

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1895.

ART. I. — BIBLICAL CRITICISM AT THE EXETER
CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE practice at Church Congresses of selecting a large subject for discussion, and assigning different parts or aspects of it to the various readers and speakers, is one that we do not deprecate, for it is a necessity, but it has a chilling effect on the audience. When the mind has been brought into a state of tension by an eloquent appeal or a well-sustained argument on a point of deep interest, it is hard to have to turn away from it to another point similar to that which has been under consideration, but not identical with it. Professor Ryle seemed to feel this when he prefaced his paper by a warning that the exciting topics dealt with by Dr. Stanley Leathes were not to be expected in an essay on the Apocrypha. The Bishop of Gibraltar's paper on "The Grounds of our Belief in the Divine Origin and Authority of the Holy Scriptures," Dr. Driver's and Dr. Stanley Leathes' on "The Growth of the Old Testament," Dr. Sanday's and Mr. Lias' addresses on "The Fulness of Revelation in the New Testament," and Professor Ryle's paper on "The Value of the Apocrypha," are legitimately grouped together under the title of "Biblical Criticism." But it is evident at a glance that they deal with distinct sections of a vast theme, and are connected co-ordinately rather than consequentially. The after-discussion is therefore sporadic in character, and no one subject is thoroughly threshed out. The Bishop of Gibraltar's paper was a calmly-worded statement that our belief in the Bible is grounded partly on external, partly on internal, evidence, each of which supports the other. Professor Sanday generously gave a great part of his time to commending other people's books, and ended by pronouncing that the doctrines of the Trinity, of the Logos, of the Atonement, and of the union of the Christian with Christ, are, in his judgment, strengthened rather than weakened by critical study. Mr. Lias, if we understood him right, seemed rather to deny

than to maintain his thesis, for he did not appear to look back to the revelation of the New Testament as being full and complete, but forward to a development "starting with the Articles of the Christian Creed as a body of first principles," such development being "guided by the writings of Evangelists and Apostles, and above all by the words of Christ." He justly remarked that thus "the theology of the future will present in many respects a most startling contrast to the theology of the past." Professor Ryle's essay attributes to the Apocryphal books a high value for Christian study. With these few remarks we pass on to the two papers which, owing to their subject, possess the greatest interest at the present moment, Dr. Driver's and Dr. Stanley Leathes' papers on "The Growth of the Old Testament."

Dr. Stanley Leathes, in a grave and earnest manner, put forward an argument for the organic unity of the Old Testament as it exists, whose growth he likened to that of a tree. To prove the antiquity of the law and the earlier history, he began with the post-captivity prophets as being that part of the Old Testament about which there is least room for difference of opinion. These, he maintained, presupposed the Levitical Law and the history and the other prophets, as, in like manner, the Decalogue, in the Fourth Commandment, presupposed the first chapter of Genesis.

For the manner in which he worked out his argument we must refer to the paper itself, which well deserves to be studied.

We have reserved Dr. Driver's paper till last. The writer had plainly set before himself the task of not offending his hearers' susceptibilities, while at the same time he did not withdraw from any of the positions which he has already taken up. The criticism which he passed on the prophets is such as, except for omissions (the predictive element is not mentioned), would be generally accepted. Where he differs from most of his fellow Churchmen, he did not argue, but made assumptions. He assumed, for example, that pieces of poetry in the historical books were the first elements of the Old Testament, and he assumed the existence of two competing schools—the prophetic school (subdivided into a primary and secondary, or Deuteronomic school) and the priestly school, from which the historical books emanated. We are not charging him with any dishonesty in this. He had not time for arguing the whole case, and therefore he assumed as facts the conjectures of Astruc and his German followers, which he has himself, with Dr. Cheyne's help, transplanted into English soil. But we must read between the lines in order to understand the force of the summary argument laid by him in the most inoffensive terms possible before the Church Congress.

The question that has to be decided is not whether there are any objections to the theory called by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol traditional, or any objections to the theory which Mr. Gladstone has called negative, but whether the objections to one of these theories are greater or less than the objections to the other. There are objections to everything. "There are objections," said Dr. Johnson, "to a vacuum and objections to a plenum, but one or the other must be true." There are objections to Homer being regarded as the author of the "Iliad" and "Odyssey," and there are objections to the authorship being assigned to others. There are objections to Shakespeare's having written the plays that go under his name, and there are objections to attributing them to Bacon or to anyone else. If the objections to the new theory as to the way in which the Bible originated are fewer than those which lie against the theory hitherto accepted, the new theory has vindicated its claim at least to careful consideration; if they are more, it has no standing ground.

The received theory is that the Bible holds a unique position owing to its inspiration, by which is meant the action of God the Holy Ghost on the minds of the writers, by which they were led into all truth; that it consists of the Pentateuch, the historical, prophetic and other books; that the writer of the Pentateuch was Moses; of Joshua, one of the elders that outlived Joshua; of Judges, one in the earlier times in the monarchy; of the prophetic books, the prophet to whom they are assigned, and so on. It is granted that the theory has its difficulties.

The new theory is that the Bible holds a unique position owing to its inspiration, by which is meant the high moral purpose of the writers, and the good effect that their writings produce on the minds of their readers; that it consists of a Hexateuch, of historical and prophetic and other books, and that the Hexateuch in its present form was written by a student living in Babylon in the sixth century B.C. This student is known by the designation C, and we must constantly remind ourselves that C was a real living man, not a symbol. To judge whether the objections to Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch, or to C's authorship of the Hexateuch, are the most weighty, we must picture to ourselves the manner in which the latter compiled the Hexateuch.

Historically we know nothing of C, but analytically—that is, by an inspection and examination of the Bible—a school of German thinkers, endorsed by Dr. Driver, have inferred that about the year 550 B.C. there were living among the Jewish exiles four literary students and antiquaries. The eldest of these four goes under the name of the second Deuteronomist,

“because he was strongly imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy.” A little junior to him was a man called H, to whom are attributed ten chapters of Leviticus (chap. xvii.-xxvi.), which received from Klostermann in 1877 the title of “The Law of Holiness,” which they have since retained. Contemporary with him was one called P, and shortly after him came C, who put the whole of the early historical books of the Bible into the shape in which we now have them.

How did C proceed in this great work? We may suppose him sitting in his room in Babylon at his study-table in front of eight desks standing in a row before him. On the first of these desks there would lie open a roll or book containing the early Jewish poetry, from the Song of Moses to the Song of Solomon. On the second desk would be a roll written by J, a native of southern Palestine, who lived about the year 800, and wrote a history of the Jewish people from the earliest times down to the death of Joshua. On the third desk there would be a roll written by E, a contemporary of J, who lived in Northern Palestine, and, like J, wrote a history of the Jewish people from the earliest times down to the death of Joshua. On the fourth desk there would be a harmony of the two books just mentioned, which was composed by a harmonist named J-E about the year 750. On the fifth desk would be lying a roll written by the first Deuteronomist about the year 700, containing some parts of the book of Deuteronomy. Then followed the three books written by C’s contemporaries. On the sixth desk would lie the work of the second Deuteronomist, who wrote parts of Joshua and Judges. On the seventh the ten chapters on Holiness written by H. On the eighth a very important roll by P, containing a history from the creation, embodying parts of the writings of J and of E, and ending, like them, with the death of Joshua.

The method in which C made use of the ample material before him was singular. While composing the books of Genesis and Exodus, he appears to have placed his table opposite the desks of J and of E and of P, and to have copied from one of them a verse, or a half verse, or the third part of a verse, or several verses, and then to have proceeded to the two others and treated them in like manner. For example, in Ex. xiv. he copied verses 1-4 from P; verses 5-7 from J; verses 8 and 9 from P; the first half of verse 10 from J; the second half of verse 10 from E; verses 11-14 from J; verses 15-18 from P; the first half of verse 19 from E; the second half of it and verse 20 from J; the first third-part of verse 21 from P; the second third-part of it from J; the third third-part of it and verses 22 and 23 from P; verses 24, 25 from J; verse 26 and one-third of verse 27 from P; the

other two-thirds from J; verses 28, 29 from P; verses 30, 31 from J.

Having thus finished the books of Genesis and Exodus, C closed the rolls of J and of E, and did not open them again, although their history continued throughout the next five books. He seems to have moved his table on to the third desk, on which the harmony of J-E was lying, placing by its side the two desks holding the rolls of P and H, his two contemporaries. His method was the same as before. For example, in Levit. xxiii., he took the first third-part of verse 39 from P; the second third-part from H; the third third-part from P; verses 40-43 from H; verse 44 from P. We are not told whether P and H were present, and gave their sanction to the mutilations which they each suffered at C's hands.

In Numbers the Harmonist J-E and P had to be combined. In chapter xx. C did this as follows: he took the first half of verse 1 from P; the second half from J-E; verse 2 from P; the first half of verse 3 from J-E; the second half from P; verses 4, 5 from J-E; verse 6 from P, etc. Very delicate work!

On reaching Deuteronomy C had to harmonize J-E, P, and the first Deuteronomist, who had lived in the age of Manasseh. Thus in chapter xxxiv. he took the first half of verse 1 from P; the second half of verse 1 and verses 2-7 "in the main" from D¹; verses 8, 9 from P; verse 10 from J-E; verses 11, 12 from the Deuteronomist. In Joshua C had again three authorities to combine—J-E, P, and the second Deuteronomist—two of them contemporaries of his own. So in chapter ix. he took verses 1, 2 from D²; verses 3-8 and half of 9 from J-E; half of verse 9 and verse 10 from D²; verses 11-14 and half of verse 15 from J-E; half of verse 15 from P; verse 16 from J-E; verses 17-21 from P; verses 22 and 23 from J-E; verses 24, 25 from D²; verses 26 and 27, down to the beginning of its last line, from J-E; the last line of verse 27 from D².

Such is the manner in which, according to Dr. Driver, C produced "the Hexateuch"—a thing unknown to Hebrews, Greeks, Latins, and, till within the last few years, to Germans and Englishmen—which Dr. Stanley Leathes calls "a nondescript and amorphous." We have added no feature to the Professor's sketch except the desks. It is possible that C may have preferred having the rolls on his table, but the rolls he must have had, and he must have used them in the way that we have described.

Now, against which of the competing theories do most objections lie? Is it more reasonable to suppose that Moses wrote the history of his own time, like Julius Cæsar, as we have it, or that C compiled it out of eight pre-existing histories

not one of which was ever heard of in Jewish or Christian history until the middle of the nineteenth century after Christ, and which disappeared from the face of the earth the moment that C had done with them? Is it to be supposed that C went about collecting all the MSS. of all the eight histories and burnt them? Some of them, the historical poems and the histories by J and E and J-E, existed before the Israelites were carried away into Assyria. Did they take no copies with them? And could the Jewish authorities at Babylon have been willing to make a bonfire of all their copies at C's request? Was such a thing ever heard of in the history of nations? Where are they—those parts which C rejected, and which must have been as much and as little inspired as those parts which he retained? If they cannot be found themselves, where is the record of them? Not a shadow of a shade of a hint of their existence survives! Then, as to methods. We have no difficulty in imagining to ourselves a writer who wrote down his own experiences, as Moses is supposed to have done, and to whom a vision of previous things was Divinely granted; but can we even imagine the possibility of a history being concocted in the way in which C is supposed to have concocted his? Look at the last example that we have given—which comes straight from Dr. Driver. Or, look at Josh. xx.: there C is represented as taking verses 1, 2 and the first line of 3 from P; then two words from D²; then two lines from P; then two verses (4, 5) from D²; then two lines of verse 6 from P; then four lines of the same verse from D²; then three verses from P. Was a history ever written in such a way, or could it be? Try what you could do with the history of England on this principle. Take a book of old ballads, three of the old annalists—Florence of Worcester, Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Malmesbury—and four modern historians, Macaulay, Froude, Freeman, Green, and make your history by putting together three sentences from one, two words from another, two lines from another, two sentences from another, two lines from another, four lines from another, three sentences from another. Do you believe that your compilation would be regarded as an original work for 2,000 years, and that you would produce what C is represented as producing—not a thing of shreds and patches, like the wrong side of a piece of tapestry, but a flowing narrative so full of felicities as to have forced those well-known words of pathetic eulogy from Dr. Newman?

Again, as to inspiration. Would it be more or less easy to believe that Moses was inspired than the unknown student working at his MSS. in a back street of Babylon? The new school has answered this question by evacuating the meaning

of the word inspiration. In their mouths it no longer means the action of the Divine mind on that of the writer, but the action of the writer's mind on the minds of his readers.

Putting inspiration aside, as we are thus compelled to do, should we feel more or less sure of the accuracy of the facts recorded if we believed them to be recounted by one who witnessed them, or by a literary man who lived about a thousand years afterwards, and reported them in the words of other writers, the oldest of whom lived about 700 years after the times at which they occurred, and the greatest number of whom were his own contemporaries?

We are constantly told by men who have not studied the subject, and desire the reputation of not being bigoted, that the only question raised by critics is a question of authorship which does not affect the substance of the Bible, and need not affect our belief in its authority. It is not true. We can see that it is at least possible that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and therefore we are able to believe that he did so. We can see that it is impossible that C could have written it in the way suggested, and therefore we cannot believe it. We can suppose that if Moses wrote, he wrote honestly. We cannot regard J, E, P, H, D as anything but falsifiers representing themselves as living when they did not live. We can believe that Moses was inspired; no one even professes that C, or those whose works he mutilated, were inspired in the hitherto accepted sense of the word inspired. We can believe in the occurrence of a miracle, such as the crossing of the Jordan, if narrated by an eyewitness, even on human testimony, but what guarantee for its truth have we in the fact that it found a place in a narrative not Divinely guarded from error, written 700 years after the event, and quoted by an unknown editor living in Babylon 300 years later? At least, let us recognise the seriousness of the issue.

De vita et sanguine agitur.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. II.—A CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE CHARACTER
AND WORK OF DR. PUSEY.¹

PART II.

IT is not quite apparent what period of her history seemed to Pusey to furnish the model to which the Church should conform. One thing, however, is quite clear, that Pusey

¹ "Life of E. B. Pusey, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford," by Henry Parry Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's.

regarded the Protestant conception of the Church and Christianity as utterly defective and unsound.

There are many expressions that prove this verbatim, but no stronger proof of it can be given than the following quotation of Pusey's own answer to the question, "What is Puseyism?" (vol. ii., p. 140).

After specifying as distinctive tokens of Puseyism high estimate of the Sacrament, of Episcopacy, of the visible Church and of the externals of worship, Dr. Pusey further expounds his system in contrast with what he calls the system of Calvin in the following terms:

"There is a broad line of difference between Puseyism and the system of Calvin. Such points are:

"(1) What are the essential doctrines of saving faith? The one says, those contained in the Creeds, especially what relates to the Holy Trinity. The other (Calvinist), the belief in justification by faith only.

"(2) The belief of a universal judgment of both good and bad, according to their works.

"(3) The necessity for continued repentance for past sins.

"(4) The intrinsic acceptableness of good works, especially of deeds of charity (sprinkled with the Blood of Christ) as acceptable through Him for the effacing of past sins.

