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

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

THAMES CHURCH MISSION.

INSTITUTED 1844.

"Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."
1 TIM. i. 15.

"For though I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me: yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel!"—1 COR. ix. 16.

THE Gospel MUST be preached to the perishing souls who, day by day, are working on our Great River, and the Committee of the Thames Church Mission find NECESSITY LAID ON THEM to ask those of the Lord's servants who possess their Master's gold and silver to assist as in their power this imperative command. The Mission has during the past year, from many causes, suffered financially. An urgent need is the reason for this appeal.

Subscriptions or Donations to be sent to the Secretary,

F. PENFOLD, R.N.,
31, NEW BRIDGE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL,

FOUNDED 1758.

500 FATHERLESS CHILDREN OF BOTH SEXES ARE MAINTAINED AND EDUCATED.

Senior School—**MAITLAND PARK, N.W.**
Junior School—**HORNSEY RISE, N.**
Convalescent Home—**HAROLD ROAD, MARGATE.**

Patrons: His Majesty THE KING, Her Majesty QUEEN ALEXANDRA.
President: Field-Marshal H.R.H. the DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE, K.G.
Treasurer—Sir HORACE BROOKS MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D., J.P.

NEW ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS ARE URGENTLY NEEDED
so that the work of the charity to the Special Coronation Year Fund may be fully maintained.

Two Votes are allowed at each Election for every Guinea subscribed.

SECRETARY: **ALEXANDER GRANT.** OFFICES: 73, CHEAPSIDE, E.C.
BANKERS: LONDON JOINT STOCK, PRINCES STREET, E.C.

THE HYMNAL COMPANION

TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Edited by the Right Rev. Bishop E. H. BICKERSTETH, D.D. (late of Exeter).

NEW REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION.

The present Edition contains 601 Hymns, of which only 466 appeared in the last Edition, 84 Hymns of that Edition, which contained 550, having now been omitted, whilst 134 NEW HYMNS have been added ; and it is hoped that the loss of those omitted, some of which time has proved were rarely sung, will be far more than compensated by the gain of those introduced.

The new Musical Edition has been edited by CHARLES VINCENT, Mus. D. Oxon, Organist of Christ Church, Hampstead, and by D. J. WOOD, Mus. B. Oxon, Organist of Exeter Cathedral, with the counsel and assistance, throughout their laborious work, of Sir JOHN STAINER, M.A., Mus. D., Professor of Music in the University of Oxford.

Grants are made in special cases on the Introduction of the "Hymnal Companion" into poor parishes.

The following refers solely to the 1890 EDITION, which is quite distinct from the old book and cannot be used with it. The Second Edition (1876) is still kept in print.

N.B.—The sizes of the various Editions are given in inches.

No.		PRICE s.	d.
201 A.	Medium 32mo., cloth, 4½ × 3	0	8
201 B.	,, roan, red edges	1	2
201 C.	,, morocco or calf, gilt edges	2	6
202 A.	Super-royal 32mo., cloth, 5½ × 3½	1	0
202 B.	,, red edges	1	2
202 C.	,, roan, red edges	2	2
202 D.	,, morocco or calf, gilt edges	3	6
203 A.	12mo., cloth, 7 × 4½	1	6
203 B.	,, roan, red or gilt edges	3	0
203 C.	,, morocco or calf, gilt edges	4	6
204 A.	12mo., with Introduction and Notes, red edges	2	6
204 B.	12mo., with Introduction and Notes, roan, red or gilt	4	6
204 C.	12mo., with Introduction and Notes, morocco, gilt	6	0
205 A.	Crown 8vo., cloth, red edges, 7 × 5	3	0
205 B.	,, roan, red or gilt edges	4	0
205 C.	,, morocco or calf, gilt edges	6	0
206 A.	Crown 8vo., with Tunes, cloth, red edges, 7 × 5	4	0
206 B.	Crown 8vo., with Tunes, cheaper paper and binding	2	6
206 C.	Crown 8vo., with Tunes, persian red or gilt edges	6	6
206 D.	Crown 8vo., with Tunes, limp morocco, gilt edges	7	6
206 E.	Crown 8vo., with Tunes, Treble Part	2	0
206 F.	Chant Book Companion	2	0
206 G.	,, Organ size	4	0
207 A.	Small 4to., for Organ, 8 × 7	8	6
207 B.	,, cheaper paper and binding, for Choirs	4	6
208 A.	Penny Edition, in wrapper, 4½ × 3.		
208 B.	,, cloth	0	2
208 G.	,, fancy cloth. red edges	0	4
208 C.	With Common Prayer, cloth, red edges, size 4½ × 3	0	9
208 D.	With Common Prayer, roan, red or gilt edges	1	0
208 E.	With Common Prayer, morocco, gilt edges	2	6
208 F.	With Common Prayer, persian, red edges	1	6
208 H.	With Common Prayer, French morocco, circuit	1	6
208 K.	With Common Prayer, German calf, padded r/c	3	0
208 L.	With Common Prayer, German calf, circuit	3	6
208 M.	With Common Prayer, smooth persian cf., red under gilt edges	1	8
208 N.	With Common Prayer, roan, r/c	1	6
208 O.	With Common Prayer, padded persian morocco, r/c	2	6
208 P.	With Common prayer, French morocco, r/c	1	6
208 Q.	With Common Prayer, French morocco, circuit, button clasp	1	8
208 R.	With Common Prayer, morocco, circuit, button clasp, r/g	2	6
208 S.	With Common Prayer, Anglo-Russian, rounded corners	2	0
208 T.	With Common Prayer, Madras r/c r/g	2	6
209	Large 32mo., cloth, ruby type, 5 × 3	0	4
209*	Large 32mo., roan, gilt	1	0
209 A.	Large 32mo., with Common Prayer, cloth	1	4
209 B.	Large 32mo., with Common Prayer, pastegrain roan	2	0
209 C.	Large 32mo., with Common Prayer, morocco, gilt	3	6
209 D.	Large 32mo., with Common Prayer, German calf, gilt	4	0
210 B.	Diamond 48mo., roan, red edges, 3½ × 2	1	0
210 C.	Diamond 48mo., morocco or calf, gilt	2	0
210 D.	Diamond 48mo., German calf, gilt, rounded corners	2	6
210 E.	Diamond 48mo., morocco, circuit edges	2	6
210 F.	Diamond 48mo., German calf, circuit edges	3	0½
Mission Hymns, paper		0	1
,, cloth	20s. per 100	0	4

☞ The "Hymnal Companion," 1890 Edition, may also be had in special bindings, with and without the Common Prayer-Book, suitable for presentation.

FULL LIST ON APPLICATION.

LONDON: SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON, AND COMPANY, LIMITED,
ST. DUNSTAN'S HOUSE, FETTER LANE, FLEET STREET, E.C.

THE MORAVIAN MISSIONS.

(ESTABLISHED 1732.)

Oldest Protestant Missions to the Heathen—First to the Lepers.

About **one in sixty** members is a Missionary. There are gathered under their care from darkest heathenism nearly 100,000—*i.e.*, more than **three times as many** as the Parent Church.

To help those devoted people whom God so blesses, and who, in the preponderating proportion of their Missionaries, are so largely doing the work of other Churches,

THE LONDON ASSOCIATION IN AID

Was formed in 1817. The following are some of many **pressing needs** for which

Earnest Prayer and Support are Sought.

FOR GENERAL FUND—largely increased annual help of at least **£4,000** if existing Missions are to be maintained and Deficiency averted.

FOR THE LEPER HOME, Jerusalem, where Inmates have doubled in number, funds are still urgently wanted to defray the cost of the New Water Reservoir, etc.

FOR LABRADOR, hitherto self-supporting, but crippled for a time in its resources, **£2.000 annually is required** for a few years, until the Mission can be re-established. For this need, and **to avert loss to the General Fund,** an **ADDITIONAL Fund** is being raised.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE THANKFULLY RECEIVED

and information given by the REV. W. WETTON COX, at the Offices of the LONDON ASSOCIATION, 7, New Court, Lincoln's Inn, LONDON, W.C., who will also gladly arrange for Meetings, Sermons, Lectures, etc.

The Churchwoman.

EDITED BY **G. M. IRELAND BLACKBURNE and H. P. K. SKIPTON.**

A WEEKLY ILLUSTRATED PAPER

For Churchwomen and others of wide and Catholic views, at home, and for sending to the Colonial and Missionary Staffs abroad.

THE CONTENTS DURING THE PAST HAVE INCLUDED:

"Reasons Why."
By the late MISS CHARLOTTE M. YONGE.

"The Average Girl."
By MISS M. BRAMSTON.

"The Blessed Life."
By the REV. JESSE BRETT.

Hymns.
By MISS ELLEN BLUNT, the REV. F. W. ORDE-WARD, and others.

Articles
By MRS. BENSON, MRS. JEROME MERCIER, MISS M. E. CHRISTIE, MISS CHRISTABEL COLERIDGE, MISS CHRISTIAN BURKE, MRS. E. M. FIELD, MRS. ROMANES, the VERY REV. PROVOST BALL, and other Writers of note, while the general contents include a Devotional Kalendar and Teaching, Leaders and well-informed Notes on Current Topics, Reports of Church Meetings and Charitable Work, A Young People's Page, Articles on Needlework and Women's Work generally, Reviews of Books, Competitions, and Correspondence.

THE CHURCHWOMAN

Is Published every Friday. Obtainable through any Bookseller. **Price 1d.; or 6s. 6d. per annum, post free, from the Office.**

SPECIMEN COPIES POST FREE UPON APPLICATION.

PUBLISHING OFFICES: 2, EXETER STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Promote the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary H W. WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq., J.P.
General Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON.

The Committee EARNESTLY APPEAL for the INCREASED SUPPORT of 1,000 NEW MEMBERS to enable them to extend the publication and lecture work of the Society. Full particulars of the Society's objects and operations and terms of membership can be obtained on application to the Secretary,

OFFICES OF THE UNION,
324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

The Friends of Armenia.

President: THE LADY FREDERICK CAVENDISH.
Vice-Presidents: Hon. Mrs. FRASER and Mrs. ALFRED BOOTH.
Chairman of Committee: E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
Treasurer: HECTOR MUNRO FERGUSON, Esq.
Secretary: Miss E. CANTLOW.

600 ORPHANS MAINTAINED.

Funds Urgently Needed.

500 Destitute Cases waiting.

AN ORPHAN RESCUED, FED, CLOTHED, AND EDUCATED FOR *Per* **£5** *Annum*

BY THE MISSION HOMES IN ARMENIA.

A letter recently received from one of the Armenian Mission Centres says: "Only a small proportion of the Orphans will be able to support themselves next year."

DONATIONS IN AID OF WIDOWS & ORPHANS gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer as above.
CHEQUES SHOULD BE CROSSED "LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK."

47, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

Spanish & Portuguese Church Aid Society.

President: RIGHT REV. BISHOP INGHAM, D.D.

HELP URGENTLY NEEDED.

The **Bishop of Durham** writes, Oct. 30, 1901: "The Society's work has A VERY WARM PLACE IN MY HEART."

Contributions will be gratefully received by the Rev. H. E. NOYES, D.D., or by the Rev. THOS. PULVERTAFT, M A., Secretary, Church House, Westminster, S.W.

ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LIM.

FIRE INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE.

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects. **Already a sum of £33,000 has been so distributed,** including £3,000 to the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Lim., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary.*

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian.*

CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

FOUNDED 1886. INCORPORATED 1892.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in the three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families, exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Widows and Orphans Fund; 4. Daughters Fund; 5. Other Benefits Fund; 6. Personal Accident Assurance (Clergy); 7. Accidents to Employees (Assurance of Liability of Clergy as Employers).

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Lim., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary and Actuary.*

SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS.

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND.)

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED for Employment and Relief at Jerusalem. **70** men and boys are employed at Abraham's Vineyard, in stone dressing, soap making, etc., etc., also in making rock-hewn cisterns from which drinking water is given to hundreds of those who have no supply.

MANY THOUSANDS have been given food and clothing, numbers live in airless underground places, or in sheds exposed to winter storms and summer heat.

THE AGED, SICK, and CHILDREN suffer grievously in all seasons from hunger and thirst. We could employ many more if Funds were provided. Donations thankfully received by *Hon. Treasurer:* F. A. BEVAN, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

Secretary: E. A. FINN, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours are occupied. Expenditure in 1901, £40,770.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand London, W.C.

AN EARNEST APPEAL.

HAMPTON'S MISSION FOR THE BLIND

Westminster Bridge Road, London, S.E.

Patron: The Right Hon. LORD LLANGATTOCK.

BANKERS: LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN BANK, LIMITED, SOUTHWARK, S.E.

A Mission and Relief Work carried on for thirty-two years amongst the destitute ***BLIND POOR*** of London south of the Thames. Unendowed and in great need. ***The Bitter Cry for Help*** of the Destitute Blind Poor of "London over the Border." ***Poverty allied with Blindness!*** Is not this a double calamity?

Contributions gratefully received by
R. K. CAUSTON, ESQ., M.P., *President and Chairman.*
F. L. BEVAN, ESQ., *Hon. Treasurer at the Mission.*

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1902.

ART. I.—RECENT LITERATURE IN RELATION TO THE WITNESS AND WORK OF ST. PAUL.—II.

THE Epistle which of all others is at present exciting the most attention is, perhaps, the Epistle to the Galatians. But this interest is not concerned with its authenticity—few, as I have said, care to dispute that—but with its date.

When an Epistle has been assigned a place as possibly the earliest or latest of all the Epistles of St. Paul, it is obviously difficult to fix the time of its writing with certainty. But at the present moment there is a somewhat growing tendency to assign a very early place to the writing in question—*e.g.*, in Germany, Dr. Zahn, Clemen, and Weber; in America, Dr. McGiffert and Professor Bacon; and in our own country, Mr. Rendall and Mr. V. Bartlet, have all recently maintained that the Epistle should rank as the first and earliest which we owe to St. Paul.

The most elaborate exposition of this view is set forth by Professor Weber, of Würzburg, in his "Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefs vor dem Apostelconzil," 1900 (and subsequently in a shorter form, 1901). He places the composition of Galatians at Antioch in the interval referred to in Acts xiv. 28, between the return of St. Paul from his first missionary journey and the meeting of the Apostolic Council, in the succeeding chapter (xv.).[1]

Of course, this note of time involves the acceptance of the South Galatian theory, so brilliantly advocated in England by

[1] This paper is printed in the form in which it was delivered in the early part of the year, so that no reference is made to the article on Weber's book in the July number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, or to the recent change of date assigned to the *Book of Jubilees* by Dr. Charles.

Professor Ramsay, and previously maintained in England, France, and Germany by other writers.

This theory, with the main arguments of which you are doubtless acquainted, has been recently attacked by Professor Schmiedel ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii., "Galatia"). Schmiedel, amongst other things, is concerned to maintain that we cannot be sure that St. Paul always speaks of geographical terms according to their official Roman usage, and whilst he admits some of Ramsay's instances, he alleges that the rest prove nothing.

But Schmiedel has nothing definite to say against what Ramsay calls the "most striking example of Paul's habit of using Roman names"—viz., Rom. xv. 19, where we find the Apostle transcribing the Roman word *Illyricum* by a Greek word, *Illurikon*, used nowhere else as a noun, but always as an adjective, the Greeks employing another name to correspond to *Illyricum*.

There can, therefore, be little doubt that the Apostle is using a Roman term, as is shown by the very form of the word, and there can also be little doubt that *Illyricum* was employed in official Roman usage. Thus we find *superior provincia Illyricum* (see "Dalmatia" in "Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. i.).

