

## Reviews.

*The Growth of Church Institutions.* By the Rev. EDWIN HATCH, D.D.  
Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS work is described by its author as "designed less for scholars than for general readers who are interested in theological subjects." It is, however, rather ecclesiastical than theological in the proper sense of the word, for its contents altogether concern not the truths of which the Church is a witness and a keeper, but the institutions by the agency of which she has striven to acquit herself of her commission. The work is, in fact, a series of historical sketches which profess to indicate the origin, and do propound theories about the development, of the outward machinery of Church government and administration, and deal also with Church property, its tenure and acquisition. The chapters have no very close cohesion. They resemble rather a series of papers put together for some periodical of the more serious order, and now collected and revised. Or are they choice extracts from lectures delivered by the author as "Reader in Ecclesiastical History" at Oxford? Dr. Hatch possesses an admirable style. He is always perspicuous and lively—the reader is never tired or puzzled; and the choice of themes is certainly one that will recommend the book to general perusal. Historical Chapters on the Diocese, the Bishop, the Parish, National Churches, and so on, are not likely to want readers, especially when so ably and cleverly penned as are these. Dr. Hatch, too, has chosen his field well chronologically, for he has undertaken to give us light upon a period that certainly very much needs it—so far, at any rate, as the general reader is concerned. He deals specially with the centuries which lie "between the fall of the Roman Empire and the political settlement of mediæval Europe."

At the same time, this limitation of his field gives opportunity, as we are constrained to think, for the practice, as regards some matters at least, of that very fallacy which so seriously impairs the same author's general argument in his very ingenious "Bampton Lectures." That argument undertook to set forth the organization of the early Christian Churches, and propounded some novel notions as to the origin and functions of primitive Church officers, specially the Bishop. But Dr. Hatch opened the course by pointedly disclaiming any reference to the New Testament. We do not deny, of course, that a writer is at liberty to determine for himself the limits of any subject with which he proposes to deal. But, on the other hand, the critic is no less at liberty—indeed, is bound—to point out when strange and startling conclusions are reached that the advocate only makes out his case for them by pointedly refusing to look at an important portion of the evidence. To us it seems absurd to discuss the organization of the early Christian Church, and to disregard altogether the Book of Acts, in which the first and the leading historical data are contained, and the Pastoral Epistles, in which St. Paul lays down with an authority which determined the future basis and the lines on which later organizations assuredly assumed to proceed. Would it be really possible for any intelligent man who accepts the Epistles to Timothy and Titus as St. Paul's to maintain, as Dr. Hatch appears to do, that the primitive Bishop was primarily, if not solely, a financial and eleemosynary functionary—a sort of ecclesiastical relieving-officer? Does the *Didaché*, which has some important things to say about the Bishop, lend any colour to such an idea? Early Church history has been aptly said to pass through a tunnel. There is light, much light, at the further end, where the

Apostolic writings illuminate the very outset of the Church's career. There is light, again, at the close of the second century, when the Fathers and the historians come forward to illustrate matters for us. Between the two epochs lies a space in which only casual and doubtful glimpses are afforded, as of the objects which one passes in traversing a tunnel. Now, Dr. Hatch, when he takes in hand to disclose what is to be found within this obscure interval, begins by sedulously and completely shutting out all the light and help to be obtained from the remoter end, and we feel accordingly utterly distrustful as to his accuracy of discernment about those things which he describes to us.

The present series of sketches follows very much the same line of subjects as that along which Dr. Hatch travelled in the "Bampton Lectures," and it is up and down affected, if not throughout pervaded, by the same fallacy. The writer starts with the fall of the Roman Empire, and is to be our guide in studying the subsequent development of Church institutions. Yes, but they did not originate at the fall of the empire; they were even then some centuries old, and their after-growth was certainly continuous with their origin and their earliest progress. But Dr. Hatch seems to cut arbitrarily in at a certain date—we cannot say at a certain fixed stage—and turns his back altogether upon the preceding history, although really the after-development was very largely conditioned and regulated by what had passed in the earlier processes.

This fact has always to be borne in mind throughout the book; and we are convinced that many statements, suggestions, opinions presented in these pages could only possess even a colour of probability or verisimilitude to one who looks at them as Dr. Hatch dexterously puts them, not in the light which their earliest records afford, but in that only thrown by the witnesses which it pleases him to interrogate for the purposes of his argument.

