards the doors with the others, while a hymn is sung, but to take seats at the back and wait for further instructions. When those remaining are thus seated and the rest have left, a band of workers takes the children apart separately and asks their reason for remaining, those whose answer is satisfactory coming back to the front seats, and those who only "want to see some more pictures," or something of that kind, being dismissed for that evening. This ensures, so far as it is possible to do so, a little company of children who are mostly in real earnest. Then, with the help of a few pictures, I explain what is meant by decision for Christ, after which I have found it best to have thrown on the screen three or four very simple prayers—drawn up by myself for this purpose—and after a few words on each, let the children kneel and pray them aloud. Then a simple Decision Card, on exactly the same lines as the prayers, is given to each when the lights are raised, names and addresses are taken, and the children pass out, while I speak to each one at the door. On successive nights the after-service age limit is gradually reduced, till all have had a chance to stay.

When the Mission is ended, the list of names and addresses thus secured is taken and each child is invited to come to the church at a certain hour on some evening when a band of workers is again in attendance. Each child is then dealt with personally for a quarter of an hour or so, being taken apart for the purpose, and the reality of his or her decision ascertained so far as is possible; other details are taken down, children are enrolled in any suitable parish organizations if not already members, and the forms thus filled up supply a fairly complete record of the result of the Mission.

Years later it is again and again a joy to find Confirmation candidates dating their decision for Christ as being "at the Children's Mission."

At the Sheffield Congress Dr. Locke pleaded, in very earnest and moderate terms, for the use of the Confessional, which, he said, provided the means for those in spiritual distress giving vent to their feelings and obtaining the help they needed. To that extent there is much truth in Dr. Locke's words, but this need is equally well met by the plan, which I ventured to advocate years ago, and which has met with some small acceptance and with a good deal of criticism, namely, the practice of a weekly Consultational, when the parish priest is in the vestry or the church at stated times, and can be seen by anyone desiring spiritual help or counsel of any kind. This may not be practicable in all parishes, but where it is possible it will certainly lead to some cases of Evangelism of the most definite kind, as I know by experience.

The above methods and that of open-air services—with the exception of the Children's Mission, which *must* be conducted by a man with the gift of speaking to children—are all within the reach of the ordinary parish priest, granted the one condition that he himself knows what decision for Christ means in his own personal experience. Without that, nothing can be done; but if that is a blessed fact in his own spiritual life, then, even if he have not the gifts of an Evangelist, he may yet do some real and splendid Evangelism in his own church and parish.

We will turn next to Extraordinary methods. Here the outstanding way of Evangelism is, I still venture to think, the Parochial Mission, albeit this method has of recent years been largely discredited, partly, I fear, as a result of the National Mission. But in my judgment there is no need for the Parochial Mission to be thus discredited, all it needs is to be re-directed. The old Parochial Missions were mainly an appeal to the outsider, in which they were often extremely successful, but in that respect their usefulness is largely over. To-day to the unconverted man in the street the announcement of a Mission has much the same effect as that of a Temperance meeting to a drunkard, it tends to keep him out rather than to draw him in. But, says the Archbishop, "the Church must evangelize itself." There is the opportunity of the Parochial Mission. It is the evangelization of those already inside

the Church which is our crying need. A vicar of a country parish, with some seventy communicants on its roll, in reply to a question had to confess that he could not think of one who was really an out-and-out Christian; and his experience is repeated more or less on every side, in town as well as in country. Probably there is not a parish anywhere in which a considerable number of its communicants do not need to be brought in decision to the feet of Christ. Every Missioner of any experience to-day knows that of the number who profess conversion at a Mission a very large proportion are communicants already. It is in this direction that the Parochial Mission has before it such an enormous field of work. Not that there will be no appeal to the outsider, but its main fruitfulness and its chief result must be looked for, at present, inside the Church itself. Its main bearing on the outsider we will consider later on.

It will be seen, therefore, that I write as one who is profoundly a believer in the Parochial Mission. But what is needed so much in this department of Evangelism is organized method. At present our way, as a Church, of conducting Missions is as slipshod and disorganized as is our usual method, as a nation, of making war, entailing an enormous waste of energy and leaving whole tracts of possible evangelistic enterprise untouched. Societies and committees do useful work, but they cannot possibly grapple with the Church's task. "The Church must evangelize herself"—that is, she must do it herself, as a corporate body, if it is to be properly effected. Yet, on the other hand, it cannot be done all at once, which is what the National Mission attempted, not without any success, but with very indifferent and inadequate results. It went to the opposite extreme from our usual method, and instead of the isolated and spasmodic efforts of our usual Mission work, it tried to do the whole work at once, and so far failed, as everything must fail which attempts too much with too little material. We must recognize the fact that not every one is fitted for Evangelism on the scale of a Mission, and that the supply of men qualified and experienced in this work who are available at present is quite small. There lies the problem—how to adopt a middle course, and an effective course, between the above two unsatisfactory extremes.

The solution lies, I venture to believe, *in the diocese*, as the one possible unit of organization; that is, the ideal of Evangelism

is *Diocesan*. But at present, in that form, it hardly exists. Of course many dioceses have Diocesan Missioners, and some have Evangelistic Councils? I was a member of one such body for some eight years, but we never did anything to speak of, except carry out a few isolated and fragmentary efforts, in order to justify our existence. But our composition was quite wrong, and we had *no* Diocesan Missioner. For if Diocesan Evangelism is to be thoroughly done, the one person who must be in charge of it is the Diocesan Missioner. But his qualifications and his duties need to be far more clearly understood. He should, I venture to think, have three qualifications, which are indispensable: (*a*) Spirituality, since without that everything else will be useless; (*b*) evangelistic power and experience, or he can never set others to work; (*c*) organizing ability, for the Evangelism of the diocese depends almost wholly upon this. With regard to his duties, he should not ever be the "jack-of-all-trades" which many of our Diocesan Missioners at present seem to have become—men who have all sorts of odd jobs that no one else will do thrust upon them, such as editing the *Diocesan Gazette*, and similar work which has no connexion whatever with the Diocesan Missioner's one and only task, Evangelism. To this latter his whole energy should be devoted, instead of, as too often, having too little of his own work to do and too much of other people's. At the same time, scarcely any man can go on conducting Missions or organizing them without himself becoming official or formal, so that probably the ideal plan —and one that would often help to meet the financial problem connected with his appointment—is for him to have a very small country parish, a curate who is practically in semi-charge, and a small car in which he can get to any part of the diocese at will. At some centre of the diocese, the place which is most conveniently reached and the most populous, he should have one or two rooms, a kind of Mission Office, at which, as a rule, he should be accessible on one day in the week, for consultation by any of the clergy on any subject connected with Evangelism; and he should be in constant and close touch with his Bishop. The Diocesan Missioner is, as it were, the Commander-in-Chief of the army on active service, and should have a paramount claim on his Bishop's thought and time whenever needed.

Assuming, then, that a Diocesan Missioner is thus appointed

and equipped, his work will fall into two main divisions, apart from his own personal evangelistic work of taking Missions, conducting Retreats, Quiet Days, etc. His first and all-important task will be—

1. To MOBILIZE. In every diocese there must be a certain number of clergy who have the evangelistic gift. Some have already used it, and gained experience; others have it, but either do not know it or have never engaged in definite evangelistic work. It is these evangelistic forces of the diocese whom the Missioner should seek to discover and mobilize. Possibly a letter to every incumbent and curate, countersigned by the Bishop, will do much to bring to his knowledge the names of men who (*a*) have some experience of Evangelism; (*b*) are believed by others to have evangelistic power; (*c*) would be willing to undertake one or two Missions regularly each year in the diocese.

Then should come into being an Evangelistic Council, quite a small body, composed *entirely* of men who have evangelistic experience, and nominated to the Bishop by the Diocesan Missioner, since it is his work they are to help and his fellow-workers that they are to be. The usual method of forming Evangelistic Councils is almost worse than useless. What, for instance, does a Diocesan Conference know of the suitability of its elected members? The object of a Council is not to minister to the importance of diocesan dignitaries who think they should be members of every diocesan body; it should be a most carefully selected company of experts, who are keen on the salvation of souls, and who know the best ways to win men for God. From the men in the diocese whom the Missioner has discovered to have real experience, he should be able to nominate his Council.

Next an inquiry should be made of every man who has done evangelistic work, or who seems likely to have the qualifications even if at present untried, as to his willingness to attend a School for Missioners. It will probably be found possible to make this an annual gathering, taking place in the summer in preparation for the campaign of the winter months. It will, of course, include addresses and instruction from well-known Missioners, but it should have a considerable portion of its time occupied in *real* conference, when methods can be compared, details discussed, questions asked, etc. This School should be very fruitful in the preparation by de-

grees of a staff of men, ready to take any Missions that are required in the diocese, gaining experience as well as increasing in numbers every year, and who could be enrolled as one body of "Assistant Mission Clergy."

The other and equally important work of the Diocesan Missioner is—

2. To Organize. This organization will lie in two directions, Central and Parochial.

(*a*) Central. Assuming that the Diocesan Missioner has some kind of central office in the diocese, this would be the natural place of his central organization; failing this, a room or rooms should be secured in one of the large centres of the diocese, to serve as a Bureau of Mission Information. Under present conditions, the incumbent of a parish in which a Mission is projected has scarcely any information at hand as to Mission material. He may quite conceivably never have seen any Mission printing, and his knowledge of Mission literature will be confined to any he can secure by writing to some Society for specimens. What he needs is a kind of showroom of all material connected with Missions, which he can visit, and where he can inspect and choose the best articles for his particular parish and purpose.