Schmiedel's learned countryman, Dr. Zahn, has no doubt that the Apostle is here using *Illyricum* in its Roman provincial sense ("Einleitung," i. 131).

But if we are prepared to admit that St. Paul may have employed the term "Galatia" in this same official sense, then it becomes difficult to see why he should not speak of its inhabitants under the collective term "Galatians."

This possibility is fully admitted by some writers who do not accept the South Galatian theory, as, *e.g.*, Sieffert in his edition of Meyer's "Galatians." A great authority—Professor Mommsen—in a recent article, to which we must again refer, in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft 2, 1901, has said that in common speech the inhabitants of Iconium and Lystra could not be called "Galatians." But by what other collective title would St. Paul have addressed them? If he speaks of "Churches of Galatia," why not Galatians, just as he speaks of Churches in the province of Macedonia as Churches of Macedonia, and of their members as Macedonians? Mommsen himself has elsewhere pointed out (see Hastings' Bible Dictionary, vol. ii., 92) that the national designation of "Lycaonian" or "Phrygian" was a servile one, applied to slaves and horses. But men belonging to Roman colonies and semi-Roman towns would be proud of the provincial title "Galatians." St. Paul, with his statesmanlike

method, with his ideal of imperial unity, would be just the man to employ it. The Roman historian, Tacitus ("Ann.," xv. 6), speaks of "Galatarum Auxilia," and the Roman citizen Paul might well have adopted the same term (see "Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii., 1593).

But I have thus touched upon the South Galatian theory, not merely for its critical or geographical value, not so much for its close union with that conception of St. Paul's statesmanlike policy which prompted him to evangelize the Roman Empire, and with this purpose in view to work mainly in the towns, to keep to the highways, to mark the centres of government—a conception so strikingly delineated, not only by Professor Ramsay, but by Dr. Lock of Keble in "St. Paul the Master Builder"—but because it may be connected with another fact of primary importance. Professor Ramsay draws out with great skill the points of likeness between the Epistle to the Galatians and St. Paul's address at the Pisidian Antioch, Acts xiii. ("Galatians," p. 401). If the members of the Church in the latter were included under the term "Galatians," this is just what we might expect.

There is one remarkable verse (Gal. iv. 4) with which Ramsay compares the words of the address at Antioch: "But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law."

"It is clear," says Ramsay, "that the teaching so briefly summed up in this verse is to be understood as already familiar to the Galatians. Paul is merely revivifying it in their memory" (p. 397). Ramsay, I venture to think, goes too far in taking the words of the address, "To us is this word of salvation sent forth," as referring to the same teaching as that contained in the verse just quoted, although the verb "sent forth" in both places is the same. The expression "word of salvation," however, does not seem to be used here in the mystical sense, as Ramsay thinks, of the Word in the fourth Gospel.

But, quite apart from this, it is most important to note that Ramsay speaks of Gal. iv. 4 as a summary of facts which were already previously known.

The sum and substance of the Apostolic preaching was "Jesus is the Christ"; but how could this thesis be proved unless the hearers, whether Jews or Gentiles, had before them a clear and accurate knowledge of the claims of Jesus, and of the fulfilment by Him of the Messiahship?

If we read the Apostolic letters carefully, always remembering that they are *letters* (and not so much *epistles*, the products of literary art, if we may draw the distinction of Dr. Deissmann), the wonder is, not how little they contain of reference

to the *life* of Jesus, but how much—and how much, too, they presuppose.

This is admitted in quarters where we might least expect it. If any one, *e.g.*, will read the most recent "Leben Jesu" in Germany by O. Holtzmann, he will be surprised to note how many are the references in St. Paul's Epistles which the writer finds to the details and the significance of the human life of Jesus.

I had hoped to have given some of these details, but time presses.

From another point of view, however, the subject will be found amply discussed by Zahn ("Einleitung," vol. ii., 162, 166). The article in the new edition of Herzog ("Jesus Christus") is of great value in tracing a similar series of references; whilst amongst older writers, anyone who turns to the English translation of Keim's "History of Jesus" will again be surprised to find how one of the most reverent of negative critics sees what is practically "a fifth Gospel" in the Epistles of St. Paul.

Whether Ramsay is right in maintaining, as recently in the *Sunday-School Times* of America, that St. Paul had actually seen in Jerusalem the Jesus with whose fame the whole city and all Judæa were ringing, I do not venture to say. But one thing may be said—that the trend of much of the recent discussions as to the chronology of St. Paul's life is clearly to place his conversion within a year or so after the Crucifixion. And this fact may in itself suggest more than one important inference. But, at the same time, there is a satisfactory reason from another point of view as to why the references to the human *life* of Jesus are not *more* obvious and *more* numerous. "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). The words need not mean that St. Paul was indifferent to the facts of the human life of Jesus; the context shows what they do mean. St. Paul is contrasting a knowledge of Christ (not Jesus) after the flesh with the knowledge which enables a man to say that he is in Christ—that he is a new creature; in other words, he regards Christ no longer as a Jew, but as a Christian would regard Him, not as one whose thoughts were fixed upon a material kingdom or upon an earthly Messiah, but upon a Christ living in the hearts of men, reigning in His Church, not after the flesh, but after the spirit.

There was, again, a further reason why the events of the human life of Jesus are not more frequently traced in the Epistles.

Men lived, St. Paul and his converts lived, not only in the present rather than in the past, but in the future; the present could not be separated from the future.

The first chapter of probably St. Paul's earliest Epistle—1 Thessalonians—tells us that Christians were to wait for God's Son from heaven: the Apostle's hope and joy: What was it? "Are not even ye before our Lord Jesus at His coming?"

And yet even that absorbing expectation of our Lord's return was not divorced from, but was rather sustained by, the teaching of the Jesus of the Gospels. The word used by the Apostle for "coming," or rather "presence," is the very word used by Jesus of the same event as He discoursed on the Mount of Olives before His passion.

And no one can read 1 Thess. v. without constantly catching, as it were, the echoes of that same great discourse.

It is surely a testimony of no little worth, not only to the vitality of our Lord's sayings, but to the abiding power of His Personality, that within such a brief space of time after His death such statements should be accepted and believed, and that such claims should be acknowledged and revered.

In his famous "What is Christianity?" no one has emphasized more than Dr. Harnack that St. Paul was the Apostle who most understood Christ and carried on His work.

He speaks of him as the man who carried out the boldest enterprise—the breaking down of the barrier between Jew and Gentile—"without being able to appeal to a single word of his Master."

But whence does Dr. Harnack gain his knowledge of St. Paul's inability in this respect? The Apostle elsewhere is able to distinguish between his own opinion and a plain and decisive command of the Lord; he is able to take his stand upon the acts and sayings of Jesus in relation to subjects of such vital importance as the atoning death and the future advent of the Lord. It is therefore somewhat dogmatic to limit his knowledge. We may at least affirm that St. Paul must have been aware that in his character of the Apostle of the Gentiles no *positive* sayings of Jesus could be quoted against him; but if he was not acquainted with the discourses of Jesus, what guarantee had he but that at any moment some Judaizing Christian would affirm that Jesus had proclaimed: "Unless they keep the law of Moses no Gentile shall enter My Church."

And if the Apostle was a mere visionary, what a temptation to support by appeal to the words of a vision his own view of the admission of the Gentiles!

He never does so; and in that restraint there lies no small proof of his soberness and candour (see "Keim," *ut supra*, vol. iii., 583).

But St. Paul's "witness" to his own work is borne not only

by his own letters, but by the accounts which we owe to the Evangelist St. Luke.

Reference has already been made to Mommsen's recent criticism and rejection of the South Galatian theory, but in the same article the great historian tells us that we have in the account in Acts of the missionary labours of Paul, for the most part, a contemporary and trustworthy historical narrative; he allows that there is no important difference between the narrative of St. Luke and St. Paul's own references to his life in his Epistles; he expresses his surprise at the wonderful honesty of the story under the circumstances, as the writer is evidently a Hellenist and a stanch supporter of Paul; he points to the countless small details which are not required for the actual course of the history, and yet fit so well into it; he blames Weizsäcker for supposing that the account of the trial of St. Paul before Felix, and again before Festus, is simply a repetition by the writer of the same event, and that one trial or the other was a mere invention; nothing is more credible, he says, than that the accusations made under one governor should be repeated under another, especially as the first process had led to no definite result, and obviously the two trials would present analogous features; above all, he is struck with the circumstance that St. Luke by no means passes over facts which might seem of doubtful credit to the Apostle, as, *e.g.*, his appeal to the division in the Sanhedrin between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; he is impressed with the care of the historian to represent both Jews and Jewish Christians as keeping fast in Jerusalem to Jewish ordinances, and especially with the simple reference of St. Paul before Felix to the object of his great mission journey as simply undertaken for the management of the collection for the poor (Acts xxiv. 17).

Amongst other points of interest in Mommsen's article he refers in a note (p. 83) to Sergius Paulus, and he is inclined to admit that the mention on an inscription in Rome of a date fairly corresponding to the narrative in Acts of a certain Sergius Paulus as one of the curators of the Tiber, a man of pretorian rank, refers to the Sergius Paulus of Acts xiii.

It is perhaps somewhat strange that Mommsen should apparently prefer this piece of evidence when identification may be established on more intelligible grounds. Pliny, *e.g.*, in his "Natural History," mentions a certain Sergius Paulus (according to the reading preferred by Lightfoot) as a chief authority for Books II. and XVIII., and each of the two books, strikingly enough, does contain special information about Cyprus, of which the Sergius Paulus of the Acts is described as proconsul. The connection of the "Gens Sergia" with Cyprus

is strikingly confirmed, as Zahn points out, by a recently discovered inscription in the island; whilst Hogarth has deciphered more accurately another inscription which had already been partly made public, containing apparently the words, "Paul, proconsul."

The whole evidence is collected by Zahn ("Einleitung," ii. 633), and McGiffert's note, "Apostolic Age," p. 175, is of interest.

It would seem, indeed, that even the most arbitrary and depreciatory criticism of the historical character of Acts is constrained to bear testimony to St. Luke's remarkable accuracy in connection with this and other details.

"After every deduction has been made," writes Schmiedel in his article "Acts," ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. i., 47), "Acts certainly contains many data that are correct, especially in the matter of proper names, such as Jason, Titius Justus, Crispus, Sosthenes, or in little touches such as the title *politarch* (xvii. 6), which is verified by inscriptions from Thessalonica, as in the title of 'chief man' (xxviii. 7) for Malta, and probably the name of Sergius Paulus as proconsul of Cyprus (xiii. 7)."

An admirable summary of St. Luke's accuracy in all parts of his book will be found in the Introduction to Mr. Rackham's recently published volume, and when we consider that St. Luke's history deals with a subject beyond any other the most intricate and confusing—that of the government of the Roman Empire and of its provinces—our wonder is the greater that his accuracy should be so complete, and so increasingly confirmed.

Professor Mommsen, it is true, does not extend to the whole of Acts his commendation of the accounts of the missionary journeys. But it is, perhaps, a little curious that he should refer for the general character of the book to the German philologist, Gercke (see p. 128 of Zöckler, "Greifswalder Studien"), who rejects, it is true, the rest of Acts in comparison with the "we" sections (Acts xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-15; xxi. 1-18; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 16), but who pours scorn upon the extraordinary attempt of various writers to break up the book amongst different authors, whilst he points very forcibly to the entire arbitrariness which characterizes their methods. In this we may entirely and heartily agree with him.

Professor Schmiedel, again, is prepared to admit that the "we" sections are from an eye-witness, whilst he refuses to admit that they come to us from the same hand as that to which we owe the rest of the book.

Here language, identity of style (*cf.* Sir J. Hawkins, and *Church Quarterly Review* for October, 1901), medical

phraseology,[1] to say nothing of Church tradition, are all against him; and all this remains, even if we ignore the fact that such a skilful writer as the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts would not have allowed the "we" sections to remain as they are, unless we are also prepared to believe with Schmiedel that he left the pronoun "we" untouched with the deliberate purpose of passing himself off as the author of the whole book.

If so, it was a clumsy, no less than an unworthy, effort.

But if we are ready to admit that the writer of the "we" sections is identical with the writer of the rest of the work, then we must remember that these "we" sections, so lifelike, so full of detail, so marked by closeness of observation and accuracy of terminology, are also full of the miraculous.

Take as a single instance the famous shipwreck chapter (xxvii.). What can be more arbitrary than Holtzmann's attempt to eliminate certain sections because they purport to describe miraculous events?

These passages in chapters xxvii. and xxviii. are closely connected with the general narrative; they are characterized by the same medical terms, and by a similar accuracy of detail.

"The miraculous cures in Malta," writes Weizsäcker, "are an historically inseparable portion of the Apostle's life." It is a remarkable admission in relation to the subject before us, although the same critic is evidently sceptical as to the nature of the cures, and believes that their narration served as a model for the exaggerations in other portions of the book.

But might it not be said with great fairness that if we find in the "we" sections evidence of trustworthiness and carefulness combined inseparably with a belief in the miraculous, we ought not to be surprised to find—nay, rather, we might expect to find—the same combination elsewhere?

And if so, why should we suppose that the writer, who could be so accurate in describing, say, the riot at Ephesus—a description confirmed by a host of inscriptions—should have taken no trouble to inquire as to the nature and number of the miracles—the special miracles as they are called—which were wrought in Ephesus by the agency of Paul (xix. 11)?

But it is not simply in the rejection of the miraculous element in its pages that we have just cause to complain of

---

[1] Since this was written, Dr. Hobart, the well-known author of *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, has passed to his rest. It is of interest to note that during the last few months the value of his work has been further endorsed by Dr. P. Ewald in Germany, and by Dr. Chase in England.

the arbitrary methods adopted by advanced critics with regard to this Book of Acts.

The same arbitrariness and subjectivity are manifest even in relation to passages where we might well be surprised to find them.

Take as a single instance St. Paul's address to the elders at Miletus (Acts xx.).

The address is inferior to no part of the book, not even to chapter xxvii. in vividness of expression and intensity of feeling, and yet we are asked by the partition critics to believe that the whole speech is the work of one or more redactors!

Thus, the first half of ver. 19 is the work of one redactor, the latter part of the same verse is the work of another redactor, R. anti-Judaicus, because it mentions plots of the Jews. Vers. 26, 27 are to be regarded as an editorial gloss because they break the connection between the counsel of ver. 28 and the motive expressed in ver. 25. Vers. 33-35 are to share the same fate, because the prayer mentioned in ver. 36 ought to follow directly upon ver. 32.

That is to say, the whole of St. Paul's exquisite appeal: "I coveted no man's silver or gold or apparel. Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. In all things I gave you an example how that so labouring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He Himself said: It is more blessed to give than to receive"—the whole of this appeal is to be omitted, because the Apostle has previously said: "And now I commend you to God and to the word of His grace"; and because at the end of the speech we read: "And when he had thus spoken he kneeled down, and prayed with them all." The *prayer* according to the critics must have followed directly upon the *commendation*.

The same English writer, Mr. Moffatt, who in his learned "Historical New Testament" apparently endorses these extraordinary glosses, has also thought fit to endorse a comment made upon a recent English Commentary on the Acts, that so long as the criticism of sources is discounted, there will remain the element of unreality and artificial combination which haunts one's mind in reading typical English work.

