

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

In demy 8vo., handsomely printed in large type, and bound in cloth, price 7s. 6d. net.

KEY TO THE HEBREW PSALTER. By the Rev. GEORGE AUGUSTUS ALOOCK, Ethical Moderator and Graduate in Honours of Trinity College, Dublin.

A Lexicon and Concordance combined, wherein are all the Words and Particles which occur in the Book of Psalms, the verses in which to find them, together with their chief Inflections, Roots, etc.

"The amount of care and research which Mr. Alcock must have devoted to his task is little less than marvellous."—*Irish Times*.

"The work deserves the highest commendation."—*English Churchman*.

In foolscap 8vo., paper boards, price 3s. 6d.

ST. PAUL. Addresses delivered in London. By the Rev. ROWLAND W. CORBET, late Rector of Stoke-on-Tern, Author of "Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day."

"Mr. Corbet has evidently been a careful student of St. Paul, and of the expounders of his doctrine, the bearing of which in its personal, social and general, relations he discusses in a manner which by its earnestness cannot fail to command respect."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"A simple and suggestive exposition, from the point of view of Anglican Divinity, of the spiritual teaching in the Epistles commonly attributed to St. Paul."—*Scotsman*.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 3s. 6d.

SERMONS OF THE AGE. Thirteen Sermons. By the Rev. T. MEREDITH WILLIAMS, B.A., Vicar of Llanarth, Cardiganshire.

"Mr. Williams treats the various topics embraced in this volume most skillfully. The whole volume deserves attention, and we hope it will have an extensive circulation."—*Llan*.

In crown 8vo., gilt lettered, price 1s. 6d. net.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. Five Ordination Addresses. By the Rev. R. G. HUNT, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

"A wise and timely contribution to the subject of pastoral training. Admirable in tone and spirit, thoroughly sane, and profoundly evangelical. The truth is put with great clearness and directness."—*Weekly Leader*.

In large crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 6s.

PREACHING and PREACHERS: Criticisms and Suggestions. By JOSEPH GOWAN.

"A quaintly interesting volume. Mr. Gowan has swept his net through many seas, and brings to land some interesting captures."—*S. S. Chronicle*.

"It is altogether one of the most thoroughly practical works on the subject we have read."—*The Rock*.

"Full of practical suggestions likely to be useful to preachers who are willing to accept friendly criticism."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

In demy 8vo., tastefully printed on thick paper, price 1s. net.

EVIL, NOT EVERLASTING. A Paper read in outline before the Rugeley Branch of the Society of Sacred Study. By Rev. OSMOND DOBREE, M.A., of the University of Dublin, Prebendary of Lichfield, Vicar of Colwich.

"The author treats the subject in admirable spirit."—*Christian Commonwealth*.

In paper cover, price 6d.

THE DISPUTED PUNCTUATION OF THE CHURCH CATECHISM. By the Rev. N. DIMOCK, A.M.

HODDER & STOUGHTON'S PUBLICATIONS.

THE RELIGIOUS SENSE IN ITS SCIENTIFIC ASPECT.

By GREVILLE MACDONALD, M.D. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

1. The Religion of Service. 2. The Religion of Renunciation. 3. The Religion of Freedom.

LOMAI OF LENAKEL: A Hero of the New Hebrides. A Fresh

Chapter in the Triumph of the Gospel. By FRANK H. L. PATON, B.D. (Son of Dr. John G. Paton), for

Six Years Resident Missionary on the West Coast of Tanna. Illustrated. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

Morning Post.—"Mr. Paton has contributed a remarkable chapter to the annals of the heroic work of the missionaries in the dark places of the earth."

Church Family Newspaper.—"The volume is one of the most remarkable of recent missionary records; it is written in a most interesting style, and is well illustrated."

RITSCHLIANISM: Expository and Critical Essays. By Rev.

JAMES ORR, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow. Just published. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

VISION AND AUTHORITY; or, The Throns of St. Peter. A

Study of the Nature and Object of the Church's Authority. By Rev. JOHN OMAN, M.A., B.D. (Alnwick). Crown 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

Spectator.—"This extremely stimulating and thoughtful work."

Glasgow Herald.—"It is seldom indeed that a reviewer has the good fortune to come upon a book like this, by which a comparatively unknown author passes at a bound into the front ranks of serious religious thinkers."

THE PROGRAMME OF THE JESUITS: A Popular Exposition.

By W. BLAIR NEATBY, M.A., Author of "A History of the Plymouth Brethren." Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Church Family Newspaper.—"The Programme of the Jesuits' is one of those books that should set people thinking. Mr. Neatby has rendered good service in compiling this popular exposition, and it ought to be in everybody's hands. . . . He rightly insists upon the magnitude of the influence possessed by the Jesuits; nor can the British electorate afford to shut its eyes to the plain truths enunciated with so much vigour in these stirring pages."

HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

In Crown 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.

THE GOAL OF THE UNIVERSE

or, The Travail of the World's Saviour.

By S. W. KOELLE, Ph.D.,

Author of "Mohammed and Mohammedanism Critically Considered."

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.

THE book containing the record of God's revelations begins with the creation of man, but immediately follows the statement that, by the creature's own failure in a testing time, sin has entered into the world, and brought with it a long train of evils, including death. These opening portions of the Bible furnish the necessary light for the right apprehension of all later developments in the history of the human race. What follows in the Sacred Word is a record of the various measures adopted by the Creator for the recovery of His creatures and the restitution of His world to its original 'goodness.' The religion of the Bible is a religion of restoration; its central figure is a 'Saviour'; it is the Creator become the Saviour.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

THIRD EDITION NOW READY.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

VITAL RELIGION;

OR,

The Personal Knowledge of Christ.

BY

Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.,

Principal of Bede College, Durham.

“The keynote of this interesting and beautiful book is the thought that religion is essentially the life of friendship and intimacy with God revealed in Jesus Christ. . . . We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily commend it to all thoughtful readers, especially to those who lament the ‘decay of experimental religion.’ The present volume is a solid contribution to the solution of the problem how ‘to find a basis for faith in actual experience.’”—*Guardian*.