Here, then, the Diocesan Missioner will gradually assemble every kind of material upon which he can lay his hands. Here will be specimens of every Mission tract and pamphlet published in the country, with full details as to publisher and price marked upon each one. While these are carefully arranged, according to subject and use, in the centre of the room, the walls will be covered with as many specimens of Mission posters, bills, handbills, invitations, cards, etc., as the Missioner can collect. He will keep a watchful eye for any Missions in other dioceses, and will write in each case asking for a specimen of every kind of printed matter there used, of which any new and striking specimen will find a place on the walls of his showroom. In a case will be found a copy of every book published on the subject—a library of Mission literature.

One of the Missioner's most needed pieces of organization will consist in finding, or probably himself drawing up, lantern services, illustrated by slides of the best quality, including special services for children. These slides will be on view at this central

Bureau, and can also be had on hire by any incumbent in the diocese requiring them for Mission purposes. The outlay on these may be rather costly, but it will be well worth it. The Diocesan Missioner will also provide for hire some of those necessaries for processions in the open air, or other outside work, which are difficult to make and costly to buy; such as torches, lanterns, transparencies for carrying through the street, and huge banners or streamers for fixing up outside a church in which a Mission is progressing.

Then his organizing will also be—

(*b*) Parochial. An announcement has recently been made of an evangelistic campaign throughout one diocese in 1923 or 1924, and similar diocesan efforts have been made previously. It is extraordinary that the weakness of such large schemes is not recognized. There are certainly not in existence Missioners sufficiently experienced to cover a whole diocese at once. The Church Parochial Mission Society has a list of just over one hundred, of whom probably not more than a third would ever be available at one time. Assume that there are double that number outside the Society's staff, and it must be obvious that to supply Missioners to all the parishes in a diocese at once is only repeating on a smaller scale the mistake of the National Mission. Moreover, parishes not in the least ripe for a Mission will engage in one because they do not like to "fall out of line," but the work will probably be done ineffectively and half-heartedly. I know of such an instance in a Diocesan Mission where a Rural Dean felt that he must join in, but had no interest in the matter, and therefore simply had an evening service for eight days in succession, with a different preacher each evening! The result, too, of such an effort is that, as parishes cannot have Missions within a period of several years at least, the whole evangelistic effort is condensed into one week, and for some years after the diocese forgets all about Evangelism!

The aim of the Diocesan Missioner should be to cover the diocese with a network of evangelistic effort which is always going on, and in this way to work through the diocese by sections in the course of some years, organizing a kind of rota of evangelistic effort. Assume for illustration a diocese of 250 parishes divided into fifteen rural deaneries, and suppose that his inquiries brought to light six men in the diocese beside himself who were experienced in

Mission work. During the first year he would be able to carry out a complete series of Missions, say, in one rural deanery, or possibly, if he could get some outside help, he might cover two. In the second year the School for Missioners might well double his little staff, so that in that year he might cover three deaneries. Working in this way he would, in the course of some five or six years, have organized an evangelistic effort in every part of the diocese, by which time the first rural deaneries possibly would be ready for a second effort. Large centres would, probably, be best treated singly, as units in themselves, always provided that the supply of Missioners was adequate. The staff of Missioners would not multiply very rapidly, as it should be a rule that an inexperienced man coming into the work should first accompany an experienced Missioner and learn from him on the spot how to conduct a Mission.

But as the work developed, and the Schools for Missioners succeeded each other, those parishes in which evangelistic efforts had already taken place would not be left severely alone for the cycle of five or six years. Gradually there could be organized, in the same way, a series of "Teaching Missions," to be followed by "Missionary Missions," so that in this way it would be possible in time for every parish, so desiring, to have one of these special efforts every alternate year, the programme of the Schools for Missioners being extended as needed in order to take in these new branches of the work. The work in the diocese would not, of course, be rapid, but it would be thorough, and, still better, it would be continuous, and a well-qualified Diocesan Missioner, backed by a keen Evangelistic Council and a sympathetic Bishop, could carry it out.

It might well be that, in course of time, some small periodical diocesan paper could be circulated, with its contents confined solely to diocesan evangelism, keeping parishes in touch with the movement, and—most important of all—calling out a constant volume of prayer.

Evangelism furnishes a common ground for all schools of thought, and in this great work men of all views could happily unite, provided that each had just one object in view, the winning of souls for Christ. That should be a *sine qua non* for enrolment on the Diocesan Staff of Mission Clergy.

ADDISON AS A STUDENT OF NATURE.

[*Concluded from* THE CHURCHMAN *of January, p.* 47.]

[*The following is the second part of the paper written for a Literary Society by the late Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, who kindly sent it to us for publication. We greatly regret that before it was possible for it to appear in these pages he passed away.*]

ADDISON'S reflections on the works of creation may seem to us commonplace, but they were not so to his contemporaries, many of whom would read with bated breath his allusions to the astronomic discoveries of Isaac Newton, or the microscopic revelations of Robert Hooke.

Thus in No. 420 he writes of what he terms the New Philosophy. The New Philosophy was the term applied in Addison's day to the laws of the universe as interpreted by Sir Isaac Newton. The Baconian system of reasoning was known at that time as "the new knowledge," and this may well have been in Addison's mind when speaking of the "new philosophy"; but that he is contemplating the discoveries of Newton and the scientists who preceded him is made clear by the fact that, in 1693, Addison pronounced in the theatre at Oxford an oration in defence of the Newtonian philosophy. This "Defence," translated from the Latin original, was printed as an appendix to *A Conversation on the Plurality of Worlds*, a translation from the French of M. de Fontenelle, who died a centenarian well on in the eighteenth century. In this paper (No. 420) Addison says:

"Among this set of writers (i.e. who appeal to the imagination) there are none who more gratify and enlarge the imagination than the authors of the new philosophy, whether we consider their theories of the earth or heavens, the discoveries they have made with their glasses, or any other of their contemplations on nature. We are not a little pleased to find every green leaf swarm with millions of animals, that at their largest growth are not visible to the naked eye."

One thinks that the writer must have been to some extent drawing on his imagination when he thus wrote. We find a parallel statement in a paper he had a few years before contributed to the *Tatler*, on the revelations of the microscope. It is called "A Morning's Dream," and suggests that disembodied spirits are able to perceive

without mechanical aid, far more than the microscope discovers to man, by sharpening the sight to what degree is thought fit. In this *dream* millions of *species* are descried subsisting on a green leaf.

"There is something," continues Addison, "very engaging to the fancy, as well as to our reason, in the treatises of metals, minerals, plants and meteors. But when we survey the whole earth at once, and the several planets that lie within its neighbourhood, we are filled with a pleasing astonishment, to see so many worlds hanging one above another and sliding round their axles in such an amazing pomp and solemnity. If, after this, we contemplate those wild fields of ether that reach in height as far as from Saturn to the fixed stars, and run abroad almost to an infinitude, our imagination finds its capacity filled with so immense a prospect, and puts itself upon the stretch to comprehend it. But if we yet rise higher, and consider the fixed stars as so many vast oceans of flame, that are each of them attended with a different set of planets, and still discover new firmaments and new lights that are sunk farther in those unfathomable depths of ether, so as not to be seen by the strongest of our telescopes, we are lost in such a labyrinth of suns and worlds, and confounded with the immensity and magnificence of nature."

Such remarks as the foregoing may to-day seem to savour of the commonplace; and it seems odd to us that Addison's vision of the planetary system should stop short at Saturn, but that was as far as the telescope had revealed the universe in his day. Uranus was discovered in 1787, Neptune in 1846. On the other hand, there is nothing surely commonplace in Addison's observations on instinct, which are as interesting now as they were two hundred years ago. It is, of course, obvious that they were written before Darwin, or even Lamarck, had said their say; but they are the product of close observation and clear thinking; and some of the facts brought forward are as incapable of explanation to-day as when they first appeared in the *Spectator*. Particularly important is the distinction he draws between reason and instinct. How deep was Addison's interest in the subject of animal instinct is shown by two of his contributions in *The Guardian* (Nos. 156, 157) on the life and habits of ants, translations from a publication of the French Academy.

"I must confess," he writes in No. 120 of the *Spectator*, "I am infinitely delighted with those speculations of nature, which are to be made in a country life, and as my reading has very much lain among books of natural history, I cannot forbear recollecting upon

this occasion the several remarks which I have met with in authors, and comparing them with what falls under my own observation: the argument for Providence drawn from the natural history of animals being in my opinion demonstrative. . . .

What can we call the principle which directs every kind of bird to observe a particular plan in the structure of its nest, and direct all the same species to work after the same model? It cannot be imitation; for though you hatch a crow under a hen, and never let it see any of the works of its own kind, the nest it makes shall be the same, to the laying of a stick, with all the other nests of the same species. It cannot be reason; for, were animals endued with it to as great a degree as man, their buildings would be as different as ours, according to the different conveniences that they would propose to themselves. . . .

One would wonder to hear sceptical men disputing for the reason of animals, and telling us it is only our pride and prejudices that will not allow them the use of that faculty.

Reason shows itself in all occurrences of life; whereas the brute makes no discovery of such a talent, but in what immediately regards his own preservation, or the continuance of his species. Animals in their generation are wiser than the sons of men; but their wisdom is confined to a few particulars, and lies in a very narrow compass. Take a brute out of his instinct, and you find him wholly deprived of understanding. To use an instance that comes often under observation: with what caution does a hen provide herself a nest in places unfrequented and free from noise and disturbance! When she has laid her eggs in such a manner that she can cover them, what care does she take in turning them frequently, that all parts may partake of the vital warmth! When she leaves them, to provide for her necessary sustenance, how punctually does she return before they have time to cool, and become incapable of producing an animal! In the summer you see her giving herself greater freedom, and quitting her care for above two hours together; but in the winter, when the vigour of the season would chill the principles of life, and destroy the young one, she grows more assiduous in her attendance, and stays away but half the time. When the birth approaches, with how much nicety and attention does she help the chick to break its prison! Not to take notice of her covering it from the injuries of the weather, providing proper nourishment, and teaching it to help itself; nor to mention her forsaking the nest if, after the usual time of reckoning, the young one does not make its appearance. A chymical operation could not be followed with greater art or diligence, than is seen in the hatching of a chick, though there are many birds that show an infinitely greater sagacity in all the forementioned particulars.