I would venture to take up these very same phrases, and to affirm that this element of unreality and artificial combination not only haunts but possesses one's mind in reading theories, which are for the most part not merely made, but often enough unmade and remade, in Germany, evolved out of the writer's own inner consciousness, without a single jot or tittle of support from any documental evidence whatever.

In reading, not without some impatience, these partition

theories, one is irresistibly reminded of some remarks of Charlotte Brontë by W. S. Williams in Shorter's "Charlotte Brontë and Her Circle," p. 169:

"How I laugh in my sleeve when I read the solemn assertion that 'Jane Eyre' was written in partnership, and that it bears the mark of more than one mind and one sex!

"The wise critics would certainly sink a degree in their own estimation if they knew that your or Mr. Smith's was the first masculine hand that touched the manuscript of 'Jane Eyre,' and that till you or he read it no masculine eye had scanned a line of its contents, no masculine ear had heard a phrase from its pages.

"However, if they like, I am not unwilling they should think a dozen ladies and gentlemen aided at the compilation of the book.

"Strange patchwork it must seem to them, this chapter being penned by Mr. and that by Miss or Mrs. Bell; that character or scene being delineated by the husband, that other by the wife, the gentleman, of course, doing the rough work, the lady getting up the finer parts. I admire the idea vastly."

But once more: If it is true to say that Christianity has been from the beginning, not book religion, but life, this surely may be said of the witness and work of St. Paul. Behind them both was a conversion, and that conversion brought St. Paul into relationship with a life. No one has helped to emphasize this more than Dr. Harnack: "Above all, Jesus was felt to be the active principle of individual life." "It is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me," he adds, quoting the words of St. Paul. Mr. Moffatt, in the second edition of his recent book, gives us, as it were, a commentary upon such words by quoting those pathetic lines of the late Principal Shairp:

"I have a life with Christ to live,
But ere I live it, must I wait
Till learning can clear answer give
Of this or that book's date?

"I have a life in Christ to live,
I have a death in Christ to die,
And must I wait till science gives
All doubts a full reply?"

But that phrase "in Christ," what does it mean? what does it involve? It may possibly have been a creation of St. Paul himself; it may carry us back to the very words of the Lord Jesus.

But whatever its origin, it is at all events significant that it was always related by St. Paul to a glorified Christ.

The Pauline Gospel of the Infancy (Gal. iv. 4) was truly a Gospel, because while it spoke so clearly of a historical Christ it spoke also of a Divine Christ, and the witness and the work of St. Paul could only have been sustained in the strength of One who was for him in his earliest, as in his latest, Epistles his Saviour, his Judge, his Lord, with whom his life on earth was hidden, and with whom he would one day be manifested in glory:

> "Yea, through life, death, through sorrow, and through sinning,
> He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed:
> Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
> Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ."

They are the words of one whose death in the last year was probably marked by us all—an unexpected loss which adds pathos to the utterance—F. W. Myers in his "St. Paul."

R. J. KNOWLING.

ART. II.—TIGLATHPILESER, KING OF BABYLON—THE KEY TO ISAIAH XIII. 1 TO XIV. 27.—II.

THE accession of Shalmaneser in the same month in which his predecessor died suggests that the crown passed by succession from one to the other—in fact, that Shalmaneser was the son of Tiglathpileser. A further proof of this is obtainable as follows: On the Second Dynastic Tablet from Babylon[1] both Tiglathpileser and Shalmaneser are called by their private names, Pulu and Ululai respectively, a familiarity which argues some previous connection with Babylon. But whereas the name Pulu stands without any addition, Ululai is described as "of the dynasty of Tinu." In the same way no dynasty is affixed to the name of the usurper Sargon, whilst his son Sennacherib is styled as "of the dynasty of Khabi the greater."[2] If, then, it be granted that Shalmaneser was the son of Tiglathpileser, it follows that the dynasty of the usurper came to a close just five years after his death, when the great Sargon mounted the throne of Assyria, and became the founder of a fresh dynasty, embracing four great Kings, who reigned in direct succession—Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Assurbanipal.

---

[1] "Records of the Past," New Series, vol. i., p. 18.

[2] According to H. Winckler the above surmise is now an established fact. Shalmaneser is found styled the son of Tiglathpileser in a treaty made between Esarhaddon and Baal of Tyre. See Schrader's "Keilinschriften," third edition, part i., p. 62, footnote 2.

The annals of Tiglathpileser, written on the walls of his palace at Calah, were treated with scant courtesy by this new dynasty. Esarhaddon took the slabs, and, after half erasing the writing, turned them face inwards, and used them in the structure of his own palace. Of Shalmaneser, who followed Tiglathpileser on the throne, we have no remains, except a single lion-weight inscribed with his name. And yet it is evident, both from Scripture and from the brief, half-obliterated notices in the Assyrian Chronicle, that his reign was by no means an inglorious one.[1] What, then, was the grudge borne against these two Kings? Was it that they made Babylon the seat of empire at the expense of Nineveh, or that Tiglathpileser, the father, had in some way, as the prophet declares, "destroyed his land and slain his people?"[2] In any case, the shortness of the dynasty, coupled with its possible connection with Babylon, agrees well with the words, "I will rise up against them, saith the LORD of hosts, and cut off from Babylon name, and remnant, and son, and son's son, saith the LORD"; whilst the strange odium in which Tiglathpileser was held, even by a merciful monarch like Esarhaddon, is in harmony with the strong expressions of loathing and contempt for the tyrant contained in the latter part of Isaiah's parable.

But whatever loathing may have been felt for Tiglathpileser as an oppressive and unprincipled tyrant, there can be no doubt that, as a clever administrator and powerful empire-ruler, he forms a fit subject for the prophet's "parable." The following extract from the pen of Professor J. F. McCurdy will explain the greatness and genius of this gifted man:

"The middle of the eighth century B.C. found the Assyrian Empire almost reduced to its original limits, and struggling rather for existence than for supremacy among the nations. The loss of territory, wealth, and prestige, the decline in trade and commerce, the revolts and dissensions within the capital itself, the threatened incursions of border tribes, all pointed to the necessity of a change of rulers, which should result in restoring its accustomed power to the realm of Asshur. The man who responded to the demand, Tiglathpileser III., did a great deal more than merely restore the old order of things. His administration of eighteen years, B.C. 745 to 727, began a new era, not merely in the history of Assyria, but also in the history of the world. Several of his predecessors had made conquests equal, or nearly equal, to

[1] See 2 Kings xvii. 3, xviii. 9; also the notices in the Assyrian Canon for the years B.C. 725, 724, and 723, given in "Records of the Past," New Series, vol. ii., p. 126.

[2] Isa. xiv. 20.

his; but he was the first who knew how to retain the possessions thus acquired—he was the first, indeed, who anywhere ruled over an empire in the true sense of this term. Before him the territory claimed by the rulers of Babylonia and Assyria was held for the most part on a very precarious tenure. The new King introduced new ideas of organization and administration, and these principles, steadily acted upon by himself and his successors, finally resulted in the establishment of a comparatively settled government throughout the North-Semitic world."[1]

To the same effect is the testimony of Professor Sayce:

"Tiglathpileser was a man of great ability and force of character. He excelled as a commander, he equally excelled as an administrator and civil organizer. His campaigns were not mere raids carried on for the sake of plunder, like those of earlier Assyrian Sovereigns; they were all conceived with a definite object, and carried out according to a definite plan. Tiglathpileser determined to found an empire in Western Asia, which should embrace the whole of the civilized world, and the centre of which should be Nineveh (or Babylon?). It was a new idea in history. Hitherto a royal conqueror had been content with exacting tribute, which was paid by the conquered people as long as the foreign army was near them, and refused as soon as it was withdrawn. The conquered districts had to be reconquered again and again; they were never welded into one with the conquering power, and formed into a homogeneous empire. To found such an empire was the task undertaken by Tiglathpileser. Slowly, but surely, he extended the Assyrian sway, turning the conquered countries into Assyrian provinces under Assyrian satraps appointed by the supreme King himself. The taxes to be paid by the newly constituted satrapies were carefully apportioned, and a great civil bureaucracy was organized which had its centre and head in Nineveh. For the first time in the history of the world the conception of imperial centralization was formed, and an attempt was made to realize it in fact. The second Assyrian Empire, founded by Tiglathpileser, was thus a new experiment in political history. It marks the beginning of a new era."[2] Tiglathpileser, then, was not merely a great warrior King, who had achieved the unheard-of success of uniting the two thrones of Assyria and Babylon, but he was also, as the above extracts show, a civil administrator, who had originated a new policy, by which he was able to hold

[1] See "Prophecy, History, and the Monuments," vol. i., p. 321—a remarkably able work.

[2] See "The Times of Isaiah," pp. 40, 41.

together a vast empire. This new policy was a very drastic one, and very oppressive, but so far as the greatness of Assyria was concerned it was successful for over a century. Its main feature consisted in the transportation of conquered peoples, after a wholesale fashion, to other parts of the empire remote from their former homes, their places being filled by captives brought from places equally distant. The evident object of the conqueror was to denationalize the various races, and to fuse them by way of intermarriage.[1] Now, as the heathen gods were local, these forced removals were in the eyes of the religious Semitic peoples nothing less than a crowning disaster. The national gods must be left behind by the exiles, so that, as Professor McCurdy points out, to be forced from one's country meant to be forced to change one's religion. Accordingly, in the "parable" now before us, the new policy of the late all-powerful tyrant is spoken of with the deepest abhorrence. As his spirit enters the world of the departed, the spirits of the mighty dead rise from their thrones to meet him, lost in wonder and astonishment at his tragic downfall. This their wonder is shared by multitudes who had occupied less exalted stations: "They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, they shall consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof; that *let not loose his prisoners to their home?*" This, his crowning act of oppression, the distinctive feature of his new policy, they mention last—he "*let not loose his prisoners to their home.*" So, then, captivity, expatriation, was the keynote of the new policy, and Israel felt it in common with other conquered peoples. It was in Tiglathpileser's days that Isaiah received his commission to prophesy: "Until cities be waste without inhabitant, and houses without man, and the land become utterly waste, and the LORD have removed men far away, and the forsaken places be many in the midst of the

[1] In illustration of this, take the following half-obliterated extract from the Annals for the eighth year of the reign, B.C. 738-737: "Six hundred captives from the town of Amlati belonging to the Damuni, 5,400 captives from the town of Dur, I settled in the town of Kunalia . . . in the towns of Khutsarra, Tai, Tarmanazi, Kulmadara, Khatatirra, and Sagillu, belonging to the land of Unqu . . . the captives of the lands of Quti and Bit-Sangibuti; 1,200 of the Illilæans, 6,208 of the Nakriæans and Budæans. . . . I settled in the towns of Tsimirra (Zemar), Arqa, Usnu, Siannu on the sea-coast (Gen. x. 17, 18); 588 Budæans and Dunæans . . . 252 Bilæans, 544 Baniæans, 380 inhabitants of the town of Nergal-ilu-ina-matati, 460 of the Sangillu . . . Illilæans; 457 captives of the lands Quti and Bit-Sangibuti I settled in the province of Tuhimmi; 555 captives of the lands of Quti and Bit-Sangibuti I settled in the town of Til-karmi, and reckoned them with the men of Assyria."

land."[1] In those same sad times the prophet portrays vividly the hopeless misery of the departing exiles: "They shall pass through it, hardly bestead and hungry, . . . they shall look unto the earth, and behold distress and darkness, the gloom of anguish; and into thick darkness they shall be driven away."[2] The historical books record the speedy fulfilment of these prophetic visions. "In the days of Pekah, King of Israel,"—viz., in B.C. 734—"came Tiglathpileser, King of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maacah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali; and he carried them captive to Assyria."[3] In the conqueror's own words: "The land of Beth-Omri . . . the whole of its inhabitants and their property I carried away to Assyria. Pekah, their King, I slew, Hoshea I appointed to rule over them."[4] A round statement like the above clearly cannot be taken literally, seeing that some were left behind under the rule of Hoshea. To estimate its force, it is best to glance at the more exact statistics of the treatment meted out by Tiglathpileser to the rebellious principalities of Chaldea. Thus from Bit-Silani he informs us that he led away 85,000 captives, and from Bit-Sahalli 54,000. We are to understand, then, that as a result of the campaigns undertaken during the years B.C. 734 to 732 there was a large, though not universal, deportation of the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom, as well as of the neighbouring kingdom of Syria-Damascus, a deportation quite sufficient to fulfil the prophet's words to Ahaz: "Before the child (Immanuel) shall know to refuse the evil and to choose the good the land whose two kings thou abhorrest shall be forsaken."

Captivity and deportation being thus a main part of the policy of Tiglathpileser, King of Babylon, it is no matter for surprise that in the prophecy before us the population of Babylon and the empire is spoken of as of a very mixed nature. These, when the great disturbance arises and Babylon is overthrown, are pictured as turning "every man to his own people," and fleeing "every man to his own land." But that which is of most consequence, and to which I would now draw the close attention of my readers, is the wonderful promise of deliverance from captivity given at the close of the first part of the Burden of Babylon, and before we come to the parable: "For the LORD will have compassion upon Jacob, and will yet

---

[1] Isa. vi., 11, 12. [2] *Ibid.*, viii. 21, 22.

[3] 2 Kings xv. 29. Note also the murder of Pekah by Hoshea in the following verse.

[4] See Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," vol. i., pp. 247, 248 of the English edition.

choose Israel, and set them in their own land; and the stranger shall join himself with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And the peoples shall take them and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and for handmaids: and they shall take them captives whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors."[1] This striking passage contains, as observed at the outset, chaps. xlvi. to lxvi. *in nuce.* Thus with xiv. 1, "The LORD *will have mercy* on Jacob, and *will* yet *choose* Israel," compare xlix. 10, 13, liv. 8, 10, lx. 10; also xli. 8, 9, and xliv. 1, 2. With the assurance of the voluntary association of strangers with the chosen people, as given in xiv. 1, compare lvi. 3. Again, the prediction of xiv. 2, that the Gentile "peoples" will be forward to bring Israel back is expanded in xlix. 22, lx. 9, and lxvi. 20; whilst the future supremacy of Israel, foretold in this same verse, is again predicted in lx. 14 and lxi. 5, 6. So that if these two verses be from the pen of Isaiah, we have an undoubted argument for the unity of authorship of the entire book. Now, it is said by Professor Driver that the prophecy of chap. xiv. 1, 2 is "*unrelated to Isaiah's own age,*" and that the promise of deliverance from captivity contained in it is based "*upon a condition of things not yet existent.*"[2] But as far as regards the captivity of Israel, *i.e.*, the ten tribes, this is not the case. Israel's captivity was a dire reality in B.C. 729, *before* the extinction of the Northern Kingdom. Further, on a close study of the terms employed in xiv. 1, 2, it will be found that, while the promised return from captivity is as truly a prophetic revelation as that of chap. xi. 11, 12, yet that the language in which the revelation is given is, as a matter of fact, in exact accordance with the then existing state of things—viz., the captivity in great measure of the kingdom of Israel while Judah remained still intact. This will be seen at once if a comparison be made between Isa. xiv. 1, 2 and the long prophecy against Babylon contained in Jer. l. to li. 58. Thus, in Jer. l. 20, we read of Israel *and Judah,* in l. 33 of their being oppressed *together,* in l. 4 of their *joint* repentance, in li. 5 that *neither of them* are forsaken of God, while in li. 24, 35, l. 5, 28, li. 10, mention is made of evil done *to Zion* by the Chaldean, and assurances are given of a return *to Zion.* But in Isaiah xiv. 1, 2, the passage before us, we note a very marked difference. Though captivity is a present reality, yet no express mention is made of Judah, nor is anything said

[1] Isa. xiv. 1, 2. Notice the break at the end of xiv. 2.