“Dr. Walpole writes with a true moral passion. He pleads for a deeper, more intimate, more vital knowledge of God. Nothing could be more appropriate in a series calling itself ‘The Church’s Outlook for the Twentieth Century’ than a volume like this, that sends us back to the fountain and source of all spiritual life.”—*New York Churchman*.

“The perusal of that high-toned book has been to us a source of refined pleasure.”—*Weekly Leader*.

“We must congratulate Dr. Walpole on having produced a very valuable work. It is of supreme importance that the personal element in religion should not be neglected, and that due attention be paid to the development of inner spiritual life. Dr. Walpole calls attention to real needs, and he gives excellent advice as to the means of satisfying them.”—*Pilot*.

“No one who wishes to follow his argument will regret the half-crown it costs, so exceedingly helpful and uncommon is his treatment of the profoundest of all subjects—Living union with our Living Lord.”—*Church Bells*.

“This is a fresh and interesting presentation of a perennially important subject. . . . The book is characterized by a spirit of true devotion to our Lord, and is marked throughout by earnestness of thought and appeal.”—*Life of Faith*.

“Contains many new and helpful thoughts.”—*Mission Field*.

“It has the tone of sincere and earnest piety and the ring of honest conviction. In other words, we like the book and we like the personality which seems to lie in peace and confidence behind it.”—*Saint Andrew*.

“There is a deal of force in the author’s words about marriage, the shams of so-called worship, prayer, attitude, and daily duty.”—*Family Churchman*.

“Many and weighty thoughts are expressed on the subject, which deserve careful consideration.”—*Liverpool Mercury*.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

1d.
Many
Illustrations.

THE SUMMER HOLIDAY GIFT FOR ALL.

Mission
Price,
5s.
per 100.

Special Notice.—SUPPLY EXHAUSTED.

** The Supply of "Sunday all the Year" is exhausted; but a **Large New Edition** will be ready in a week or two, specially adapted by New Papers and Illustrations for "**A Summer Holiday Gift for all.**"

** A few copies of the **Whitsuntide Edition** have been reserved, and a **Specimen** will be sent to any Clergyman wishing to further the Circulation of the Summer Holiday Edition.

The **Mission Price** of the "Summer Holiday Edition" will be **5s. per 100.** This is necessary to meet the **actual cost of production**, irrespective of any trade margin. The Number is marvellously cheap, and would make an ordinary Shilling Volume.

The Parish Local Press Mission for the 20,000,000 in England "outside our Father's House."

or,
God's Gold
and
God's
Flowers.



or,
God's Gold
and
God's
Flowers.

Containing a new Sunday Tale, in six chapters, by EDWARD GARRETT, entitled "**MARK LORIMER.**" With other Papers and Fine Art Illustrations.

Arranged by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., Editor of **THE DAY OF DAYS,** "**HOME WORDS,**" Etc.

The Archbishop of Armagh, Dr Alexander, writes to the Editor:

You bring me face to face with a *terrible and unexpected fact* when you tell me that *twenty millions, rich as well as poor,* are never seen in any church in the compass of these islands. May you find a blessing in your attempt to make the *Press*, in some measure, a Pulpit, through the agency of a Parish Local Press Mission."

EARLY ORDERS.

It will greatly aid the Publisher in ensuring speedy supply of the New Edition if Orders can be sent as early as possible.

100 Copies for 100 Homes, or 600 Population, for 5s.

500 Copies for 500 Homes, or 3,000 Population, for £1 5s.

This is scarcely more than the cost of Bills announcing Sermons, and the effort would be almost sure to fill the Church.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain 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 WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.

324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

EDUCATIONAL.

WEYMOUTH COLLEGE.

A fully equipped Public School

in which Boys are definitely prepared for the Universities, any of the Professions, or for Business Life. Very healthy situation by the sea. Splendid Fields for Cricket and Football. Reduction made for the sons of Clergy and Officers. The religious teaching of the school is Protestant and Evangelical.

Apply to H. C. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A., The College, WEYMOUTH, Dorsetshire.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE,

Near TENBURY, WORCESTERSHIRE.

BOYS thoroughly prepared for Public Schools. Most healthy situation; large playing fields and Fives Courts; separate cubicles. Head master, REV. W. A. RENWICK, M.A., late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford.

APPLY: REV. THE WARDEN.

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching. Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium. Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy materially reducing Fees.

For Prospectus apply: Rev. H. JOHNSON, Head Master.

ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LTD.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.
FIRE INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE.
 The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., which are for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., 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.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.
 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, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.
 JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., Secretary and Actuary.

THE SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND)

Employs 70 Jews at Abraham's Vineyard, Jerusalem, in cultivation of ground, quarrying and dressing stone, building, and olive oil soap making, and distributes drinking water to many hundreds of poor Jews who have no supply from—rock-hewn cisterns, constructed by Jews on the vineyard. Also gives clothing and food to 1,500 mothers, mostly sick, feeble, or blind, with families.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED that more of the starving Jews may be employed.

CONTRIBUTIONS THANKFULLY RECEIVED by—

F. A. BEVAN, *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

Messrs. DRUMMOND, *Bankers*, 49, CHANCING CROSS, S.W.

AND BY

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

where the Olive Oil Soap may be had for 4/- per doz. tablets, post free.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£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, barge-men, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours

are occupied. Expenditure in 1902, £46,642.

Increased Contributions and Offerings, 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*.

SUMMER HOLIDAYS.

Cook's Select Conducted Arrangements.

PARIS, VERSAILLES, and FONTAINEBLEAU.

Special Limited Party, leaving every Wednesday.
PARIS and SWITZERLAND, including Furka and
Grimsell Passes, Chamounix, etc., fortnightly from
July 9th.

PARIS, SWITZERLAND and THE RHINE, fort-
nightly from July 11th.

BELGIUM, THE RHINE, BLACK FOREST, and
SWITZERLAND, July 6th, 13th, etc.

NORWAY, SWEDEN, DENMARK, etc.—Special
Tours, occupying 13, 17, and 20 days, leaving
Mondays, Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays.

SCANDINAVIAN and RUSSIAN VACATION TOUR,
leaving July 7th.

Particulars of Conducted Parties for shorter periods, also of Popular Tours, including Travel and Hotel, and
of tickets for Independent Travel, gratis on application.

NORWEGIAN STEAMER CRUISES, July 16th
and 31st.