Then, again, we notice throughout the book many very broad generalizations which appear to be based on an extremely imperfect induction of facts. Dr. Hatch makes some rather large and unqualified assertions—say, to take an example almost at hazard, about the establishment of the Metropolitan organization, which he attributes mainly to Charlemagne, and then quotes at the foot of the page one or two authorities belonging to some one century or country, as though they proved the statement set down in the text about the Western Churches altogether. Now, the principal work of organizing the Western Church and its dioceses under Metropolitans has been usually assigned to Boniface, backed actively by the Pope, two generations or nearly so prior to Charlemagne's great Council at Frankfort in 794; and, indeed, was itself nothing else but a revival of a system which was in vigour in the fifth century, but had been brought low by the subversion of the Roman power. Still, if Dr. Hatch can show that this Church "institution" was mainly indebted to the strong hand of the Frankish conqueror, and was principally an arrangement effected by the secular power, so be it. All we say is that Dr. Hatch asserts it here and does not prove it. Altogether, we demur to the habit he has of quoting some local Canon, Constitution, Capitulum, or what not, and then drawing some inference which is presented as though it held true of the whole Western Church. In truth, the various Churches of the West—those of Italy, Spain, Gaul, Germany, Britain—were, during the period of which Dr. Hatch professes to treat, in very various and ever-varying degrees of development, and had institutions differing greatly from each other. The times were often times of confusion and disorder. There were gains and losses—periods of growth and of decline; and nothing can be more hazardous than to argue from some enactment or record belonging to one date and country to the Churches of the West generally. In the times later than those with which Dr. Hatch

deals an approximation to uniformity was doubtless effected under the Papal tyranny. It might not be unfair in the fourteenth century to reason as regards ecclesiastical institutions from what is shown to hold about one European country, to the state of things in another European country about which less is actually recorded. But such a process is most unsafe as regards the centuries here in question.

Dr. Hatch's witnesses, then, are those who can have seen and known but some passing aspects of Church life in parts or corners of Christendom. But further, we are not always satisfied that he construes correctly the evidence which they do give. Take, *e.g.*, what is said in the chapter upon "National Churches" about the share of laymen in the ecclesiastical synods. Dr. Hatch tells us broadly that these synods consisted of laity as well as clergy, and that they took cognizance of ecclesiastical and doctrinal affairs as well of secular affairs. In a word, we are given to understand that the "nobles and officers of the palace," and such as they, sat co-ordinately with the archbishops and bishops, the king or emperor oftentimes presiding also, and determined dogmatical controversies together with the clergy just in the same way and with the same vote, voice, and authority. Now it may be a very proper question to raise and discuss whether the laity ought to have equal vote and voice with the spirituality in a National or Provincial Synod. This is not the place to enter upon such a discussion. But as regards the centuries which Dr. Hatch passes in review, it is certain that the laity exercised no such powers. Is there not, indeed, something rather like an anachronism in supposing—the instance is Dr. Hatch's own—the Carolingian counts discussing the subtleties of Adoptionism? The English Church has laymen who are perhaps as learned in theology as are their reverend brethren. Lord Selborne, we do not doubt, would be as well qualified personally to give an opinion about a controversy of faith as almost any one of our bishops. But we should not look for much guidance about such matters from a Frankish noble of the eighth century. The lay members present at Frankfort undoubtedly accepted what the three hundred bishops defined, and signed the decrees and canons only as assenting. Dr. Hatch refers to several of the long list of Councils of Toledo. But he ignores what the very records of those councils themselves again and again make clear: that the synod was regarded as consisting of the ecclesiastics present, and that the laymen were sometimes, perhaps always, simply *viri illustres* who were invited to attend, and only signed by way of intimating their acceptance of canons to the drawing up of which they had certainly contributed nothing whatever. This appears constantly in the acts of the councils themselves. The signatures are sometimes those of bishops or their deputies only; when the laymen sign also, a different formula is used by them. The bishop writes (*e.g.*), "Ego subscripsi" or "definiens subscripsi;" the layman, "Ego annuens" or "consentiens subscripsi." How Dr. Hatch came to ignore plain facts like these, which appear on the face of the records of these councils, we cannot even surmise. He has overlooked a distinction which Bishop Bilson long ago pointed out. "To be present in synod is one thing: to deliberate and determine in synod is another thing." In a word, we do not believe that during the centuries in question there can be demonstrated to be any clear instance in which lay members sat co-ordinately in Church Synods with the clerical ones, or gave conclusive and determining votes about spiritual or doctrinal questions. It is quite true that there are abundant instances of "*mixta concilia*" in which bishops and laymen sat together, and that these, as Dr. Hatch points out, furnish the lines which our own organization of Church and State has followed. But these "*mixta concilia*" were no more synods than the House of Lords is so. These State Councils, however, are often confounded with synods by those who study history only superficially.