[2] See "Isaiah: his Life and Times," pp. 85, 86. The italics are his, not mine.

of a return to Zion. The captives are merely spoken of in such general terms as "Jacob" and "Israel," "house of Jacob," "house of Israel," which, while they do not exclude Judah, do not necessarily include it; so that in this respect xiv. 1, 2 would seem to be more closely related to the circumstances of Isaiah's own age than even xi. 12, where "the dispersed of Judah" *are* expressly mentioned. Again, in these two verses the return spoken of is not to Zion, but "to their own land," to "their place," to "the land of the LORD." The inference, then, is that when Isaiah xiv. 1, 2, was written Israel was in captivity, but *not* Judah; and this, speaking broadly, was the state of things in B.C. 729, when a considerable portion of the ten tribes had gone into captivity, while those who remained in the land of their fathers were under the sway of Hoshea, the nominee of Assyria.

In reviewing the above argument, it will be found that there is one point in which we lack confirmation. From Israel's captivity being mentioned in the Burden of Babylon, and in connection with a desolation presently to come upon Babylon, one might suppose that the captive Israelites were taken to Babylon, whereas the conqueror expressly tells us that he took them away to Assyria. To this seeming discrepancy it is sufficient to reply that Babylon is here regarded as the seat of empire, and that, as shown above, Tiglathpileser made it his second capital, and appears toward the close of his life to have given it the preference over Nineveh. Thus, being carried captive to Assyria and being carried captive to Babylon become equivalents. C. BOUTFLOWER.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—THOUGHTS ON SOME SOCIAL QUESTIONS, PAST AND PRESENT.—I.

THE close of the old century and the beginning of the new has given rise to many comparisons as regards social matters, some of the conclusions arrived at being unfavourable, while others are too flattering and generally optimistic. Those of us whose memories can go back through a long period of years are not inclined to agree entirely with either of these opinions and statements, but desire to discriminate between those matters which have without doubt improved, and others which have not done so, during the lapse of years.

As the younger members of the present generation are somewhat apt to believe that the present state of things is

mainly owing to their own exertions, and that little of it is due to the labours of the past, it may be well for them to learn some facts from those who have had a longer experience than their own.

In considering Social questions, it is remarkable to find the unanimity with which the terms "apathy" and "indifference" are used with regard to them. This state of feeling is the case more especially in the country than in London, as I have reason to know from a residence in both, but everywhere it is the truth in greater or less degree; evils, if known, are ignored, or considered to be hopeless, and beyond the reach of help, and what has always been, must still continue to be. That this is more especially true with regard to "intemperance" cannot be denied. That this apathy is to be found even in the "Great Council of the Nation" is surely a disappointing and undeniable fact, social questions and urgent reforms being too often postponed or laid aside year after year. The late Bishop of Durham says indeed truly, "There is no strong public feeling against the vices which are widely dominant among us—gambling, drunkenness, impurity. Till the conscience is enlightened and aroused, legislation must be ineffective."

But the most remarkable and striking instance of "apathy" is certainly shown by women, who shrink from the contemplation of unpleasant subjects and evils, and only too willingly shut their eyes to them, a disposition which, I cannot help remarking, is strongly supported by their male relatives, who are almost universally opposed to their knowledge of, or taking part in, any such matters. But I cannot help asking, will shutting our eyes and ears to all the evils which surround us ever effect an improvement in them, or help to remove the terrible burden? Having had experience of the poor in London and the country (though chiefly in the former), I am confirmed in my opinion that the average poor in London have a higher standard of morality than the rural poor. I am, of course, not speaking of "wicked London" (as it was called by the late lamented Bishop), but of those working classes with whom I had to do in my ten years' work with a "Mothers' Meeting." Amongst the three hundred families visited by the Parochial Mission woman, she heard of only one instance of a girl having "gone wrong"; and some years after I was told of another, which had come before the Guardians, as the girl applied for admission to the workhouse. I knew the family well, and the mother died during my residence in the parish, which probably might account for this sad circumstance. But perhaps the most remarkable part of it was the overwhelming sense of shame and disgrace felt by her family,

and their earnest request to the Mission woman to keep it secret from their neighbours in the same locality, and even from the clergyman who had presented the girl for confirmation. Surely this is very different from what I heard in the country places in which I lived subsequently, where an absolute indifference seems to prevail as to all such occurrences, and no shame is felt.

Looking at the state of things which exists not only in country villages, both in the North and South, but in the towns also, is it possible to say that we are satisfied with the results of our costly education in either Board, or Voluntary, Schools, as shown in the after-lives of the children, both boys and girls? As I wish to give facts in support of my assertions, I cannot refrain from stating the following circumstances, however painful they may be. I have just heard of a country union in which a girl has been received for her second confinement at the age of sixteen! About twenty-five such cases are admitted annually, many at the age of fifteen. The number as given in the Report of the Workhouse Girls' Aid Committee of Kensington is no less than 100 in the year, and I will give the following extract from it: "The number of these women does not appear to be decreasing. In our larger unions it is estimated that 100 illegitimate children are born every year, so that, taking twelve only of the largest London workhouses, we have a total of 1,200 such births each year. This but represents a small proportion of the total number." What can the excellent committees referred to (which ought to be adopted in every workhouse) hope to be able to do in going to the root of this terrible evil? They may well ask, "The problem is one of considerable magnitude. What means are available for stemming this vast tide of illegitimacy and pauperism?" And I may add, Who will answer this question?

The chief social efforts of which I heard in country towns were for the support of Rescue Homes on a small scale, which seemed to me utterly inadequate, and merely palliative of results, instead of going to the root and causes of the evil they sought to remedy. As I have so often said before, during the last fifty years, but must repeat once more, it is of little use to remove the victims from temptations when it is perfectly certain that another band (for the supply will equal the demand) will immediately be forthcoming to take their place, and it must be obvious to everyone who has considered this sad subject that the only real and effective measures are such as are adopted by the White Cross League, and all those who maintain and uphold the fundamental law of one standard by which men and women are alike to be guided and ruled

and judged. I may add that the beginning of this only really effective movement is within my own recollection. A Northern Bishop says in his recent charge: "The low standard of public opinion on this subject, not alone in our own district, sometimes almost fills our hearts with despair. Unfaithfulness before marriage, and the light view of it as a sin against God, are among our greatest hindrances, and until all religious bodies set themselves, not only in word, but in practical discipline, against this all too prevalent sin, there will be no healthy public opinion created." That preventive measures are now being adopted in this and other departments of social work is a matter for sincere satisfaction and congratulation.

And here I cannot help asking another question as to the efficiency of our methods of education as regards practical, or, I might say, physical, results. It is impossible to believe but that a more direct teaching on the matters concerning life and health might be promoted in our schools. We read every year of the enormous mortality amongst little children, said to be caused mainly through unwholesome and unsuitable food; and this is traced to the ignorance of the parents. Can we doubt that many of the sad cases of invalids and cripples (of whom we are told there are no less than 1,800 in London alone) might be prevented or ameliorated by the teaching of the mothers of this class, not only in schools, but in after-life, by the Mothers' Meetings, now held everywhere. Again, as to the results of education in after-life, can we read without shame and horror the following fact?—The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children records that in one month 2,700 cases of neglect by starvation and ill-treatment were recorded, involving 7,648 individuals and 3,511 offenders!

While comparing the condition of country and London as regards morality, it is impossible to exclude the consideration of intemperance also; and here, surely, we find the greatest amount of the "apathy" of which I have spoken. My experience showed this evil to be far more general, especially amongst the young of both sexes, in country towns than in London, and the number of public-houses far greater and more striking. In two or three towns that I could name, it was almost impossible to count them in driving through the streets, so numerous were they on either side; and when one old tumble-down or unattractive house was condemned, it was rebuilt by the wealthy firm of brewers in an absolutely palatial style, and well-named "palace," irresistible to passers-by. In the afternoons, especially on Bank Holidays, boys and girls, even children, were seen the worse for drink in the streets. It was impossible for me to believe an opinion which I have heard, that the number of public-houses does not affect

the drinking of the population. It is supposed to be, and it may be, useless to quote statistics, but to my mind they are of overwhelming importance, and I will give a few, at least, of them which may be forgotten by some.

Our National Drink Bill amounted last year to over £162,000,000. All the public-houses being supported by the working classes, they are thus responsible for their number, as whatever the rich may consume in drink, it is not procured there.

Out of 11,000 committals of women to Holloway Prison in the year 1899, there were 4,000 habitual drunkards; in one day 150 were in confinement, with from three to 65 convictions each, while more than half had three convictions within twelve months; 82 were received in one day. Then we are told that 60,000 children came to ill-usage through drunken parents; and when we read the testimony of the inspectors of workhouses that total abstainers are not found amongst the inmates, can we avoid the conclusion that half of our State institutions and hospitals might be closed if the evil of drink were suppressed, for it is a well-known fact that the larger proportion of inmates in both are driven there as the result of immoderate drinking? The testimony of some of our excellent matrons of the modern Poor Law infirmaries confirms this sad fact after years of experience in this department of work. As regards the two other vices of gambling and betting, they may have become less prevalent among the upper and middle classes than in past generations, but have they not largely increased in the lower classes, as a glance at the police-court reports will swiftly prove, these temptations being the cause of so many crimes?

Another matter I must name, in which, I believe, no one will contend that we have improved, is that of domestic service. I, who can look back for more than seventy years, recall with gratitude the excellence of those who served us and my grandparents, including our valued old nurse. A lifelong service indeed was hers, but, besides herself, there were many others (one of her family, even for forty years), as nursemaids, housemaids, and men-servants, whose stay with us was for over twenty years. It is rare now to find such contented devotion to one family and situation, and every year it becomes more so. The restless spirit of the age, with a love of "change," is especially remarkable in this class, with increased fastidiousness, independence, and a growing desire for liberty, amusement, and dress; and many of us are asking what will be the condition of matters in the course of this new century. The employment of Chinese, or coolies, or at least Germans, is foretold, and is not improbable, the latter being largely

engaged at present for domestic service.[1] As to a supply from those who are now being taught in Board-schools, there is little, or I may say nothing, to be hoped for, as they openly declare their determination *not* to "go to service." One of my recent cooks, who herself left school at ten years old to assist in earning for a widowed mother, told me that all her young nieces, of whom she had several, expressed the same resolve, and look forward, no doubt, to being "young ladies," with their titles, in shops, post-offices, or some similar employments, where, of course, the chief temptation and attraction is "evenings to themselves," though not "at home." Yet, I must add, this same cook read and wrote well, and had quite as much learning as was necessary for her position in life, even though French, drawing, and the piano were not added. This modern notion, new within the last fifty years, can surely not be considered an advance and improvement on old times. Greater liberty and less control, and even the suggestion that our maids should be addressed by their mistresses with the title of "miss," will, I believe, not avail to induce them to remain "in service," not even if pianofortes and bicycles, and the abolition of the things now called "caps," are added to the list of bribes held out.[2] I cannot help wondering sometimes if mistresses recommended or required the present fashion of frizzled hair (exactly like the woolly heads of negroes), it would be willingly adopted by our maids.

There is one more point connected with our servants to which I must allude, and which can hardly be considered an improvement on old times—viz., the great increase of correspondence which has taken place, and which, I believe, is in great measure caused or encouraged by some societies and plans which are connected with young servants, and which arrange for correspondence with them. It may do good and be a help to some, but I cannot help thinking that at least it must take up a large amount of time which ought to be given to their employers. I have known of weekly and daily letters, which, of course, have to be answered.

It strikes me sometimes that there is something to be said in excuse for the failings of domestic service, and that is in the unreality that almost necessarily pervades it, the members wearing, as it were, a mask, and never appearing as their real selves or with their natural manners and voices, being, in fact, what one may describe as two personalities—above stairs and

[1] The entire discontinuance of the terms "master" and "mistress" is surely another striking sign of change in these relations.

[2] I have recently heard of two parlour-maids who advertised and received forty and fifty replies, some ladies going in carriages and bicycles to interview them. No wonder that wages are rapidly mounting up!

below. Everyone must have noticed the change that occurs when in the presence of their masters and mistresses, and this change cannot be conducive to an open and honest character and deportment. It has sometimes occurred to me if this may not be true also with regard to those who surround Royalty. Are *they* seen, as a rule, in their real selves, or with a mask on?

There is surely one other remarkable change in the servants of the present day—as to Bible-reading, which was the habit formerly on Sundays, but is now almost entirely superseded by magazines, or even the Sunday paper. But is not this the case also with all classes?

There is one more subject I must touch upon in connection with past and present, and that is dress. It is many years since I wrote a leaflet on this matter for a small society which was started, and I was asked to assist; but, like all similar efforts, it proved fruitless, and came to nothing in striving against the all-powerful force of fashion. It is surely remarkable, on looking upon old records showing women's dress during many generations, to find the prevailing hideousness and folly of almost all the fashions which have found favour —or, at least, have been adopted—by all. One of my sisters, who was given to collecting, made drawings of costumes from the earliest times, and throughout the whole series the prevalence of ugly, and even preposterous, fashions is the impression left by them. Whatever the artistic tastes and knowledge may have been of the Great Masters who painted these portraits, we find the same disregard of beauty and proportion. But what strikes me as so remarkable in this fact is that the same thing is true at the present day, when art schools are to be found all through the country, and where one would suppose that art principles would be taught and recognised, even in connection with dress. But, instead of this, what do we find? Can anything be more utterly at variance with all such principles as the fashions of even the last few years, when hats of enormous dimensions tower upon the heads of delicate and slender girls, and even children, and bonnets with standing plumes which almost rival in height the soldiers' bearskins? I have often been tempted to suggest to *Mr. Punch* that he should take up the subject of these foolish exaggerations of head-dress, and hint that the towering black plumes at present in fashion must be those of the discarded ornaments of hearses, now, happily, things of the past. Then, as to garments: We have gone from the extreme of the most enormous skirts, distended on crinolines, to those of such narrow dimensions that not a fold is to be seen in them, tightly stretched,

as they are, over the figure; but, to make amends apparently for this scanty supply of material in width, we have the addition of a trailing skirt, of all recent inventions the most objectionable from every point of view, the doctors telling us that it may even be the means of spreading serious and dangerous diseases, as well as of conveying dust and mud into the houses.[1] One would hardly think it possible that any persons could be so lacking in common-sense and decency as to persist in such methods, but so it is, and will remain till Fashion once more forbids it. Protests have been made in the papers, and even a proposal that some sort of organization should be formed to oppose it, but at present without avail. If such dresses are desired for the house or evening wear, at least they might be fastened up when walking out-of-doors—a suggestion which, it might be supposed, the common-sense of everyone would supply. One instance of the ever-varying absurdities of fashion may be forgotten by many, and I will record it. When the great glass-house was being erected in Hyde Park in 1851, the architect was asked how he meant to arrange for its being swept and cleaned daily. He replied that there was no need to provide for that: "spaces would be left between the boards of the flooring, and the ladies' trailing garments would do all the rest!" And thus they swept the streets also! The conclusion at which I have arrived on this matter is that principles of art, beauty, grace, and common-sense have nothing to do with the important subject of dress, and that we are under the tyranny of persons—I suppose in Paris—who have no knowledge of them, a tyranny in which all persons acquiesce, without a thought of rebellion, however much of health, comfort, cost, or convenience may be involved. I have more than once expressed my conviction that a great part of the opposition of sensible and educated men to the admission of women to responsible or public work is due to the absurd and exaggerated dress so conspicuous at the present time, and so suggestive of frivolity. Why cannot the example of our Princesses be followed, in their small becoming bonnets and sensible skirts? But Fashion is too tyrannical.