GERMANY and AUSTRIA, leaving July 6th,
27th, etc.

THROUGH THE DOLOMITES, leaving July 10th,
August 7th and 28th.

SWISS ALPINE TOURS, leaving July 1st, 15th, etc.

THE CARPATHIANS, Tours de Luxe in Hungary,
leaving July 15th, August 5th and 19th.

SALZKAMMERGUT (Austrian Alps), leaving July
8th, August 6th, etc.

ROUND THE WORLD PARTY, September 2nd.

Illustrated Programmes Free.

THOS. COOK & SON, Ludgate Circus, London, and Branch Offices.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The OLDEST Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.
The ONLY Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.

Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent

Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Secretary.

Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.

Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

Funds are Urgently Needed.

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

THE RISE and GROWTH of the Protestant Alliance Magazine.

Being an abridged reprint of the Jubilee Issue (with a Series of Illustrations) explaining the
Basis, Principles, and Work of the Protestant Alliance. PRICE ONE PENNY.

PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,

Offices: 430, STRAND, LONDON. Opposite Charing Cross Hospital.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT

IS A CERTAIN CURE FOR

Chapped Hands, Chilblains, Burns, Scalds, Rheumatism,
Sciatica, Lumbago, Piles, Old Wounds, Eczema, Erysipelas,

AND EVERY FORM OF SKIN DISEASE.

Manufactured only at 78, New Oxford Street, London.

Sold by all Chemists and Medicine Vendors.

EDE, SON & RAVENSCROFT

 TELEPHONE:
602, Holborn.

Established 1889.

ROBE MAKERS

Royal Warrant Holders.

ROBE MAKERS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.
SURPLICES FOR CLERGY AND CHOIR. CLERICAL TAILORING.
 Hoods, Cassocks, Scarves, Stoles, College Caps, Clergy Collars, etc.

PEERS', LEGAL AND CORPORATION ROBES.
93 & 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE MISPRINTED CATECHISM:

A Reply to Mr. Pimock.

By J. T. TOMLINSON.

Price 1½d. post free.

 CHURCH ASSOCIATION, 13 AND 14, BUCKINGHAM
 STREET, STRAND, W.C.

BYGONE DAYS: a Story of Village Life.

 By JNO. T. PROCTOR. In crown 8vo., cloth,
 price 3s. 6d. net.

The story is written to illustrate the manners and customs, religion and superstition, of Lincolnshire village life in the early part of the nineteenth century, the redeeming and elevating influence of love in the lower circles of human society giving the picture a bright and cheery tone. Although the characters and places are disguised, neither they nor the incidents narrated are fictitious, but real, and drawn from the writer's personal experience. Many of them will, no doubt, be recognised by older people still living in the district.

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d. net.

THE COLLIERS OF WINDY HILL:

Crucial Moments in a Welsh Village.

By WILFRID SPARROY,

Author of "Persian Children of the Royal Family."

WHEN the curtain rises Myfanwy Phoenix is dead, but her memory lives on, influencing the lives of her friends at crucial moments. Thus the story is episodal; it is also dramatic, impersonal, a bit of life in a field that is fresh to modern literature. The scene, which is laid in a Welsh colliery village, is suggestive of the Celtic spirit, with its earnestness of outlook and its unswerving faith in the realization of its dreams.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

HOME MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Additional Curates Society.

39, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER.

More than 1,200 ADDITIONAL CLERGYMEN are now at work in poor and densely-populated Parishes through the help of grants (about £55,000 a year) from this Society.

No Party considerations affect the appropriation of the Funds.

THE
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1903.

ART. I.—THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH CATECHISM.

IN the March number of the CHURCHMAN I was allowed to compare the new Free Church Catechism with the old Catechism of the Church of England. It seemed to result from the comparison that, whilst exclusive Churchmen glory in the Church Catechism as dogmatic, and Dissenters repudiate it as denominational and sectarian, it is, in fact, peculiarly undogmatic and undenominational. The word "dogmatic" is used in ways which make it desirable in general not to use it at all; but I have used it in the convenient sense that identifies a dogma with a doctrine—that is, with a proposition which affirms something concerning God and the things of God. The Free Church Catechism is chiefly made up of such propositions or definitions; in the Church Catechism they are strikingly absent.¹ And in the modernized beliefs of the Nonconformist bodies, or of that anti-Sacerdotalist Federation into which they are being incorporated, there is nothing that makes it impossible for them, with the exception of the Baptists, any more than it is impossible for the other great Christian communions of the world, to accept the Catechism of the Church of England.

I am encouraged to believe that it may be worth while to develop more distinctly and more fully than I was led to do

¹ It is instructive to notice that at the Savoy Conference the criticism of the Catechism by the Presbyterian divines is to the following effect: "The doctrine of the Sacraments is much more fully and particularly delivered than the other parts, in short answers fitted to the memories of children; therefore they propose a more distinct and full application of the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, and to add somewhat particularly concerning the nature of faith, repentance, the two covenants, justification, sanctification, adoption, and regeneration."

in my former article what I have called "The Idea of the Church Catechism."

It is convenient to regard the Church Catechism proper as closing with the paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer. The questions and answers relating to the Sacraments form an appendix, having even less organic connection with what goes before it than appendices usually have. Speaking roughly, we may say that the original Catechism was authorized in the middle of the sixteenth century, under Edward VI., and that the account of the Sacraments was added to it half a century afterwards, under James I.

The keynote of the Catechism is struck by the first question, "What is your name?" The name by which the child is known at home, and by which he knows himself, is made to remind him that he has been christened, or is a Christian. "You are a Christian." It is the name and profession of a Christian that the instruction uses as a starting-point. The child, having been present at christenings, has seen the minister take the infant, sprinkle water upon it, and at the same time say, "I baptize thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Out of this germ, of Christian Baptism, the Catechism develops what the Christian ought to know and to do.