But at the same time the hen, that has all this seeming ingenuity (which is indeed absolutely necessary for the propagation of the species) considered in other respects, is without the least glimmerings of thought or common sense. She mistakes a piece of chalk for an egg, and sits upon it in the same manner. She is insensible

of any increase or diminution in the number of those she lays. She does not distinguish between her own and those of another species; and when the birth appears of never so different a bird, will cherish it for her own. In all these circumstances, which do not carry an immediate regard to the subsistence of herself or her species, she is a big idiot.

There is not, in my opinion, anything more mysterious in nature than this instinct in animals, which rises above reason, and falls infinitely short of it. It cannot be accounted for by any properties in matter, and at the same time works after so odd a manner, that one cannot think it the faculty of an intellectual being. For my own part, I look upon it as upon the principle of gravitation in bodies, which is not to be explained by any known qualities inherent in the bodies themselves, nor from any laws of mechanism; but, according to the best notions of the greatest philosophers, is an immediate impression from the first Mover, and divine energy acting in the creatures."

The subject of instinct is continued in the following essay. It is supposed to be written while on a visit to his friend Sir Roger de Coverley in the country.

"As I was walking this morning in the great yard that belongs to my friend's country-house, I was wonderfully pleased to see the different workings of instinct in a hen followed by a brood of ducks. The young, upon the sight of a pond, immediately ran into it; while the step-mother, with all imaginable anxiety, hovered about the borders of it, to call them out of an element that appeared to her so dangerous and destructive. As the different principle which acted in these different animals cannot be termed reason, so when we call it instinct we mean something we have no knowledge of. To me, as I hinted in my last paper, it seems the immediate direction of Providence, and such an operation of the Supreme Being, as that which determines all the portions of matter to their proper centres. A modern philosopher, quoted by Monsieur Bayle in his learned dissertation on the Souls of Brutes, delivers the same opinion, though in a bolder form of words, where he says, *Deus est anima bruturum*, 'God himself is the soul of brutes.' Who can tell what to call that seeming sagacity in animals which directs them to such food as is proper for them, and makes them naturally avoid whatever is noxious and unwholesome? Tully has observed that a lamb no sooner falls from its mother, but immediately, and of its own accord, applies itself to the teat. Dampier in his travels (published 1691) tells us that when seamen are thrown on any of the unknown coasts of America they never venture upon the fruit of any tree, however tempting soever it may appear, unless they observe that it is marked with the picking of birds, but fall on without fear or apprehension where the birds have been before them."

It is in this essay that Addison shows his vital interest in natural

history by expressing the wish that "our Royal Society would compile a body of natural history, the best that could be gathered together from books and observations."

I cannot remember more than one essay in the *Spectator* that has the ocean for its subject. This essay takes the form of a letter addressed to the *Spectator*; but as it is accompanied by a poem of which Addison was the undisputed writer there can be little doubt that the essay was from his pen. It can scarcely be said to be written in his happiest vein, but his mind is full of God as he writes. The immensity of the power of the Almighty seems to him reflected in this object of contemplation. It kindles his imagination and solemnizes his mind. He recalls what Longinus, the illustrious writer on the Sublime, and other classics have said upon the subject, but prefers the words of the psalmist in Psalm cvii. 23 *seq.*: "He commandeth, and raiseth the stormy wind, which lifteth up the waves thereof. They mount up to the heaven; they go down again to the depths; their soul is melted because of trouble. They reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and are at their wits' end. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and He bringeth them out of their distresses. He maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still." "How much more comfortable, as well as rational," says Addison, "is this system of the psalmist, than the pagan scheme in Virgil and other poets, where one deity is represented as raising a storm, and another as laying it. Were we only to consider the sublime in this piece of poetry, what can be nobler than the idea it gives us of the Supreme Being thus raising a tumult among the elements, and recovering them out of their confusion: thus troubling and becalming nature?"

As we read this paper in the *Spectator* the thought is irresistibly suggested that it was written as an introduction to a poem, or hymn, of ten stanzas, which Lord Macaulay reminds us is a record of the writer's trust in God, and enshrines many memories of travel. In December, 1700, Addison encountered a storm of great fury in the Mediterranean. "The captain of the ship," says Macaulay, "gave up all for lost, and confessed himself to a Capuchin who happened to be on board. The heretic, in the meantime, fortified himself against the terrors of death with devotions of a very different kind." How strong an impression this perilous voyage made on

him appears from the ode, " How are Thy servants blest, O Lord," which was long after published in the *Spectator*.

How are Thy servants blest, O Lord!
How sure is their defence!
Eternal wisdom is their guide,
Their help omnipotence.

The greater part of the hymn describes a dangerous storm—to quote three stanzas:

Confusion dwelt in every face,
And fear in every heart,
When waves on waves, and gulfs in gulfs,
O'er came the pilot's art.

Yet then from all my griefs, O Lord,
Thy mercy set me free,
Whilst, in the confidence of prayer,
My soul took hold on Thee.

The storm was laid, the winds retired,
Obedient to Thy will;
The sea that roar'd at Thy command,
At Thy command was still.

And so we leave Addison, as we like to leave him, with words of praise and faith upon his lips, and our study of this amiable and talented representative of the era in which he lived closes with an expression of the cheerful spirit of optimism and contentment which characterized him through life, and did not desert him in death.

Theology, reduced in price to one shilling, has, to a large extent, become the organ of the Anglo-Catholic movement. Not that all its articles favour the peculiar outlook of this school, but its Editorial Notes show great sympathy with it, and a recent number published the addresses at one of its Conferences. We always read *Theology* with interest, for its contributors write with knowledge and show courtesy to those who differ from them. All interested in Reunion should make a point of seeing it, for they will then understand more clearly the points of contact and difference between the different advocates of Church Union.

THE CELTIC CHARACTER.

By the Rev. C. J. Offer, M.A.

THERE are three natural groups into which the human race is commonly divided—the Indo-Europeans, consisting of Persians, Greeks, Latins, Celts, Teutons, Slavonians, etc.; the Semitic and the Mongolian groups. Of the first group one of the most interesting if less prominent branches is that of the Celts. Of the two last groups the Semitic alone is familiar to Western races in the Jews, the depth and intensity of whose religious feeling has marked them out amongst the religious people of the world. But the Jews have not had anything like the influence upon the creative and constructive forces of British civilization compared with the Celts, who have very materially affected the race of the Britons. The origin of this singular people must be sought for far back in the early centuries, when the nomadic tribes of Central Asia began to expand and explore towards the West.[1] Their home, according to the latest investigators, must have been around the Vistula, north of the Carpathians,[2] until their expansion towards the West, which process must have been long in existence by the time we first hear of the Celts[3] as a separate people, called "Keltoi" by the Greeks in the fourth century B.C. The Celtic Venedi, however, remained in occupation of the district around the Vistula as late as the second century B.C. The Celts appear to have already developed certain distinct customs, such as cremation and the use of iron tools and weapons instead of bronze. Somewhat earlier than this the Celts swarmed over Central Europe as far south as Lombardy, from whence they drove out the Etruscans,[4] and pushing on into Italy, finally succeeded in capturing Rome, who

[1] For a full account of Central Asia and the birth of peoples, see Prof. Peisker's article in the *Camb. Med. Hist.*, Vol. I, chap. xii. A much briefer treatment is given by Dr. Haddon in *The Wanderings of Peoples*, chaps. ii, iii.

[2] This is the view of Prof. Peisker, *op. cit.* Vol. II, chap. xii. It is based on the fact that the northern Europeans, who were the ancestors of the Celts, originally possessed names for the beech and yew, which, however, do not grow eastwards of a line drawn from Konigsberg to Odessa. Their home, therefore, must have been somewhere north and west of this limit.

[3] From Pytheas of Massilia, *c.* 330 B.C., quoted by Oman, *Eng. before the Nor. Conq.*, chap. i., p. 9.

[4] Attracted thither, according to Gibbon, by "the prospect of the rich fruit and delicious wines."—*Decline and Fall*, Vol. I, chap. ix. [ed. Bury].

had despised her barbarian foes, and paid the penalty for her contempt. This branch of the Celtic family never ranked as Allies of Rome, but, on the contrary, was expressly excluded from Roman citizenship.[1] Another group penetrated into Asia Minor, where they left their mark in the survival of the name "Galatia," the volatile character of whose inhabitants was used by Bishop Lightfoot[2] to establish his "North Galatian theory." Here the Celts formed a well-organized political entity in the second century B.C., and were granted independence by the Senate after their successful revolt against Eumenes of Pergamus.[3] Contemporaneously with this southern movement there was a corresponding activity in the North. The pressure of a new people—new, that is, to the Europe of the time—the Teutons—produced a Western trek in the northern parts of Central Europe. The compelling force of this as of the other migrations was doubtless political rather than economic,[4] and the Teutons for a long time were content to settle in the territory north of the Elbe, which river formed the southern boundary of their state. It was here that they came into contact with the Celts, who like the Greeks led captive their conquerors by subduing them with their superior civilization. "There is no race to which the Teutons owe so much as to the Celts . . . the whole Teutonic race shared a common civilization with the Celts, to whom they stood in a relation of intellectual dependence; in every aspect of public and private life Celtic influence was reflected."[5] This period must have begun to close about the beginning of the first century B.C. For the latter part of the preceding century was marked by ferment and unrest throughout the whole Germanic world. "Nations were born and perished. Everywhere there was pressure and counter-pressure. Any people that had not the strength to maintain itself against its neighbours, or to strike out a new path for itself, was swept away. The tension thus set up first found

[1] They were, however, permitted to retain their national constitution, and no tribute appears to have been levied upon them. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, iii. 7.