LOUISA TWINING.

(To be continued.)

---

[1] At a recent meeting on the "Open-air Treatment of Consumption," the following words were said by Sir James Crichton Browne: "Without this seed [of consumption] they could not have tubercular disease. The lungs of consumptive persons were the granaries from which the seed was drawn; the atmosphere was the sower that scattered it broadcast; the trailing skirt, so often seen in Mayfair, swept up from the pavement dust mixed with bacilli, and was a source of great danger." But this worse than absurd fashion is not, alas! limited to Mayfair.

Art. IV.—"HENRY VIII."[1]

MR. POLLARD'S volume is the latest addition to that splendid series which has given us Creighton's "Elizabeth," Gardiner's "Cromwell," and various dissertations about the Stuarts. This volume is equal to any of its predecessors in the quality and interest of the portraits which it contains. Those who remember the Tudor Exhibition will know what excellent materials there are to reproduce, and they should welcome, among other reproductions, Holbein's magnificent Duke of Norfolk. The coloured frontispiece of the King himself is both richer and mellower than the previous experiments in colour. Many readers may possibly regret Mr. Pollard's determination to exclude foreign portraits. Julius II., Leo X., Clement VII., Paul III., Charles V., and Francis I. were all actors in this period of English history, and most of them exist in masterpieces of portraiture. In any case, it is a pity that Erasmus was excluded. That pre-eminent wit and scholar belongs to no single nation. He is a citizen of the world, and is not affected by centuries or frontiers. His English friends, his visits here, his enchanting letters to us and about us, his connection with both Universities and his official duties at one of them, his practical service to the reformation of our theology and learning, all give us so real a claim to him that his exclusion may be described as an affront. Many of us, too, would certainly have been glad to possess an adequate reproduction of Stretes' beautiful and fascinating Edward VI., which was at the New Gallery this year, especially as no engraving of it is known to exist.

As we turn from the portraits to the history, Mr. Pollard must be congratulated and thanked for producing the best life of Henry VIII. which has yet been written. Henry and his reign have never ceased to be the subjects of partisan accounts, or the pretexts for theological disputes. Innumerable theories about the King and his period have been in fashion, and have infected almost every historian. There is the old-fashioned Protestant theory that all the proceedings of Henry and of the Reformers were absolutely right; that it was, somehow, disloyal to our constitution in Church and State to challenge their characters or their motives. There is the narrower Roman Catholic view, which can see nothing right in anything which was done by the Reformers and their partisans. From these principles we know by experience what will follow. The defects in Henry's character are made the most of. They alone are made out to be the cause, not

[1] By A. F. Pollard. Goupil. £3 3s.

only of the divorce, but of the Royal Supremacy, of the separation from Rome, and therefore of the whole development of our history and institutions. Those who adopt this view seem to ignore the actual state of the Church from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth, just as they ignore some of the chief elements in our own early and mediæval history. There is, again, that presentation of Henry VIII. which sets him before us as a King who, in the eyes of the Constitution and of Mr. Froude, can do no wrong. That view is exceedingly plausible; it removes innumerable difficulties; it is argued with unrivalled ingenuity; it is expressed in a style of unusual power and penetration. Mr. Froude's work almost attains to the simplicity and victory of genius, but it has succumbed in detail to the publication of the State Papers. I say in detail, and I use the term strictly, because I think Mr. Froude's work, in spite of all its errors, still holds the field as the strongest and truest exposition of English affairs during the sixteenth century. He saw clearly the principles and forces which were contending for the mastery of England in that "time of her visitation." He saw no less clearly that the health and life of England depended on the victory of progress and freedom, as against the forces of repression and reaction. It is quite easy to convict Mr. Froude of partiality, of passion, and of innumerable mistakes; but if ever the causes of liberty and progress should be endangered by a clerical reaction, it is probable that the country would rally to Mr. Froude's History, as an expression both of grievances and of their remedy, just as our forefathers rallied, in similar circumstances, to Foxe's "Acts and Monuments." That history, too, has been attacked in detail, and in some instances justly. Nevertheless, Foxe holds his ground in his general presentation of the case between the Reformers and the Reactionaries, or, as it might be stated, between the Church at large and the clerical profession. That is precisely Mr. Froude's position, as I conceive it, in his dramatic and patriotic handling of the battle between progress and reaction.

The State Papers prove that some of Mr. Froude's details are inaccurate, and some of his deductions untenable. His portrait of Henry VIII. will not bear examination, and his portrait of Elizabeth is even less worthy of the original; but these flaws do not affect his broad and strong conception of the principles with which Englishmen had to deal in the sixteenth century. Since Mr. Froude began to write, an immense quantity of material has been made accessible and arranged. Mr. Pollard has mastered all this information. Out of it he has constructed a new portrait of Henry VIII. It is really a finer and more flattering portrait than Mr.

Froude's. It is also truer, for it will bear minute examination; and the more thoroughly the details of the history be known, the more gratefully will Mr. Pollard's view of Henry be accepted by all impartial judges. Mr. Pollard knows the times and the characters which he describes. If his observation be minute, his vision is clear and large. It is not confined to English history. He sees that ecclesiastical and theological disputes must not be separated from political, social, economical, and intellectual affairs. He considers all the elements in a difficult and complex problem, and his conclusions are satisfying. They carry conviction with them, and should be most satisfactory to those who are most capable of judging.

Some criticism of details is generally expected from a reviewer. Some reviewers appear to think that the discovery of a blemish covers them with distinction, at the expense of the author whom they review. I have only one small blemish to point out, and I mention it only that it may be corrected, because in itself it is very unimportant. In two places Mr. Pollard speaks of "Lionel, Duke of Clarence," where he means obviously George, brother of Richard III., son-in-law of the great Earl of Warwick, father of Lady Salisbury, and grandfather of Cardinal Pole. Duke Lionel was a son of Edward III., and he married Violante of Milan. So far as I have noticed, there is no other technical error in Mr. Pollard's volume; and his literature is no less admirable and sound than his history. Like Bishop Creighton in his "Elizabeth," Mr. Pollard sees that a volume of this kind should be a personal and psychological study. It should be the drawing of a character, even more than the history of a time. In that respect, the previous volume on Charles II. leaves a great deal to be desired, and even Mr. Gardiner's "Cromwell" is not altogether satisfying. I hope we shall one day have a "William III." in this series, as well done as "Elizabeth" and "Henry VIII."

There was no period in our history so critical as the sixteenth century. It was the bridge between the mediæval and the modern world; and the way in which that bridge was crossed has decided the fate of many nations. Some nations crossed it unwillingly, looking back, and so turning into salt which hath lost its savour. Others looked forward, and accepted the new light, and followed it courageously; and they have had their reward. "Old things," as Mr. Froude has written, "were passing away, and the faith and life of ten centuries were dissolving like a dream. . . . A new continent had risen up beyond the western sea. The floor of heaven, inlaid with stars, had sunk back into an infinite abyss of immeasurable space; and the firm earth itself, unfixed from

its foundations, was seen to be but a small atom in the awful vastness of the universe." The ancient world rose again, after its burial of a thousand years. The language of the New Testament and of early Christianity was recovered. Men began to deal with realities and facts, instead of dreaming and making syllogisms. The intellectual machinery of the Middle Ages found something tangible to work upon. All this new wealth of learning and knowledge was made acceptable by the new art of printing; "the last and greatest gift," as Luther says, "by which God enables us to advance the things of the Gospel."

Into this new world Henry VIII. was born. He received its culture, and lived to see it established in his kingdom. Mr. Pollard shows him to us a young Sovereign, full not only of promise, but of performance, hailed as the inaugurator of a golden age, the first English King who was touched by the Renaissance, and one of the most accomplished of our rulers. He personified in himself the new age, and he also represented the character of his people, in their defects and limitations, as well as in their better qualities. He is presented to us a fairly industrious King, apparently amusing himself, but watching his affairs, and learning, and preparing to lay hold of them when he felt his time had come. We see him, as well, honest, enthusiastic, loyal to the established order as he found it, reverential to the Pope, respectful to the Emperor, but gradually deceived and disillusioned by his father-in-law of Aragon, by such a Pope as Julius II., by Francis I., by his wife's kinsmen of the House of Austria. Henry might have been an idealist in More's "Utopia," and he found himself in the world of Machiavelli's "Prince." Mr. Pollard has dealt very finely and skilfully with Henry's psychological development out of an inexperienced and generous youth into a stern and calculating ruler.

In spite of all his arbitrary ways, he carried the nation with him. Indeed, he could not have existed without the national support. The country wanted above all things a firm Government, and it dreaded above all things a return of the civil wars through a disputed succession. These two elements in the problem go far to explain Henry's success. To avoid a dispute about the Crown, the people were willing to see rival claimants abolished if necessary. To make the succession safer, they tolerated or encouraged all Henry's matrimonial adventures. It must be remembered that his marriage with his brother's widow was disliked and doubted from the first; that the Papal power to dispense was by no means accepted as beyond question; and that the deaths of numerous children increased the doubts and scruples, especi-

ally in the King himself. All these matters were discussed and pondered long before Anne Boleyn came upon the scene. The matter was complicated still further by the relationship of Katharine to Charles V., and by the dependence of the Pope on that Emperor. Charles maintained the cause of his aunt; though, as Mr. Pollard shows, his actions were governed to a large extent by policy and interest. Henry's case was never judged fairly. The Pope was not a free or an impartial judge. His decision was influenced by the question of the Papal States, and also by the prospects of his own House in Tuscany. It was not surprising, therefore, that Henry began to question the nature and limits of the Papal authority itself. His questions were raised at a time when scholarship was throwing a new light upon the origins of Papacy. The scandals of the Church and the obstacles placed in the way of all reform had made men long for a change. The strength of the Crown enabled the Government to deal firmly with the clergy; and so the Reformation came about. Henry undoubtedly had a good case for his first divorce. He undoubtedly spoilt it by selfishness, brutality, and folly. The divorce was not the cause of the Reformation, but it certainly was the occasion for making it a practical question. The Papal claims, it must be remembered, too, were not only challenged in England, but in every country where the civil power was not reactionary and repressive. The conduct of Henry's case was a flagrant example of Papal injustice and misgovernment. In reasserting the Royal Supremacy, Henry was not claiming or inventing new powers; he was merely strengthening ancient rights, many of which were not even dormant. In all these matters Mr. Pollard shows great skill, knowledge, and impartiality.

There is one side of the Church question upon which Mr. Pollard scarcely touches, and that is the dissolution of the Religious Orders. He does not show how this was, primarily, an economical and social question, through the immense wealth possessed by those corporations; nor how it was a political and national question, through the dependence of the Orders and of their wealth upon a foreign Power. It was a question, in that aspect of it, upon which the whole supremacy and freedom of the Crown really turned. Compromises have been accepted between the Papacy and various Rulers in these affairs, but no solution has yet been arrived at by which their clashing and incompatible claims have been adjusted. The troubles which have been caused perpetually by the Religious Orders, and the incubus which they become to every country where they are established, justify the policy of Henry and Cromwell in sweeping them away.

Mr. Pollard deals most skilfully with the question of foreign relations and policy during Henry's reign. He shows how dangerous Henry's position often was, and how he faced his difficulties with marvellous courage and ability. Upon a knowledge of these questions must depend our judgment about the various executions in Henry's reign. Those who suffered were not murdered capriciously. Their executions all had to do with intrigues about the succession, or with conspiracies aided and planned with foreign Powers, who were acting usually in the interests of the Papacy. We must lament that Sir Thomas More fell a victim to the difficult times in which he lived, and to his faith in that Papal authority which was not fully examined before his death. Fisher, as we know now, was implicated in treasonable correspondence.

Henry VIII. was a strong man, who guided us, without disaster, through a dangerous and an inevitable crisis. It was inevitable if we were to remain true to our national traditions. He "broke the bonds of Rome," in Gray's words, and secured our freedom as a Church and Nation. He gave us our place and function in the modern world. Our national freedom and our imperial growth date from his reign. To him we owe the existence and organization of our present naval power. To him, again, we owe those new landed families, the successors of the monks, who were the chief barrier against reaction under Mary, and the chief support of Elizabeth in her battles with the Papacy and Spain. Their descendants were the chief opponents of Charles I., and the leaders of the revolution against James II. Surely they have served the country better than the effete and selfish Religious Orders would have done.

Mr. Pollard sums up the whole matter by saying: "It was not Henry, but the Reformation, which put the kingdoms of Europe to the hazard. The Sphinx propounded her riddle to all nations alike, and all were required to answer: Should they cleave to the old, or should they embrace the new? Some pressed forward, others held back, and some, to their own confusion, replied in dubious tones. Surrounded with doubting hearts and unstable minds, Henry VIII. neither faltered nor failed. He ruled in a ruthless age with a ruthless hand; he dealt with a violent crisis by methods of blood and iron, and his measures were crowned with whatever sanction worldly success can give. Whether or no the history of England for the past four centuries has been all a mistake, whether or no she took the wrong path at the parting of the ways in 1529, it was well for her peace and material comfort that she had for her King, in her hour of need, a man, and a

man who counted the cost, faced the risk, and did with his might whatsoever his hand found to do."

We can have little doubt that England chose the right path at the parting of the ways: whether she have always walked in it rightly is a more dubious question. We must remember that other and deeper causes were at work than those which politics can touch. So far as this world goes, Henry's methods may be justified by stern necessity; but the methods of blood and iron would in themselves have been of no lasting use unless there had been working alongside of them those methods, not of this world, upon which kingdoms and individuals ultimately depend. We have no right to accept the great and responsible inheritance which the men of that generation have bequeathed to us without making every allowance for the dangers and difficulties of those who gained it. Among these Henry VIII. stands pre-eminent, and Mr. Pollard has done a splendid act of justice by showing his figure as it really was, dominating and guiding that terrific storm. Popular sympathy is often given too easily to those who opposed the principles and causes for the triumph of which we are indebted to Henry VIII. The King's difficulties and dangers are ignored, and the means he was driven to use against them are alone remembered. Mr. Seebohm has put that side of the case well where he says: "Who can fail to be impressed with the terrible responsibility, in the eye of history, resting upon those by whom in the sixteenth century, at the time of the crisis, the reform was refused? They were utterly powerless, indeed, to stop the ultimate flow of the tide, but they had the terrible power to turn what might otherwise have been a steady and peaceful stream into a turbulent and devastating flood. They had the terrible power, and they used it, to involve their own and ten succeeding generations in the turmoils of revolution." The descendants of Henry VIII. and his age have, at any rate, been spared from the revolutions which have devastated and still threaten some of the nations which took the other path at the time of the Reformation, just as Henry's ability and firmness saved our country from the wars and massacres which devastated the same countries in that age of trial.

ARTHUR GALTON.

ART. V.—THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AND CHURCH REFORM IN SPANISH LANDS.—I.