Each of the three sacred names with which the child was sealed in his Baptism had some significance for him. He was claimed for the Father. That means, obviously enough, that the infant was taken to be the child of the heavenly Father. He was claimed for the Son. Who was the Son? He was the Lord Jesus Christ. What could anyone be to Him? All Christians were adherents of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, believers in Him, followers of Him; they had Him for their Head, and were formed into a society under Him. The baptized infant was joined to Christ, made a member of the body or community of which Christ was the Head. He was claimed in the third place for the Holy Ghost. The nature and action of the Holy Ghost are difficult for anyone, specially difficult for a child, to understand. But *breathing* is naturally connected with the Holy Ghost, or Spirit, the Divine Breath. The Holy Ghost is to be known through air, the unseen air which is breathed, which supports life. This name speaks of a Christian as being in an unseen world, to which his inner man belongs, and in which his inner man is vivified by heavenly influences. The child as claimed by the Holy Ghost is in a spiritual realm to which he belongs, as he belongs by his body to the world or kingdom of nature, and as the English child belongs to the country and realm of England. So the Catechism tells the child that

when he was christened he was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

Presently the Catechism describes this triple condition as a state of salvation, and bids the child rejoice thankfully that he has been called to it. "Called to a state or condition"—that is the Catechism's own variation of the phrase "made" in Baptism. And then the child is taught to pray that by the help of God's grace he may abide as long as he lives in the blessed state to which he has been called; that he may not fall away from being the child of God, and member of Christ, and subject of the heavenly kingdom, that God would have him be. The child should often say to himself: "In dependence on my heavenly Father's help, I am to be a dutiful child towards the heavenly Father; I am to be a faithful adherent of my Lord Jesus Christ; I am to be a loyal freeman in the kingdom of the Holy Spirit. I shall be an enemy to myself, as well as ungrateful to my gracious God, if I willingly fall away from that state."

From its earliest days of intelligence the child is taught that there is danger of such falling away, and that it will be always necessary for him to cleave to the Divine Power to which he belongs.

In one of our Collects we pray that grace may be granted to us to withstand the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and to follow our God, the only God. Each of these powers, the devil and the world and the flesh, is exhibited to us in Scripture as a rival of the heavenly Father, and therefore to be expressly repudiated and resisted by God's dutiful children. Our Lord, whose denunciations were not wanting in severity and plainness, said once to the Jews who rejected Him, "Ye do the works of your father" (St. John viii. 41). They had made themselves, He said, children of the devil, and not of God. The devil was a murderer and a liar, and they were doing the works of their father. So we learn that our Lord regarded ill-will and falsehood as the special works of the Evil One. Our God is love, and His word is truth; everyone, therefore, who surrenders himself to ill-will instead of love, and to falsehood instead of truth, is making himself a child of the devil and refusing to be the child of the heavenly Father. Of the world St. John says: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (1 John ii. 15, 16). The spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father, is directly opposed to the flesh in us: "they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. viii.

5-16). The child is taught, therefore, that, inasmuch as the Father in heaven has called him to be His child, he is bound to be on his guard against each of these severally—the devil, the world, and the flesh; to strive against becoming ill-disposed and false, worldly, sensual. In the prayer which the child learns, as not only the best of prayers, but as the guide to all praying, the first serious wishes which he who prays is taught to cherish are that the name of the Father, the Father who is in heaven, may be regarded with due reverence by all men, that the Father's kingdom may come with power, and that the Father's will may be done perfectly over all the earth.

The second character to which the baptized person has been called, answering to the second of the Divine names, is that of member of Christ. He is to have Christ for his Head. Who is Christ? What is the meaning of being a member of Christ? These are questions to which the young Christian must learn by degrees to give fuller and fuller answers. Our whole knowledge about Christ may be said to be contained in the Gospels, if we add that this is illustrated and developed by the Acts and all the history and literature of the Church. And it is through Christ that we receive our truest knowledge of the Father also. It is remarkable that the Catechism has no direct mention of the Bible, or of the New Testament, or of the Gospels. It refers the learner to the summary of Christian belief which we have in the Apostles' Creed. The greater part of this summary consists of the particulars of the manifestation of the Son of God, who lived and died as Jesus of Nazareth, and who was proclaimed as the Christ or King of the Jews. The Lord Jesus Christ attached a few men very closely to Himself whilst He was visible on the earth; when He had gone up to His Father's right hand, He sent down the Holy Spirit and created a society of persons drawn to Him and accepting Him as their Head. It was of the essence of belief in Him that He should be known as the Son of the Father. Thus believed in He had the power to deliver men out of bondage to darkness and nature into the freedom of having trust and hope in God. He who has been baptized into the name of the Son of God is attached to the Redeemer whose nature and work are set forth in the Apostles' Creed; and it is his privilege to learn more and more of Christ's nature and work as controlling the life of His adherents.

The character given by being baptized into the name of the Holy Ghost is represented by the title, "an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." The word "inheritor" has no doubt aided that understanding of "heaven" as a place of future felicity which is so unlike what may be learnt about heaven

from the New Testament. But the kingdom of heaven is the spiritual kingdom—the world or commonwealth which we apprehend and in which we live through the Divine Spirit; the invisible kingdom which Christ established and of which He is King, and which all Christian communities seek with more or less of imperfection to realize and exhibit in the visible world. And an inheritor of this kingdom is one who may claim all the rights and possessions of a subject and citizen of it. And the young citizen of the kingdom of the Spirit has the simple duty of learning and obeying the laws of it—laws which are defined as God's holy will and commandments. The Ten Commandments of the ancient Mosaic Law hold an honoured place in the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. They are Jewish rather than Christian, but it is found that with a certain amount of translation, and with reasonable spiritual interpretation, they can be advantageously used for instruction in Christian duty. The Jew was taught that he must have no other god than his own God Jehovah, who had brought him out of his bondage in Egypt; that he must make no images, lest they should lead him into idolatry; that he must treat the name of Jehovah with reverence; that he must observe the seventh day of the week as a day of rest; that he must set his hopes on prosperity in the new land which his God Jehovah was giving him. The Christian understands that he must have for his only God the Father who has given him redemption through His Son Jesus Christ; that he must not allow any visible things to seduce him from loyalty to his God; that he must cherish reverence towards the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; that he must provide for the due rest of those who labour, and therefore that he must lend himself to the wise observance of the Christian Lord's Day; that he must promote such honouring of parents and of those who have any of the authority of parents as will guard the permanence and well-doing of human society. That all God's commands have reference primarily and ultimately to the inner man is a truth upon which the Lord Jesus is known to have continually insisted.