"(5) The means whereby a man, having been justified, remains so. The one would say (the Calvinist) by renouncing his own works and trusting to Christ alone; the other, by striving to keep God's commandments through the grace of Christ, trusting to Him for strength to do what is pleasing to God, and for pardon for what is displeasing, and these bestowed especially through the Holy Eucharist, as that which chiefly unites them with their Lord.

"(6) The Sacraments regarded in this, the Calvinistic system, as signs only of grace given independently of them; by our Church, as the very means by which we are incorporated into Christ, and subsequently have this life sustained in us.

"(7) The authority of the Universal Church as the channel of truth to us. The one (our Church) thinks that what the Universal Church has declared to be matter of faith (as the Creeds) is to be received by individuals antecedently to, and independently of, what they themselves see to be true. The other, that a person is bound to receive nothing but what he himself sees to be contained in the Holy Scriptures."

We may, then, take Puseyism to be both a temper of mind and a system of belief. The Puseyite temper may be described as one the ruling idea of which is a love for what is visible, orderly, antique, and beautiful in religion. Few persons will quarrel with this temper. It is a recovery from the

slovenly Church of Hanoverian times, and from the bareness of Puritan worship. It is a temper wholly consonant with the genius of Protestantism. It decayed under the influences of that Puritan development which the foolish persecution of the High Church bishops under James and Charles I. rendered almost unavoidable.

The praise of its revival belongs chiefly to the Oxford school. This praise should be conceded without grudging. Oxford possesses the very *genius loci* for such a revival, and Pusey and his fellows certainly deserve thanks for awakening purer and more genial tastes in the accessories and outward parts of devotion.

But Puseyism, as Pusey here asserts, is not only a temper of mind and a direction of taste; it is also and much more a system of belief. Puseyism is set forth as the opposite of Calvinism. I doubt whether the scheme of belief against which Pusey contends is correctly described. It seems to me likely that the main positions which he here condemns are positions common to all reformers, and not distinctive of Calvin alone. I doubt, moreover, whether any of the Reformers ever taught, as an essential doctrine of saving faith, what Pusey puts first in his account of Calvinism—*i.e.*, the belief in justification by faith only.

The Reformers did unanimously teach the doctrine of justification by faith, but they did not teach that a belief in this doctrine was essential to salvation. For they knew that to believe in believing could not justify man, while they maintained, with the New Testament, that a man is justified only by believing. It is, however, certain that the Reformers would have repudiated with energy and unanimity the fourth point which distinguishes Puseyism from its opposite. That good works, especially deeds of charity, sprinkled with the blood of Christ, can ever be acceptable for effacing past sins, according to Pusey's teaching, strikes at the very foundations of the Gospel as taught by Luther, and as taught by St. Paul. It is but another form of that compound salvation in which Christ and the sinner, grace and law, faith and works, are coupled together, and which is so unsparingly exposed, so solemnly rebuked, in the Epistle to the Galatians.

This doctrine has ever been dear to devout but unenlightened teachers. It is the parent whose offspring in the first generation is legal Christianity, but by a degeneration, sometimes gradual, at other times sudden, and always inevitable, the doctrine issues in complete identity with Romanism.

In three great particulars Puseyism contradicts the Christianity of the Reformation. It does not make the Bible alone the supreme rule of faith; it does not place the justification of

man in faith alone without works; it does not assert the priesthood of all believers as the only priesthood on earth acknowledged by the New Testament. Space forbids me to enlarge upon these doctrines; but the most superficial reader will see that they touch the essence of Christianity, and that opposing views about them must separate Christian men as widely as it is possible for Christian men to be separated from one another.

No wonder, then, that Pusey's doctrines on the rule of faith, on justification, and on the priesthood excited grave alarm; no wonder that they were tested by the Thirty-nine Articles, and no wonder that the Thirty-nine Articles required Newman's utmost skill to admit these doctrines into their language and their spirit.

It is alleged by Dr. Liddon that the Tractarian movement was a completion of the Evangelical revival. Few Evangelicals can subscribe to this statement. It may be true, as Dr. Liddon says, that the teaching of the early Evangelicals was defective; but if it had been far more defective than it was, if it had even been the thin and rudimentary type of Christianity which Dr. Liddon supposes it to have been, no Evangelical would allow that Puseyism was its proper supplement. That supplement is found, not in an earthly and sacerdotal institution interposing priestly mediators between the soul and God, making the Word of God nugatory by its traditions, having one standard of holiness for the religious, and another for Christians living the common lot of all men, but in the noble and simple ideal of the Church sketched in the New Testament, and partially restored by the English Reformers—a Church whose ministers are pastors and teachers, overseers and evangelists; whose members are kings and priests unto God; whose sacrifice is the finished self-offering of Jesus once for all; whose ordinances are signs and seals of grace; whose infallible rule in faith and conscience is God's Word written and freely to be read under the light and teaching of the Holy Ghost.

Such a Church system alone agrees with the primitive teaching of the Evangelicals. But to attempt to unite Evangelical doctrines to the system distinctively known as Puseyism would have been only to do what our Lord declared could not be done, to put a patch of new cloth on an old garment.

But surely it is demonstrably erroneous to say that primitive Evangelicals taught a Christianity that was highly defective, and it is something more than an error—a culpable error—to say that their Gospel was limited to a few chapters in two of St. Paul's Epistles.

A very cursory inspection of the life of the Rev. Richard Cecil, the father of Evangelical clergy, suffices to disprove this accusation. Cecil was deeply versed in Christian evidences, and during his ministry in London, while he used to preach in the evening the great doctrines which are, after all, the peculiarity and essence of the Gospel, he used on Sunday mornings frequently to take the various evidences of religion as the subject of his sermon.

John Wesley's published sermons range over a surprising variety of topics; they are by no means confined to conversion and cognate themes.

Mr. Simeon's skeletons of sermons embrace almost every point which can be treated by the Christian preacher.

It is needless to cite further instances. Instead, therefore, of looking upon Puseyism as a supplement to the Evangelical revival, I regard it as adverse to that revival, tending to retard and to deprave the power and purity of the Gospel within our Church.

Though Pusey from time to time let fall expressions of pity rather than of hearty love for the Evangelicals, his attitude towards them gradually became one of devout estrangement. Nor is this surprising; for both the great parties within the Church of England know that each wants to hold the helm, and each to steer in a direction widely distant from the other. This fact gives dramatic vividness to the narrative. Pusey wished to make the Church of England mediæval; Evangelicals wished to keep her Protestant.

In this vital struggle it is material to know on which side lies the *à priori* right; in other words, what do the Articles and the formularies of the Church mean? All the world knows that Newman wrote Tract XC. to show that the Articles might be understood in a sense not Protestant—that is, in a Roman sense. Newman afterwards found that this would not do; the Church of England was too stubbornly Protestant for a man of his make. Pusey clung tenaciously to the paradox.

It is a delicately painful question, What was Pusey's ecclesiastical position in 1846? It is a larger and more momentous one, Is that position tenable within the Church of England without violating the laws of grammar, the conclusions of logic, and the obligations of conscientious loyalty?

On both these questions I propose, in conclusion, to make a few observations; but before doing so, I pause to sketch the contrast between Pusey and Newman—a contrast which throws a kind of tragic splendour around the speculative inquiry.

There is, probably, not in our ecclesiastical history a pair of names suggestive of more vivid contrast than those of Pusey

and Newman. No two of our reformers stand so close, so contrasted. Chillingworth had no *alter ego*; neither had Jeremy Taylor. Richard Baxter stood in solitary grandeur among the Puritans—at least, so far as concerns his fame with posterity. In the dreary annals of the eighteenth century no name vies in sacred renown with that of John Wesley. But neither John's saintly brother Charles, nor his splendid fellow-labourer George Whitfield, furnishes a contrast so strikingly pathetic as is that between Pusey and Newman. Newman was first in the field of Catholic reaction. The enterprise of reversing the Reformation became clear to his mind sooner than to Pusey's. From the outset he shaped the movement and led the van. For a long time the whole body of Tractarians followed his lead. When the moderates began to waver or to pause, the fervent advanced with Newman at their head. Step by step he moved further and further from the old positions, and nearer and nearer to Rome. He resigned his vicarage; for two years he hesitated at Littlemore, then he resigned his Fellowship. At length he seceded from the order, system, and life of Reformation Christianity. A scheme for bringing back the Church and realm of England into Roman obedience proved to be beyond even his wonderful powers. That great enterprise, if ever effected, must be prosecuted from without. Catholic principles had, indeed, been sown in the Church of England which might take root and flourish there, and thus prepare the wilderness of heresy to become the paradise of Catholic truth. But Newman felt sure that the Church of England, as she is, can never be Catholic. She is too deeply committed to Protestant Christianity by her spirit, her traditions, her relations with the civil power, her articles, homilies, and Prayer-Book, and, above all, by her deference to the Bible open in the hands of all her members. This Church cannot be amalgamated with the Catholic system. Before that amalgamation she must cease to exist; must die to herself and her past; must in penitent humiliation, abhorring the schism and the sin of three centuries, prostrate her pride at the feet of the Roman Pontiff, receive his absolution, and in newness and innocency of life start reconciled upon her path at the point whence she swerved in the evil days of 1532.

Not even Newman could effect so vast a revolution. His duty, therefore, to himself left him no alternative but to save his soul where alone his soul could feel sure of salvation.

In thus reasoning, Newman appears to me perfectly correct; the logic has no flaw. Granting the existence of a visible Church, with bishops and priests descended from the Apostles, and possessing exclusively, indefectibly, the deposit of grace

and truth, the Church of Rome is probably that Church, and the Church of England is probably not that Church. The truth of this postulate is that point where Protestants part company with Catholics. But to Newman it had become a necessity. His lucid understanding, reluctantly indeed, but inevitably, saw the issue of such Church principles. In this respect Pusey stands in contrast with Newman. His ardour for the Catholic view was not less than Newman's, but the clearness with which he conceived it was far inferior. His development of it, therefore, in his writings and in his life had none of that finish and fulness which belong to Newman. It cost him something, no doubt, but he never made for it those sacrifices which cut life to the root. He had not to renounce professional income, station, and prospects. He had not to break with his past; to confess himself deceived at forty-six; to descend from the eminence of a unique and trusted teacher to the low degree of a neophyte. Some have imputed Pusey's conduct to sordid motives; some have blamed Newman for temerity; but it cannot be doubted that, of the two, Pusey suffered least for the cause of which both were champions.

Nor is it in their career and character alone that these two friends present a contrast. Their mental gifts were very different. The most obvious point in this difference is their literary style. Pusey wrote a rugged, dark, and unmelodious speech, difficult to understand, and impossible to admire; its ugliness is occasionally repulsive. Newman's English, in its finest vein, is, perhaps, the most beautiful written in our century, and has no superior in the English of any age. Absolute clearness, natural simplicity, ease and strength, and aptitude for every theme, are its qualities. If Pusey was more technically learned, Newman had a wider and more varied knowledge. Pusey was no poet and no historian; Newman wrote exquisite verse, and had the true eye for history. Pusey dealt in details, with events as they arose; he cared less about great principles or the larger harmonies of things.

Had Newman been able to remain in the Church of England, he might have inflicted upon the Protestant religion a wound which no human skill could heal. Happily for the precious interests of the Church of the Reformation, he could not abide within her, and the work of her undoing passed from his hands into the less capable management of Pusey.

What, then, was Pusey's position when he and his friend reached the parting of the ways? Newman went boldly over to Rome. Some of Newman's disciples recoiled into that region of thin beliefs in which living Christianity breathes her last; others, like the Vicar of Leeds, remained in the Church of

England—anti-Roman at least, if not at heart Protestant. Pusey's position was not exactly the same as either of these. His secession was expected and prayed for by many devout Catholics. His tenderness for Rome had long been growing; it had shown itself in translations from Latin service-books, of Latin books of devotion, of Latin directories for priests. His favourite models not only belong to the Latin Church, but belong to the most Latin department of that Church. His gaze had been attracted to that ancient, vast, and gorgeous communion of which whoever looks upon her with clear and competent knowledge must confess that she is either the one holy and catholic Church or the Enchantress of Babylon.

Of this tenderness for Rome, and of the disparaging tone towards the Reformation, which grew together in Pusey's mind, examples abound, especially in the latter half of Dr. Liddon's second volume.

The later chapters, indeed, leave upon the mind the impression that Pusey, when Newman seceded, was ripe for seceding. He was Roman in almost everything but the name, with the Romanism of the Council of Trent, not of the ordinary Papist. The solution of the question, Why did Pusey not follow Newman? seems to be this: he did not think it worth while. He found himself holding a creed substantially the same with the creed of Newman, in a position which gave him opportunity and influence to teach the creed to many.

There were some points of difference between the two. Pusey could not worship the Virgin Mary, could not deny the cup to the laity, could not allow the Pope's supremacy in the Papist sense; but was it worth while to quit the Church of England for the sake of three or four Articles, when he could remain in her and with security propagate the rest? To all intents and purposes Pusey held and taught the doctrines of Trent in the Church of England. If the Anglican and the Roman are but two portions of one Church, why shift his position?

If this be a fair account of the matter, we are forced to inquire, Is such a position compatible with fidelity to the English Church? I do not hesitate to reply in the negative, without feeling obliged to charge Pusey with wilful and conscious unfaithfulness.

The question is not whether Protestantism or Romanism is the true religion, but whether the Church of England is Protestant or Roman. The former question must be answered by an appeal to the Bible; the latter by an appeal to history. Newman himself made this appeal, and because he found the verdict of history decisive in favour of the Protestantism of the Church of England, he quitted her. The shifts and

artifices by which Pusey evaded the witness of three centuries make a melancholy, and not honourable, exhibition. Wise and prompt firmness on the part of the Bishops might have averted the miserable sequel. By a dire dispensation, while Pusey was teaching in the Professor's chair, and Newman was preaching from St. Mary's pulpit, Bagot was Bishop of Oxford, and Howley Metropolitan of Canterbury. The pages which contain the letters of these two dignitaries make us burn, and sigh, and laugh by turns. Amiable and respectable in every private capacity, their published dealings with the Oxford school are, alas! faithful to the precedent of clerical misrule. The Archbishop appears wary and adroit; the Bishop of Oxford presents a spectacle of bewildered and mundane ineptitude. Having no clear views of their own, Howley and Bagot first patronized, then hectored, then muzzled the Tractarians. It was the old story over again. The ease and the sunshine of worldly prosperity produced in the Church a weak and tasteless theology, and rulers without strength.

A new era came. The Evangelical revival confounded by its novelty and spirituality prelates nurtured in an earthly tradition. A generation and a half later another movement, widely differing from the preceding, emerged from the stream of time. Once more the Bishops were unprepared to meet it. They could neither confute the arguments of the new teachers nor understand their temper and their design. Had they possessed profound erudition, they might have convinced the mass of English Churchmen that the new doctrines were untenable. Had they been men of splendid sanctity, they might have persuaded the earnest seekers after unworldly religion that the Church of England was the home of saints. Had they been inflexibly attached to the foundation-truths of the Protestant faith, they might have rigorously discouraged the advance of disguised Romanism.