THE writers of the "*Tracts for the Times*" who asserted that union with the Papists is impossible evidently believed in the importance of the differences between Canterbury and Rome. They saw Rome as she is in England, but if they had seen her degradation in the Peninsula their conviction would have been strengthened and their standpoint emphasized. In this country the Gospel at Mass is read in the vulgar tongue; in Spain and Portugal in Latin. Practical contempt for the intelligent comprehension of Scripture teaching finds natural expression in the wild extravagances of Mariolatry and the universal sale of Indulgences in chapel porches and pious wareshops. A Roman Catholic lately returned from Andalucia (the holiest land of the Virgin) writes: "The Church is dying of inanition," and states, after a careful study of the religious situation, with the aid of knowledge of the language and access to the best quarters: "It is terrible to think how the Blessed Sacrament itself is made a source of extra profit. Theologians, of course, will excuse and explain, but the man in the street is not a theologian, and the effect on him is bad. He remains in the street, and does not trouble the Church. Is it any wonder that priests are looked down upon, and are not received into ordinary society? What can be their moral influence? Uneducated, and with no aspiration after better things, how can they help on the moral regeneration of their country? They retard it in every way. I must leave aside the darker colours of the picture. They are the natural result of the system" (*Pilot*, May 24, 1902). A very keen observer, after a long journey through Spain, remarks: "Ignorance is everywhere the lash that whips us all; but he who is in search of downright superstition and blind idolatry should go to Spain" (Luffman, "A Vagabond in Spain," p. 261). Again, to quote the late St. George Mivart:

"We were informed in Seville by a well-informed priest that out of a population of 118,000 not more than 500 men and 2,000 women make their Easter Communion, and that not more than 5,000 men go to Mass on Sundays." Since this was written the religious state has become much worse. Testimony to this is confirmed by close observers, and the opinion of the late English chaplain at Seville, the Rev. J. Blackburn Brown, M.A., is a striking pendant from an Anglican standpoint: "I have recently travelled through the whole length of Spain, and after several months spent in the country, during which I made careful and repeated inquiries from residents of different creeds and nationalities, besides

keeping my own eyes open, I can only say that, bad as I expected to find things, the half had not been told me. The moral and religious condition of both priests and people reminded me with terrible force of the sickening and appalling state of things when Hophni and Phinehas were priests in Israel." What has been said of Spain may be considered true of Portugal, and we can only hint at the greater degradation of the Latin lands of the New World.

Amid such surroundings infidelity and indifference are rife; the revolt from superstition has led to blind unbelief, and those who claim to be cultured and progressive ally themselves with those who profess to have no faith in God. For over one-third of a century the Bible Society has been openly working in the Peninsula, and the circulation of its precious merchandise has led to the awakening of the religious sense where it had been dead, and the dropping of the scales from many blind eyes. Men turning at times to their official teachers for guidance as to the import of the Scripture message, are at once told: "You must surrender your Bible or receive the curse of the Church." They prefer the priest's anathema to the outrage of their conscience, and become marked men. In every case in Spain persecution follows—it may be illegal detention by village tyrants, or, if the victim be a conscript, legal incarceration because he cannot worship the Host—always social ostracism must be faced, for by a strange delusion a blatant atheist may remain a true Spaniard, whereas a Bible-reading native is a pariah. Even in Spain more charitable views prevail in time, and obedience to the decalogue—the practical evidence of the acceptance of Scripture teaching—wins its way into the hearts of honest men. In Portugal, in the chief centres of population public persecution is dead, and in Mexico and South America the strident cry of a false patriotism is not invoked to give force to the hatred of a true life lived outside the Roman allegiance. The brave and earnest men who have sacrificed much for the Truth naturally group themselves into little bodies for the purpose of mutual aid and encouragement, and they are of necessity propagandists of their convictions, for they accept the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ, and long to win others to their side. They have heard of friends and teachers of the faith they love in neighbouring districts; these they seek out, as they long for soul communion and greater knowledge of God. Ministers are sent to instruct them and administer the Sacraments, and schools are opened to instruct the children in the Reformed faith; for parents naturally object to their offspring being trained in what they believe to be a travesty of the teaching of the New Testament and the doctrine of

their Saviour. The majority of the Peninsular Reformers desire to follow the historical traditions of the primitive Church in matters of Church order and public worship; in America very large sections of those who have adopted evangelical principles stand in the same old paths, and the question naturally arises: What stand ought the great Anglican communion to take with reference to those foreign Churches which three centuries after the Reformation era preach Gospel truth on Church lines?

A brief review of the position of the Churches of England, Ireland, and the United States will show what may be done and has been done in the past.

1. *The Church of England.*—The constitution of the great mother Church of the Anglican Communion places her in a position of difficulty as far as official interference on her part is concerned. She is at once an integral part of the State as well as the Church of the people. Her Bishops are appointed by the Crown, and have seats in the House of Lords. When a Bishop was sought by Churchmen in the United States the English Bishops could not act, and the wise and great philosopher, Bishop Berkeley of Cloyne, wrote to the Scottish Bishops: "My reading does not enable me to comprehend how, without an Episcopacy, the Gospel, together with all its Divine institutions, can possibly be propagated. In the present state of matters I do not see how an English Primate can, without royal license at least, if not Parliamentary likewise, proceed to consecrate any Bishop for those districts which erst were allowed to give titles to assistant Bishops. In this state of things I think the glory of communicating a Protestant Episcopacy to the United Independent States of America seems reserved for the Scotch Bishops." The difficulty of the transmission of the Episcopacy by the English Bishops to a foreign body of reformers is greatly increased when the official religion in that country is Roman Catholicism. It is at once evident that the home Episcopate cannot transmit its orders to the Peninsular Reformers without very grave difficulty, and it is naturally unwise for it to meditate any such step on the American continent.

2. *The Church of Ireland.*—Until the Disestablishment Act the Church of Ireland was united with the Church of England, and was subject to the above-mentioned limitations. After that great crisis it adopted a constitution of its own, and in the forefront placed a declaration, which, among other clauses, contains the following:

"The Church of Ireland, as a Reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby reaffirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship whereby the Primi-

tive Faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.

"The Church of Ireland will maintain Communion with the sister Church of England and with all other Christian Churches agreeing in the principles of this declaration: and will set forward, as far as in it lieth, quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people."

Obviously the Church of Ireland is free to act as it desires in the matter of transmitting the Episcopate. It is free, self-governing, deriving its authority from Christ, who is Head over all things to the Church, and its Bishops have executive freedom, limited only by its Episcopal constitution. Emphasizing its Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, and Protestant principles, living as a minority in the midst of Roman Catholics, it can sympathize with the men who hold its faith and fight for its doctrines.

3. *The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.*—This Church had its ecclesiastical independence included in the result of the great struggle for national independence. Practically, its ecclesiastical position is identical with that of the Irish Church, but many of its Bishops hold the view that the Roman Bishops so called have no jurisdiction at all, as they are merely deputies or vicars of the Pope. Whatever may be said of this opinion, it is an indication of the sturdy independence always maintained by the American Church.

Unity of action among all the branches of the Anglican Communion on vital matters is a most desirable end. A comprehensible policy of agreement on fundamental principles, with liberty of action in details, is necessary if internecine strife is to be avoided. Accordingly, the idea of a great pan-Anglican Conference arose, and every ten years in Lambeth all Bishops of the Communion are summoned—or, rather, are invited, for the organization is voluntary—to meet in London for the discussion of pressing problems of major importance. This body has no legislative authority; its influence is entirely moral; but all Churches place great weight upon its utterances. In 1878, at its second meeting, the Peninsular Reform Movement came under its notice for the first time in the form of a memorial from the Reformers requesting the consecration of a Bishop to superintend their work. The committee to which the memorial was referred resolved: "That your committee, having carefully considered a memorial addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England by four priests and certain other members of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church praying for the consecra-

tion of a Bishop, cannot but express their hearty sympathy with the memorialists in the difficulties of their position, and, having heard a statement on the proposed extension of the Episcopate to Mexico by the American Church, they venture to suggest that when a Bishop shall have been consecrated by the American Church for Mexico he might be induced to visit Spain and Portugal, and render such assistance at this stage of the movement as may seem to him practicable and desirable."

Bishop Riley—consecrated by the American Church for Mexico—visited the Peninsula, having first obtained a commendatory letter from Archbishop Tait, and by his advice synods were held in Madrid and Lisbon, and a memorial from each synod was presented to the Irish House of Bishops praying for the transmission of the Episcopate. While in the country Bishop Riley ordained and confirmed. At this time both bodies of the Reformers used in public worship the S.P.C.K. translations of the Book of Common Prayer. This was provisional, as no Prayer-Book had been compiled. A few years later service books were approved by the synods containing large portions derived from the ancient Mozarabic and Braga uses.

In 1888 the position of the Reformers was again considered by the assembled Bishops. Based on the report of a committee presided over by Bishop Harold Browne, the following resolutions were passed *nemine contradicente:*

"That with regard to the Reformers in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal struggling to free themselves from unlawful terms of Communion, we trust that they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline, and to secure such Catholic organization, as will permit us to give them fuller recognition.

"That, without desiring to interfere with the rights of Bishops of the Catholic Church to interfere in cases of extreme necessity, we deprecate any action that does not regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican communion."

No mention was made of the Mexican movement, for, unfortunately, Bishop Riley had justly incurred the censure of the American Episcopate. He proved himself intractable to brotherly counsel, and wished to have his own way. In consequence chaos followed his footsteps. The melancholy issue of the bold step of the American Church made the 1888 Conference very cautious.

At the 1897 (the Jubilee) Conference, many new facts came before the Bishops: the revival of the Mexican movement, the work among the Portuguese in South Brazil, and the

consecration of Bishop Cabrera, were all passed in review. The resolutions passed read:

"That we recognise thankfully the movement for the formation of an autonomous Church in Mexico, organized upon the primitive lines of administration, and having a Liturgy and Book of Offices approved by the presiding Bishop of the Church of the United States and his advisory Committee, as being framed after the primitive form of worship.

"That we express our sympathy with the Reformation movement in Brazil, and trust that it may develop in accordance with sound principles.

"That we repeat the expressions of sympathy (contained in the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1888) with the brave and earnest men of France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal who have been driven to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome, and continue to watch these movements with deep and anxious interest, praying that they may be blessed and guided by Almighty God."

This brief narrative plainly shows that the Bishops, realizing a solemn duty, are extremely slow and cautious in practical fulfilment. No stone had been left unturned to commit the Conference to a condemnation of the Irish Bishops who had dared, in the teeth of the wish of an advanced section of English Churchmen, headed by Lord Halifax, to consecrate a Bishop in Spain. The Conference disappointed the agitators, and their discomfiture was shown by the tone of the comments of their journals.

The action of the Conference will be better understood by a brief résumé of what had been done by the American and Irish Churches for their protégés.

1. *The American Church and Bishop Riley.*—In 1879 Bishop Riley was consecrated Bishop of the Valley of New Mexico. D. Manuel Aguas was destined for this high privilege, but he received his home call some years before the consecration took place. Dr. Riley is a Spanish-speaking native of Valparaiso, a man of great eloquence and apparently strong force of character. His striking personality seemed to mark him out as a natural leader of men. He was set apart as Bishop on the distinct understanding that until the Church had three Bishops of its own he should be associated in its government with seven Bishops (American). His clergy refused to acknowledge his authority, and he in turn refused to work with his Episcopal colleagues. No effort was spared to bring about a truce to his rebellion, and finally, after protracted negotiations, he was formally deposed from his high office, and is not acknowledged by the Mexican Church. The sad

history of this failure has never been written, but its occurrence has had a very deep effect in prejudicing the minds of the Anglican Episcopate against the transmission of the Episcopate to Latin races. Bishop Riley, in his early life, did a good work, and it is a source of great sorrow to find a life so well begun passing under a thick cloud.

2. In November, 1879, Bishop Riley in person presented to the Irish House of Bishops a memorial asking for Episcopal Orders to be given to the Peninsular Reformers. The Bishops then passed a resolution: "In the absence of any authoritative communication to us from the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church in its corporate and national capacity, it would not be conducive to the best interests of that Church or consistent with the spirit of the Lambeth resolution were the Irish Bishops to enter prematurely on the consideration of the important and difficult question to which the memorial refers." Bishop Riley, immediately after the meeting of the Bishops, visited the Peninsula, superintended the formation of synods, and in the following spring (1880) presented to the Irish Bishops duly authorized memorials praying for the consecration of Bishops for Spain and Portugal. The House of Bishops unanimously resolved that, "In the event of sufficient guarantees as to doctrine and discipline being provided by the Reformed Spanish and Lusitanian Churches, we are prepared to comply with their request as to the consecration of Bishops, all necessary canonical conditions having been complied with." It was then mentioned that Prayer-Books were in process of preparation, and the Bishops in December authorized Lord Plunket—then Bishop of Meath—to visit Spain as their representative to convey to the Reformers a message of sympathy, and to arrange for the printing of the translation of the Prayer-Books to be laid before the House of Bishops.

Archbishop Trench of Dublin strongly advocated the compilation of national service-books with roots in the early Peninsular uses, and declared he could not sympathize with any movement to transplant in the Peninsula branches of the Anglican Communion. From long and intimate knowledge of the spirit of the people, he felt that any such effort was doomed to failure. Lord Plunket made his report to the Bishops, who in December, 1881, determined, before taking further action, to submit the translated Prayer-Books to the Lambeth Committee appointed to consider such matters. Queries were asked as to (1) the probable breach of ecclesiastical order, (2) the sufficiency of the guarantees as to doctrine and discipline, (3) the expediency of the proposed consecration, and (4) the advisability of entering into a covenant with

the Reformers. Of the nine members of the committee, Archbishop Tait was ill, the Archbishop of York remained silent, the Irish Archbishops deferred their statement until they met their colleagues, and the five remaining members wrote letters which may be summarized as follows:

1. All replied that no breach of ecclesiastical order would be committed.

2. The presiding American Bishop and the Bishop in charge of the American Churches in Europe held that the formularies supplied the necessary guarantees, but the Continental Bishop regretted their vagueness on the new birth in the Baptismal Office and the omission of the oblation and invocation of the Holy Spirit after the words of Institution in the Liturgy, "an omission which deprives them of the strongest protest against the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation." The Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson) considered that the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles—with the necessary local changes—supplied the necessary guarantee in the Lusitanian Church, but thought the general basis of discipline vague. The Scotch Primus considered the Lusitanian Church supplied the necessary guarantee, but the Spanish Church did not, and the Bishop of Gibraltar thought, after a cursory examination, "the formularies very good."

3. Four of the five Bishops (the Bishop of Gibraltar being the exception) saw no reason why the Irish Bishops, if satisfied with the guarantees of doctrine and discipline, should refuse to grant the prayer of the synods, and the Bishop of Gibraltar believed the Churches had not yet attained sufficient importance to justify the compliance asked. Should the Irish Bishops comply, he suggested that the title of the Spanish Bishop should not be territorial.

4. On the question of a covenant, the Bishop of London thought this rested with the Irish Bishops, the American Bishops thought it desirable, the Scotch Primus believed it a precarious step, and the Bishop of Gibraltar said nothing.

In the meanwhile the ecclesiastical press raised a keen controversy on the subject; the Nonconformist Englishmen engaged in Spanish reform evoked sectarian strife, and in April, 1883, the entire matter was postponed until after the Lambeth Conference of 1888. The Portuguese Prayer-Book was now published, the translation having been made from a manuscript not finally approved by the synod; changes were made in the Spanish Book, and the Thirty-Nine Articles were adopted by the Church; the title of the Bishop-elect was changed to Bishop of the Spanish Reformed Church, and the work went slowly forward in the Peninsula. Bishop Cabrera explains the adoption of the Articles as the outcome of a wish

to have a definite statement of doctrine, and, as they realized the great difficulty in preparing a new one, they selected the Thirty-Nine Articles as that in accord with their opinions and the articles of religion of the Churches with which they wished to be allied. Many have criticised this step, but the development of other Episcopal Continental movements has vindicated the wisdom of the action of the synods. In the year following the Lambeth Conference (1889) the House of Bishops, while expressing its unabated interest in the movement, felt that in view of the conflict of opinion and the doubts of the competence of the Irish Bishops to consecrate a Bishop for a foreign Church with a foreign ordinal, it would be unwise for them to consecrate a Bishop. They hoped the Reformers would receive the Episcopate from a source free from the difficulties that barred their action.