It is true that the Catechism does not show upon its surface an intention of developing the Christian calling according to the method set forth in the above exposition; but I think it will be recognised that the order which I have indicated, and which may be seen at a glance in the following conspectus, does not add anything to the Catechism or change anything in it, but only gives a more systematic form to what it teaches :

THE CHRISTIAN CALLING.

The threefold <i>Divine name</i> into which the Christian is bap- tized.	The Father.	The Son.	The Holy Ghost.
His threefold <i>con- dition</i> , or the state of salva- tion to which he is called.	A child of God.	A member of Christ.	An inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.
His threefold <i>obli- gation</i> .	To be dutiful to the Father, and to refuse to be the child of the devil (John viii. 42-44), of the world (1 John ii. 15, 16), or of the flesh (Rom. viii. 8-15).	To believe in Christ and ad- here to Him as his Head.	To keep the laws of the kingdom, written by the Spirit on the heart.
Three <i>forms</i> which will help him to abide in his calling.	The Lord's Prayer (Our Father).	The Creed.	The Ten Com- mandments.

The questions and answers relating to the Sacraments form a part of the Church Catechism as we have it now, and it is of an importance which can hardly be overrated, as setting forth in a definite and logical manner the views concerning the Sacraments which our Church commends to its young learners. Let me apply to this appendix the same kind of consideration as I have applied to the original Catechism.

The governing idea of this part is to be found in the word "grace." Looking at the word from an etymological point of view, we may trace its meanings thus: (1) Originally it means that which pleases in anything, what we may call *charm*. (2) What chiefly pleases in a person is *kindness*, and this is the predominant meaning of grace. (3) Then it means an act of kindness, a *gift* of some kind. (4) And as kindness evokes an answering kindness, grace is used in Greek and in Latin for thankfulness or *thanks*—a meaning retained in the phrase "Grace before or after meat." We may dismiss meanings (1) and (4) from our consideration. The others—(2) and (3)—are what concern us.

The Catechism does not ask, "How many Sacraments are there?" but, "How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?" We find two ceremonies, or practices, of a "general" or universal character recorded in the Gospels as having been instituted by our Lord Himself. And these have the character of being *signs*, outward actions appealing to

the senses, and intended to convey something unseen to the inward man. And it is assumed that our Lord ordained these for universal use in His Church. When Christ breathed upon His disciples, and said to them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (or Breath), He was doing a sacramental action; and it is conceivable that He might have ordained this action for use in His Church. But His disciples did not understand Him to be doing so. The laying-on of hands in the ordinance of Confirmation or Strengthening is very near the two Sacraments in character and authority, and it is of general or universal use. But there is no record of Christ's having instituted it, though it is open to anyone to think it probable that the Apostles were carrying out an unrecorded direction of their Master in laying their hands on the baptized. A sacramental interpretation of this ordinance is given in the Order of Confirmation. The Bishop prays: "We make our humble supplications unto Thee for these Thy servants, upon whom (after the example of Thy holy Apostles) we have now laid our hands, to certify them (by this sign) of Thy favour and gracious goodness towards them. Let Thy fatherly hand, we beseech Thee, ever be over them." Through the laying-on of the Bishop's fatherly hand the confirmed are encouraged to see the fatherly hand of God laid for blessing and care and guidance on their spiritual heads.

Let us take that phrase of the Bishop's prayer, "Thy favour and gracious goodness towards them," as expressing more fully the meaning of the word "grace" in the doctrine of the Sacraments. I gave "kindness," or favour and gracious goodness, as the second meaning of "grace." The third was "a gift." And in this third sense "grace" is very largely used in the New Testament. St. Paul called the collection for the poor Christians of Jerusalem a grace (2 Cor. viii. 4, 6, 19). It was his habit to speak of his Apostolic commission as the grace that had been given to him, his grace—the special favour granted to him. It is under this head that we must place the spiritual influence which grace so often means. But I wish to ask whether we have not fallen into the habit of *detaching* spiritual influence—the gift—from God or Christ or the Holy Spirit, the Giver, more than the Apostles did or could have done. To them the spiritual influence was in the grace or kindness or love of God felt by the heart of man. "If ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious" (1 Pet. ii. 3). To St. John all human goodness was love; and "we love because He first loved us" (1 John iv. 19). And St. Paul's account of the influence which produces human goodness is, "God's love has been poured out upon our hearts" (Rom. v. 5). When St. Paul prayed, "May the grace of the Lord Jesus

Christ be with you," he meant, "May Jesus Christ in His grace be present with you." We are following the Apostles if we take the grace given to us in the Sacraments as being, not some gift separable from God, but God's favour and gracious goodness expressing itself towards us.

The sign in Baptism is a double one, appealing to the eye and the ear. What is seen is a washing with water; but in the act of washing the minister seals the baptized with the spoken name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Christian, holding this sign to be ordained by Christ Himself, sees and hears God in His gracious goodness forgiving and accepting the baptized person, and claiming him for His own. That is the grace signified by the sign. The gracious God is seen raising the person brought to Him out of subjection to nature and the earth and the darkness and evil of the merely natural condition, into fellowship with Himself. To accept this grace is to put away sin and to live to God—to cherish continual repentance and faith.

In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, the minister is seen setting apart bread and wine to represent the Body and the Blood, the Body broken and the Blood poured out of the Son of God, who gave Himself for men. The Christians go up together, and have bread from the one loaf and wine from the one cup given to them. What is seen by the Christian through this sign is, God in His grace giving His Son, crucified for men, to be the spiritual nourishment of those who will feed together on Him. To feed on Christ is a very strong image; but it was one chosen and repeated by Christ Himself, and it has a visible form given to it in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. We may translate it into: Look to Him, pray to Him, study Him, follow Him, depend upon Him. But the sign which He ordained, the partaking of His Body and of His Blood for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul, carries more spiritual force with it, conveys the grace of God more effectively, than any multiplication of these phrases. And the Christian response to this grace of God is, obviously, to live more and more in spiritual association with Christ and with the brethren.