The Prelates now before us appear neither as scholars, nor as saints, nor as rulers, but as officials whose golden rule was moderation, whose sovereign remedy was compromise, to whom peace meant torpor and novelty meant danger. It was impossible that such men should direct, control, or curb the genius of Newman and the sedulous zeal and activity of Pusey. For the ills that came after they are not a little responsible. Their feeble and temporizing rule only increased the trouble. They had the confidence neither of the Evangelicals, nor of the Tractarians, nor of the liberalizing sect. Thus forces antagonistic to each other acquired intensity and expanded, until they resulted in a conflict within the Church which cannot end without her detriment, and may end in her disruption.

ART. III.—AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

IN the theological and religious sphere, few questions are of greater importance than the question of authority in matters of faith. This primary basis is the starting-point of everything connected with faith, of everything which is of interest to Christian life. It is not surprising, therefore, that the subject should from the earliest time down to the present have impassioned those who have grasped its importance, and that it should have been by that fact the battle-field of philosophers as well as of Churchmen.

The arguments raised in former time by this polemic were dogmas decreed by oecumenical gatherings, or proofs taken from the Scriptures and considered infallible. Now, thanks to the progress made by critical and historical science, thanks to a more human psychology, and also to a greater feeling of responsibility, we have reached the point which enables us to establish quite differently, and more rationally, what should constitute the basis of faith. We no longer believe because we are told to believe, but because we have experienced the object of our faith. We no longer accept the convictions which are forced upon us; we consent to them only when we have tried their intrinsic value with regard to our religious faith. It is the nature of this experiment that we purpose to examine in this paper.

In starting from the point of moral consciousness which unveils the action of a Supreme Being on His creatures, we shall ascertain the fact that by means of successive revelations, this inner organ being transformed into religious consciousness, continues more and more to grasp the essence and the plans of Divinity, until it is perfectly enlightened by the personal revelation of Jesus Christ. We shall then see that the perfect knowledge of God is founded by Christ, and that His work in humanity has created a new faith. We shall have attained our aim if, in drawing the modern believer away from the accessory sources of Christian faith, and bringing him to the one source of life, we enable him to share the certitude that no faith can be quite firm until it has been tested by experiment, and unless we have but one last authority concerning faith—that of Christ's Person.

"A religious conception of the world is not a religion. Properly speaking, we cannot create a religion, we can but receive it."¹ Such is the opinion of a philosopher who is not a stranger to Christianity. In developing this opinion, the author shows that if, on the one hand, religion consists first of

¹ Secretan, "La Civilisation et la Croyance," p. 355.

all in communion with God, and if, on the other, man has freely resolved to separate himself from Him, he cannot return to Him of his own will alone. "If we could save ourselves we should already be safe."¹ From this we conclude that, if we wish to re-enter the primitive state which, led by our natural desire to free ourselves from a bond, we have abandoned, God Himself must be willing, and must stoop to His creature. Religion, for that reason, can only be revealed. Now, if it be asked whether this revelation applies to one special faculty of man, whether in man it finds a special organ which enables it to obtain knowledge of itself, we may answer that this revelation, in the essence of belief, appeals in different degrees to every means of knowledge. To inquire whether it applies to reason, to the heart or to the will, is a narrow-minded, not to say erroneous, starting-point. For man is altogether penetrated by it, whether he will or not, and that is precisely what gives him a special place in creation.

Thus considered, revelation makes man a dependent being, not only in regard to the sphere of his religious needs, but also, and even more, in regard to that which constitutes his whole being; intellect, will, feeling, are determined, in spite of himself, by a superior commanding power. Although he can, it is true, refuse to follow its injunctions and obey its peremptory orders, still it is doubtful whether he can ever free himself altogether from them. But in acknowledging our dependence, we confirm the existence of the authority of Him who is capable of exercising it, consequently of an absolute authority. This is a simple and logical conclusion.

This revelation, whose authority is unquestionable because it subjugates the whole being, discloses itself by means of two different agents—moral consciousness and religious consciousness. This division of purely theoretical order is equivalent to another, simpler perhaps, which distinguishes a general from a particular revelation. It will not be superfluous to dwell somewhat more closely on the distinctive features of each. The revelation which comes to man first of all, even before he can realize it, is that of a Supreme Being, who makes man's contingency clear to him. This experience is prior to any act of the will, and is the result of no intellectual process, of no reasoning, of no philosophical deduction. It is so independent of the subject in whom it is produced, so exterior to any personal activity, that one may without hesitation bestow upon it an absolute value.

This primary revelation, which is none other than the manifestation of a sovereign invariable authority, creates in us the

¹ Secretan, "La Civilization et la Croyance," p. 356.

moral consciousness from which duty is derived. It is impossible to escape the one, for one cannot wipe out an impression made independently of self—denying the other does not bring us to any conclusion, for we cannot suppress an undeniable obligation which subsists in spite of any feeling we may entertain in connection with it. Moral consciousness is therefore an unquestionable reality which science is powerless to contest. It is the absolute which is above every external proof, and of which we feel, if we do not see, the evidence.

This fundamental principle would probably have been never contested, had it not occasionally been placed on the same ground as moral law by people who did not realize that, in so doing, they were confounding two extremes as opposite to each other, as *necessary* and *contingent*.

Moral consciousness is immutable and simple. It is the feeling of obligation in its greatest purity, in its greatest abstraction. It is the secret voice which condemns all we do against our own inner persuasion; that is to say, it is a criterion of divine origin.

Moral law, on the other hand, is a compound, a rational, that is to say, a human resultant of all the ideas of right produced by the surroundings, the education, the morals, and the religion of such and such a man or people. The difference and the distinction are evident. From all this we see, that what we call a general revelation perceived by the moral consciousness is, in fact, by its character of universal authority, the only one which compels every human creature, because it always makes him to feel his dependence. Religious consciousness makes us take a step further. From the feeling of dependence it elevates us into the need of adoration, for it determines the cause of the impression produced on us. While moral consciousness "enables us to experience an authority in which we acknowledge the direct action of the supreme and absolute Being, religious consciousness reveals to us the existence of God, by naming Him, and showing Him as existing and acting before us."¹ These two different kinds of consciousness are only the two degrees of the internal single organ. Their reciprocal relation to each other is so narrow, that we must analyze them to be able to distinguish them. Still, we must notice that if the one is fixed, unalterable, in spite of the most divers factors that could be brought to act upon it, the other, the religious consciousness, is susceptible of being enlightened and developed. For as it feeds on successive Divine revelations, it is by degrees enriched by deeper attainments, and succeeds in penetrating the nature of God and His universal plan more and more.

¹ C. Malan, "Manuel d'Instruction Religieuse," p. 5.

There are three phases through which the religious consciousness must pass. Each one corresponds with our stages of progress towards the divine Being. The first of these stages is distinguished by intellectualism. God is represented therein in an abstract, metaphysical form which excites no sympathy. It is the stage of pagan religion. The second has been reached by Judaism, which brings man face to face with a Being who appears to him as dictating His will and imposing His laws. Judaism has made God more concrete; and in bringing the creature nearer to the Creator, has prepared our accession to the last phase, Christianity, which closes the development which long centuries have completed. Christianity, taken as a whole, is a product of revelation, in which lies its source and by which it lives. Having been prepared in the course of history by successive manifestations of the Divine will to man's natural consciousness, it came into existence when God unveiled Himself entirely to it in the person of Jesus Christ. The plans of Providence were realized in Him, and were transmitted to humanity through Him. Now, a striking proof of man's high origin is that Christ by His life, by His word, has so well answered the human soul's aspirations, has inspired so great a confidence, that He at once acquired the authority which was His due as the Founder of God's kingdom. In drawing men to Himself, in enlightening his natural consciousness, He has transformed it, and given it a new nature through the impression which He leaves on it, and from the influence which He exercises over it; in a word, He has produced Christian consciousness. This, which constitutes the believer's consciousness, presupposes faith in Christ, and, consequently, faith in the Word which bears witness to Him.¹

The elements of this consciousness, and the materials upon which it is exercised, consist of the Scriptures and the person of Christ. These are the two only supports of Christian consciousness. They are different in kind, but do not exclude each other; on the contrary, their reciprocal contact gives them greater efficacy. While the one creates faith, the other strengthens and steadies it. A man cannot be converted into Christianity without the preaching of the Gospel, and a true Christian will always be found to consider Christ, who is the centre of this Gospel, to be his steadfast and only support.

Scripture may indeed be the way leading to faith; it may fulfil to us the same office as the Master's word did among the people of His time. But what is Scripture? Since it has been challenged by historical criticism and by theological scholarship, divers conceptions, varying according to the opinions and

¹ Walch, xv., 1115.

the degrees of piety of those who formed them, have been brought to light. We will not enter into particulars in regard to these different theories. We will only, as briefly as possible, explain our point of view, which we consider sufficiently well-grounded on the word of God to be neither in contradiction to the data of Scripture nor to the results of personal experience. That the Bible possesses a special authority is a generally admitted fact. Theological controversies do not bear on this attribution, but rather on the question of the knowledge how to put this authority in a definite shape and how to explain it.

The Protestant principle provides us already with an answer. In admitting that no exterior authority can be enforced on the conscience, in claiming for each individual the responsibility of his own religious life, this principle condemns every action, every act which is not the product of individual experience. In applying this principle to Scripture, we observe that its authority springs rather from its own nature than from its dependence on any particular ecclesiastical body which maintains it. If, indeed, the Protestant Churches appeal to Scripture as the supreme rule in matters of faith, it cannot be admitted that the Church, being an inferior authority, could guarantee that on which itself depends. There must, therefore, be some way of arriving at an absolute certainty on this point, independently of the Church—a way accessible to every Christian without distinction of education or of rank—and this only way is faith.

Such a starting-point once established, the authority of the Scriptures need not be proved by scientific demonstrations, whether drawn from history or dogmatics. In any case, we leave the question undecided whether Scripture is to be considered a revelation *in itself*, or only a document of revelation. Although we have every right to consider the Bible as a collection of documentary witnesses of revelation, that fact is not sufficient to give us the certainty of its authority in regard to faith. Properly speaking, a document belongs to history, and is in consequence submitted to the test of historical criticism. Therefore, though we might agree in affirming that the Bible possesses altogether a perfect documentary authority, we do not deny that some qualifications must be made on the subject. Such an opinion, for which we are indebted to scholarship, would at the very utmost produce a submission to an authority not of a religious nature, and an acquiescence which would be no better than that exacted by the Roman Church, and which could never succeed in producing a personal conviction. Dogmas do not lead to any greater inward certainty. Starting from a preconceived idea of the composition of the

Scriptures, faith thus attained subsists only as long as the premisses on which these dogmas are built up are not contested. But it is well known that they have been seriously contested and shaken by contemporary biblical criticism. Thus was the idea of plenary and verbal inspiration which became a dogma, and at last an article of faith. A theory on the manner in which religious truths should be revealed to us was established, by which thoughts and actions of a purely human kind were attributed to G.d. By such methods not only do we fail to obtain religious certainty, but if we have the misfortune to entertain any doubts in regard to the basis on which our belief in Scripture is founded, we even risk the loss of every possible certainty.

The error common to such conceptions has arisen from the fact that we endeavour to explain the authority of the Scriptures on the grounds of its origin, instead of founding it upon the effect derived from them. Faith is an immediate certainty. The revelation granted to the sacred writers is an act of the past. If, therefore, it is to have any influence upon us now, it must be made present to us. That the Bible is a document of Divine revelation is not sufficient; if it is to become of religious authority, it must also be the bearer of an actual revelation. Christianity cannot exist without such a revelation. For what is it worth, if God does not enter into the life, does not assure us of His communion with us, does not make us feel His paternal love—in a word, if He does not reveal Himself to every one of us individually? The contents of the Gospel are the same as those of the revelation. But the Gospel is not an objective message, which leaves each one free to believe or not to believe as he chooses. No; the Gospel is a divine power which begets faith. It is in this sense that we call it the "Word of God." It is not a word spoken by God in the past; it is a word of the present time, by which He speaks *actually* to man.

But what is it which induces us to believe in the Gospel? By what means are we to recognise it as the "Word of God"? It is through Him who constitutes its centre; it is through the person and life of Jesus Christ. As we contemplate Jesus and study His life; as we witness His invincible love for, and His unlimited devotion to ungrateful and sinful humanity; as we realize the perfect communion existing between Him and the Father, we cannot but feel subjugated by His power and influence, because *in* Him, and *by* Him, we find God. "Christ showing us the Father"—this is the central idea of the Gospel. The experience acquired by His first disciples of His spiritual power and influence on them is still perpetuated by ourselves. Their writings may be docu-

ments of the past, as far as their exterior form is concerned; they nevertheless reveal to us their divine origin by making us feel their effectual power. The Jesus of to-day is the same as the Jesus of the Apostles. He is still present, existing and acting among us. And just as we contemplate in Him the perfect image of God, so the word which makes Him known to us is also to us the word of God. What strikes us still more particularly is that whatever may be the human voice which speaks that word, we forget that it is man's voice. We only recognise the word of God Himself, who enters into direct communication with us. His word enables us to feel that the same God who revealed Himself in Jesus, and acted through Him, exercises now His influence upon ourselves.

Hence there can be no doubt in regard to the value we may ascribe to the Scriptures, nor to the Christian authority we may derive from them. Scripture has indeed, become an authority based upon the faith we place in the person of Him who is its Creator, and whose spiritual influence has formed Christian consciousness.

This is the true and only authority to which every believer must appeal. It is the true authority, because it depends on the unexceptionable witness of that intimate circle of disciples which received the Master's teaching directly from Himself, and because from our own experience we realize the genuineness of the effects produced by that teaching. It is the only authority, because it goes back to God, of whom Christ is the personal revelation.

In conclusion, we may say that this authority presents us with the threefold character of a moral, spiritual, and experimental authority. A moral authority, that is to say, independent of all traditions, free with regard to all scientific research, unassailable even in regard to the most negative results of scriptural criteria, which cannot weaken the intrinsic value of Christ's inner life. Spiritual authority it possesses, enabling us to throw over letter-worship and mere dogmatism, both being powerless to produce real and living faith, for neither leads to the Gospel, but rather to the law, which, "if it be a light burden to the pharisee, is a heavy yoke to the sincere man."¹ They do not help us to reach the Saviour. He only becomes such to us when, starting from the narratives that draw us to Him, and rising gradually above external testimony, we come in contact with Jesus Himself. Then only will His historical life be lightened up by the true light; then only shall we grasp the real compass of His earthly career.

¹ Hermann, "Der Verkehr des Christen nach Gott," p. 64.

And, lastly, experimental authority. Christ never imposed Himself upon us authoritatively. On the contrary, He always invited His hearers to put His doctrine to the test. This is still our task, and as we accomplish it we are constrained to render due homage to His personality. We recognise the wonderful transformation it has wrought in the world, bringing with it the progress of a higher civilization, and the regeneration of the individual by the principles which He came to reveal. If we are living Christians we shall become better as we come into closer contact with Him; we shall feel that His presence in our hearts is so mighty as to take possession of our whole being, in order to transform and fashion it to His life.