An appeal was then made to the Swiss Old Catholic Bishops, who had followed the movement with sympathy. Their hands were tied by a compact with the Archbishop of Utrecht, which forbade them to take part in the consecration of a Bishop for a Church that held the Thirty-Nine Articles or similar doctrines, and although it was made plain that the formal rejection of the Thirty-Nine Articles would probably bring with it a native Episcopacy, the Reformers stood firm in their maintenance of the Scriptural truths expressed in this document.

In 1894 certain changes had taken place in the Irish House of Bishops, and the then Primate—the far-seeing Dr. R. S. Gregg—was a tried friend of the Reformers. Accordingly, at a meeting held on February 24, 1894, the historic resolution was adopted, two Bishops—Cork and Derry (Dr. Alexander)—not voting:

"That, considering the length of time during which the applications of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformers for the consecration of Bishops have been before us, the difficulties under which they have laboured, and the progress made during that time in numbers, in the adoption of liturgical services, in the building of churches, and in the formation of congregations, we would not consider it as an indefensible exercise of the Episcopate if, at the request of such congregations, the Archbishop of Dublin, who is intimately acquainted with the history of the movement and with the character of those who are carrying it on, acting in concert with two other Bishops who may be willing to act with him, either of the Church of Ireland or of a Church in communion with the Church of Ireland, should, if he shall so deem fit, proceed to Spain and Portugal, and there confer Episcopal Orders upon the two clergymen chosen in those two countries respectively

by the representatives of the said congregations, and of whose personal fitness the consecrating Bishops shall be fully satisfied."

In April, 1894, the question was discussed by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, who decided that, as such action belonged solely to the House of Bishops, the matter should be left entirely in their hands. Accordingly, in September the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishops of Clogher and Down, set out for Spain in the company of the Rev. H. E. Noyes, to whom the Reformers are much indebted for ceaseless service in their behalf, and, before taking further steps, met the synod of the Reformed Spanish Church. A concordat was entered into between the synod and the consecrating Bishops to the following effect:

1. That until the Reformers have three Bishops of their own there shall be associated with their Bishop or Bishops a Provisional Council, consisting of two or three Bishops of the Church of Ireland or of some Church in communion therewith.

2. That during the same interval the synod of the Church shall be pledged: (*a*) Not to permit the election or consecration of any Bishop for the said Church without the written consent of the Provisional Council of Bishops; (*b*) Not to alter or add to the doctrines, formularies, or discipline of the said Church without the previous approval of the Provisional Council; (*c*) To submit for the examination and sanction of the Provisional Council every resolution of a fundamental character that may be proposed for the adoption of a future synod.

3. No Bishop consecrated shall have power to consecrate for another Church without the consent of the other Bishops forming the Council.

On Sunday, September 23, the solemn service of the consecration of the Rev. Juan B. Cabrera, who had been a Roman priest, and is now the trusted leader of the Spanish Reformers, took place in a crowded church, built by the munificence of Irish Churchmen. The Irish ordinal was used, and the solemnity of service will never be forgotten by those who witnessed the stately Archbishop and his two loyal colleagues —still, happily, in our midst—laying hands on the deeply-moved Spaniard, who had suffered much for his devotion to the faith of the Gospel. The Bishops have seen no reason to regret their action, for the consecration has consolidated the work of the Church, and the wise rule of the Bishop has done much to remove difficulties and stimulate activity.

No Bishop has been consecrated for Portugal. The late loved and brilliant President of the synod, the Rev. Canon

Pope, D.D., refused to accept his unanimous election by the synod, as he felt the Church would do better under a native Bishop. After the death of Lord Plunket, the Reformers petitioned the Irish Bishops to do for them what had been done for Spain, and they resolved "That the Bishops of the Church of Ireland desire to express their sincere sympathy with the members of the Lusitanian Church in their brave struggle in behalf of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Evangelical faith, and trust that, with the blessing of Almighty God, they may increase in numbers and in influence, and become a great power in their own land. The Bishops are most anxious to assist them in any way in their power, but regret that at present they cannot proceed to the consecration of a Bishop."

It may fairly be surmised that the Bishops felt the time had not come, and that the necessary Episcopal acts, confirming and ordaining, might for some time longer be performed, on invitation, by a visiting Irish Bishop, or by Bishop Cabrera. This has been done: the Right Rev. the Bishop of Clogher and Bishop Cabrera have performed Episcopal acts in Portugal, and the synod has worked with commendable wisdom and discretion. The Portuguese service-book has been revised, and the chief points of difference from the manuscript translation are found in the Baptismal and Ordination services. In the Baptismal Office the minister may say after the baptism of the child:

"Dear brethren, let us now give thanks, and say the Lord's Prayer;" or, "Dearly beloved brethren, seeing this child is now regenerate," etc., as in the Anglican service.

As the only formulæ used in the laying-on of hands in Portugal were the Spanish and Anglican, the Portuguese Church has followed the example of the American Church, and has adopted alternative formulæ to be used at the discretion of the Bishop:

Spanish: "God Almighty grant thee the gift of the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Presbyter in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen;" or, *Anglican:* "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Irish Churchmen will note with interest that the Portuguese Reformers have adopted in the text the liberty which their Church gives its ministers in the preface to the Irish Prayer-Book. This liberty of interpretation of the baptismal formularies and the ordinal has been one of the most precious benefits the Church of Ireland derived from Disestablishment, and has made the position of many of its ministers much easier. What has been secured to English Churchmen by the Gorham judgment is officially declared by the Church of Ireland to be the right of all her sons.

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. VI.—AFTER THE CHURCH CONGRESS: "ONE THING IS NEEDFUL."[1]

IT is a vivid and touching picture which is presented to us at the close of this evening's Second Lesson, of our Lord's reception in the household of Martha and Mary. "He entered into a certain village, and a certain woman named Martha received Him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet and heard His word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to Him, and said, Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me." It is evident that the two sisters were similarly devoted to our Lord, and thankful to have Him with them. But their devotion to Him took very different forms. In Martha it took the form of eagerness to serve Him. "She was cumbered about much serving," or, as our Lord said, she was "careful and troubled about many things." The Lord whom she loved and honoured was in her house, and she could not do enough for Him; no anxiety or care or toil could be too much to bestow upon Him. But the other sister was chiefly sensible of the supreme privilege of being able, in the quiet of the home, to sit at His feet and hear His word. Both sisters had heard Him in His public ministry, and He had won the devotion of both their hearts. But Martha's instinct was at once to make some return for the blessings she had received,

[1] A sermon preached in Peterborough Cathedral on the evening of Sunday, October 12, 1902.

and to testify her affection and homage in unstinted service. With Mary, on the other hand, what she had already heard had aroused a profound craving in her soul. It did not seem to occur to her that He could need anything: she was only sensible of the infinite need of her own heart, and the moment He was in her house she was at His feet, listening to His words, and drinking the water of life which flowed from His lips. To Martha this attitude of Mary seemed a selfish one, and she almost reproaches our Lord Himself for allowing it. "Dost Thou not care," she said, "that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me." It was a very natural remonstrance, and we may well feel some sympathy with the generous heart that could not make enough of an opportunity for serving her Master, and was jealous of what to her seemed her sister's selfishness. But our Lord's answer, while recognising, with all His graciousness, Martha's care of Him and devotion to Him, yet indicates that His approval rested chiefly on the sister whose main anxiety was to receive from Him and not to give to Him, to hear Him rather than to serve Him. "Martha, Martha," He said, "thou art careful and troubled about many things, but one thing is needful, and Mary hath chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her." If, indeed, it were a matter of doing Him honour, the highest honour that could be paid Him was to look to Him for more and more faith and life, to sit humbly at His feet and to receive His gifts. It was not, after all, mere selfishness which brought Mary to His feet; it was a sense, and a just sense, of the soul's need, and of the infinite gifts the Saviour had to bestow. He, after all, wanted nothing—she wanted everything; she had chosen the good portion, and the Saviour's sympathy rested upon her.

It is to be borne in mind, then, in learning the lesson of this story for ourselves, that the example set before us is that of two types of genuine Christian devotion. The contrast between the two sisters is not between a worldly and a devout character, not between a woman whose mind was entirely engaged in her household cares, and another whose soul was wholly absorbed in religious devotion; but between two women who were similarly devoted to the Saviour, and who showed that devotion in distinct manners—one by being wholly occupied with the thought of what she could do for the Saviour, of the service she could render Him; the other being overpowered by the thought of what the Saviour could do for her, of the enlightenment He could bring to her, the life He could pour into her soul, of the immeasurable

blessing of sitting at His feet. Is it not a lesson we have need to take to heart, that the sympathy, if not the approbation, of our Lord is given rather to the second type of devotion than to the former? Is there not a tendency in us, not unconnected, as has been said, with generous impulses, to think that the nobler type is the one that gives, rather than the one that receives, and that to be cumbered about much service, when that service is rendered to One who is worthy to receive all honour and homage, is something nobler than simply to ask for more blessings, to crave for more grace and more life? But in our Lord's answer to Martha He intimates that such a judgment rests on a very inadequate sense on our part of the relations between us, of His infinite grace and of our infinite need. All the service that we can render Him, all that we can give Him, are as nothing in comparison with Him. As David exclaimed, when dedicating the treasure he had prepared for the Temple, "Who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? For all things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee. . . . All this store that we have prepared cometh of Thine hand and is all Thine own." On the other hand, we render Him the deepest of all homage when, in this conviction that all things come from Him, we open our hearts, our minds, our whole natures, to His gracious influences, to His word, to His Spirit, when we seek to be moulded by Him into the character, the image and the likeness, for which He has designed us; and when, consequently, we make it our chief object to sit at His feet, to listen to Him, and to be inspired by Him. And if, like Mary, we go so far as even to subordinate our service of Him and worship of Him to hearing His word and receiving His grace, we may be sure, at least, of the sympathy and, perhaps, of the approval of the Saviour.

Such a lesson, perhaps, comes before us not inappropriately at the conclusion of a week in this Diocese in which a large gathering of clergy and laity have been discussing in Congress numerous questions of Christian duty and Christian life. A Church Congress is visible evidence that the members of the Church are careful and troubled about many things. The question of the mutual relations of the various bodies into which Christians in this country are unhappily divided; the question of public worship in the Church of England, its duty and its ideal, and whether that duty and that ideal are adequately realized in our Book of Common Prayer; the question of the relation of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount to our

social obligations and to economical problems; the question of temperance; the question of the maintenance of religion in the home under the conditions of modern life; the question of the elementary education of children throughout the country; the question of the compatibility with modern science of our belief in the miraculous acts recorded of our Lord—these are certainly sufficiently numerous and sufficiently grave problems to render men careful and troubled. In respect to many of them, we may well be described as, like Martha, cumbered about much serving. The energies and time of the clergy, in particular, are absorbed in many of such practical questions to a degree which, as they feel and lament, often hampers their spiritual life and devotion, and they might well echo Martha's cry to our Lord: "Dost Thou not care that I am left to serve alone? Bid others therefore that they help me." As this narrative in the Gospels well illustrates, there is a considerable danger in this intense activity in matters of public worship and national service. That danger is that we may be so cumbered with much serving as to have no sufficient time or thought left for the receptive side of the Christian life, for listening patiently to the teaching of God, for sitting at the feet of the Saviour, and obtaining from Him the guidance, the truth, and the life, which alone can enable us to deal aright with the practical problems by which we are encompassed and encumbered. We are in danger, in short, of forgetting that, however numerous and urgent the practical problems of the present day, it remains always true that there is one thing—one thing above all—needful, and that no activity, no devotion, no earnestness in service, can compensate for its neglect. That one thing needful is the portion which Mary chose, the truth, the grace, and the life which are derived from communion with the Saviour in the various ways of His appointment, in His Word, in His sacraments, and in prayer. This is the one test which we should do well to apply to every problem which we have to face, and to every course of action by which it is proposed to solve it. Are we leaving due room for the portion of Mary as well as for that of Martha, for the one thing needful, as well as for the much serving, and the "many things" which the claims of the day impose upon us? We shall often find that this simple test will be an invaluable guide, and will save us from many an error.

Take, for instance, the question of Education, by which the country is now so distracted, and which this week is once more to distract the thoughts and the energies of Parliament. Amidst all the confusions of the discussion, let us never forget

that there is one thing needful, and that is that the children of England should be brought up to sit at Jesus' feet and to hear His word. In the service of the children there are many other things about which statesmen and the friends of Education are anxious and troubled, and justly; and, like Martha, they are often impatient that the ministers and the friends of religion should seem occupied rather with questions of religious education than with those of secular instruction. No doubt that secular instruction is of incalculable importance to the material prosperity of the country; but its material prosperity would not last long if its moral and religious welfare were not maintained; and that of which true Christian men must all be convinced is that that moral and religious welfare is absolutely dependent on its children learning, in such a manner as never to forget it in after life, to sit at the feet of Jesus and to hear His word. Whatever other instruction may be required, this is, at least, the one thing needful. I ventured to say that all Christian men were convinced of this truth. But if they all took it to heart as they ought, could there be the lamentable dissensions, which are our danger and our shame, respecting the conditions under which the word and the will of Jesus should be taught to the children? If Christian men not merely acknowledged, but duly realized, the paramount importance to every human soul, the paramount need for every child, of knowing that the Lord Jesus is its only Saviour in this world and in the next, and of sitting at His feet in life and in death—if they duly realized this, would they not find some means of agreeing to let His words be heard in every school in the land, and of averting the awful danger, a danger of which some public men seem to speak with a light heart, of His words being banished from all schools which rest on public support. Let us, in the midst of this controversy, settle in our minds as the one thing needful, that, notwithstanding the "many things" required for the service of education, time and means should be found for bringing children to sit at Jesus' feet and to hear His word. Let us realize it as our primary duty to see that that portion is not taken away from the children of England. Let that obligation, that solemn responsibility, be realized, and we shall doubtless find the means of fulfilling it.

Or apply the same principle, again, to the question of the maintenance of religion in the home, under the conditions of modern life. We know what is meant by that reference to the conditions of modern life. We know that it refers to the strain, the hurry, the incessant occupation which modern life involves. It means that the man and woman and the whole household

are, like Martha, cumbered with much serving, and that time is grudged, and is hardly found, for the family prayer, and for the family reading of the Scriptures, which formed an essential part of the life of our fathers. But time would be found if we were convinced, as our fathers were, that to sit at the feet of Jesus and to hear His word is the one thing needed for the soundness, for the happiness, for the best graces of family life; and that unless the voice of Jesus is heard day by day, the warmth of His love and the light of His truth cannot be duly felt in the home. It is not merely, as Martha thought, in order to serve Him—though that is of itself an imperative duty—that the family should be gathered at His feet every day; but it is to hear His word, like Mary, to receive that good and gracious portion, which is the one thing needful, and which, through all the anxieties of the day, cannot be taken from us—it is for this that regular family prayer is the greatest of all necessities for the household. Look upon it only in the light of a duty, and you may be tempted to explain it away; you may reason that God does not need such service, or at least that He will excuse you from it under the pressure of your cares and labours. But look on it, like Mary, as your supreme privilege to have the opportunity, day by day, of bringing yourself and those who are dear to you to the feet of Jesus, to hear His word, and you will find the same time for that one thing needful for your souls as you do for all the things you feel to be needed for the body.