[2] See the description of the Celtic temperament on p. 14 of his *Commentary on Galatians*.

[3] Cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.* II, iii. 8, 10.

[4] Dr. Peisker's contention, cf. his art., *Camb. Med. Hist.*, Vol. I, p. 328.

[5] Dr. Bang, in *Camb. Med. Hist.*, I, chap. vii. p. 185, and cf. Prof. MacCulloch's remark that in all such contact with other races "the Celts probably gave more than they received." Art. in *Hastings Dict.*, "Rel. and Ethics," Vol. III.

relief on the Rhenish frontier." [1] The obvious result of this was to hasten the movement westward of the Celtic peoples, which appears to have taken the usual route through North Eastern Gaul and across into Britain via Southampton Water and the Humber. Another movement struck south along the lower reaches of the Elbe; this movement, however, had been preceded by other Celtic migrations dating probably from about 550 B.C., the whole migratory process being completed by *c.* 150 B.C., so far as Britain is concerned. This movement produces the final Celtic migration to Britain of the Belgœ.

These movements appear to have taken place in successive waves, which in various ways have left very distinct traces behind them. Of these different waves the first must have been the Goidels or Gaels whose language assumed the forms of Erse in Ireland, Gaelic in the Highlands, and Manx in the Isle of Man. To this branch of Celtic tribes approximated in many ways the ancient Picts, who were grouped with the Goidels of Scotland under the name of Caledonians, and who spoke their language.[2] The second large migratory wave was composed of another branch of the great Celtic family usually denominated by the term Cymri, but sometimes by the term Brythonic, from which is derived perhaps the name Britannia,[3] as most probably Gaul is from Gael. From this migration, which penetrated as far north as the Firth of Forth, we get the surviving dialects of the Welsh and the Bretons in France, and the now extinct dialect of Cornwall. These were probably of the same family as those whom Cæsar met in Gaul, and whose vast stature was a surprise to the Romans. Finally, the third wave reached our shores from Gaul, probably as late as 170 B.C., and was composed largely of the Belgœ,[4] who settled in South East England, stretching from Wiltshire to Kent, but keeping south of the Thames. These were the foes that confronted Julius Cæsar in 55 B.C. The result of these various invasions was, with the

[1] Dr. Bang, *op. cit.*

[2] Prof. Rait, *Hist. of Scotland*, chap. i.

[3] Dr. Hodgkin's view. *Pol. Hist. Eng.*, I, p. 8. But Prof. Oman gives, as the origin of the phrase, the "Pretanic isle" from the Massiliot explorer Pytheas who uses the names which he probably obtained from the "P" using Celts and not the "Q" using Celts. *Eng. before the Nor. Conq.*, p. 15. Britannia, of course, was the name of that part of France known as Armorica and later Brittany, but the name was given after the Celtic invasion from Britain in the sixth century A.D.

[4] The capital of the Belgœ was Winchester, known as Venta Belgarum.

exception of some remnants of the earlier inhabitants lingering in distant parts of Ireland and Scotland, to make these islands largely Celtic.

This fact has many consequences of importance. Apart altogether from linguistic influence, the wide dispersal of the Celts over Britain is sufficient to guarantee that in spite of the Roman Conquest, Celtic character would still be a great power amongst the suppressed population, all the greater, perhaps, for being a cherished racial mark ignored by their conqueror. It will probably always be a disputed point how far the Britons were Romanized during the centuries of the Roman occupation of Britain, but it is certain that in many respects it failed to stamp out many native elements that survived the invasion. Undoubtedly Roman organization and law, Roman customs and language profoundly affected the upper strata of society, the official and governing classes. But it is almost equally certain that the same influences did not percolate with similar thoroughness to the lower ranks of the population. All the existing evidence points to the fact that the Roman occupation was pre-eminently a military one, and that the Romans " either did not attempt or did not succeed in the attempt, largely to win over the inhabitants to their own ways and to accustom them to that civic life which had been the cradle of their own civilization." [1] We should therefore not be surprised to find that a strong strain of Celtic influence survived in the ordinary Briton to temper the Teutonism of their Saxon invaders. But if so, very few traces of such influences actually survive. " Nothing can be more definite or well marked," writes Professor Oman, " than the evidence that the higher civilization of the conquerors destroyed within two or three generations the lower national culture of the Conquered." [2] But it is possible in such cases to exaggerate the significance of material evidences: and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility for a people to assimilate the customs and habits of a conqueror without any radical alteration of character or nature. Consequently the absence of tangible evidences, such as sculpture or poetry provide, is not sufficient of itself to destroy the possibility of a very substantial survival of the fundamental characteristics of the Celtic nature. It would be only natural to suppose that Roman culture

[1] Hodgkin, *Pol. Hist. Eng.*, I, p. 76.
[2] Oman, *op. cit.* p. 106.

would be largely assimilated and Roman manners and customs extensively imitated by the British after centuries of Roman occupation. But it is also safe to assume that many of the lowest classes would perpetuate by inter-marriage those Celtic characteristics which no superficial assumption of Roman customs could obliterate. Later, after the Saxon invasions, these characteristics would be gradually merged in the central stream of Anglo-Saxon life; but even so the main reservoir of Celtic influence remained intact amongst the mountains and valleys of Wales. Consequently when we look less to the material evidences of survival than to the spirit and nature of the English race we cannot but be struck with the evidences of the existence of a strong Celtic strain in our blood which points to some powerful survival of Celtic influence after the Roman and Saxon conquests; and the influence apparently possessed sufficient vigour and vitality to survive the subsequent shock of the Danish invasions and the Norman Conquest. This Celtic element, as Matthew Arnold long ago pointed out, "manifests itself in our spirit and literature." [1] In any case there is often to be found in the English character and temperament those elements of delicacy and sensibility to spiritual influences which are marked characteristics of the Celtic nature. And this seems to point to a survival amongst the lowest strata of society of Celtic elements which succeeded in maintaining themselves in spite of all appearances to the contrary. And historical considerations render this intrinsically probable. We know that the Western half of Britain shook off its Roman culture, which had never penetrated far below the surface, in the time of chaos and confusion which supervened upon the withdrawal of the Roman legions and the abandonment of Britain to the ravages of her enemies. The victory of the Mons Badonicus [2] marked the arrest of the Teutonic invasions and the commencement

[1] *Essay on the Study of Celtic Literature.*

[2] Probably Bath, but great uncertainty surrounds both the date and place of this fight. It is fully discussed by Prof. Oman, *op. cit.* pp. 200, 201. In any case the neighbourhood of Bath is not an impossible scene for the decisive encounter which checked the westward march of conquest. But even supposing the "conflagration," as Gildas calls it, "licked the Western Ocean," that could only mean the Bristol Channel and the Dee, and even then, as Prof. Oman says: "The area of permanently conquered territory cannot have reached nearly so far," p. 209, cf. Plummer's Bede, Vol. II, p. 31. Strathclyde and West Wales (Devon and Cornwall) were not subdued until the seventh and ninth centuries respectively; but Wales never succumbed to the Invaders.

of the period of settlement which left the lands West of the Severn to the Britons; and this victory provided, by the immunity from disturbance thus secured, a fruitful soil for the survival of Celtic characteristics. Therefore we should expect that the close proximity of a great Celtic people like the Welsh would be bound to exercise considerable influence upon their neighbours, especially those of the neighbouring shires. And we have ample evidence that the genuine Celtic spirit not merely lingered amongst the hills and valleys of Wales, but at intervals burst out with rich and splendid expression notably in the sixth and twelfth centuries. In each case the outburst coincided with a time of great national expression and self-consciousness, and in the latter century took the permanent form of literary production.[1]

The Celtic spirit, therefore, by no means tended to extinction during the centuries which saw the successive conquests of England, and this spirit is usually regarded as revealing itself in history by certain clearly marked characteristics. It is almost universally understood as being of an excessively volatile and fickle nature, nervous, highly-strung, and extremely sensitive to religious impressions. But it is an easy task to exaggerate outstanding racial characteristics and to give them a prominence far beyond their due. It is true that Cæsar notes of the inhabitants of Gaul a fickleness and instability which agrees well with the commonly accepted tradition. And their conduct in antiquity appears to support him, for they were noted as being a restless people, nomadic both by habit and by choice, and, according to Mommsen, a terror to all civilized people until finally curbed by the forces of Cæsar and the frontier organization of Augustus. In addition it must be admitted that Thierry's statement that one of the foremost characteristics of the Celts, "want of perseverance, aversion to discipline and order, ostentation and perpetual discord," [2] has been rather painfully exemplified by some Celtic descendants in the modern world. Nevertheless it is a matter for consideration whether these undoubted

[1] G. G. Coulton in his *Chaucer and his England* quotes Walsingham's lines, "O stormy people, unsound and ever untrue. Aye, indiscreet and changing as a vane." And he points out that this was the common verdict of English writers; but he ascribes it to the Age "when men in general were far more swayed by impulse than by reflection," and when "the fundamental insecurity of the social and political fabric was such as to thwart even the ripest reflection at every turn," p. 134.