I repeat that, in order to enter into the true doctrine of the Sacraments, we ought to accustom ourselves to the Apostolic manner of regarding the action of God's grace, and that it may help us in doing this to render in our minds the grace of each Sacrament by God's favour and gracious goodness towards us. In the Sacrament of reception the gracious God is seen pardoning, receiving, taking into union with Himself. In the Sacrament of continual nourishment and

incorporation the gracious God is seen giving the crucified Christ to be the life of the Christian community. It is appointed that for our new or spiritual life we should be thus surrendered to the love of our God and kept under its eternal power.

J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.

ART. II.—"LIFE AND LETTERS OF BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D."

II.

THE first ninety pages of the second volume deal with Dr. Westcott's work as Canon of Westminster from 1883 to 1890. How he regarded this post may to some extent be judged from the fact that the offers of three deaneries—Exeter, Lincoln, and Norwich—were unable to tempt him away from it.

With this period I must not stay to deal at length. Undoubtedly, Dr. Westcott's position at the Abbey caused him to become much more widely known to the general public, and, as his son writes, "it was while he was at Westminster that my father's interest in social questions first became manifest, though he had for years previously¹ been an anxious student of such matters" (p. 15). Among social questions we must in this connection include his intense interest in bringing the teaching of the Gospel to bear upon international relations, of which, speaking at a Peace Conference, he said: "The question of international relations has not hitherto been considered in the light of the Incarnation, and till this has been done I do not see that we can look for the establishment of that peace which was heralded at the Nativity" (p. 23).

Among the letters belonging to this period will be found some very striking and valuable sayings—*e.g.* :

"A sermon means to me a week's work . . . the summer sermons are already (February 28) filling up fragments of thought" (p. 36).

"It will be well to make some rule about assistance in the distribution of the elements at large Communion. For the first time for many years I was lately present in a church when the elements were administered to a 'railleful' at a time, and I was much impressed by the solemn silence. Perhaps Convocation may sanction this" (p. 42). "I ought to say that I feel strongly that the adoration of a localized Presence

¹ See vol. ii., p. 261.

in the consecrated elements appears to me to be one of our most real and grave and growing perils" (p. 48).

"It is almost a necessity that the kind of training furnished in these [*i.e.*, theological colleges] should be narrower and less largely human than that which can be gained at the University" (p. 51).

Re the episcopal letter on Peace: "Ought the Christian Church to be silent? Ought the great moral victories to be won outside her organization?" (p. 52).

Re the extreme High Church party: "They have learnt in a singular way the secret of Roman power; they yield absolutely nothing" (p. 66).

"As far as I can judge, the young High Church party need patient discipline, and they are quite out of sympathy with the generation above" (p. 69).

"It is the localizing—*i.e.*, of necessity the materializing—of the Lord's Presence which seems to me to be most perilous, and I should shrink from any form of words and act of worship which countenances this localization. 'Clasp Me not, for I am not yet ascended'" (pp. 79, 80).

"It is the fashion now to deprecate Hooker, but I cannot go one line beyond his teaching on the Holy Communion" (p. 80).

"No one can believe more firmly than I do that we are living in a time of revelation, and that the teachings of physical science are to be for us what Greek literature was in the twelfth century. But I think we are in more real danger from impatience than from blindness. I do not think, as far as my experience has gone, that there is any unwillingness on the part of our responsible teachers to listen to new tidings, but there is serious peril lest in our haste we should take the signs for the truth itself" (p. 87).

On March 6, 1890, when he was in his sixty-sixth year, Dr. Westcott received, through Lord Salisbury, the offer of the Bishopric of Durham. "This offer," writes his biographer, "was indeed a sore trial to him. For some days he wrestled in prayer, noting in his text-book on the 8th that 'light is breaking.' On the 11th his decision was made, and he enters *ὀυκέτι ἐγώ*, and then doubly underlines his two texts for the day, which were Jer. i. 8 and Cor. xii. 9. The same day he writes to his eldest son: 'In the prospect of such a change every thought of fitness vanishes. There can be no fitness or unfitness, but simply absolute surrender. I think that I can offer all; and God will use the offering'" (p. 93).

Let me here revert to a question upon which I touched in the opening sentences of this notice. There are those who doubt whether the Church is practising a wise economy when

she places a great scholar and a deep philosophical thinker like Bishop Westcott in a position in which the mere routine work is enormous. There are others who to-day are in favour of “young” Bishops, who shall take up the laborious work—now apparently necessarily attached to the episcopal office—while their physical strength is at its greatest. Bishop Westcott’s eleven years’ episcopate proved that neither of these ideas is necessarily true. “Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh,” and “length of days” does sometimes “teach wisdom”; at any rate, it tends to give experience and sympathy, of which clergymen who have worked under “young” Bishops have, so we are told, sometimes felt the want. To his work at Durham Dr. Westcott brought not only a mind stored with “the learning of the schools,” but he brought also an unusually long experience of deep thinking upon the many great questions of the age which were then, as now, “pressing for solution.” In one sense of the word, the Durham years were his great “spending” time; they were pre-eminently the period of his life in which he gave freely, not, as before, mainly to scholars and students, but to all sorts and conditions of men, of the rich treasures of thought and knowledge which he had so long been accumulating.

There is no need here to dwell upon the congratulations Dr. Westcott received on his appointment, or upon the details of his consecration, or of his reception in the diocese: all these are admirably described in the “Life.” I would rather attempt very briefly to indicate the special directions towards which, as a Bishop, he seemed to bend his energies, and in which he seemed specially to make his influence felt.

From the first he took the fullest and keenest interest in *social* questions. Of these, we have already seen, he had been a student from boyhood, and some of the earliest reminiscences in the first volume refer to his interest in these subjects.

One of the Bishop’s earliest speeches in the diocese was against the great national evil of betting and gambling, and in a letter of almost the same date he writes: “When the inherent waste and selfishness and cruelty of gambling—the hope of gaining through another’s loss—in all its forms are once clearly apprehended, such an intelligent and strong public opinion will be formed as will make legislation possible and effective” (p. 107). The Bishop was also much interested in the Co-operative movement, among whose objects he trusted it would be found “that the workman shall feel that he has a deep interest in his work, and that he shares the full pleasure of its success, for that is the soul of Co-operation.”