Perhaps we ought to remark that Dr. Hatch exhibits a consciousness that he offers very weak evidence for his bold and broad assertions. He tells us in his preface that as the work is designed for general readers, he "has not thought it desirable to encumber the pages with more than the most necessary references to his authorities." But we are not to infer that "the evidence also is scanty;" he is ready to support his statements "by sufficient proofs." These, we presume, are to be forthcoming in "the more elaborate work which the writer has for some time had in preparation." Now this seems to us to be inverting the proper order of things. If Dr. Hatch, in giving what he terms a "summary of results," were generalizing for us the issues of inquiries and studies about matters on which all the world is in principle agreed, we might think that he had provided a very useful manual. But to throw out a number of dogmatic assertions for "general readers" about topics controverted on all sides, and to set down as though they were certain or demonstrated statements which Dr. Hatch must well know are contradicted by leading authorities both ancient and modern, and then to tell us that he is about by-and-by to publish a more elaborate work in which these strange or doubtful propositions will be proved, is surely not to deal with us fairly. We ought first of all to have had the "elaborate work" and the "sufficient proofs;" then afterwards might have come in its natural order the "summary of results." At present the "results" are very often only examples of "ipse dixit."

One of the most remarkable chapters in the book is that on "Tithes and their Distribution." Dr. Hatch writes as though he held a commission from the Liberation Society to furnish historical grounds which they might allege as they try to despoil Dr. Hatch's brethren. He tells us that "Tithes, as a Christian institution, date from the eighth century. They are one of the results of the great Carolingian reformation." It is not quite clear what is meant by this statement. If Dr. Hatch means that tithes did not become a fixed legal payment until the eighth century, he is probably not far from being right. If he means that the duty of dedicating at least a tenth to the service of God is first definitely heard of then, he is manifestly wrong. There are plenty of references to the payment of tithe as a Christian duty to be found in the ancient Christian writers from Irenæus downwards, and in Canons of Councils almost from the beginning of conciliar activity in the Church; and, indeed, Dr. Hatch in the sequel of his chapter quotes or refers to several of these. What does he mean then by asserting that tithes as a Christian institution date from the eighth century? It is quite plain that as a religious and moral obligation they date from primitive Christian times, and that they were enforced by synodical rule two or three centuries before "the Carolingian reformation." What Charlemagne really did was to make legally imperative that which previously had been a Church rule.

Very strange then it is to find Dr. Hatch affirming that tithes "are not ecclesiastical in their origin, but come to the Church from the State." On the contrary, Dr. Hatch's own witnesses, adduced in the later part of this very chapter, prove that their payment was first enjoined by the Church as due to God, and afterwards insisted on by the State as a thing its subjects ought to do. Dr. Hatch tells us, by way of further explaining the State origin of tithes, that originally they were a rent paid for the leasing of Church lands; that "the tenth or tithe of the produce was a traditional and customary rent for lands so leased;" that the amount of the rent, and the fact that it was paid to the Church, gradually created a new conception of its nature, and it became "identified with the Levitical tithe." How this explanation is to be reconciled with the testimonies quoted by Dr. Hatch himself, as to the principle of the Levitical tithe having been quite familiar and recognised by Church authority for centuries previously to "the Carolingian reformation," we do not see. What