[2] Quoted by Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, I, ii., 4.

characteristics have not received undue attention from historians to the exclusion of other and more durable features of the Celtic character. The description of the Celts given by Mommsen is such as we should expect of a wandering people not yet habituated to settled modes of life. They were driven into Western Europe by forces beyond their control, and were thus compelled during a long period to adopt a mode of life which develops just those characteristics which create "good soldiers but bad citizens." The life of a nomadic people in Europe in the centuries immediately succeeding the first inroads of the barbarians beyond the Roman frontiers can hardly have been conducive to a settled existence or the development of civic virtues. The continual imminence of danger, the ceaseless search for the means of subsistence, the constant change produced by the threatening proximity of still more powerful tribes were disastrous to the creation of more pacific habits of life. And in addition we may observe that these particular Celtic habits are common to nearly all tribes in a state of transition and migration. Something very similar could be said about practically all the tribes whose successive invasions brought desolation to central Europe and revealed invaders who seemed as incapable of leading a settled existence as the Celts. Thus Dr. Hodgkin, speaking of the description of the Germans by Tacitus, refers to them as a people who possessed "an invincible preference for the life of the warrior over that of the agriculturist" [1]—almost the identical statement, it will be seen, made by Mommsen of the Celts. Gibbon also speaks of the Franks in similar terms. ". . . An inconstant spirit, the thirst for rapine and a disregard of the most solemn treaties, disgraced the character of the Franks." [2]

There appears to be nothing very exceptional, therefore, about this fickleness of the Celts; and neither history nor experience, especially in modern times, lends much support to the traditional view. When the whole question of the continued existence of Celtic Christianity in England was under discussion at the Council of Whitby in A.D. 664, the Celtic representatives were inflexible in adhering to their principles and displayed none of that changeableness commonly ascribed to them. And even earlier British History supports this view. For by the Canons of the Council of Arles, held

[1] *Life of Theodoric, p.* 54 (Heroes of the Nations).
[2] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, I, xi.

in A.D. 314, and attended by the three British Bishops of London, York and Lincoln,[1] it was decreed that all churches should accept the custom of the Church of Rome with regard to the date of keeping Easter. This custom followed the eighty-four year cycle which was therefore introduced into Britain in accordance with the decree of the Council. When, centuries after, Wilfrid taunted the British bishops with maintaining an inconvenient and antiquated system he was really paying a high testimony to their fidelity. Other people and churches had changed their customs; not so the British.[2] And if we may judge by the attitude of the British bishops in their interview with Augustine in 603 A.D., "inflexible obstinacy" was as much the characteristic of those ancient Celts as of those to whom the words were originally applied by Pliny.[3] And indeed the modern world can exhibit an equally clear indication of the true nature of the Celtic temperament both in Wales and Ireland. Professor Pollard is very near the truth when he remarks that whereas the stolid Britisher is never averse to fluctuations of the political barometer, to-day "the only people who never change their mind at general elections are the mercurial Celts."[4] And if this is true of Liberal Wales it is equally true of Catholic Ireland. For no people have exhibited a more resolute tenacity in their adherence to their own views than the Sinn Fein inhabitants of that unhappy land. And, strange as it may seem, their view gains support even from the history of the Celts in Asia Minor. For in spite of the fact that they dwelt amongst several other races, each with their own customs and characteristics—Romans, Phrygians, Greeks, Jews, forming their all-pervading environment—they were true to type and clung to their own language for more than six hundred years.[5] Bishop

[1] Reading Colonia Lindunensium for C. Londinensium.

[2] Cf. Dr. Williams, *Christianity in Early Britain*, pp. 147, 149. The controversy on the date of keeping Easter is the subject of an Excursus in Plummer's Bede, Vol. II.

[3] It is interesting to observe that it is the actual word used by Wilfrid at Whitby to describe the attitude of the British towards their native religious customs. He refers to the Picts as being "accomplices in the obstinacy of the Britons." ". . . praeter hos. tantum et obstinationis eorum complices, Pictos dico et Brettones, cum quibus de duabus ultimis oceani insulis, et his non totis, contra totum orbem stulto labore pugnant." Bede, *H.E.*, iii. 25 (Plummer's Ed.).

[4] *The History of England.* (Home Univ. Lib.)

[5] Lightfoot, *Ep. to Gal.*, p. 12. Cf. Ramsay's *St. Paul*, p. 132. Also his whole account of the Province of Galatia, chap. vii. It is interesting to note that Freeman in commenting on the similarity of tongue between the Treveri in northern Europe and the Gauls of Asia Minor, observes that what astonished

Lightfoot has carefully catalogued the different elements that go to compose the rich diversity of the Celtic character, and traced a correspondence in St. Paul's incidental allusions in his "Epistle to the Galatians." But in so doing it was only natural that he should lay the stress on that fickleness and "mobility of mind" which Julius Cæsar noticed in the Celts of Gaul.[1] But, as we have seen, this fickleness was an inheritance from the past, and probably assumed no greater prominence in the Celts than in some other races. In any case it was a trait that was far outweighed by the Celtic power of steady adhesion to a great cause, and their hasty repudiation of Christianity in St. Paul's time really tells in their favour, for it indicates an inherent tendency to revert to the old rather than to follow the new. And in the case of a people so situated many forces would tell against Christianity, such as the persistent pressure of conservative and reactionary forces which would abound in a province like Galatia. Their knowledge of Christianity could not have been profound, for the activities of St. Paul appear to have been restricted to a somewhat limited area even supposing the North Galatian theory to represent a correct interpretation of the facts. And St. Paul's preaching in Greece would fail to reach many of the native elements where indigenous characteristics most persistently linger, as the inhabitants appeared to have retained their native tongue in ordinary life.[2] The unexpected reversion to their old faith, therefore, was not so strange as it no doubt appeared to the anxious mind of St. Paul. Lightfoot seems not to have calculated on the conservative forces at work. If St. Paul had been able to prolong his labours and consolidate his work in Galatia a different result might soon have been manifest, unless, which is improbable, the impress of surrounding peoples had tended to eliminate that characteristic of the Celtic character which we find so prominent in those who confronted Augustine and Wilfrid in the west in the sixth century A.D.

him most was "that any native tongue should have borne up so long in either country against the influence of Greek in the one case and Latin in the other." Essay on Augusta Treverorum in *Historical Essays* (3rd Series). Perhaps after all the explanation is to be found in the Celtic power of loyal adherence to traditional beliefs and habits.

[1] The people of Lystra, it must be admitted, according to St. Luke's condensed account in Acts xiv. 18, 19, showed traces of distinct instability of character in their rapid surrender to Jewish intrigue.

[2] Acts xiv. 11.

It seems, therefore, that writers have tended to exaggerate the undoubted fickleness of certain branches of the Celtic family at the expense of their other and more stable racial characteristics which have contributed not a little to the glory of the Celtic race. But the placing of one of their characteristics in a less prominent position relative to the others is not to deny to the Celts those other natural attributes which have left their mark in history. For it is important to recognize that the Celtic race has contributed much by infusing into life just those elements of vivacity, spontaneity and enthusiasm which the more sober and phlegmatic Teuton sorely lacks. To those elements we must probably ascribe the Englishman's willing championship of lost causes, his power of sustained and nervous oratory, his occasional outburst of self-sacrificing enthusiasm. These are elements which are neither to be despised nor neglected, and the world would have been the poorer if some mischance had eliminated them from Western life. The future may prove that the Celt can combine more successfully than any other race stubborn tenacity of purpose with a rich and vivacious nature. The ideal is not impossible. At one time the Celts of Ireland were the schoolmasters of Northern Christendom and their land a fount of learning for half the countries of Europe.[1] In addition the recent history of the British Empire shows that men of Celtic blood have contributed not a little to the efficiency of that great political fabric.

If therefore a settled Ireland can release for the wider service of mankind the rich store of Celtic enthusiasm and ardour, the Celt may yet succeed in playing a decisive part in the future development of Anglo-Saxon civilization.

[1] See the very interesting account in R. L. Poole's *Illustrations of Mediæval Thought and Learning*, pp. 8–21 (2nd Ed.); cf. H. B. Workman, *Christian Thought to the Reformation*, pp. 139, 140.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

WESTMINSTER MISSION ADDRESSES.

THE CHRISTIAN CALL AND MOTIVE. Addresses by the Bishops of Edinburgh, Lichfield, Lincoln, London, St. Edmondsbury, Truro and others. London: *S.P.C.K.* 5s.

The Westminster Mission has come and gone. Comparatively little notice has been taken of it in the public and religious Press, as the public mind was interested in other matters during its fruitful ten days. It has not been held in vain, and the volume, *The Christian Call and Motive*, containing a series of addresses delivered last July, will be valued by all who are fortunate enough to possess it. For the most part addresses of this character do not stand the test of cold type. These are an exception to the rule, and after reading them we venture to urge others to obtain the volumes and to study it for themselves. The book is divided into nine sections dealing with "The Claim of God," "The Kingdom of God," "The Judgment of God," "Christ the Revealer of God," "Christ the Redeemer," "The Spirit of Sonship," "The Holy Spirit in the Church and in the World," "The Church the Body of Christ," "Vocation."

Considering the diversity of outlook of the speakers, we are struck by the height from which their vision is seen. All are keen on the work of soul winning, all contribute something of value, and the closing words which summarize the proceedings of each session are specially helpful. Dr. Walpole, Bishop of Edinburgh, who presided, brought with him something that cannot be described, but can be felt by readers. As he truly said, "We can all do something. We must get rid of our cowardice, cast aside our reserve; we must be the friendliest people in the world, full of refreshment, full of hope, full of heart, and so go forward determined at any rate to win some one into that glorious Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of One Who is perfect love."

NEW TESTAMENT ARCHÆOLOGY.

NEW TESTAMENT ARCHÆOLOGY. Discoveries from the Nile to the Tiber. By the Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., F.R.G.S. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 6s. net.