Within a few months of Dr. Westcott’s arrival in the diocese there took place the terribly long and disastrous Coal Strike,

when between 80,000 and 90,000 men were thrown idle, and which lasted from March 9, when the pits closed, until work was resumed on June 3. This strike, it was computed, in the loss of wages alone to the workpeople, cost £1,100,000, while to the country generally the loss was reckoned at not less than £3,000,000. It is well known how terribly distressed the Bishop was with this industrial warfare, which was literally devastating the diocese and bringing want and misery into thousands of homes; how, after most carefully approaching each of the contending parties, he ultimately became arbiter between them; how, with him as chairman, a conference of representatives of both masters and men met at Auckland Castle on June 1; how, while the conference was sitting, thousands of workpeople waited in almost breathless expectation in the park; and how, as the result of the Bishop's mediation, the pits were reopened two days later.

The Bishop's action, and its consequent success, served to strengthen immensely the position he had already gained in the hearts of his people; and from that time onwards he was not only “the miners' Bishop,” but, at least as far as the county of Durham was concerned, he was, as Mr. Burt's excellent appreciation of his work and influence is entitled, “Everybody's Bishop.”

Another movement into which all through his episcopate Dr. Westcott threw himself heart and soul was that of the Christian Social Union. When apparently no other call could draw him away from his almost incessant diocesan labours, an invitation to address some great gathering on behalf of this society was generally too much for him to resist. The most important of these speeches will be found in his later published works, while the following sentences from a private letter to one of his daughters show very clearly why the objects of the society were so very near his heart: “The use of the word ‘Christian’ is positive, and not negative. It says that the work of the union is founded on the Christian Creed. . . . ‘Social,’ again, is necessary. It shows that the work of the union is to influence our social life, as distinguished from our individual. . . . I tried to set out the duties of members in a paper contained in ‘Christian Aspects of Life.’ The central one is quiet study. It is worse than useless to attempt to ‘do’ anything before you are master of the subject. But so much everyone can do personally—quietly reflect whether this act or this habit is for the glory of God” (p. 261).

Yet another cause in which, as Bishop, Dr. Westcott evinced the greatest enthusiasm was that of foreign missions. Where, in so many words, shall we find the expression of a grander

conception of this all-important part of the Church's work than the following: "Foreign missions, St. Paul teaches us, are an open witness to the will of God for the world. Foreign missions proclaim a living Saviour and King of all men. Foreign missions vindicate for the Church the energy of a Divine Life. Foreign missions, in a word, express a great hope, kindle a sovereign love, feed an unconquerable faith; and we, too often depressed, chilled, disheartened by the cares of the passing day, require the inspiration which they bring for the blessing of our lives" (p. 189).

Though the Diocese of Durham was free from any litigation, or any attempts at litigation, during Dr. Westcott's episcopate, and though he again and again commends the loyalty of his clergy to himself and their general readiness to listen to his counsels and admonitions, yet the "ritual controversy," and the tendencies both in doctrine and practice of the members of the extreme party, caused him much anxiety and distress, as the following extracts from letters, written while he was Bishop, show:

"At the present time this independence [of the English clergy], unless it is chastened, threatens to destroy our corporate unity. Authority is already in some cases held of light account in the presence of resolute and impressive self-assertion" (p. 201).

"I have read what you say on 'spiritual power' with the greatest thankfulness. It seems to me that Rome and the ritualists force on us working substitutes. . . . The external is smothering all true life" (p. 223).

"I believe that the clergy generally do not appreciate rightly the general dislike of Englishmen to ornate services" (p. 301).

"I trust absolutely the loyalty of all the Durham clergy . . . at the same time I feel that many elsewhere forget their ordination promises, and that not a few are Roman in heart and policy" (p. 302).

"I told Lord Halifax, when he sent me his Bradford speech, his utterances fill me almost with despair" (p. 302).

"I cannot find any basis for the High Church theory in the New Testament. It is based, as far as I can see, on assumed knowledge of what the Divine plan must be. I had occasion to look through the New Testament not long ago with special reference to the question, and I was greatly impressed by a fact which seems to have been overlooked. All the Apostolic writers are possessed (as I think, rightly in essence) by the thought of the Lord's return. They show no sign of any purpose to create a permanent ecclesiastical organization" (p. 307).

"The Bishops of Winchester and Salisbury came into my room, and we had a long talk of all things and more. Certainly there is [1899] very much to cause alarm. I feel sure that a war is inevitable. The causes alleged may be trivial, but behind there is the conflict of Roman and Anglican principles, which are absolutely irreconcilable" (p. 309).

[To a clergyman who had announced in his parish magazine "that the Holy Eucharist will be specially *offered on behalf of . . .*"] "I am most anxious not to abridge in the least degree the liberty which our Church allows to her children; but I cannot doubt that the thought conveyed, naturally, by the words which I have underlined is alien from her teaching" (p. 349).

"I shrink with my whole nature from speaking of such a mystery, but it seems to me to be vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord 'in or under the forms of bread and wine.' From this the greatest practical errors follow" (p. 351).

"I cannot admit the parallel which you draw between incense and evening Communion. The question of incense has been decided, after an exhaustive inquiry, by the authority designated in the Prayer-Book to settle ambiguities of direction. The question of evening Communion has never been argued" (p. 352).

"In the context in which the words occur, I have not the least doubt that *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, do this*, can only mean *do this act* (including the whole action of hands and lips), and not *sacrifice this*. . . . (2) The *τοῦτό ἐστι, this is*, must be taken in the same sense in 'this is My Body,' and in 'this cup is the New Testament.' It cannot be used of material identity. . . . May we all turn from strife about words to the living Lord Himself, who is with us all the days!" (p. 354).

Among the letters written from Durham will also be found many valuable thoughts on other subjects—*e.g.* :

"Could you say some quiet words about the perils of statistical religion? It is alarming how the energies of the clergy are taken up in tabulating results. I have boldly cut out all figures from the Visitation returns" (p. 163).

"The question of the age of candidates for Confirmation is one of pastoral experience. I have had unusual opportunities of forming a judgment, and I have not the least doubt that a late age is best for the religious life" (p. 303).

On a meeting of the Houses of Convocation with the House of Layman: "This is a most happy beginning. . . . What we want most is the clear expression of the opinions of average men" (p. 355).

Four years after Dr. Westcott went to Durham, his old chief at Harrow, Dr. Vaughan, dictated to him from his sick-bed the two following messages :

"I said to him at the time of his appointment that if God spared his life for three years it would not be in vain."