we are apparently asked to believe is that this payment of a tenth as the rent for leased Church land first suggested the idea of a tithe being a sacred debt. It is intimated that people, from paying rent in this proportion, gradually came to think that they ought also to bestow a tenth of everything they had on the Church! And yet a page or two afterwards Dr. Hatch refers to Alcuin's intercession on behalf of the Saxons. Alcuin remonstrated with Charlemagne for imposing tithes on the newly converted Saxons, thus making Christianity a heavy burden to them, and adds that "even those who had been born and educated in the Christian faith scarcely consented to pay tithes of their substance." Yet in the face of this manifest indication that tithes were not a popular impost, Dr. Hatch, by way of inventing a secular origin for them, wants us apparently to take it for granted that those who had to yield a tenth of their produce for rent, found the process of decimation so delightful that they proceeded to extend it to all their other property that was not rented of the Church! And we are referred, as the only authority that is quoted for this incredible assumption, to a decree of the Council of Valence in 855. And the decree certainly does direct that a tenth of the produce of Church lands should be paid as rent; but far from substantiating Dr. Hatch's position on the question it directly subverts it, for it orders that "the ninths and tenths" be paid to the Church—that is, that the tithe should be paid and another tenth besides for rent. In other words, the solitary authority which Dr. Hatch gives for his assertion that tithes took their origin from rent, proves distinctly that they did not, for it provides that the tenth should be paid as rent in addition to the tithe; it assumes the pre-existence of the tithe. We had better give the canon as it is rendered into English, and correctly rendered, by Dr. Hatch.

"With respect to the properties and farms which were once offered by the faithful to the ownership of the Church, but are now subject to the power of laymen, it is resolved that *ninths* and *tenths* be faithfully paid to the churches from which they have been withdrawn; nay, let all the faithful most readily offer to God their tithes of all that they possess."

Dr. Hatch dwells at length upon the ancient arrangement by which the tithes were originally at the disposition of the Bishop, who allotted them to various holy purposes—his own maintenance, that of the churches, that of the clergy, and the relief of the poor. And he argues that if tithes are to be defended as "an ancient right of the Church, resting on divine law, and independent of, though recognised by, the State," then the claim of the poor to a share in them cannot be questioned. On the other hand, if we claim them because of the civil enactments which enforce their payment to the clergy, and which make no mention of the poor, why, then, says Dr. Hatch, "the right of the State to make new regulations respecting them cannot be questioned." Such is the dilemma on which Dr. Hatch seeks to impale the defenders of the rights and property of his brother clergymen, or rather of the parishes of which they are incumbents. But Dr. Hatch must be very well aware that the old arrangement by which not tithes only but all Church revenues went into the hands of the bishop did not last long anywhere; and as landowners desired to secure a resident priest for their own tenants and dependents, they did so by endowing the incumbencies which they founded with tithes and glebe. This process was encouraged by zealous bishops, and legalized and established by Christian kings. Dr. Hatch intimates that there is a great mass of existing deeds of donation. So far as England is concerned, we think that there must be, as regards parochial endowments, many more deeds of apportionment of tithes extant than deeds of gift. But there has never been one quoted, so far as we know, and we do not think there is any one extant, or that there ever was one, which allotted any share of the parochial tithes to the poor. The incumbents who receive ancient parochial tithes

do so because the founder of the parish or some subsequent owner of property in it left the tithes to maintain in perpetuity a clergyman for the spiritual oversight of the parish. The State came in afterwards to ratify and to secure the gift; but the tithes are not in any sense the creation of civil enactment—they are the offspring of individual munificence. This is the true answer to Dr. Hatch's dilemma; though the parochial clergy who pay poor-rates might well plead that the poor and needy have even now a goodly share in the tithes.

We hope when Dr. Hatch's "elaborate work" appears that it will exhibit a more complete and impartial examination of the authorities on which we must ultimately depend for our acquaintance with Church institutions between the fall of the Roman Empire and the mediæval settlement of Europe. And if Dr. Hatch will really interrogate the witnesses on all sides, and not pick and choose what suits his theories, we anticipate that some adventurous statements made in this volume will have to be reconsidered and very much modified. It is a clever book, but we cannot commend it as a fair one. Moreover, it is Erastian to the core.

CANON.

*Literary Epochs.* By G. F. UNDERHILL. London: Elliot Stock.