This is not a scholar's book. The author has lived many years in the East and has subsequently read a large number of books, from which he has culled interesting bits of information to elucidate the New Tetament. It covers a very wide range of topics, such as languages, writing materials, the government and the religions of the Roman Empire, sites and scenes in Palestine, and New Testament criticism. From the nature of the case, the information is somewhat scrappy. Whenever the author makes incursions into such unfamiliar fields as Semitic languages and classical lore, he is liable to go astray. In spite of its shortcomings, the book abounds

with many interesting and illuminating items of information, and the ordinary Bible-lover who is not over-critical as to the minute accuracy of a book, will enjoy reading this volume. It may be added that the book is furnished with sixteen excellent illustrations.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF THOUGHT.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. By Mrs. Horace Porter. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mrs. Porter's previous books, *The Christian Science of Life* and *The Christian Science of Prayer*, were published anonymously. The first of them attracted the attention of the late Bishop Handley Moule, who warmly commended it—a fact which probably served as an assurance to those who thought that it had something to do with Mrs. Eddy's strange new religion, whereas the intention was to show a more excellent way. In these pages Mrs. Porter pursues her line of study and deals with "that distinctive system of thought-training which belongs to the Faith of Christ," more particularly in relation to the light thrown upon the subject by psychology—a most useful corrective to Christian Science, falsely so-called, of which the authoress does not hesitate to say that it is "perhaps the most familiar example of the 'bluffing' of facts." But even those whose minds have not been disturbed by this strange cult, will find here much that is suggestive. The chapters on "*Thought-planting*" and "*Prayer and Worship*" are distinctly useful.

ON MANY SUBJECTS.

NOTES ON THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN: The Symbols as seen in the Light of History. By P. P. Cutchey. London: *Elliott Stock.* 1*s.*

The author is of opinion that maybe the time is now at hand for the vision to speak: and sets forth the Seven Features of the Prophecy—The Introduction; The Messages to the Churches; The Seals; The Trumpets; The Beasts; The Judgment of Babylon; The Sevenfold Conclusion. This book is but another of a certain type of eschatological exposition, and has many of the defects of its class. There is an irritating variety of type, a most ingenious handling of the problem of 666, a most complicated chart to illustrate the "Judgments upon apostate Christendom," and a most precise mathematical method of dealing with dates.

THE IMPRISONED SPLENDOUR. By the Rev. Murdock MacKinnon, M.A., D.D. *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Nine sermons on Philippians iv. 8: "Whatsoever things are true . . . think on these things"—the utterance of a preacher of wide culture and originality, one who can leave the beaten track without ever deviating from the Truth. Dr. MacKinnon has handled this passage with the consummate skill of the man whose pulpit is his throne, but who occupies it with a sense of responsibility that makes

flippancy impossible. To have extracted so much from a single verse is proof of the capacity both of preacher and text. Truly the well is deep!

SENSIBLE RELIGION. By the Rev. E. W. Shepheard-Walwyn, B.A. *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* 2*s.* net.

Some very practical addresses likely to appeal to young people. Mr. Shepheard-Walwyn has devoted a good many years of his life to working among boys, and there is no doubt he understands them and enters into their difficulties with a sympathy and keenness of perception all too rare. Some of these difficulties are dealt with in these pages—the truth of the Bible, the Atonement, Faith, the Sexual Instinct—these are a few of the subjects. There is loyalty to Truth combined with the shrewdness of the man who knows the futility of pious platitudes.

THE VOICE OF JESUS: Thoughts for Boys and Girls upon the Holy Gospels throughout the Christian Year. By H. Parham *Skeffington & Son.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net. The Bishop of London, in commending this volume, writes, "The great merit of this book is that it weaves Bible Reading into the teaching of the Church, and helps children to hear the Voice of Jesus speaking to them as they read each short passage on their knees." There is much that is helpful here, but the sacramental teaching is of a type that the young readers, for whom this book is intended, may easily form impressions that are not warranted by Holy Scripture.

QUESTION TIME IN HYDE PARK. Fourth Series. By the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* 8*d.* net.

A useful little book, in which are gathered together questions and answers dealing with Christianity in History, arranged in three sections, and to each of which are added "Illustrations" dealing with the answers: these are for the most part valuable quotations from many sources. The replies show much shrewdness, good temper, and a desire to be fair to those from whom Mr. Rogers differs. It would not be difficult to criticize some of them, but on the other hand it would not be easy to do better, especially on, practically, "the spur of the moment." Those who have to meet the man in the street will find much useful matter in these pages.

CHRISTIAN EQUIPMENT AND TRAINING. London: *S.P.C.K.* 6*d.* net.

No well-informed Churchman needs to be told what valuable work the venerable S.P.C.K. is doing in a variety of ways. This attractive booklet, with its many illustrations, tells the story of various enterprises at home and abroad. It may be that there are still a few who regard the Society as merely a publishing concern, but if they turn over these pages the notion will soon be dispelled, and they will feel that the income is all too small.

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER'S NEW VOLUME.

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST. By the Right Rev. A. C. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester. London: *John Murray*. 12*s*.

We sincerely hope that the labours of the Bishopric of Gloucester will not prevent Dr. Headlam from completing the work of which he has given us the first part in this well-balanced, finely-conceived and clearly-written volume. Dr. Headlam has been a familiar contributor to our theological literature, and although this book is masterly, it has very little of novelty for those who have followed his thought and work in the Magazines. Nevertheless, it gives unity to what had been scattered, and lays before the reader considered verdicts on many subjects of controversial importance. Dr. Headlam has evidently pondered long over every line, and if we complain at times of the absence of references for statements—made casually—we know him to be so conscientious a writer that we are ready to accept what he says without verification by reference to outside authority. We say this for we have tested him, when we were in doubt, and always found him accurate and trustworthy. We do not know whether it will be considered complimentary to him to say that he has all the good qualities of the late Canon Sanday with a discriminating sense that prevents him being carried away by novel theories that on consideration have to be abandoned. Old-fashioned students will be saddened by an underlying theory of inspiration that is not satisfactory to them. He tells us, for example: "I should not be inclined to consider that a statement repeated in three Gospels is of greater value than that contained in one." He, however, hastens to add, "but the importance of these words is that it reminds us that what lies behind an imperfect narrative is something more wonderful than it gives not less so."

This is the real charm of the book. It is everywhere permeated with the sense of reverent wonder at the gracious Personality of our Lord. It never murders to dissect—it analyses to show forth something more of His glory. As Dr. Headlam says, the Gospel writers accept the facts "Jesus is the Messiah, the fulfilment of Jewish expectations; He is the Son of God; He is the Lord; He is the Saviour of mankind; He is the source of light and life to the world; He is the object of human devotion and adoration; His coming has created a new epoch in the world. Human nature has been transformed. Human life has a higher meaning. There is no limitation to the wonder and glory that is ascribed to Him." "The problem of Jesus is the problem of Christianity." With this fundamental attitude we are in complete agreement, and the more we reflect on the situation the more convinced we are that the invention of Jesus as He is portrayed in the Gospels would be a much greater wonder than His existence. We are, however, convinced that the tendency to minimize the value of the fourfold testimony may be carried a great deal too far. Looking at the matter

from a mere historical standpoint, there is no divergence in view between the essential character of the Christ life and teaching in the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. Undoubtedly the four documents come from four men of very different types and temperaments. The fact that the impress made on all four was identical, that the use of sources was in the last resort independent, when we find anything contained in two, three or four of the authorities, we may conclude that it was a matter of very real importance to them, and the selection of that particular subject for mention implies that in the minds of the Evangelists and, we do not think we go too far when we add, in that of the Christian community known to them, it had very real importance.

We regret that Dr. Headlam has not given in its natural place his view of the narratives of the birth and infancy of our Lord. He tells us in commenting on St. Luke's narrative of the births of John the Baptist and our Lord, "It must frankly be confessed that there is much reasonable doubt as to the limits of what is history and what is legend in the story, and the criticism, whether positive or negative, which would speak dogmatically goes far beyond the evidence available, but there is no reason to doubt that we have put before us true types of religious life as it existed at that day in Palestine." This is not what we wish to know. We desire a considered view of the narrative of the Virgin Birth in the Third Gospel and its companion story in the First. It is enough for us to know that St. Luke was the accurate writer we have proved him to be, and we did not need a certificate that he gave a true picture of the times, but we should have welcomed a discussion in the proper place of the Virgin Birth. Not that Dr. Headlam rejects the miraculous. Far from it. The miraculous element in the Gospels is an integral part of the ministry of our Lord. It harmonizes well with the setting in which it is found. "Now the great mass of the miracles of healing are widely accepted. A few years ago they were not. Another change in scientific methods might make new theories about miracles possible. We have indeed no certainty that every miracle in the Gospel happened as is described. But the moral I draw is that the evidence for miracles (not every miracle) is good, and that to attempt to deny them on *a priori* grounds is singularly unscientific." This is well said, and we do not think that even the so-called nature-miracles of our Lord give any ground for scepticism to those who acknowledge Him to be the Incarnate Son of God. They will always be rejected by those who do not accept Him as Lord. That is no reason why those who do, should throw doubt upon the honest truthfulness of the Gospel narrative. In the Church as well as outside the Church there is a great deal too much readiness to accept as impossible what is recorded in the Gospels and has been received by the Church from the beginning.

Dr. Headlam has some striking sentences on our Lord's knowledge and His attitude to current thought. "Our Lord's language is completely in accordance with the religious and scientific ideals

of His contemporaries. . . . The one condition of being able to exercise His ministry as a man teaching men was that He should do it in accordance with the thought and ideas of the day. What theological theory is implied by this fact is a matter of future inquiry. We are not concerned at present time with that problem. What is necessary to point out is that a religious teacher who in the first century of the Christian era adopted the scientific language and ideas of the present day would have talked in a language utterly incomprehensible to the people." "Our Lord's purpose was to teach mankind religion and not science. He did not come to do away with the necessity of human effort. He came to teach them to fulfil His will and thus live a life in which they might learn about God's work. So in every direction His science was the science of His own time." It will be remembered that Bishop Knox in his book *On What Authority* took up a position similar to this.