Does this authority, then, incur the reproach of subjectivism? We cannot think that it does; for what we find in our communion with Christ is neither ourselves nor the frequently vague results of Christian speculation. What we find in Christ is God Himself stooping down to us. "Nulli prosit qui cognoscit Deum in gloriâ et majestate, nisi cognoscat eundem in humilitate et ignominiâ. Sic Joh. xiv., cum Philippus juxta theologiam gloriæ diceret 'Ostende nobis Patrem,' mox Christus retraxit et in seipsum reduxit ejus volatilem cogitationem quærendi Deum alibi, dicens, 'Philippe, qui videt me videt et Patrem meum.' Ergo in Christo est vera theologia et cognitio Dei."¹

EMMANUEL CHRISTEN, B.D.,
Minister of the French Protestant Church in the Crypt
of Canterbury Cathedral.



ART. IV.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANGLICAN SERVICE-MUSIC FROM THOMAS TALLIS TO SAMUEL SEBASTIAN WESLEY. (*Concluded.*)

PART II.

III. **A**ND now, as we proceed with our study, there rises into view that brilliant constellation, in which it is Henry Purcell's highest praise that he shines with surpassing glory. Humfrey, Blow and Wise are the other lights, not to be called lesser but in comparison with him; and of Turner and Tudway it is enough to say that their individual brightness is not extinguished in the blaze of light. The first three were choir-mates in the Chapel Royal in 1661, under Captain Henry Cook; and the others only a few years later. Humfrey was

¹ Luther.

sent by Charles II. to study music in France, that the King might revive some of the joys that had beguiled his exile. In this way the influence of Carissimi and Lulli was powerfully exerted upon the music of this country.

This is the golden age of English music. And yet, withal, it is a period of transition, when our musicians were advancing in new paths towards a goal of perfection which the pioneers might perhaps enable their successors to reach, but could hardly attain in their own lifetime. There are two distinct directions in which the movement can be marked: (1) polyphony is yielding place to monody, and (2) the sublime is not now the aim of the composer so much as the beautiful and the ornamental. What, then, will happen in a domain of art where, in the nature of things, full-voiced harmony can yield but little ground to the melody of a single part, still less of a single voice, and where the sublime cannot but be the composer's aim? It is impossible, on the one hand, but that these great contemporary musicians, all bred in the ecclesiastical school of music, will make a new epoch even in so secluded and strictly guarded a domain as Anglican Service-music; yet, on the other hand, it is not here that their genius and enterprise will find fullest scope, or achieve the most distinctive and enduring results.

This new stage in the development of Service-music has been termed, for the want of a better name, the LATE CONTRA-PUNTAL. The characteristics of the school are best described in the words of Hullah: "In the place of the overlapping phrases of the old masters, growing out of one another like the different members of a Gothic tower, we have masses of harmony subordinated to one rhythmical idea; in place of sustained and lofty flights we have shorter and more timorous ones, those even relieved by frequent halts and frequent divergences; and in lieu of repetition and presentation of a few passages under different circumstances, a continually varying adaptation of music to changing sentiment of words, and most fastidious observance of their emphasis and quantity."¹

We can now understand the evolution of that new feature in the setting of the Canticles to which allusion has been already made—the Verse Service. Passages were written for voices *soli*, alternating with, and sometimes beautifully contrasted with, the music of the choruses, and occasionally instrumental *ritornelli* were introduced. In art, as in life, love will find out a way; and so the field was found where entrancing melody, exquisite expression, and sprightly ornament might all be used to the utmost advantage, and the aspirations of the modern school be abundantly satisfied.

¹ Hullah's "Modern Music," Lecture IV., "On the Transition Period."

Pelham Humfrey wrote a Service in E minor, full of beautiful expression; in which respect we see the fruit of earlier efforts made by Henry Lawes, whose skill in wedding music and verse is renowned by Milton.¹

Wise wrote an Evening Service in E flat, adding melody to science, and setting the words with no less judgment than genius.² He contrived also to avoid the besetting weakness of this school, which betrays itself in a "meaningless collection of short points" with no sustained dignity and no completeness of design.

Blow wrote no less than fourteen Services; and those in E and A and his Gamut Service are highly extolled. His style is bold and forcible; and if sometimes it lacks gravity, it rises at times into true grandeur.

But every achievement of that age is overshadowed by the transcendent genius of Purcell. In sacred and in dramatic music he is equally supreme. In his anthems, perhaps, there is now and again a touch of obtrusive realism that savours of the secular; but in his Services his stately dignity is ever worthy of his theme. The Service in B flat is a work of consummate learning and skill; and elaborate, imitative writing of every species abounds throughout. The "Gloria Patri" in the "Deus Misereatur" is a canon *per arsin et thesin*, and the reply to the leading part is made by inversion. It is a specimen of art where, perhaps, the art is a little too apparent; but Horsley in the introduction to his original collection of Canons gives it unstinted praise. In Vincent Novello's edition of Purcell's "Sacred Music" there are two other Services, besides the famous "Te Deum" and "Jubilate" in D, that were written for St. Cecilia's Day in the year 1694. This is the first "Te Deum" in English that had full orchestral accompaniments; and in this, as in much else, Purcell was Handel's forerunner,³ and made ready his way. The alternating use of wind and stringed instruments, the one resolving the discords struck by the other, produces a marvellous effect, and shows a skill and knowledge which, so early in the history of instrumental music, are beyond all praise.⁴ The majestic chorus "All the earth doth worship Thee" and the expressive melodies "When Thou tookest upon Thee" and "When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death"—but what can we say?

¹ Sonnet XIII., Milton's "Poetical Works"; Masson, vol. ii., p. 482.

² W. H. Husk, in Grove's "Dictionary."

³ The Utrecht "Te Deum," 1712, the Dettingen "Te Deum," 1743. Blow and Croft also wrote a "Te Deum" with instrumental accompaniments.

⁴ W. S. Rockstro, on "Schools of Composition," in Grove's "Dictionary."

Majesty and beauty are everywhere. Of one passage, however, we must make a special note, so noble an example is it of the characteristic feature of this school—the alternation of Verse and Chorus. “To Thee Cherubin and Seraphin continually do cry” is set as a Verse for two parts; “Holy, Holy, Holy,” is rendered by the full chorus. It is a heavenly inspiration; and what music has accomplished there, mere words can never tell. But such a Service is for High Festival. We need to remember this; else, in comparison, very noble work seems insignificant.

Golding and Weldon both deserve honourable mention, the former for his Service in F, and the latter for the Communion Service, with settings of the “Sanctus” and “Gloria in Excelsis”—the first compositions of this kind since Gibbons.

We will mention but two other writers of this period, Croft and Greene. The “Te Deum” and “Jubilate” in A by William Croft are among the very finest music of which the English Church can boast. The expression is apt and varied—pathetic, penitential, placid, jubilant: and yet there is no patchwork; the whole is perfect and harmonious. The fugal writing in the “Gloria” is a splendid climax; and for grandeur of effect, this work has seldom been surpassed. Maurice Greene wrote a Service in C, printed in Arnold’s “Collection”; and a “Te Deum” in D with orchestral accompaniments, composed for a thanksgiving service after the suppression of the Scotch Rebellion in 1745. He lived on into that period of decadence of which we have now to treat; but he may fairly be ranked with the great ones of a former generation, for his music combines the learning and power of the earlier writers with the melody of the best German and Italian masters of the first half of the eighteenth century.¹

IV. We enter now upon the fourth stage in the history of Service-music, though hardly can we call it a stage of development. Greene lived till 1755, and witnessed the career of Charles King, a chorister at St. Paul’s Cathedral under Blow, and afterwards the master of the boys and Vicar Choral. This man possessed no special musical gifts, and certainly no originality; but he exerted a great deal of influence on the character of Services. The style of writing in which King led the way has been called the LATE SIMPLE HARMONIC. Its characteristic feature is not harmony, but simplicity; and by simplicity is meant, not that positive but indefinable quality which is the stamp of genius, and in itself sublime, but the mere absence of large design or elaborate treatment either in counterpoint or harmony. The popularity of King’s Services is difficult to

¹ *The Harmonicon* for the year 1829, p. 72.

explain ; but they were easy for the singers to render, and easy for composers to imitate ; the melodies were often pretty and the choruses sprightly. His Services in C and F are the two most popular.

Among the writers of this school there are many names to record ; but little need be written. Kent, Travers (who wrote a Service in F and a "Te Deum" in D), William and Philip Hayes, Nares (who wrote a Service in F), Jackson of Exeter, (whose Service in F is a useful monument of the degeneracy of this period), Dupuis, Jones, Battishill, Stafford Smith, and Chard—these have all left a name that will not easily be forgotten, nor is it just to judge them solely by comparison with the giants of a former age.

Three names have been reserved for special notice : Cooke, Boyce, and Arnold.

Dr. Benjamin Cooke, who was organist at Westminster Abbey in 1762, wrote a very bright and impressive Service in G, which is a great favourite, and one of the finest specimens of this school.

It is not given to every age to produce works of the highest excellence ; but it behoves every age to admire such works, and preserve them with reverent care. This is William Boyce's great distinction. The two volumes known as "Boyce's Own" are a fair memorial ; but the three volumes of cathedral music, "Boyce's Collection," do him more honour, and make his name immortal. He wrote two short Services, one in A and the other in C, which are both very beautiful. "A man must know all schools," said Samuel Sebastian Wesley, "to write unexceptionally in any." This is the secret of Boyce's power. There are other Services in E minor and G ; and a Service in A, "Te Deum," and "Jubilate," which Arnold completed.

And not thus only did Arnold take up Boyce's mantle. He published four volumes of "Cathedral Music by the English Masters of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," and so carried on, in his turn, the work which Boyce had received as a solemn trust from Greene.

When such works as these were being compiled, the dawn of a brighter day, though it might tarry, was assured. It is useful, however, to inquire what were the causes of this marked decadence. Even when all has been granted that is true touching the inferior genius and ability of this generation of composers, other causes were certainly at work to depress the art of Church music. And as these causes distinctly affected the style of Service-music, they are a proper subject of our inquiry. Now Boyce and Arnold, in making their noble compilations, and discharging a task that surely should have won

the grateful interest of every English Churchman, both suffered pecuniary loss. And this, be it remembered, was but a salient instance of a very general spirit of indifference and neglect. Moreover, the depreciation in the value of money greatly reduced the remuneration of the musical staff in the Cathedral Churches. No new endowments were granted either from public or private sources; on the contrary, funds originally assigned for the maintenance of the musical service were otherwise appropriated. Hence the number of singers in cathedral choirs was often shamefully low, and some of the singers often shamefully inefficient. In "Musick's Monument," published by Thomas Mace in 1676, that eccentric but truly amiable man tells an amusing and significant story, "not," as he protests "from any Jocundity, or Jolly-light-humour (God knows), but only to show what Confidence Ignorant Clerks have grown up unto, meerly as it were to shroud their Insufficiency; and seemingly likewise to justify the same, only for the want of better or more sufficient allowances." Such an ignorant clerk had been sharply reprov'd by the Dean for his "Great-Dunstical-Insufficiency in singing of an Anthem alone; whereupon this Great-Jolly-Boon Fellow vented himself in these very words (for I myself was both an Eye and Ear witness) with a most stern Angry Countenance, and a vehement Rattling Voice, even so as to make the Church Ring withall, saying: 'Sir-r-r (shaking his head), I'd ha' you know I sing after the Rate of so much a year (naming his wages), and except ye Mend my Wages I am resolved never to sing Better whilst I live.' Whereupon," says Mace, "the Dean was silenced and retired discomfited; and all his choir-mates fell straightway upon that Great-Jolly-Boon Fellow and hugged him in ecstasies of admiration and delight."¹

To this effect, though in another style, did S. S. Wesley write in the year 1849, when he published his pamphlet entitled "A Few Words on Cathedral Music, and the Musical System of the National Church, with a Plan of Reform." It is a work that in every line reveals a love of art, reverence for religion, and a refined and gentle nature. "To suit," says he, "the reduced choirs of cathedrals, composers have departed from the true school of composition. Their recent anthems have not been *choral*; they have been devised simply to exhibit particular singers. Solos, duets, etc., and the 'Te Deum,' 'Jubilates,' and 'Magnificats,' etc., commonly used in Cathedral Service are more like 'glees' than Church music; and these seem, moreover, to have been written simply for the amusement of

¹ "Musick's Monument," chaps. xi. and xii., "Concerning Cathedral Musick."

their own authors, no official demand having proceeded from the Church."¹

In the same spirit of reverence for the ideal of Church music the Rev. J. Jebb had, in 1844, protested against that very modern innovation which is found in Dr. Nares' Morning Service, and Ebdon's Evening Service—the singing of solo parts.² This reverend gentleman's lectures, and the writings of the Rev. William Mason, Precentor in the Cathedral Church of York, 1782, must be taken to qualify Dr. S. S. Wesley's reproach that "the clergy have never recovered that just appreciation of the claims of Church music which they lost in the reign of Elizabeth." Praise, too, is due to Mason for his earnest desire to obviate the old Puritan objection against the Cathedral Service, even when he would do this by means that we cannot commend. For instance, not only must fugal writing vanish from Service-music, but musical rhythm and full harmony must succumb to the inexorable demand for clear articulation and an intelligible rendering of the words. Under his direction, Dr. Camidge, the organist of York Cathedral, being at that time young and pliable, composed several Services, and wrote no single phrase of melody till he had first written out the Canticles as a time-exercise to the monotoned recitative of the good Precentor. These well-intentioned efforts, however, are not to be derided; and Dr. S. S. Wesley, in his most famous Service, has rendered the words "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" and "Thine honourable, true and only Son" in a manner that wholly subordinates the rhythm to the just length and accent of the syllables.

V. And now let us see the fulfilment of the hope and promise of darker days. Let us seek to apprehend, as clearly as possible, the features of that modern school of Church music which is the heir of all the ages. It is not easy to find a term that both aptly and concisely describes it, and Dr. Stainer has been content to call it the MODERN DRAMATIC. Its characteristic aim is this: to express, by bolder means and with more vivid effect than ever before, the emotional character of the words in the music that embodies them. The exponents of this school are many, and we cannot attempt a complete enumeration. It includes such names as these:—Attwood, Beckwith, Crotch, Bennett, Walmisley, Smart, Goss, Cusins, Dykes and Tours: Mendelssohn and Gounod have a fellowship in it: but Samuel Sebastian Wesley is its typical representative and distinctive glory.

¹ "A Few Words on Cathedral Music," S. S. Wesley, p. 37.

² "Three Lectures on the Cathedral Service," by the Rev. J. Jebb, p. 126. Solo parts and symphonies are found, however, so early as 1620, in an Evening Service by Peter Rogers.