The keynote of this little book is the tendency of intellectual power to gather in clusters. This, of course, is a well-known idea, and is very generally admitted, but at the same time it can be pushed to excess. Stirring times, says Mr. Underhill, procreate striking men, and he seems to imply that their genius is called into existence by the surrounding circumstances, whereas it is more reasonable to say that their genius is coloured by the prevailing tinge in the social being of the period. We need not go to the length of asserting that some famous literary man would never have written at all but for the accident of being born at a particular time; rather, that his mind acquired a bent conformable to the period in which it grew up and expanded. We should always carefully inquire into causes which induced an author, or congeries of authors, to write as they do, and examine the signs of the times which influenced them; anything beyond this is beside the mark. Much praise is due to our author for the careful way in which he investigates and discourses on the causes of literary excitation, but the good old rule of *μηδὲν ἄγαν* is occasionally forgotten.

After a couple of chapters devoted to the periods of Athens and Rome that are associated with the names of Pericles and Augustus, more modern literature is investigated, beginning with that of mediæval Italy. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and their lesser brethren, who helped in the crusade against priestly tyranny, are discussed with a sympathetic and discriminating touch. The Elizabethan era succeeds, and meets with more attention than is vouchsafed to any other; nor will any one fall out with this. Bacon is compared with Plato, to the latter's disadvantage; the remarks on Shakespeare are apposite and well chosen. Mr. Underhill hardly does justice to Spenser, the "poet's poet." The "tediousness and obsolete language" that he speaks of are impalpable, while we are borne away on that wealth of quick imagination and rich description which is pre-eminent in his writings. He is certainly like Longfellow in one point; that he is more eagerly read by the young and the old than the middle-aged; and the reason is not far to seek, for he is poetry personified, and his dreamy and romantic verses are not practical enough for those who are confronted by the stern reality of middle life.

The age of *le grand monarque* Louis comes next, and the keynote of the literary history of his reign is clearly laid down. His famous dictum *L'état c'est moi* applied equally to letters as to statecraft. No one man has ever influenced authors so much as this famous sovereign. The time of

Anne succeeds, followed by the French Revolution, and a bird's-eye view of the literature of the United States concludes the "Epochs." Surely Mr. Underhill sets somewhat too high an estimate on the development in America. Its authors, he says (p. 197) "have blossomed forth into a spasmodic growth of intellect which brings them on an equality with their rivals in Europe." Many will regard this as undue praise. In every department of literature but one, they are in the rear; immeasurably so in poetry. The sole point in which they surpass European writers is in that humour which depends for its interest on exaggerated hyperbole, and this is surely no great conquest. In this section of Mr. Underhill's book occurs an extraordinary and unaccountable blunder. Amongst the American authors is cited no less a person than the old Puritan, Richard Baxter, author of the "Saint's Rest!" Milton, we may add, is misquoted once. Occasionally the language is very vigorous: *e.g.* (p. 182):

The same propensity which causes silly feminine society to idolize the lawn-tennis-playing, drawing-room, washing-his-hands-with-invisible-soap curate of the present day;

and again (p. 214):

Even at the present day we have hardly expelled the insane thrasonical meretriciousness of pseudo-æstheticism, which, but for the foolish gullibility of weak-kneed calves calling themselves men, and women distracted on account of their painful inability to attract, would never have existed.

The general tone of the book is just and refined; and the one or two blemishes we have pointed out will not irreparably impair its interest. Nothing comes seriously amiss to a true book-lover which is tendered in such a spirit of love towards literature as this.

B. A.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*Girl Neighbours.* By SARAH TYTLER. London: Blackie and Sons.

This is a case of old-fashioned girls *v.* girls *à la mode*, in which the arguments on both sides are very fairly set out, and judgment is given for the former. The "neighbours," Pie Stubbs and Harriet Cotton, are true and realistic specimens of girlhood. A very attractive story, and beautifully illustrated.

*An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.* By the Rev. J. E. YONGE, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

This, the latest volume of the Theological Educator series, conveys full and accurate information. Every point is carefully explained and illustrated, numerous references to Holy Scripture are given, and there are valuable notes; the whole supplies a condensation of the standard authors on the subject which will be extremely useful to candidates for Holy Orders.

*Remarks on the Supplement to the Church Catechism.* Proposed by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury. By the Right Rev. CHARLES PERRY, D.D., Late Bishop of Melbourne. Elliot Stock.

It is only necessary here to remark that this pamphlet is a reprint ("with some alterations") from the December CHURCHMAN.