We may mention that Dr. Headlam believes that the brethren of our Lord were his real brothers—the sons of Mary. The reasons against this view are not derived from history. The birth of our Lord, Dr. Headlam is inclined to think, took place about 7 B.C. and His death in A.D. 33. He was therefore forty when He died—a change in computing His age which is increasingly accepted by students. The picture given of the religious, social, political and natural history of the Holy Land is one of the most brilliant descriptions of the times that has come under our notice. No one reading it can fail to envisage more clearly the environment in which the Redeemer lived and worked. The book ends at the Transfiguration, and we are sorry that it does, for in many respects it leaves unanswered many questions that arise, and we can only hope that its Second Part will not be long delayed. We have no hesitation in saying that *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* is one of the few indispensable books on the greatest of all Christian subjects, and it cannot be neglected by any student who wishes to face boldly and intelligently the problems raised in the press and the literature of the day. Preachers will find it full of fresh material for sermons, thinkers will discover in it seed plots for fresh thought and the ordinary Christian will find Dr. Headlam one who, with a sense of assured knowledge of all that has been written, preserves his essential belief in the Christ of History and Experience.

ANGLICAN ESSAYS.

ANGLICAN ESSAYS. By the Archbishop of Armagh and others. Edited by the Archdeacon of Chester. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Most English Churchmen believe that there is a gulf wide and deep between the Churches of Rome and England. They have been singularly silent while Anglo-Catholics and others have endeavoured

to prove that the main difference between the two Churches lies in Papal Supremacy. Historic Anglicanism is not a figment of the imagination. It is based on Scriptural and historical facts that cannot be explained away. Its formularies are clear and definite, and we needed a frank and full declaration of the principles that have kept the Church together and have made it the power for righteousness it remains in this country and throughout the world. The Archdeacon of Chester has gathered round him a number of writers, who know what they believe and are able to expound their position in clear and intelligible language. The whole book is a testimony to the sound learning and love for truth that have always marked our Church, and we believe that it will be found an invaluable armoury for those who have to face error, no matter how cunningly concealed, in an age that is apt to confuse loud shouting with possession of truth.

The Archbishop of Armagh, writing with his customary insight and breadth of knowledge, discusses "Christian Liberty." He boldly faces the basis of authority and shows how Church and Bible have their part in determining truth. "There is a saying which has been appealed to as a first principle, and which has indeed become a cliché, repeated without very much thought: 'The Church to teach, the Bible to prove.' If this means that it is the duty of the Church in every age to hand on the Primitive Rule of Faith, as expressed in the Great Creeds, and to maintain this rule by continual appeal to Holy Scripture, it is sound enough. But if it is taken to mean that the Church as a teacher is above criticism, an original source of Divine knowledge whose interpretations of Scripture must be accepted without examination, it is not only false in itself, but also destructive of all truth. For truth must ever be prepared to stand the searching light of free investigation." This is truly and wisely said, and needs to be borne in mind. Dr. D'Arcy finds in our Lord the final authority—superior to both Church and Bible. "In Him and in His teaching and life are to be found the solution of the great problem of the modern world. He can bring liberty and order into harmony."

Dr. R. H. Murray, an Irish *emigré* now in an English living, writes a notable Essay on "Aspects of the English Reformation." Like all his work it is first-rate, and the outcome of a brooding philosophical mind that has an almost unparalleled knowledge of Reformation times. We hope that his paper will be read and re-read, for it places the English Reformation in so clear a light that no one who masters its contents will be led astray by partisan writing. Here is a paragraph that merits notice: "Now it is sometimes argued at the present day that the Church—not the State—ought to have reformed itself. Such a view is an anachronism. For it presupposes that there was a national Church before the days of Cranmer, whereas there was nothing of the sort. Even if Convocation had undertaken such a task—and it is a weighty 'if'—men like Sir Thomas More would have offered as stout opposition to its work as they offered to the work of Parliament. The truth is,

that men at the time, who objected, objected not to the way the Reformation was accomplished as to the fact that it was accomplished at all. The fact—not the fashion of the fact—was the outstanding question." If we carefully analyse contemporary attacks on the method of the Reformation we shall find that they are based not so much on a desire to have everything done in accord with ecclesiastical traditions, but on a wish to have the pre-Reformation religion maintained in the land. We commend to the attention of all who have any sense of historical accuracy the pages devoted to the question of the divorce of King Henry VIII. They will kill many mendacities that have become part of the current tradition of Anglo-Catholic writers.

That doughty mediævalist, who is the hammer of inaccurate and *parti pris* polemics, Mr. G. G. Coulton, writes on "Rome as Unreformed." It is an indictment of the Church of Rome which must either be refuted or accepted. It sets forth facts that cannot be denied and challenges, by quotation and comment, public attention. All who have read Mr. Coulton's other works know what to expect—unambiguous writing that cannot be misinterpreted and an extensive erudition that enables him to tread firmly where sciolists falter and fall. He concludes: "Those who hanker after Roman Catholicism are not only in danger of committing themselves doctrinally to things from which, in their naked deformity, they would shudder, and which most of them could never so stifle their conscience as to put into practice. They are also blinding themselves to the patent facts of the world around them, which falsify precisely those Roman pretensions which, by their unique and uncompromising character, are at first sight most attractive." It may be asked, If Rome be as black as Mr. Coulton has described, how has it maintained itself throughout the ages, and how can it possess its present hold over human minds? This is a puzzle to many, but when it is remembered that Rome still holds fundamental Christian doctrine, it is possible for honest men and women who hold the truth Rome teaches to be blind to its errors and to preserve communion with God undisturbed by the falsehoods they unconsciously accept.

All interested in Revision should study the valuable paper of the Archdeacon of Chester on "Communion or Mass." It will open their eyes to the real issues at stake. We are among those who believe that nothing but Truth will stand the shock of time's criticism and the unfettered use of human reason. Scripture gives no support to the central teaching of the Mass. As the Archdeacon says: "It seems to be quietly assumed that not only the Reformation settlement, but all our distinctly Anglican theology must now be 'scrapped.' If it be asked why, we can get no definite answer. All we are told in favour of the revival of the Mass is that it is Catholic." He has no difficulty in refuting this claim, for the Mass is not part of the primitive Christian tradition.

The other papers are also worthy of careful study. Archdeacon Thorpe shows the evils resulting from "The Cultus of the Virgin

Mary," and Archbishop Lowther Clarke discusses "The Lambeth Appeal and Its Results." The Rev. C. E. Raven writes on "The New Reformation" in a manner that is characteristic of him and his school. He hits hard at many who are with him in spirit and cannot follow him in details. It was worth while including his article as it shows the Anglican outlook in presence of new factors of life and society. He has no wish to break with the past, and for him the future is hopeful. The book closes with a number of extracts from the Charges of the late Bishop Jayne, who was always sure of his facts, and had the gift of making his thought clear. Unlike most volumes of Essays, this has an admirable index, which adds greatly to its usefulness, and we trust that loyal Churchmen will not only buy but will also carefully study its contents. If the book be mastered by members of the National Assembly, we have no fear as to the result of the debates and divisions on Revision. Those who are not members of the Assembly ought to read it none the less thoughtfully, for they will find themselves compelled to do their part in forming Church opinion that will not fail to make itself felt within the Assembly. We thank the Editor and his collaborators for a book that cannot fail to carry a message to every honest mind it reaches.

MR. REDLICH'S THEORIES.

OLD TESTAMENT STORIES and How to Teach them. By the Rev. E. Basil Redlich, B.D. London: *Macmillan & Co.* Price 6s. net.

Mr. Redlich is the Director of Religious Education in the diocese of Peterborough. A short time ago he published an "Introduction to Old Testament Study" from a modern critical point of view. The present volume is written to show teachers how to impart those critical views to the children. The period dealt with is from the Creation to the election of the first King. The author's plan is as follows: He first gives a brief critical introduction to the story he is discussing. Then he splits the relevant text of the Bible into its supposed sources. Each source is printed separately in the words of the R.V., with occasional alterations. These are commented upon, pointing out the discrepancies between the different sources, the unhistoricity of the story, the crudity of the theological conception of the Hebrew writer. Occasionally he condescends to say a kind word of the early Hebrew Scripture. He ends each story with a few hints to the teacher as to the best method of imparting these precious items of information to the children.

There are many wise and good things in this volume, and we thoroughly sympathize with Mr. Redlich's aim that nothing should be taught in the Old Testament which might be contradicted by science. Having said this, we regret that for two reasons we cannot conscientiously recommend this book, seeing that it is written for the instruction of the young.

(i) The critical standpoint of the writer is too dogmatic and is more destructive than constructive. The Amraphel story in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, which by competent Assyriologists is regarded as a contemporary document, is dogmatically put down by our author as coming from an unknown source, written " over 1,400 years after Abram " ! On page 19 we are assured that " the first written version of Jewish history was four centuries after Moses," i.e. about the days of Solomon, and that for all the previous centuries " the writers had nothing to help them but traditions handed down by word of mouth from one age to another, or songs and poems similarly preserved." If this statement be true, the Hebrews who lived during the four centuries before Solomon were not acquainted with the art of writing ; for had they been acquainted with it, they would have committed to writing the songs and the traditions of their ancestors. What evidence have we for such a sweeping assertion ? All that we know about that period is against it. In Judges viii. 14 we read that Gideon caught a youth who *wrote down* (R.V.m.) for him the names of the princes and elders of Succoth. If a chance Hebrew lad, belonging to a small town, *could write*, some two centuries before the days of Solomon, how can a reasonable man doubt that at least the leaders of the Israelites could write also at that age ? Mr. Redlich admits that Moses wrote the Ten Commandments (p. 220). Was Moses the *only* person who could read and write ? If so, what was the use of his writing if none of the Hebrews could read it ? If some of them could read, did they lose that faculty when they settled in Canaan ? It must not be forgotten that one of the towns captured in Canaan was called Kirjath-Sepher, or " Book-Town," and witnessing to the culture of its inhabitants. The Tel-el-Amarna Tablets and Prof. Sellin's discovery of the archives of Ishtarwashur, King of Taanach, have demonstrated that, in Pre-Israelitish Canaan, cuneiform writings were used not only for diplomatic purposes but also for everyday correspondence. Did the new-comers copy only the vices of the inhabitants and none of their culture ?