As we said at the beginning of this essay, every great movement in the history of music bears its influence within the secluded and mysterious borders of Anglican Service-music. Accordingly, in this latest style of Service, it is possible to trace the influence of the outer world, of secular music, and of the romantic and imaginative schools of composition.

Aims, too, that had been originated and achieved in schools of instrumental music were now pursued in the music of the Church. Examples of this we find in Attwood, Crotch and Sterndale Bennett, who all achieved great successes both in instrumental and ecclesiastical music;¹ and Beckwith showed that the organ was capable of that tone-painting which is so marked a feature of the dramatic school.

Attwood, like Pelham Humfrey a century before, enjoyed the patronage of princes, and studied abroad. The Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV., sent him to Italy; and before he returned to England he became the pupil of Mozart. In later years he cherished a personal friendship with Mendelssohn, who often, at his invitation, played on the organ at St. Paul's. Attwood wrote a fine Service in D, and several others were edited after his death by his godson Walmisley. To Attwood, also, we are doubtless much indebted for Mendelssohn's "Te Deum" and "Jubilate" in A, the "Magnificat" in B flat, and the "Nunc Dimittis" in E flat. The "Magnificat" contains some noble fugal and contrapuntal writing, and the "Te Deum" is very majestic, and in the latter portion full of tenderness and pathos.

Henry Smart has written some admirable specimens of this modern style, notably the "Benedictus" and "Nicene Creed" in his Service in F, while other parts of the same Service belong rather to the late simple harmonic school.

But conspicuous among all the achievements in this latest style is Wesley in E. The music is wonderfully powerful both to evoke and express the emotions appropriate to the changing words. And the insight of true genius is equally manifest towards the close of an elaborate composition in such words as "numbered with Thy saints in glory everlasting," or "we worship Thy name ever world without end," and in that sublime opening strain, "We praise Thee, O God," where the musician proves himself the master of a deep mystery, and makes us feel that high ecstasy and heavenly serenity can be perfectly at one. Dramatic, romantic, imaginative—all such terms are feeble and inappropriate. He knew all

¹ W. S. Rockstro, on "Schools of Composition," in Grove's "Dictionary."

schools, and turned all he knew to good account. But his style is his own, matchless in beauty, awe-inspiring in its solemn majesty, and withal a noble "illustration of the reform which he was always urging."¹

Our appreciation of this great masterpiece is heightened when we turn from it to consider the efforts that Wesley made to meet the more limited abilities of parochial choirs, and yet to give us of the best. Goss, with a like intent, wrote unisonous Services, a "Te Deum" in A, and a "Cantate Domino" and "Deus Misereatur" in C. But there are no compositions that better attain the end in view than the Recitative Services² which Wesley wrote, founded on Gregorian melodies. The reciting note is always within the average compass both of choir and congregation, and the cadences are simple, solemn and very beautiful.

This is a class of writing hardly within the region marked out by our definition; but the majestic organ-accompaniment, written after the best traditions of Church music, makes these Services something more than chants, and justifies the mention of them here.

And now our task is ended. But our studies inspire hope and forward-looking thoughts, which we cannot willingly leave unexpressed.

The schools which we have reviewed are, doubtless, in their styles, to a certain extent, mutually exclusive; yet nothing is plainer than this—that to a very great extent their excellences can be combined. Did not Gibbons unite learning and elaboration with perfect lucidity and clearness? Did not Purcell unite with all these qualities most beautiful and expressive melody? And if many composers since Purcell's day have written below the level of the dignity and gravity which Church music demands, did not Wesley show that a learned and elaborate style of composition, the most tender and expressive melody, the most vivid and dramatic harmonic effects, could all be made subservient to worship, and conducive to the fit utterance of a spirit of earnest and reverent devotion?

The progress of Anglican Service-music is, therefore, to be compared, not to a highway which, traversing a fair country, compels the wayfarer to leave behind him many more beauties than in one prospect he can ever see again; but finds its aptest illustration in the river, which ever in its onward course is deeper, fuller, broader, more majestic, till it lose itself in the vastness and mystery of the shoreless sea. The music of the Anglican Service has proved itself a fit adjunct of religion.

¹ Sir Herbert Oakley in Grove's "Dictionary."

² Dr. Spark's "Lectures on Church Music," 1851.

Man's service to God, in the broadest and best sense, has thereby been ennobled, and his hope of a higher service hereafter immeasurably assured.

But Music has its own career and destiny, apart from the individual history of the souls of men. In the progress achieved in the generations past, we see something of God's purpose in the ages; and Music must still bear a part, one among many, all ordained of God, to prepare and consummate the

One, far-off, divine event
To which the whole creation moves.

ATHERTON KNOWLES.

ART. V.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTRUISM.

ONE of the most characteristic features of this extraordinary age is its excessive altruism. There are many things, no doubt, that will bear upon the future historian, when he takes in hand the latter half of the nineteenth century, with a weight which he cannot ignore; some which are so apparent that we see them now, others which are steadily permeating the vitals of society, subtle and unseen; but this regard for the feelings of others is so instilled into our religion, our social ethics, yes, and even our politics, that perhaps it will be held as the predominant note of our era. We all know what is meant by altruism. It is regarding the happiness of others as of equal importance with our own. Other people's feelings are as sacred as our own; their opinions, if not the same as ours, even if diametrically opposite, may perhaps be all right, while our own are all wrong. And it is remarkable that this phase of the *zeit-geist* does approach very nearly to the actual meaning of the word, *i.e.*, thinking only, or chiefly, of others. One's self is quite subordinate; the motto is *vivre pour autrui*. Utilitarianism aims at the happiness of the whole, or the greatest number, but reckons the personal unit of equal importance with the other units; but, strictly speaking, altruism altogether sinks consideration of self. No doubt such a state is practically impossible; our natural instincts rebel against it; nor does it seem to be Scriptural; but it is curious and remarkable how it struggles for assertion in our writings and actions of to-day, and not altogether without success.

But it will readily be seen that such altruism may easily pass into a maudlin and unscientific condition. Even where

it is dictated by the purest and noblest motives, there is the danger of running into inaccurate excess. "Love your neighbour as yourself," our Saviour said. But the important point is, Of what nature is our love for self? If it is merely hedonistic; if material pleasure and comfort are the sole and only things which we desire for ourselves, then we do our neighbour an injury by loving him in the same way, and desiring only the same things for himself. On the other hand, if we clearly see the inestimably higher and nobler sources of true happiness than are found in material pleasures; if we appreciate the advantages of character; if we understand the beauty of self-denial, the refinement of suffering, and the reality of religion, we *must* wish our neighbour to share equally in these, and not in physical comfort only, else we do not love him as ourself. It has yet to be argued that pleasure is the end and object of existence, even by philosophers. Christian philosophers are well persuaded otherwise. An altruistic hedonism is not the essence of the Sermon on the Mount. The Golden Rule does not supply the regulations of ill-considered benevolence.

But even conceding all this, there yet remains much, very much, for which all impartial observers are deeply thankful to Almighty God. In religion, education, politics, industry there is more general regard and consideration for others than perhaps the world has ever seen. Even an excess of this is infinitely preferable to a hard, crude, and irreligious egoism. It is better, on the whole, to be foolishly generous than deliberately illiberal. It is well that the whole house should be filled with the savour of the ointment.

It will perhaps be useful to examine, as signs of our times, certain books which have recently appeared, dealing mainly with social and ethical questions, which have quickly acquired more or less notoriety.

And first let us take that very remarkable work, "Social Evolution."¹ When grave journals, such as the *Times* and *Spectator*, go into raptures over an unknown author, it may be taken for granted that he has written a book worth reading. This impression would only be confirmed after a perusal. It is written in a remarkably clear and easy style, in pleasing contradistinction to many books on sociology, the authors of which appear to think it is necessary either to rant or to be obscure. Mr. Kidd neither indulges in false sentiment nor pompous verbosity. He is plain and scientific, and knowing this, it is all the more important to note that the leading idea of his work is to point out the immense, the necessary, part

¹ "Social Evolution." By Benjamin Kidd. London: Macmillan.
VOL. IX.—NEW SERIES, NO. LXXVI.

played by religion in the development of human society. His own religious convictions are carefully hidden from view. One can only, indeed, infer that he personally is a believer; whether a Roman Catholic, Unitarian, or Evangelical is entirely uncertain. This strict and rigid neutrality again renders more impressive the elaborately worked-out idea, that hitherto Science has been utterly to blame in her unscientific conflict with Religion, and in wilfully ignoring the essential part played in human life by a belief in the supernatural.

We cannot, of course, do more than give a very incomplete and fragmentary sketch of this fascinating volume. The author begins with a graphic delineation of the state of society at present, and of the outlook before us. His picture is highly coloured, but, on the whole, correct. There is not much real doubt that the times are pregnant of great changes. Even the unobservant, or the unwilling, must admit that looming away beyond the threshold of the twentieth century there are probably changes in the constitution of society which will rank with any that have before occurred in the world's history, if, indeed, they do not surpass them. Already there is the uneasy vibration in the air that carries to our hearts the conviction that great alterations, for good or for evil, are brooding over civilization. Scientific men are aware of this, but, and this is Mr. Kidd's dominant contention, the connection of religion with these evolutions is ignored by them. He writes:¹

“These religions of man form one of the most striking and persistent of the phenomena of life when encountered under its highest forms, namely, in human society. Yet, strange to say, science seems to have taken up and to have maintained, down to the present time, the extraordinary position that her only concern with them is to declare (often, it must be confessed, with the heat and bitterness of a partisan) that they are without foundation in reason. But . . . the more we regard the religious phenomena of mankind as a whole, the more the conviction grows upon us that here, as in other departments of social affairs, science has as yet obtained no real grasp of the laws underlying the development which is proceeding in society. Religious phenomena are among the most persistent and characteristic features of the development which we find man undergoing in society.”

This is perfectly true, and it is more than pleasant to find such convictions expressed in an unbiased and perfectly “scientific” manner.

¹ P. 20.

The conditions of human progress are traced in successive chapters, that progress which it is altogether beyond our power to check, which we can only observe, and which results from innate physiological causes. But though we cannot check, nor even permanently alter, the stream of human progress, we can observe its causes and guess at its tendency. Now, one of the most important conditions of progress is that there must be more people in a country than the resources of the country can support on an equality. There must be a constant struggle, not only for existence, but for a favourable existence. Without this conflict there is no improvement. A standstill leads to stagnation, and that to corruption. As Mr. Kidd says,¹ "If all the individuals of every generation in any species were allowed to equally propagate their kind, the average of each generation would continually tend to fall below the average of the generation which preceded it, and a process of slow but steady degeneration would ensue."

From this it follows that the conflict of individuals in one stage of existence is bound to produce an improvement in the conditions of life of their successors. But we all know that it is very difficult for the social unit to console himself for his struggles by the thought that his posterity of an indefinite future will benefit. In fact, the interests of the social unit, and of the whole social organism, are always in conflict. We know that perfectly well. "If we examine the motives of our daily life," says our author, "and of the lives of those with whom we come in contact, we shall have to recognise that the first and principal thought in the minds of the vast majority of us is how to hold our own therein."² To borrow an easy illustration, how many of us would deny ourselves a single scuttle of coal so that there would be more left for the twentieth century? The central fact with which we are confronted in our progressive societies is, therefore, that the interests of the social organism and those of the individuals comprising it at any time are actually antagonistic. For the interests of progression, therefore, there is no sanction of individual reason.

But progress continues. What, then, supplies the sanction for it? Some sanction there must be, or else man would abandon the struggle which causes improvement. His intellect gives him no encouragement; nay, dissuades him from the task, bidding him employ every possible means for his own enjoyment alone. Here, then, comes in the fundamental truth of social evolution. Rationalism supplies no sanction for the progress—no, but altruism does. This is what Mr. Kidd calls the central feature of human history; that the sanction supplied

¹ P. 37.² P. 53.

for the conditions of all human progress is ultra-rational; it is religious, it is Christian. Science plays next to no part in the improvement of humanity at large, and its social amelioration; all is due to the altruistic instinct inculcated by Christ. In short, Mr. Kidd's definition of a religion, in the sense in which alone science is concerned with religion as a social phenomenon, would run somewhat as follows: "A religion is a form of belief, providing an ultra-rational sanction for that large class of conduct in the individual where his interests and the interests of the social organism are antagonistic, and by which the former are rendered subordinate to the latter in the general interests of the evolution which the race is undergoing."¹

Such is a brief sketch of the main contention of this remarkable book. The thesis as a whole is supported with wonderful elaboration of detail, and copiousness of illustration. There are many points, no doubt, on which one would desire clearer information. To our mind, the great world-religions are placed on too much of an equality, though it is only fair to say that the author is clear enough on the fact that to Christianity alone is the true altruistic sentiment due. And after all, perhaps it is a great advantage that in this, the first book which logically places the relations between religion and science in social evolution on a proper footing, there should be no bias of any kind whatever apparent, but simply calm, clear statement of fact.

We said that it is impossible to tell the author's own religious convictions, but we must not omit to notice his intense respect for the Reformation. According to him, it was a re-birth of Christianity. Again and again he insists on its paramount value, speaking of course chiefly from the standpoint of social science. But the following is a remarkable passage: "It is to be doubted whether the peoples who, in suppressing the religious development of the sixteenth century, succeeded in preserving the outward forms of ecclesiastical unity, will be so successful in ultimately preserving the essential spirit of Christianity as those amongst whom the development was allowed to pursue its natural course."²

One other feature, too, remains to be pointed out. What relations does Mr. Kidd bear towards the great modern movement known as Socialism? He seems to think that socialism falls between two stools. On the one hand, it is right in perceiving and adopting the altruistic sentiment which now pervades the white peoples; but on the other hand, it is wrong in trying, under rationalistic sanction, to grasp material comfort for one section of society at a given time, regardless of the

¹ P. 103.

² P. 303.

necessities of posterity. So to speak, ordinary collectivism will try to condense at one period, and for the benefit of one generation merely, all the social comforts on an equal footing of distribution, and to prevent by State control any interference with this arrangement by subsequent generations. But in such an aim as this, the great fact of man's necessary and continuous evolution is lost sight of. Such a sitting on the safety valve would produce an explosion. There must be the continual strife to produce continual improvement. The function of the State, Mr. Kidd thinks, in the twentieth century, will be to preserve and secure free competition rather than to suspend it. At the end of this nineteenth century, he thinks, equal political rights have been extended to all; the task of the succeeding age will be to secure equal social opportunity for all. All people will engage in the rivalry of life on conditions of equal opportunities. We quote again :

"It may perhaps be inferred that the development of society in the direction indicated will be itself a movement towards socialism. This is not so. The gulf between the state of society towards which it is the tendency of the process of evolution now in progress to carry us, and socialism, is wide and deep. The avowed aim of socialism is to suspend that personal rivalry and competition of life which not only is now, but has been from the beginning of life, the fundamental impetus behind all progress. The inherent tendency of the process of social development now taking place amongst us is (as it has been from the beginning of our civilization) to raise this rivalry to the very highest degree of efficiency as a condition of progress, by bringing all the people into it on a footing of equality, and by allowing the freest possible play of forces within the community, and the widest possible opportunities for the development of every individual's faculties and personality."¹

This duly seems to express in scientific language the instantaneous objections that leap to everyone's mind when the term socialism is employed. How can we do away with competition? how can we interfere with the natural inequalities of mankind? Such and similar expressions occur to the ordinary man with a force that he feels to be unanswerable. And, more or less, they are unanswerable. The altruistic instinct which pervades us is the very mother of fair and reasonable improvement. It cannot strangle its own child. It must continue to nurse it. Man cannot be made magnanimous by machinery, even by State machinery. But altruism, inspired and maintained by Christianity, can remove harsh and artificial inequalities, can

¹ P. 238.

induce men to love one another, and to give to each other the same opportunities for a religious and rational use of God's gift of life.