Or look again at another of the subjects which was the occasion of anxious discussion at the Congress—the question of the ideal of worship and the adequacy of our services in the Church of England. Approach that question from the point of view of Martha alone; look solely at the question of the service you are rendering to Almighty God, and you will find there are no limits to the development of it which are possible, and to the practical problems which may be presented to you. A grand cathedral like this is the best evidence of the extent to which men may go, and may nobly and religiously go, in devoting all the wealth of art and music, and ceremony and architecture, to the honour and glory of God. No check can well be placed upon the impulses of love and gratitude and adoration which led men in the past—and, thank God, lead them still—to offer, like David, the gold and the silver, and the precious stones and all manner of workmanship, as well as all the glories of music and ceremony, for the service of the house of God. But it has again and again happened in the history of the Christian

Church, and it may in too many cases be seen now, that while men are thus careful and laborious, in the spirit of Martha, in offering their service and making their sacrifices to God, they forget to give its due place to that other purpose for which churches are built and services ordered, that men and women may sit, like Mary, at the feet of Jesus and hear His word. The service we render to God may be so elaborated, and so crowded with ceremony and art and music, as not to leave an adequate place for that hearing of God's Word and that submission to His holy inspiration on which we may be assured that, as in the case of Mary, He looks with the deepest sympathy. After all, as Solomon exclaimed, "the heaven, and the heaven of heavens," cannot contain Him. How much less can our noblest temples and our most splendid worship be worthy of Him! But, as Isaiah says, if He dwells in the high and holy place, He dwells also "with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit; to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." That to which He loves to devote His glory and His grace is to comfort, to purify, to inspire the minds of those who wait upon Him, who sit at His feet, who crave for His truth and grace. Accordingly, to bring God's word and God's grace, through the Scriptures and the Sacraments, to the souls of all who come to worship at His feet may be regarded as one thing needful and indispensable in Divine service. If any developments of worship obscure or hinder that purpose they are wrong, and the fitness of all such developments may, to a great extent, be judged by the degree in which they are compatible with this object. It is the peculiar characteristic of the service of the Church of England that she makes more provision than any Church in the world for the reading of God's word to her children, and for the administration of the Sacraments in such a way as to impress upon all who receive them the manner and the purpose of their original institution by Christ Himself. It becomes us, moreover, individually, ever to be present in Church in the spirit of Mary, no less than in that of Martha, and never to be so cumbered about the many things involved in our service as to forget, with the deepest humility and devotion, to sit at Jesus' feet and to hear His word.

These are but illustrations of the manner in which this declaration by our Saviour of the one thing needful serves to guide us amidst the distractions of modern problems and difficulties. It is the privilege of the Christian Church that its Lord is with it alway, even to the end of the world. Though He is not visible, His words are in our hands, and

His Spirit represents Him. Let us bear in mind that, side by side with all our activities, all our labours, all our sacrifices, if such there be, there remains one thing ever needful—to sit at Jesus' feet and to hear His word. All else will pass from us—all this visible world, with all its energies, its splendours, its infinite attractions; but if we choose as our own that one good portion of the word and the grace of the Lord, we shall possess that which shall never, not even by death, be taken away from us.

HENRY WACE.

The Month.

THE Church Congress at Northampton was a very interesting one, and some of its debates were well worth careful attention. One of its conspicuous features was a most striking address to the working men by the Bishop of London. He seemed to feel at home in addressing a body of men who reminded him of his old friends in Bethnal Green, and he urged some cardinal Christian truths on their attention with a force, a directness, and a transparent conviction all his own. There was sufficient humour and good humour in the address to lighten and sweeten it, but it was quite free from any of that strain of mere familiarity which too often mars the tone of speakers on such occasions. The charm of it is that the Bishop himself is so distinctly visible behind it, and it is a conspicuous instance of the impressiveness of a true and earnest Christian man, speaking out of the genuineness of deep conviction and in entire sympathy with his audience. Addresses like this from a man in the position of the Bishop ought to strengthen greatly the influence of Christianity and of the Church among others than the class to whom it was more particularly directed.

The discussion of miracles will, on the whole, contribute to strengthen belief in the supernatural narratives of the Gospels, but on the other hand it revealed a very mischievous tendency in the latest school of Oxford speculation. That tendency amounts to nothing less, as its chief spokesman avowed, than a disposition to reduce the miraculous in the Gospels to its lowest possible point, until it is distinctly suggested that even the Incarnation itself may be explained without involving a miracle. It ought to be more plainly recognised than it seems to be by some of the leading theological authorities at Oxford that such a view must prove in practice, whether it may be in the personal convictions of those who represent it, absolutely incompatible with the Creeds and with a natural interpretation of the Epistles. It is vain to attempt to minimize the supernatural character of our Lord's person, life, and ministry in this way. As was shown in one of the papers, the supernatural powers of our Lord are essential to His revelation and to His real power as a Saviour, and though it may seem easier at first to accept a Christ who is but half the sacred and Divine reality, the belief in the whole Christ, both God and man, will really be found easier, both to faith and to reason, in the long-run. The discussion on the Old Testament showed signs that the real bearings of the prevalent school of criticism are beginning to be appreciated, and in consequence to be distrusted. If

criticism were simply an analysis of the various sources from which the books of the Old Testament were compiled, it would be interesting, and would not gravely affect practical issues. But when it requires, as was plainly avowed at the Congress, that the conception of the course of Jewish history entertained, not merely by the Christian Church, but by the Apostles themselves, must be revolutionized, practical clergymen realize that the gravest difficulties are placed in the way of ordinary readers of the Scriptures. If St. Paul was mistaken about the whole course of Jewish history, his authority as an interpreter of the revelation of God to the Jews is fatally undermined; and if the impression which the historical books of the Bible naturally convey of the course of that history is erroneous, it will be idle to speak of their inspiration. But if we are deprived of the inspiration of the Old Testament and of Apostolic authority in the New, the position of the Christian faith will become very difficult to defend. When a clergyman of distinction compares the historic value of Scriptural narratives to the historic value of the play of "Macbeth," we may well seem to have reached a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*, and may feel very confident that there is some latent error in the professorial methods. In another field of thought and action a similar *reductio ad absurdum* was presented in Mr. Athelstan Riley's confident argument that, on the principles he represented, image worship was as harmless as the intellectual apprehension of Divine things, and was practically indispensable to the maintenance of the Catholic faith. The social discussions of the Congress were also of much interest and instructiveness.

Parliament is now engaged in considering the Education Bill, and the bitter controversy which the Nonconformists have maintained during the recess is being brought to its practical issue. Mr. Balfour, in a strong speech at Manchester, has declared his resolution to pass the Bill in substance as it stands, and Mr. Chamberlain has distinctly announced that its defeat would mean the resignation of the Ministry. On the other hand, the Nonconformist opposition has reached the irrational length of declaring, through Dr. Clifford, that if the Bill passes he will take—or attempt to take—the unconstitutional, if not impossible, course of calling on the King to veto it. When a party have worked themselves into this degree of irrational excitement they are likely to lose the respectful attention of the mass of the English people, and the Archbishop of Canterbury is probably right in the quiet confidence he has exhibited in his Charge that the Bill will pass into law. But it must be owned that it will raise very anxious questions, and questions for the Church as well as for Nonconformists.

Reviews.

An Eirenicon for Churchmen. By W. B. BRADSTOCK. Elliot Stock.

THIS is a singularly candid and honest inquiry into the existing circumstances of the Church of England. It is full of practical sagacity, and of that disposition to look facts in the face and acknowledge their existence which is unhappily somewhat rare amongst controversialists. And yet the remedy proposed by the author for our present troubles seems to be almost quixotically impracticable. It is "that the Bishops should make a short, collective, and unanimous declaration as to what doctrines now held more or less within the Church of England are (1) obligatory on its members, (2) alternative, (3) entirely optional, and (4) to be rejected." No doubt there are very obvious advantages in such a declaration, but who will bell the cat in the way of inducing the Lambeth Conference to draw it up? Or how do we know that the Bishops would agree? And in order for the declaration to be of the slightest use it must be unanimous, or one diocese might have different doctrines from another. Scores of objections, indeed, occur to the mind. Surely the author himself has his misgivings when, referring to the necessity of a Bishop keeping a neutral position in optional matters, he writes: "The late Bishop of Liverpool and the present Archbishop of York furnish examples of the kind of conduct which I suggest should be avoided in the future." The immediate value of this little book lies in its honest and genial tone, and the practical shrewdness and sagacity of its counsel to clergymen and laymen. Occasionally the author develops a turn for epigram—*e.g.*: "The first thing to be done is to get at the greatest common measure of your parishioners;" or this, "Dissenters ought not to be regarded as fore-cabin passengers to heaven." The following, too, is a wise caution: "If, unhappily, you have to protest, at least let it be about a vital difference." We have no hesitation in saying that, if the tone and temper of this little book were prevalent amongst Church-people, we should, at least, have more acquiescence, if not agreement.

Under Calvin's Spell. By D. ALCOCK. R.T.S.

The mere name of this story makes us think of Geneva, and it is indeed in that old town that the scene is laid. Probably Geneva under Calvin presents a unique spectacle of an attempt at a pure theocracy. He was a wonderful man, and as for the town—do we not all know it? where the Latin struggles with the Teuton in the blood of the people,

bestowing on them both German sobriety and French vivacity. What would Calvin say now if he could see the immense and luxurious hotels and the gaudy municipal Casino? He might find some consolation in the reflection that still no Roman priest is allowed to wear his distinctive garb in the streets for more than twenty-four hours; but we fear that of many Genevese it is true that, while Protestantism has been preserved, evangelicalism has evaporated.

The story is brightly told; the history is accurate and fair. The conflict between Calvin and the Libertines, the fate of Servetus, the final absolutism of Calvin, all is there. In the purely narrative parts we are introduced to the loves of Norbert de Caulaincourt, a young French refugee, and Gabrielle Berthelier, a Genevese girl. As Norbert's love was true, needless to say its course was not smooth; but all ends well, and the young lady turns out to be a Savoyard heiress. There is not a dull page in the book, and the general accuracy makes one regret such occasional mistakes as Annecy, Chambery, and Farrel (the Reformer). The illustrations are not good. On the whole, the story will prove undeniably interesting to boys and girls alike, and conveys at the same time a great mass of useful information.

Flash-lights for English Churchmen. By the Rev. W. B. RUSSELL CALEY, *Home Words* Publishing Office.

These "Flash-lights" are seven chapters dealing with well-known points at issue between the English and Roman Churches, such as the authority of Scripture and tradition, the denial of the cup to the laity, the seven Sacraments, etc. There is a vigorous introduction by the Bishop of Sodor and Man, and the author himself gives no uncertain sound. We do not, indeed, think that a strong case is strengthened by the use of such expressions as that of calling the Roman Church "this great masterpiece of Satanic ingenuity." No one, however, could take exception to the statements regarding the doctrine of each Church which are made in this little book; they are scrupulously fair, and the arguments by which the views of the English Church are supported are well and clearly put. We like best, perhaps, the chapter on the "Power of the Ministry"; but the book as a whole will be useful to those who do not require to go very deeply into the subject, but to gain a general grasp of the fundamental points of difference.

Philippa in her Youth and Middle Age. By MARY E. SHIPLEY. Elliot Stock.

At the close of many a story one would gladly know what becomes of the hero or heroine some ten or twenty years afterwards. In the present case the authoress is good enough to tell us on her title-page that we are to have Philippa Somerton in youth and also in middle age. And it is well that this is so, for as a girl the Rector's daughter is not altogether lovable or interesting, in spite of, or perhaps just because of, the very high opinion she has of herself. Still, there is much goodness in

Philippa, else she could not have won the affection of such girls as the Wilmots ; and she tries, after all, bravely to do her duty at home, where there is no mother to guide her. The third family at Beecham introduced are the Telfers, who live at the Hall, the Lady Mary being amusingly proud of her ancestors and their titles. Cupid, who is, of course, always on mischief bent, makes Clara Telfer of the Hall and Guy Wilmot fall in love, and many a strange thing has to happen before Lady Mary can be induced to give her consent to their marriage. So the first part of the story ends with wedding-bells after all, though not for Philippa ; she has been busy at home teaching brothers and sisters, passing examinations, and starting "societies" among her friends and acquaintances, for she is an ambitious young person.

In Part II. we have Philippa about forty years of age, though looking much younger and still full of energy. Upon the death of an aunt she has been left utterly alone, and is compelled to earn her own livelihood. We get a sad glimpse into the struggle where women have to fight the battle of life for themselves. But good fortune overtakes poor Philippa at last, when help seemed very far off. It comes in a truly romantic form through her early friendship with the Wilmots, and we have the pleasantest picture of what may be accomplished when sympathetic and generous-hearted folk work in harmony together. Truly one would like to have had a peep into that pretty Midland village where Mr. Wilmot started a library for Philippa's benefit—a village that promised to grow in reputation owing to the discovery of useful mineral waters. It was uphill work at first for Philippa and the young friend who joined her there, but all goes well in the end. We leave our heroine about to become the wife of Sir George Lamond, a gentleman who made good use of the library and reading-room, which were so well managed, and he had long admired the courage and energy Philippa displayed in her work. The story is admirable, and must prove a favourite with young girls. The authoress seems to have some of the charm we find in the books of Charlotte Yonge, to whom we see the story of Philippa is dedicated.

The Maid at Arms. By R. W. CHAMBERS. Archibald Constable and Co.

In "The Maid at Arms" Mr. Chambers presents us again with a romance based upon an historical subject, and, as in his "Cardigan," we have a tale full of dash and adventure. The story portrays the terrible and anxious times of the American War of Independence—terrible because the fierce Mohawks, the Oneidas, and other savage tribes had been allowed to join in the struggle. The heroine, Dorothy Varick, in keeping with her sobriquet—the maid at arms—is a girl full of the adventurous spirit which the stirring times and her upbringing have aroused in her ; yet where could more tenderness and true womanliness be found than in all her relations with her cousin Ormond ? For it is Dorothy's fate to love this cousin, who has come from the far South, with a love that is irresistible, although, for duty's sake and to please her

father, she has promised to wed Sir George Covert, a promise, moreover, which she means to hold sacred. Ormond, unaware that his young and fascinating cousin has already plighted her troth, has fallen as deeply in love with Dorothy, and the manner in which they endeavour remain true to themselves and to their honour under the trying circumstances is told with much charm and naïveté. The author, while carrying on our unflagging interest in the exciting and stirring scenes between the hostile parties and their scouts, and in the fortunes of Dorothy and her noble-hearted lover, at the same time gives those who read more carefully many graphic pictures of the country in which his characters play their part—the grand primeval forests and vast plains of Northern America, which in those days were traversed only by narrow tracks and pathways. The account given of the fierce battle of Oriskany reminds one only too vividly of similar scenes enacted during the late war in Africa. Mr. Chambers shows careful work in the study of the many and varied figures that flit across his pages, from Cato, the faithful old negro servant of Sir Lupus Varick, to the Huron witch, in her scarlet rags, who could race through the forests at such speed that but few could overtake her, and whose vehement harangues roused many of the savage tribes to take up the cause of the Confederacy against the British troops. We are introduced also to many of the military commanders. The tale is both stirring and instructive, and many who have but little knowledge of what led to the War of Independence in our splendid colony of America will very likely be led to look up that page in our history.