(ii) Mr. Redlich's style when dealing with the Old Testament is open to severe criticism. Abraham's " testing," whereby it is brought home to him that Jehovah, unlike the gods of the heathen, does not approve of *human* sacrifices, is characterized by our author as " capricious and cruel." The Blessings of Jacob were never spoken by Jacob. The gorgeous Tabernacle is a " fiction of imagination." God's coming to Adam in the cool of the day, is explained as signifying that God " feels the heat, for He walks only in the cool of the day." The Hebrew word *éd* in Genesis ii. 6 correctly translated " mist " in R.V., is rendered by our author " stream," contrary to all usage, and so we get the non-sensical phrase, " there used to go up a *stream* from the earth." Fancy a " stream " going *up* !

We have been compelled thus far to point out the defects of this book, but we are not insensible of the uncommon ability of the author as a teacher. If he will only use his undoubted gifts to build up and not to pull down, and will adopt a more reverent tone

toward the sacred Book that has made Britain great, and has been a source of inspiration to countless millions of the best of the children of men, we shall look forward with pleasure to the publication of the second volume of the book, of which he speaks in the Preface.

K. E KEITH.

THE PEOPLE OUTSIDE.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE OUTSIDE. By Thomas Tiplady, H.C.F. London: *South-West Mission*, Lambeth Central Hall, S.E.1.

This sixpenny booklet consists mainly of chapters reprinted from the *Methodist Recorder*, and it bears on its cover the now famous extract from the Archbishop of York's sermon at the last Congress: "Religion attracts; the Church repels. The Church must evangelize itself." This is certainly one of the most "live" books that we have read for many a day. It is a trumpet-call to Methodism, but not to Methodism only, but to all the Churches. Mr. Tiplady is very much "on the spot." He condemns the pew rent system in a brilliant article. He reminds us that Robert Blatchford's articles could have been effectively pulverized by Dr. Frank Ballard, but that there was not enough enterprise to make use of the Press. He tells us that if Lipton's shops were empty they would not open more, but would spend £100,000 on a publicity campaign. He criticizes our hymns, and complains that we have but little "rapture"—that modern Methodism *must* have it or dwindle into nothingness. There are some bold suggestions. One is that the Sunday evening service should be "a purely Evangelistic one." More than a year ago a writer in the *Record* suggested that for a year we should scrap the usual evening service and go in for an Evangelistic campaign, but no practical result followed the suggestion. Let us hope that Mr. Tiplady will be more fortunate. The chapter on "*Robert Blatchford's Recantation*" is a knock-out blow for the secularist. This unpretentious book should be read and re-read by both parsons and people everywhere. We put it down with the feeling that if we had more men of the same calibre as the author there would be fewer empty churches!

THE PRESENCE OF GOD—a study in Divine Immanence and Transcendence, by the Rev. Canon W. H. G. Holmes, M.A., of the Oxford Brotherhood of the Epiphany in India: with a preface by Bishop Gore. London: *S.P.C.K.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Canon Holmes, by his unique experience and previous works, has established a reputation that entitles him to deal with the subject of this volume. He knows Indian thought as few do—but he writes from no mere intellectual standpoint. "The spirit of the book is devotional and in a true sense practical. He knows that Christianity is a life—it is 'the way'—before it is a doctrine: and the main aim of the book is to show us how to walk in the Way, which yet cannot do without right thinking: for the Way is also the Truth." So writes Bishop Gore in his short preface.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Prayer Book Revision.—A pamphlet on Prayer Book Revision from an Evangelical point of view by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D., is published by the Book Room at 1*d.* net. It is short and concise and deals especially with the proposals in N.A. 60, the particular portions which Evangelicals welcome, those which they dislike, and ends with an appeal to Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen to unite on a policy of no *doctrinal* revision of the present Prayer Book. A four-paged leaflet has also been issued by the National Church League on the *Proposed Revision of the Prayer Book* published at 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100 for general distribution. It is written simply and deals with the origin and proposals for Revision, the character of the Report, and the purpose of the proposed changes. It ends with a note on the duty of Churchpeople. In *Anglican Essays* which has just been published, edited by the Ven. W. L. Paige Cox, B.D., quotations are given from, and reference is made in one or two of the Essays to, Bishop Dowden's pamphlet *Define Your Terms*, which is published by the Church Book Room at 1*d.* net. Mr. W. Prescott Upton's manual on *The Proposed Revision of the Prayer Book* which was mentioned in the January number of THE CHURCHMAN has reached a 2nd edition, and has been considerably revised and enlarged. It is priced 3*d.*

The Canadian Revision.—Archdeacon Armitage, who was Secretary of the Canadian Revision and saw the various draft books through the Press, has issued a very interesting volume entitled *The Story of the Canadian Revision of the Prayer Book*, 9*s.* net. It explains the various changes made, and the reasons therefor, furnishing at the same time a most interesting and intelligent account of the new material, especially the new services. The Primate of All Canada writes :—" I have nothing but praise for your production, which is splendid. You have told your story in a most interesting way. What might easily have been a prosy reciting of facts has been relieved and brightened by a raciness and a knowledge of Prayer Book revision generally."

The London Meeting of Lay Churchmen.—The Report of the 10th London Meeting of Lay Churchmen, held in January last, is now obtainable, price 1*s.*, post free. The general subject of the Meeting was *Prayer Book Revision*, and the papers include *The Need and Purpose of Revision and the Question of Alternative Use* by Dr. Eugene Stock ; *Prayer Book Revision in Relation to Sacerdotalism, Modernism, Evangelicalism*, by Mr. Stephen Neill ; *Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany, etc.*, by Mr. W. Prescott Upton ; *The Psalter and the Occasional Services*, by Miss B. C. Mulliner, M.A.Lond. ; *The Holy Communion*, by Mr. G. A. King, besides speeches on the general subject by Mr. Albert Mitchell, Sir Thomas Inskip and others. The papers will be found of particular interest in view of the Prayer Book Revision proposals. It would be invidious to pick out any particular paper as more valuable than the rest, as all are useful and instructive, but that by Mr. Stephen Neill is of remarkable interest, coming as it does from a young Cambridge graduate, while Professor Pite's opening address on the general question will be read with much advantage.

A Church History.—A large number of requests for a re-issue of *The Layman's History of the Church of England* by the Rev. G. R. Balleine have been received during the last few months, and we are glad to announce the issue of a 3rd edition at 2*s.* 6*d.* net. (postage 5*d.*). The new edition has been brought up to date and will, we hope, have as great a demand as the two previous editions, both of which went out of print in the year of their publication. It is difficult to speak too highly of this admirable little book. It is written from " the best Evangelical point of view " in a most entertaining and attractive way, avoiding little technical points, of interest only to the scholar. It deals clearly and truly with the great questions and issues that have successively arisen in the course of the history of the Church of our land. A review of the book appears in this issue under " Reviews."

The Infallibility of the Church.—No work on the Roman Controversy has made so deep an impression as *The Infallibility of the Church*, written by the late Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. For wit, clearness and common sense the book has no rival. Dr. Salmon stood in the front rank of the world's scholars and teachers, and every page of the volume bears testimony to a sureness of historical insight and a grasp of essentials. It was originally published at 9*s.*, and in 1914 a cheap edition was issued at 2*s.* 6*d.* net, which is now completely exhausted. As it is one of the ablest books written on the Roman Controversy and has never been answered or contradicted, it is felt that an effort should be made to secure the immediate publication of another edition, and we are glad to say that Mr. John Murray has consented to publish it. It is impossible to issue the new edition under 5*s.* net and even then the publishers will receive very little return for their outlay. We very much hope that our readers, if they have not already a copy of this most valuable work, will obtain one. All will be able to read it with interest and we may say enjoyment, for it is most interestingly written and is by no means "'dry reading."

Whereunto are We Drifting?—In view of the statements made in the " Anglo-Catholic " Handbooks our readers who have not already obtained a copy of *Quousque? Whereunto are we Drifting?* (2*s.* 3*d.* post free) would do well to obtain a copy. It contains a number of extracts and quotations from the writings of " Anglo-Catholic " Divines showing how far the present so-called Catholic school goes beyond, not merely the old historic school of days gone by, but those who went all lengths with the Tractarian Movement. The book will be found most useful by those who are engaged in repelling this assault on the faith and practice of our Reformed Church.

An Australian Soldier on Christianity.—Dr. E. Digges La Touche was a distinguished Irish clergyman, who for health reasons undertook work in Australia. When the call came in 1914 he volunteered for work as a chaplain. Older men were chosen, so he volunteered as a private, and did excellent Christian work among his comrades. Given his commission, he died leading his men in Gallipoli. Shortly before leaving Australia he delivered five lectures on *The Philosophy of the Faith* which have been published by the Church Book Room under that title (1*s.* 8*d.* post free). His thought is always clear, his scholarship is undoubted, and his enthusiasm for what he believes to be truth is evident in every page. There has already been a great demand for the book which will well repay the small outlay.