With this necessarily inadequate synopsis we must leave a volume which would well repay serious study. But on quitting this and similar scientific works, and regarding merely general literature of the present moment, how much we find, in those books which are on the lips of everybody, of the essence of altruism, either vague or well-defined! In fact, it is not too much to say that all "serious" writing, even of fiction, apart from the ephemeral class of what might be termed *Answers* literature, is tinged either with altruistic, or with anti-altruistic, that is to say, individualistic, ideas. To take for instance, the last translation into English of a work by the Russian mystic, Count Tolstoi.¹ Here we have what might, without offence, be called altruism run wild. Count Tolstoi's religious ideas are well known. He is a most out-and-out exponent of the non-resistance of evil, and while there is much that is fantastic and unreal in his statements, no one would deny that there is a great deal that is beautiful and true. But what an injurious thing it is to a writer when he loses his sense of proportion! One could take any single truth that is taught by Christianity, separate it from the others, place it in a hot-house of mysticism and unreality, and force it to an unnatural growth—but it would not then be Christian. All heresies contain a truth, but a truth distorted to excess. So in reading this book, interesting and suggestive as it is, which is aimed against war and military service, the impression left upon one's mind is "This is beautiful, but it is impracticable and unreal," and nothing that is unreal is exactly Christian. When Tolstoi relates some of the horrors that are perpetrated by the authorities in Russia, indignation throbs in our hearts in sympathy with his, but when he urges that no man should take arms, even to defend his native country, we shut up the book.

Another remarkable book, if only from its unconventionality, is Mr. Stead's latest philippic,² thousands of which have been sold, both in America and in England. He takes as his *motif* Lowell's beautiful poem beginning

"Said Christ our Lord, 'I will go and see
How the men, My brothers, believe on Me.'"

This idea is applied all through to Chicago, but, Mr. Stead is

¹ "The Kingdom of God is within You." By Count Leo Tolstoi. London: W. Scott.

² "If Christ came to Chicago!" By W. T. Stead. London: *Review of Reviews* Office.

careful to explain, only as a sample of other great cities. There is much in the book that recalls vividly to the minds of those who have forgotten, or who are unconscious of them, the dreadful evils that lurk in large centres of population. But it seems to us that Mr. Stead falls into a frequent trap for fiery minds. He forgets that Christ only speaks to Christians. The moral laws of Christianity, still more its spiritual ones, have a compulsive power, a force that guides and controls, only upon those who have given in their allegiance to the Founder of these laws. "If Christ came to Chicago" He would find those who were His servants—and those who were not. Those who are not His followers do not, naturally, care at all about His regulations as to purity, self-denial, and love; but there must be in Chicago, as there certainly are in English cities, many who work for their Master, and labour for His outcast and poor. Yet the book is not without its use in encouraging those who toil, and stimulating those who lag; and it is certainly not without importance, as illustrating the keen and impassioned altruism, prompted by Christ's teaching, which is so striking a feature of much public work. It is becoming more and more impossible for public men to avoid taking it into account, and for private individuals to escape the hold of its influence, even, perhaps, where neither could be strictly called Christians.

To come to a little book which also enjoys a wide circulation—"Stephen Remarx."¹ It is the story of a young clergyman, well-born, and with every "social" possibility, who devoted himself to working and preaching among the poor. Perhaps it is not necessary to add that he dies of a dramatic street accident—"Robert Elsmere" and other books have led us to expect the early death of the self-denying hero, though on what grounds, moral, or even literary, we do not know. However, that is only a detail, born, we trust, of no gloomy forebodings on the part of the author, who has given us a very suggestive and charming picture of a modern St. Francis of Assisi. Nay, we do not hesitate to say that in some parishes, in some towns, if the working men are to be won to Christ, methods must be adopted that are akin to those described by Mr. Adderley.

But a more weighty and authoritative volume, perhaps, with English Churchmen, than any we have quoted, is the volume of sermons just issued under the auspices of the Christian Social Union.² The sermons are on social subjects, and were preached at a City church during the Lent of last

¹ "Stephen Remarx." By James Adderley. London: Edward Arnold.
² "Lombard Street in Lent." London: Elliot Stock.

year. We are told that "the idea of the promoters was to bring vividly before the minds of business men and others that the pressing social problems of the day would be the fittest object of their thoughts, prayers, heart-searchings, and aspirations during the solemn season of Lent; and that, as Christians, they were bound to seek for direction in their solution from their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ." With this object, Canon Scott-Holland preached on "National Penitence" and "The Marriage Law"; Archdeacon Farrar on "Am I my brother's keeper?"; the Dean of Winchester on "Social warnings from History"; the Dean of Ely on "The Imperial Christ and His Democratic Creed," and so on—twenty-three sermons in all, with a preface by the Bishop of Durham. We need not give quotations from the book, which probably is, or will be, familiar to our readers, but simply allude to it as yet another sign of the great characteristic of our times which we are discussing. One thing we may be permitted to regret—the undeniable tone of pessimism which runs through some of the sermons, able as they are. Perhaps this is partly to be accounted for by the influences of the season in which they were delivered, but it is apt to become depressing to the Christian worker. What does this statement mean, for example: "There is an almost shoreless sea of misery around us, which rolls up its dark waves to our very doors"¹ We know exactly how many poor there are; what we have to do is to work with confidence and with hope; we shall not do all we want, but no good comes from reiterating statements about a "shoreless" sea. Again, to go to the other extreme, in the sermon on "Recreation," we venture to think the Headmaster of Haileybury is a little severe on professional football. At all events, a Scotch headmaster, in a recent magazine article, has taken a very different view. There is much to be said for the cutler in Sheffield, who sits all the week on his bench making always just one particular part of a knife, until he threatens to become as machine-like as a machine, and then on Saturday afternoon finds fresh air and relief to his brain in watching a match of consummate skill, even though the players are Scotchmen. And in one or two sermons one is almost tempted to think of the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent advice to his clergy: "Understand, and you will not interfere." In any case, do not let us talk about the gloomy side of things until we can speak of nothing else. Many of these sermons are instinct with hope, and full of cheerful encouragement. Mr. Gent's calm and confident treatment of "Religious Education" is especially valuable at the present

¹ P. 33.

time. Few will dissent from the theory of the principles laid down in Mr Stubbs' "Democratic Creed of the Church."¹ Prebendary Eyton's "Social Hope" is all that its title implies. The opening words of the Bishop of Durham's preface are pregnant with calm wisdom and logical confidence. We cannot refrain from quoting its close:² "Some among us may naturally be stirred to impetuous action by the sight of evils which come upon them with sad surprises. During the fifty years through which I have watched the advance of national, social, and industrial reforms, I have gained the patience of courageous hope, which still grows stronger in the actual stress of conflict. Let the ideal be duly fashioned and loyally held and pursued, and little by little it will be surely established."

We think we have collected enough of the straws that show which way the wind is blowing, without discussing novels like "Marcella," or pseudo-scientific books like "Vox Clamantium." Indeed, there can be no doubt in the mind of the interested observer that now, more than ever before, whole nations are impressed, entire movements are dominated, by the spirit of putting ourselves in others' positions. The burden of the grief of others weighs heavily upon us. Concrete instances of this abstract truth—societies, laws, institutes, books, sermons, speeches—occur to our minds the instant we let our recollection range over the events of the past few years. Multitudes of exceptions there are, no doubt, supplied by individuals; but the spirit of the age is the spirit of charity. Surely, then, the responsibilities of Christian teachers are very great. "In this nineteenth century," says Professor Drummond, "we are only just beginning to find out what Christianity really is." A bold statement, and one that most of us would scarcely endorse, but in a certain sense it is true that the public life and politics of the nation realize the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount to a degree which eclipses that of any previous age. The great love of a Christian altruism, set free by the Reformation, has grown side by side with scientific civilization, but has grown faster, and is now its schoolmaster to lead it unto Christ. But as social evolution owes so much to Christian altruism, it is well that two things should be clearly borne in mind: First, that social reformers must, if their work is to be lasting and beneficial, be men of religion. Is not this evident? If the sanction for progress is supplied by religion, are not those the best guides of progress who are themselves directly influenced by that motive power? "If a man say 'I love God,' and hateth his brother, he is a liar." It is the part of us all to endeavour to promote the prayer "Thy will be done *in earth*"

¹ P. 174.

² Preface, p. xiii.

—but the test of the true social leader must be his own character before God, for “by this we know that we love the children of God *when we love God.*” The two truths are inseparable; the decadence of the French nation will be ours if we divorce love of man from love of God, as they did at the Revolution. It is true that he cannot love God who does not love his neighbour, but the converse is equally true that no man can effectually love his neighbour who does not love his God. And again, the altruism of the twentieth century must determine clearly what are the things which it postulates. If a man desires evil things for himself, he does harm to his neighbour by conferring upon him, even unselfishly, the same gifts. So a mere materialism, unaccompanied by any graces of character, will bring no benefit to a race, but the reverse. A hard-and-fast materialistic Socialism would check all progress, would do away with ideals, and remove the motive for evolution. Then decadence and stagnation would ensue. We do not want a hedonism for the masses of the people, neither the hedonism of the champagne-bottle and the realistic novel, nor the hedonism of the pigsty. The people must be taught not to want this themselves. First and foremost it must be impressed upon them that there is One who taught us to love one another, and to Whom all must give an account of their actions—peoples as well as persons, masses as well as units. They must be taught to remember to say: “We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge.” That is what the democracy must learn, that the altruism of these times is not vague and casual, but is the concrete expression of the will of a living Person, to Whom all are responsible.

W. A. PURTON.

ART. VI.—AMBITION.

ON the occasion of our Lord's lesson from the little child, St. Peter had just been honoured by Him with a fresh mark of favour and an extraordinary distinction. He had been selected to find and pay the tribute money. The contrast which our Lord drew between the things of Cæsar and the things of God had again raised the hopes of the disciples to look forward to the restoration of the kingdom to Israel. The wonder of the coin in the mouth of the fish had seemed to them to point out some speedy development. Putting these things together, and anxious to know whether their good old friend Peter was indeed to have a supremacy amongst them in that dawn of glory and happiness to which they were looking forward, they asked the question,

memorable through all time for its reply: "Who, then, is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?"

The answer of our Lord was first intended for His own disciples, then for those who are called to bear office in His Church, and lastly, for every individual Christian. He put it, according to His emphatic custom, which ensured permanent remembrance, in the form of a very touching symbolical act. He called a little boy unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said: "*Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.*"

What a change in all their ideas! Except, He meant, you put aside your notions of supremacy, and primacy, and foremost place and hierarchical dominion; except you become humble and small, like this little child; except you are penetrated through and through with that spirit of modesty which is the most beautiful characteristic of the child, by the child's want of pretension and self-seeking, which enables it to be satisfied with whatever comes before it, without ulterior objects, without seeking or claiming more as its due—you cannot in any true sense be members of the kingdom of heaven. In what does the real greatness of the child consist? In its perfect contentment with its own littleness and dependence. If the child aimed at anything beyond its own simple duties, or tried to achieve more than was required of it, such a claim would necessarily ensure disappointment. It is the absence of pretension, the refraining from all pushing of himself forward, which constitutes that true humility which is a fundamental essential of the Christian character. Only by daily and hourly realizing to ourselves our littleness before God and the brethren, can we hope to realize the life of the kingdom of God, and to grow in that inward grace which is the only greatness that is permitted to the servant of Christ. The greatness will be in proportion to the genuine, unaffected humility; the failure in proportion to its absence.

Now this is not the ordinary view. A recent brilliant historian, for instance, aware of this attitude of the world, in apologizing for the ambition of a great commander, excuses it in a man of the world, on the ground of its usefulness as a tonic. And in those whose lives are not framed on the teaching of our Lord, there can be no doubt that ambition is not without its advantage as an ingredient in a character. What we have to remember is, that to the Christian ideal it is antagonistic. "Self-contained," he writes of his hero, "from early manhood, he began life with the determination to make

a name for himself in the world. A craving for distinction has wrecked the careers of many second-rate men; but it is the ruling principle with most of the best, as well as with many of the worst amongst us. Sages have denounced ambition as beneath the dignity of the true philosopher; holy men have condemned it as dangerous to the soul; and a great poet has pronounced it to be the last infirmity of a noble mind. We have, however," he continues, "Shakespeare's authority for calling it the soldier's virtue, and, in the case of this man, it was assuredly the tonic that saved him from that deterioration of mind and body which follows inevitably upon a life of idleness and luxury." I do not think that the case for ambition in the disposition of a man whose mainspring is other than the Christian ideal could be put better than by this able and discriminating biographer. And we all recognise that the motives of men are infinitely various, and that what is not good in itself may become comparatively useful by taking the place of what is worse. Some medicines are in themselves poisons, but they are given as powerful antidotes to evils that otherwise would prove fatal. We can all see that ambition, meaning a desire to occupy a high place for which a man thinks himself fit, or to be the doer of certain things of which he deems himself capable, is not, in the man of the world, in itself anything bad. It is unquestionable that ambition makes men of the world more active and energetic than they would be without it in the public service. Through ambition men have been lavishly generous; through ambition they have sometimes been widely benevolent; through ambition they have served their country; through ambition they have slaved day and night in Parliament; through ambition they have built great institutions; through ambition many great books have been written, many churches built, many splendid sermons preached, many great and illustrious deeds achieved. "Without ambition," says one, "we creep through life with a snail-like pace, unnoticed and unknown; with it we soar like the eagle, take a station above our fellow-men, and often wield sceptres and govern nations by our nod." "Man is the creature of interest and ambition; his nature leads him forth into the struggle and bustle of the world; love is but the embellishment of his early life, or a song piped in the interval of the acts; he seeks for fame, for fortune, for space in the world's thoughts, the dominion over his fellow-men." Clarendon boldly asserts that "as long as the world lasts, and honour and virtue and industry have reputation in the world, there will be ambition, emulation, and appetite in the best and most accomplished men who live in it." And the calm and judicious Adam Smith assures us that "those great objects of self-

interest, of which the loss or acquisition quite changes the rank of the person, are the objects of the passion properly called ambition—a passion which, when it keeps within the bounds of prudence and justice, is always admired in the world; and has even sometimes an irregular greatness which dazzles the imagination when it passes the limits of both those virtues, and is not only unjust but extravagant.”

When we listen to all this the old man within us is stirred, like the disused hunter that once more hears the hounds giving tongue. Surely, we say, there can be no harm in my wishing to be first? Is there not something of a noble ring in the old Greek motto, *Ἄλειν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπέροχος ἐμμέναι ἄλλων*—Ever to shine in the front, and to make myself greater than others? What is the profession I have adopted? Why should I not wish to excel in it? Why should I not spur myself on by wishing to be Prime Minister, or Lord Chancellor, or a great commander by sea or land, to amass a great fortune, or to achieve a peerage, or to write a famous book, or to sway multitudes by my skill in song, or to rouse the tears and laughter of brilliant audiences night after night by my skill on the stage, or to become a famous orator, or to found a distinguished family? Why should I not all my life be struggling to win prizes, as I strove when I was a school-boy? Why may I not wish to associate my name with important undertakings, and to show that I can do things better than other people, and to be able to remind them that it was I who did this or that, and thus to win their constant gratitude and admiration? It seems to us hard and unreasonable that we should be deprived of those incentives to energy and capacity which we readily allow to the men of the world.

And then we think of the Lord Jesus Christ and His trenchant, unhesitating, unalterable lesson: *“Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said: Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.”* The point here is not the simplicity of the belief of the little child, but his utter unworldliness, his absolute humility, his entire ignorance of the aims and objects of the world. Instead of self-assertion, lowliness; instead of grasping at usefulness, thankful contentment with our own allotted duties; instead of any thought of the praise or blame of men, genuine, sincere modesty; that is not only the true Christian temper, but our Lord in His Divine and untemperizing fearlessness tells us that without it we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven at all. We may be highly moral men, we may be Christians in name,

we may be professing adherents of the Cross, we may be useful ecclesiastics, but to us the kingdom of heaven is unknown and untrodden ground.

And there is a chorus of witnesses from experience and observation. "Ambition is a gilded misery, a secret poison, a hidden plague, the engineer of deceit, the mother of hypocrisy, the parent of envy, the original of vices, the moth of holiness, the blinder of hearts, turning medicines into maladies, and remedies into diseases. High seats are never but uneasy, and crowns are always stuffed with thorns." "Say what we will," wrote the observant novelist Bulwer, "we may be sure that ambition is an error; its wear and tear of heart are never recompensed; it steals away the freshness of life; it deadens its vivid and social enjoyments; it shuts our souls to our own youth, and we are old ere we remember that we have made a fever and a labour of our best years." "Ambition," wrote the author of the "Anatomy of Melancholy," "that high and glorious passion which makes such havoc amongst the sons of men, arises from a proud desire of honour and distinction, and when the splendid trappings in which it is usually caparisoned are removed, it will be found to consist in the mean materials of envy, pride, and covetousness." "The ambitious person must rise early and sit up late, and pursue his design with constant, indefatigable attendance; he must be infinitely patient and servile." "Wisdom is corrupted by ambition, even when the quality of the ambition is intellectual; for ambition, even of this quality, is but a form of self-love." And lest skillfulness and discretion in ambition should deceive us, Voltaire with his merciless dissecting-knife uncovers the disease: "The modesty of certain ambitious persons consists in becoming great without making too much noise; it may be said that they advance in the world on tiptoe." What did the ambitious Diotrephes gain, whose love of having the pre-eminence led him to the extraordinary step of declining to receive the last of the Apostles, the gentle and loving St. John, the beloved companion of the Lord Jesus Christ? He gained the unenviable notoriety of being pilloried as a warning and example for ever unintentionally in one of the private letters of that great Apostle, which has been preserved as one of the inspired writings of the Word of God!

There is a tomb in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral that is full of a most pathetic interest. It is a block of black marble, carved by the famous Italian sculptor Torrigiano. It covers the ashes of Nelson, and it was prepared for a monument to himself by the great Cardinal Wolsey in that sumptuous chapel which he built at Windsor Castle. From it speaks a voice to any of us Christians who would dare in our own petty degree to push our personal reputation and

advantage, instead of forgetting ourselves and doing our duty. You well know the words :

I have ventured,
 Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders,
 This many summers in a sea of glory,
 But far beyond my depth ; my high-blown pride
 At length broke under me, and now has left me,
 Weary and old with service, to the mercy
 Of a rude stream that must for ever hide me.
 Vain pomp and glory of the world, I hate ye :
 I feel my heart new opened.
 And thus far hear me, Cromwell ;
 And when I am forgotten, as I shall be,
 And sleep in dull cold marble, where no mention
 Of me must more be heard of, say I taught thee—
 Say, Wolsey, that once trod the ways of glory,
 And sounded all the depths and shoals of honour,
 Found thee a way, out of his wreck, to rise in :
 A sure and safe one, though thy master missed it.
 Mark but my fall, and that that ruined me.
 Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition :
 By that sin fell the angels ; how can man, then,
 The image of his Maker, hope to win by it ?
 Love thyself last : cherish those hearts that hate thee ;
 Corruption wins not more than honesty.
 Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace
 To silence envious tongues. Be just and fear not :
 Let all the ends thou aimst at be thy country's,
 Thy God's and truth's.

I think we can hardly still ask, Why is ambition an evil? It is poisonous because it is selfish. Selfishness is the abnegation of Christianity. Unless you take up your cross daily and deny yourself, and follow Christ, you cannot be His disciple. Self is an ignoble object to work for, and shuts out the aims that are high and Christlike and pure and true. Where selfishness is, there the essential atmosphere of Christian love is impossible. And ambition is deadly because it is absorbing. It makes men unjust, unfriendly, grasping, jealous, envious, and mean. "Ambition is a mental dropsy, which keeps continually swelling and increasing until it kills its victim." "Ambition makes the same mistake concerning power that avarice makes concerning wealth: she begins by accumulating power as a means to happiness, and she finishes by continuing to accumulate it as an end." The objects of selfish advancement and importance gradually exclude the true spiritual aims of the soul. And, thirdly, ambition is the enemy of peace. The ambitious man can never expect others to give way to his schemes of self-advancement unless he dominates them by mere bluster, or intimidates them into unwilling acquiescence. All men are bound, by their duty to themselves and to their own responsibilities, to oppose the schemes of the ambitious and to keep them in their proper place. True

harmony and understanding can only exist among those who in honour prefer one another, who seek not their own but another's good, and who desire to work for the lasting benefit and happiness of all in whose company they are thrown.

And oh, my friend! you cannot plead that you are under no temptation to this sin. You cannot say that because the great prizes of life are beyond your reach, therefore you have no ambition. It is just as possible to be eager for small honours and distinctions in a petty sphere, as it is to struggle for brilliant results. The ambition to shine in the bar-room of a pot-house is as real as the lust of political power or ecclesiastical fame. Every day you yourself, my friend, have the opportunity of bullying and blustering, and beating down other people, and pushing yourself forward, and seeking your own advantage, and looking out for occasions of assuming the duties and responsibilities of others in order to prove your own importance and necessity. Hardly an hour passes by but you can show your love of grasping and self-seeking. There is not one of us that does not need earnestly to pray for the spirit of the little child.

It was by the ambition of the clergy in the fourth century that the Church left her primitive simplicity, and paved the way for the degradation in doctrine and in morals of the Middle Ages. The social dignity and privileges given to them by the Christian Emperors, their exemption from most of the public burdens, the increasing wealth of the Church, tended inevitably to make its ministry more worldly, and to tempt men to seek it without any spiritual qualifications. The increase of luxury and pomp amongst the clergy of the great cities, especially at Rome, is lamented by Christian, as well as exposed by heathen, writers. The practice of haunting the houses of the rich, and especially of women, by the clergy and monks, in order to obtain gifts, legacies, and the disposition of property, by those devoting themselves to a religious life, to the prejudice of their natural heirs, grew to such a height as to demand restraint by imperial edicts. The bishops, alas! left their primitive humility and close and brotherly relations with their clergy and the people, for the splendour of courts, and the assertion of exclusive dogmatic prerogatives. The spirit of ambition seized specially on the bishops of the ancient capital of the world, and in spite of the resistance of every other Church to the continual invasion of their privileges, in spite of the complete and determined independence of the Churches of the East and Africa, the subtle and sleepless Roman genius step by step, generation after generation, laid the foundation of those claims which resulted at length in the monstrous and anti-Christian tyranny of the Papacy.

Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the

midst of them, and said: "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven." What an extraordinary and incredible contrast we cannot help feeling between these tendencies of that most critical fourth century and the Spirit of our Master! And do not for a moment say that, without self-seeking, there would be no energy and progress. The best work that has ever been done in the world by ruler, by bishop, by pastor, by general, by man of science or of letters, by painter, by poet, by benefactor, has been done by him who had the greatest spirit of self-sacrifice in things both small and great. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might;" that is a nobler and more inspiring motive than self-seeking. "Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God;" that will produce more true and valuable activity than the worship of self. "The only ambition that is commendable is zeal in the cause of virtue and of good actions." If you are modest, humble, and self-denying in all your actions and pursuits, you will attract a hundred times more co-operation and support than if you are secretive, isolating, exclusive, grasping and selfish.

And then think of the reward! Think of the different degrees of spiritual happiness and satisfaction in the world to come proportionate to the thoroughness and sincerity of our pursuit of righteousness in the present life! The true object of all of us should be to grow in grace for its own sake, and its own present blessing. And in proportion to that development in us of all that is pure, noble, good, true, generous, unselfish, Christ-like, so will the question be determined whether we are to have the one talent, the five talents, or the ten; the greater nearness to Christ; the clearer vision of God; the degree of blessedness in virtue symbolized by the rule over one city, over five, or over ten!

"Ambition is the vice of noble souls?"

As 'tis a vice, then let those souls beware

(Thrice noble though they be, and passing fair

In the world's eye, and high upon those scrolls

Her favoured minions where the world enrolls),

Lest it conduct to shame! Be thine the care,

Soldier of Christ, that nobler strife to dare,

Which the rash spirit of the world controls,

And makes ambition virtue! Be it thine

To win thy bright unfading diadem.

By works of love. Around his brows shall shine

In heaven, from glory's source, the purest beam,

Whose aspect here, with beauty most divine,

Reflects the image of the GOOD SUPREME.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Review.

The Meeting-Place of Geology and History. By Sir J. W. DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S. London: R.T.S., 1894.

ANY work by Sir J. W. Dawson is sure to be important, as it is the production of an accomplished writer, and of a most talented geologist. In the work before us the author tells us that his aim has been to give a clear account of the debatable ground between the later part of the geological record and the dawn of history, and it will be found to be full of valuable information. He commences by briefly recapitulating the course of geological history, and gives an accurate outline of the earliest geological periods. From this he passes on to notice the earliest traces of man, and he denies that the geological evidences known to us at present do not warrant our believing that man existed in the Miocene or Pliocene eras. Nevertheless, he declares that, if man existed in the Miocene era, there would be nothing in this inconsistent with the Bible! This is an astonishing statement, for the Miocene period must have been *hundreds of thousands* of years ago. How geologists will agree with this statement of Sir J. W. Dawson, it is difficult to conceive. The Palæolithic age (usually called the Palæolithic period) is next described, and a good account is given of its great beasts, and the numerous human remains and works of art found in the caverns of Western Europe. This part of the book is particularly valuable, and our author declares—what cannot now be denied—that the earliest men were of a high mental development, and that they believed in the immortality of the soul. He, however, attaches little value to the numerous discoveries of human weapons and works of art of this age which have been found in America. After describing the different races of the Palæolithic age—such as those of Cannstadt, Cro-Magnon, and Furfooz—Sir J. W. Dawson declares that the Palæolithic (or Palæolithic) age came to an end by a great diluvial catastrophe. The break between it and the succeeding, or Neolithic, age is complete, and the great mammalia of the Palæolithic age disappear suddenly and completely from the northern hemisphere. This great invasion of waters at the close of the Palæolithic period is declared by our author to be the Biblical Deluge. The Neolithic age succeeded that of the Palæolithic, and is briefly noticed by Sir J. W. Dawson. He describes its fauna and its human beings. The great mammalia (*i.e.*, elephants, rhinoceroses, hippopotami, lions, and tigers) disappeared from Europe—with Primitive Man—at the close of the Palæolithic era, and were succeeded in the Neolithic age by bears, stags, wild oxen, and wolves. Man in the Neolithic era was an agriculturist and a shepherd, and entered Europe from Asia, thus succeeding the ferocious races of the Palæolithic (or first-stone) era, who had been swept away by the great diluvial catastrophe. From the Neolithic age the history of man goes on, without a break, through the ages of Bronze and Iron, down to the dawn of history, and this serves to increase the importance of the great gap and break between the Palæolithic and the Neolithic periods. Sir J. W. Dawson thinks that the Palæolithic period represents the Antediluvian era, and he discusses at length the Chaldean story of the Flood, comparing it with the account of that catastrophe which is given in the Book of Genesis. He thinks that the savage Cainite race can be discovered in the wild men of the Cannstadt race, whose remains have been found in the Palæolithic caves and gravels; but this, of course, is mere conjecture. When Sir J. W. Dawson writes as a geologist, he is on sure ground, but when we venture into the doubtful and difficult region of Biblical criticism, our conclusions often

seem theoretical and less strongly supported by evidence. He places the site of the Garden of Eden at the head of the Persian Gulf, and escapes from the obvious difficulty which arises from the recent formation of the land in that region by the statement that at the time of man's appearance the land stood at a much higher elevation in this district than it does at present. In his succeeding chapters he discusses the Prehistoric East, the Noachian Dispersion, and special questions which arise from the narrative of the Noachian Deluge. Here he writes in a somewhat sketchy manner, and it is to be desired that he could work out his points with greater detail. The account he gives of the prehistoric caverns in Syria and Lebanon is interesting, as it brings before us a race of men clad in skins, armed with weapons of flint and bone, and contending against the elephant, the bison, and the woolly rhinoceros. The recent discoveries in Egypt, Chaldea, and amongst the relics of the Hittites, are glanced at, and a brief summary of results closes the book. The early portion of the work, which deals with the geological and archæological evidence relating to Primeval Man, is certainly its most important part, but the brief outline of early history in Bible lands which succeeds may be read with much profit, and much useful information may be gained from it.

D. GATH-WHITLEY.

Short Notices.

The Voices of the Stars. By J. E. WALKER, M.A., with a Preface by Prebendary REYNOLDS. Elliot Stock. 1894.

The plain and simple object of this little work is to give a trustworthy account of the science of the heavens, but *not* with the supernatural left out. The author justly recognises that Nature, with Nature's God left out, is nought—a mere monster of a vain imagination, and therefore incapable of being *thought*. There appears to be little to find fault with, and much to commend; we therefore hope it will be widely read.

Through Conversion to the Creed; being a brief Account of the Reasonable Character of Religious Conviction. By Rev. W. A. CARNEGIE. Longmans. Pp. 129.

The sincere thanks of all thoughtful readers are due, and will, we feel sure, be given, to Mr. Carnegie, for this valuable little book. Evidently well acquainted himself with the deeper forms of intellectualism of the present day, Mr. Carnegie deals with a difficult subject in a clear and masterly way. The sequence of thought which leads to a consideration, successively, of the nature, analogy, conditions, hypothesis, and development of Faith, is admirable, and calculated to be of great service to "honest doubters" and seekers after truth, and we heartily wish the book a wide circulation.

Farmer Goldsworthy's Will. By Mrs. ISLA SITWELL. S.P.C.K. Price 3s. 6d. Pp. 307.

A most interesting and capital story, exposing the dangers of covetousness and self-righteousness. The interest is well sustained to the very end. It will be in great demand in village libraries.

A Heart of Gold. By CECILIA SELBY LOWNDES. S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 160.

This is a charming little tale of a lonely little boy in London, who makes friends with an old gentleman over the way, and eventually goes

to live with his nephews and nieces in the country, and there finds various trials to his temper, which he struggles against bravely.

The First Cruise of the Good Ship "Bethlehem," and A Woodland Choir.
By L. B. WALFORD. S.P.C.K. Price 1s. Pp. 107.

Mrs. Walford has here turned her talents to writing for the poor; the first story of self-denial for missions is very pretty and touching, the second a little less natural in plot and tone.

Patty Burton. By F. E. READE. S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 128.

This is an excellent and interesting story for girls on the Ninth Commandment, and the danger of gossip.

James Godfrey's Wife. By Mrs. HENRY CLARKE. S.P.C.K. Price 3s. 6d. Pp. 376.

This carefully-written story is equal to anything Mrs. Henry Clarke has done already, and contains many valuable lessons for young wives—not to speak of husbands.

As between Man and Man. By CRONA TEMPLE. S.P.C.K. Price 2s. 6d. Pp. 221.

Crona Temple is well known as a writer of fiction for village libraries, and this tale of Lancashire life will undoubtedly be a favourite.

A Black Diamond. By EDWARD GARRETT. Home Words Office, Paternoster Row. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 151.

This is the first volume of the *Home Words* Library. The series opens well with this story, which is brightly written and well illustrated; it is a plea for the Christian doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man in America and other places where racial prejudices are strong.

Turn and Turn About. By the Rev. WALTER SENIOR. Home Words Office. Price 1s. Pp. 76.

The author's talks with wives and mothers in *Home Words* were so much appreciated that he has been induced to write the present little work for men. The advice he gives is much needed, and we hope it will be widely read.

The Poems of William Leighton. Elliot Stock. Pp. 270.

These poems our readers may have seen before, as this is a new and cheaper edition; they are very good, full of feeling, grace, and music; some very pathetic.

Almost a Crime. By the Rev. T. S. MILLINGTON. Home Words Office. Price 2s. Pp. 160.

This is the second volume of the *Home Words* Library. It gives us the story of a fishing village and its vicar; it is well told and well illustrated.

Clay-modelling for Schools. By GEORGE S. HAYCOCK. Newmann and Co. Price 2s. Pp. 26, with numerous plates of models.

The author has given us an introductory course of modelling. The instructions and plates are clear, and as modelling is being now introduced into many of our elementary schools this book will be found very useful. Mr. R. G. Dickson, of the Sloyd Association, gives an introduction.

Allan Alford. By the Rev. W. J. BETTISON, M.A. S.P.C.K. Pp. 189.

This is a simply-written, pleasant tale of the conversion of a village carpenter by means of his invalid son; it would be a very suitable book for a Sunday-school prize.

Bob Rat; a Story of Barge Life. Charles H. Kelly. Pp. 89.

This little anonymous work has reached its thirty-first thousand; it tells most graphically its story of the curiously secluded lives of barge-men, some good, some bad.

Beneath the Banner. By F. J. CROSS. Cassell and Co. Price 1s. Pp. 244.

We have here short accounts of thirty-six "noble lives and brave deeds"; that they are very varied will be seen when we mention that Simeon, Nelson, Joseph Livesey, George Moore and Lord Cochrane are all to be found among them. The accounts given are just sufficient to make a boy wish to know more about the heroes described. It has many illustrations, and one or two interesting facsimiles of handwriting.

A Christmas Tale, and other Poems. By ELLEN ELIZABETH GILLET. Elliot Stock. Pp. 58.

A collection of short poems, mostly with a religious tendency. The devout and cultivated heart naturally expresses itself in these days in song.

Brushwork for the Kindergarten. By Mrs. ROWLAND HILL. Newmann and Co. Price 5s. Pp. 75.

This is a delightful book, which must greatly assist teachers with younger children; and we do not know but that elder people will enjoy the study of these delicately coloured plates. The preface contains a letter from Mr. Alma Tadema, giving a few ideas on brush-drawing.

Eminent Men of Kent. By JAMES SIMSON. Elliot Stock. Pp. 178.

The author professes to give a record of those men connected with the county of Kent "who have attained a high position in the public esteem through the indelible marks they have made upon the times in which they lived." The accounts are, of necessity, short, as the period treated of is practically all English history, and the line of heroes begins with St. Augustine and ends with the present Lord Warden. The book is readable.

The Teacher and the Class. Edited by the Rev. H. S. B. YATES. Sunday School Union. Price 1s. Pp. 77.

The editor gives us six articles specially written for the *Sunday-School Chronicle*. They are: "The Ideal," Dr. Horton; "The Qualifications," Dr. Stalker; "The Preparation," Miss Stock; "At Work," the Editor; "The Responsibility," Rev. Douglas Mackenzie; "The Reward," Arch-deacon Farrar. These names are the credentials of the work, with whose teaching we heartily agree.

The Lord's Prayer, Illustrated by the Lord's Life. By A. T. M. S.P.C.K. Pp. 60.

This is a useful little book, simple and practical.

Mary of Bethany. By J. R. MILLER, D.D. Sunday-School Union. Pp. 39.

In this booklet some plain lessons are drawn from the life of Mary for the use of young women. The advice given is earnest and wise.

A Chapter of Church History from South Germany. By L. W. SCHOLLER, translated by W. WALLIS. Pp. 234.

This is an account of the life of Johann Lutz, a Roman Catholic priest, and Dean of Oberroth, in Bavaria, who became dissatisfied, was received into the Protestant Church, rejoined the Romanists, became acquainted with the "Apostolic" Church in England, which, after his excommunication, he eventually joined. It is the life of an earnest, devout man, who strongly held the peculiar beliefs of the "Apostolic" Communion.

Spokes in the Wheel of Life. By the Rev. C. G. GRIFFINHOOF. S.P.C.K. Pp. 87.

Twelve very good and sensible addresses to young men on such subjects as "Friendship," "Health," "Home," etc.

Advent Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer. By the Rev. C. A. GOODHART. S.P.C.K. Pp. 71.

The author has taken the Lord's Prayer from an Advent standpoint ; he shows how it fixes our thoughts upon the end we hope for, and at the same time is not unmindful of our present difficulties. The short expositions of the clauses are plain and direct, with many similes and illustrations.

A Forgotten Great Englishman. By JAMES BAKER. R.T.S. Pp. 160.

This is an interesting life of Peter Payne, the Wycliffite, a man hardly ever alluded to by modern English historians, but one of the most eminent of the great reformer's followers, who was a great power amongst the Hussites of Bohemia.

The Perfect Home. By the Rev. J. R. MILLER, D.D. Sunday-School Union. Pp. 206.

Dr. Miller gives us some pleasant homely advice addressed to husbands, wives, parents, and children. It is full of devout wisdom.

The Gospel of St. Mark. By ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. Price 3s. 6d. Pp. 247.

The author gives us here seventeen lessons from St. Mark's Gospel ; they are popular and practical, though Church people will not always agree with his views, particularly those on the Lord's Supper.



THE MONTH.

THE Rev. Prebendary Stephens, who has been appointed to the Deanery of Winchester, was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, taking his degree with a first class in the Final Classical Schools in 1862. He was ordained two years later by the Bishop of London to the curacy of Staines, and since 1870 his work has lain in the diocese of Chichester. Mr. Stephens was for three years Vicar of Mid Lavant, and in 1876 he was presented to the Rectory of Woolbeding, which he still holds. His association with Chichester dates from 1872, when he became a lecturer at the Theological College, and in 1875 he was appointed to a non-residential stall in the cathedral. The new dean is the author of "Memorials of the See and Cathedral of Chichester," "Cathedral Chapters considered as Diocesan Councils," and a "History of the Diocese of Chichester." He is better known to the general reader as the biographer of his father-in-law, Dr. Hook, the famous Vicar of Leeds, afterwards Dean of Chichester, and also of Lord Hatherley. In 1872 he published "St. John Chrysostom : his Life and Times," and a few years ago he translated the same Father's "Treatises and Letters." The dean-designate, who represented his diocese in the Lower House of Convocation from 1880 to 1886, is a High Churchman.

The Rev. Charles Gore, who has been appointed to the vacant canonry of Westminster, was educated at Harrow and at Balliol College, Oxford, where he gained a scholarship in 1870. He was placed in the first class in Classical Moderations in 1872, and again in the final school of Literæ Humaniores in 1875, being elected a Fellow of Trinity soon after taking his degree. Mr. Gore engaged in tutorial work at his college from 1876 to 1880, and in the latter year accepted the position of Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College. From 1884 until last year, when considerations of health necessitated his retirement to the small country vicarage of Radley, he was the librarian and Head of the Pusey House at Oxford, and since 1885 he has acted as one of the Bishop of Lincoln's

examining chaplains. The new canon was Select Preacher before his own University in 1882, and subsequently served two terms of office in the same capacity at Cambridge. It is, however, by his writings that Mr. Gore is most widely known. His "Roman Catholic Claims" is a scholarly supplement to Dr. Littledale's more popular work, "Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome," while "The Church and the Ministry" and "Hints for the Study of Theology with a View to Holy Orders," reflect the opinions of the school of thought of which Mr. Gore is a prominent exponent. Mr. Gore was the editor of "Lux Mundi," published in 1890, a volume which caused not less controversy among advanced High Churchmen than in religious circles generally, and was the author of the essays on "The Holy Spirit" and "Inspiration." Three years ago he delivered the Bampton Lectures, choosing for his subject "The Incarnation of the Son of God." With regard to the Old Testament, Mr. Gore represents the opinions of the late Bishop Colenso; in Church doctrine he holds the views of Dr. Pusey and the Bishop of Lincoln.

A royal warrant has been prepared directing letters patent to issue nominating the Rev. Henry Frank Johnson, Rector of Chelmsford and Archdeacon of Essex, to be Bishop Suffragan of Colchester, in succession to the late Dr. Blomfield. The new Bishop was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was ordained in 1858. He was Vicar of High Wych, Herts, from 1862 to 1880, and in the latter year was appointed by the late Bishop Claughton to the Rectory of Chelmsford, succeeding to the Archdeaconry of Essex in 1885. He is a High Churchman.

The Rev. H. Wesley Dennis, Assistant Master at Merchant Taylors School, and Secretary of the Clergy Orphan Corporation, has been appointed Principal of Battersea College, in succession to Canon Evan Daniel. He is a High Churchman.

The Queen has been pleased to appoint the Venerable Frederic William Farrar, D.D., Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster, to be one of the Deputy Clerks of the Closet in Ordinary to her Majesty, in the room of the Rev. Canon George Prothero, M.A., deceased.

The Rev. Richard Gee, D.D., Vicar of New Windsor, and honorary Canon of St. Alban's, upon whom her Majesty has conferred the vacant canonry of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, taking his degree in 1840. He was ordained in the same year, and from 1844 to 1878 was Vicar of Abbots Langley, Herts. In the latter year he became Vicar of New Windsor, and was at the same time appointed Reader in her Majesty's private chapel in the Castle. Dr. Gee was appointed an Honorary Chaplain to the Queen in 1884, and a Chaplain-in-Ordinary in 1888, and for the last seven years has been Warden of St. Mark's School, Windsor.

The Lord Chancellor has appointed the Rev. J. H. J. Ellison, Vicar of St. Gabriel, Pimlico, to succeed Canon Gee as Vicar of Windsor. Mr. Ellison's ministry has been much valued at St. Gabriel's, and he has been conspicuously successful in stirring up the younger clergy to an increased support of the S.P.G. He is son-in-law to the late Archbishop Tait. He will be much missed in London.

The Press Association states that the Rev. Henry Temple, Rector of Oswaldkirk and Honorary Canon of Ripon, has been appointed Canon Residentiary of York, in succession to the late Lord Forester.

A Dalziel (the *Times* special) telegram from Sydney, dated November 29, says: "The Rev. E. A. Anderson, Vicar of St. Paul's, West Maitland, New South Wales, has accepted the Bishopric of Riverina, which was rendered vacant by the death of the Right Rev. Sydney Linton, D.D." Mr. Anderson took his degree at Queens' College, Cambridge, so lately as 1882, and he was ordained in the same year. He went out to Queensland almost immediately. In that colony he was first Vicar of Holy Trinity, Mackay, and afterwards Incumbent of Hughenden, being made an Honorary Canon of North Queensland in 1889. He accepted the New South Wales living which he now vacates in 1891.

The Rev. F. A. P. Shirreff, late Principal of St. John's Divinity School, Lahore, has been appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rectory of St. Dunstan-in-the-East, and he will reside in the parish. Mr. Shirreff is a well-known Urdu and Persian scholar, and will be of great service to the Church Missionary Society with respect to commentaries and versions of the Bible.

We record with sorrow the death of the Rev. Charles Brodrick Scott, D.D., who for twenty-eight years was Headmaster of Westminster School. Dr. Scott took his degree in 1848, when he was Senior Classic and a Wrangler, having previously gained the Pitt Scholarship. He also obtained the Senior Chancellor's Medal, the Le Bas Prize and the Members' Prize. After holding a Fellowship and assistant tutorship at Trinity College, Cambridge, he became Headmaster of Westminster in 1855, a position which he held till 1883. He was appointed a prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1873, and an honorary student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1875.

The Rev. John Reuben Hill has resigned the Vicarage of Searby-cum-Owmby, in the Diocese of Lincoln, to which he was appointed in 1890, in order to return to missionary work in India in connection with the S.P.G. Mr. Hill goes to Banda, in the North-West Provinces, which station he himself opened in 1873.

In reply to the interpellation of the Bishops of Salonica and Cordova, as well as of the Carlist Senators, the Spanish Minister of Justice has declared that the Government were not able to prevent the consecration of a Spanish Protestant Bishop in the Protestant Temple at Madrid, because the Protestants had fulfilled all the requirements of the law and the Constitution.

The Rev. H. E. Fox, of Durham, has received a cheque for £70 from Uganda as payment for Bibles, Testaments, and portions of Scripture. This makes £700 received in one year for this purpose from the Native Church there.

The Mercers' Company have made a second grant of 250 guineas to the building fund of the Church House.

The Grocers' Company have sent a donation of £50 to the Curates' Augmentation Fund.

The Mercers' Company have voted the sum of 50 guineas to the labour homes work of the Church Army.

The Clergy Orphan Corporation have received a donation of £100 from the Goldsmiths' Company in aid of the work of their schools.