"If that voice, that look, that elevation of thought, were spared for three years to that Northumbrian population, they would find in them a charm of persuasion and a force, though I know he would not like me to say it, they had not found even in Bishop Lightfoot. May God grant that in extreme old age he may preserve them all!"

Dr. Vaughan's prayer was more than fulfilled, for not for three years only, but for rather more than eleven, was the Bishop preserved to the Northumbrian people over whom he had gained such a mighty influence for good. And though in the closing years his work was doubtless often done with difficulty, though to his private friends he might confidentially confess to being very tired, though on more than one occasion he was temporarily laid aside by illness and extreme weakness, no one could say that through any incapacity of his the diocese ever suffered.

In the last sermon which he ever preached in Cambridge, he said: "I have had an unusually long working time, and, I think, unequalled opportunities of service"; and he worked to the end, for the last act of public "service" in which he took part—when in his cathedral he preached the annual sermon to the Durham miners—was just a week from the day on which he passed away.

Though on that Saturday afternoon (July 20, 1901) he was far from well, he could not be persuaded to disappoint the working men; to the last the call of duty was as strong as ever. It was noticed that as he passed with the procession into the cathedral the miners' band was playing :

"Abide with me, fast falls the eventide."

Though at the time he seemed to be no worse for the effort he had made, on the following days he rapidly grew weaker; then an attack of peritonitis supervened, and on the following Saturday evening, surrounded by his children, "he peacefully fell asleep and entered into rest."

Thus Bishop Westcott outlived his three great contemporaries—Lightfoot, Hort, and Benson—all of whom had been his pupils. It is not for us to make comparisons; but the following may, I think, be permitted: In pure scholarship, and in the power of generalizing upon and lucidly portraying a great historical situation, he probably stood second to Bishop Lightfoot, while as a deep philosophical thinker he must yield

to Dr. Hort; but for breadth of interest, and as an influence, not only upon the English Church, but upon English theology and religion, we believe, the first place must be conceded to him.

It has sometimes been charged against this little band of great theologians, that at Cambridge they have left no successors of equal eminence to continue the school which they may be said to have founded, and that to-day the theological faculty in Cambridge is not maintaining the traditions which they bequeathed to it. But has the time yet come for us to pronounce such a judgment?

If, in the providence of God, it has been decreed that no group equally pre-eminent should yet have arisen to take their place, but that, instead, hundreds should already look back upon their teaching and their influence as, humanly speaking, the highest inspiration of their lives, while they and thousands of others constantly turn for spiritual nourishment to their works, it is not for us to question the wisdom of the Divine Will.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

ART. III.—DR. HORTON'S CHALLENGE.

THE address given last month by Dr. Horton as Chairman of the Congregational Union deserves a warm reception at the hands of Churchmen. Of course, there are many things in it which Churchmen cannot agree with. On some of these things I shall have something to say presently. But if Dr. Horton fairly represents those whom he addressed, the Congregationalists are feeling their way towards reunion with the old Church. Here are some of his words:

"And we, facing still the organization of the Church of England, can but repeat the thought and purpose of our fathers. We have a sacred deposit which we are not at liberty to surrender. I am not aware that we in any way separate from the Church. We simply say we stand for the notes of the Church as it was at the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. To Catholic, Roman, or Anglican we frankly say that our organization is incomplete because we never designed a new Church system, but were merely compelled to indicate essential elements of the old. Make room for us *and our truth* in your system, and we are prepared to re-enter your borders in fact, as we always have done in spirit. . . . And may we not say that far better than creating other machinery of a diocesan or connectional type would be the re-emerging of our churches

in the Church, diocesan or connectional, which already exists ? . . . None are less hampered with denominationalism, none are better affected to reunion, than we."

And what is the "truth" which Dr. Horton calls upon us Churchmen to make room for in our system ?

"The first note of the Church," he says, "is that it is a community of redeemed souls which becomes for that reason 'a pillar and ground of the truth.' It is composed of those who are new creatures in Christ. . . . The second note of the Church is that the community, the local community, being, as Hort says, 'a body of Christ, a sanctuary of God,' has its own inviolable rights, and is the depository of supernatural powers . . . the members by word and deed can edify one another . . . they are able to recognise and appoint their rulers and teachers . . . they exercise disciplinary power, they can bind and loose, they can remit and retain sins. . . . The third note . . . is negative. . . . In the community there is a variety of mutual ministry and of spiritual powers for operating on the world, but there is no priest. . . ." Dr. Horton goes on to speak of priesthood as claiming an official exclusiveness of access to God. And to his third note of the Church, thus explained, I suppose most of those who read the *CHURCHMAN* will agree. I need not repeat what I wrote myself on the subject in the April number, p. 376. As to the second note, I go a long way with the speaker. With us Churchmen, except the patron and his nominee, and the patron at long intervals, there is nobody in the parish or out of it that has any substantial voice or part in the parish church and its institutions. While everything else has changed in England, the Church has been trying to grapple with the complicated problems of these latter days under arrangements which were probably the best that were possible a thousand years ago. And when good work is done, as it often is, it may fall down any day, like a house of cards, on the arrival of a new incumbent, or through the perversity of an old one. Lay workers amongst us, from the youngest Sunday-school teacher to the Chairman of the House of Laymen, have no assured position. They are helpers of the clergy, not servants of the Church. And to this absence of local organization as part of our Church system I attribute a large part of our failure. Our position is, in this respect, at the very antipodes of the Congregationalists'. Our position is not right. But is theirs ? It would not be right even if Dr. Horton's first note of the Church were matter of fact, instead of an ideal ; for while he says he is not aware that he has separated from the Church, that is the very thing that he and his friends have done. Instead of holding fast to the local Church and labouring to

strengthen and reform it, they have gone forth from it and set up rival communities. And then, with all the alleged superiority of their system, human nature being what it is, the difference, morally and spiritually, between one of our congregations and theirs by no means corresponds to the difference of organization. Congregationalists have their fair share of faults. If we have Lord Bishops at a distance they often have Lord Deacons on the spot—a kind of official who was described long ago by John Angell James, in his "Church Members' Guide," as being in some cases "the patron of the living, the Bible of the minister, and the wolf of the flock." I have on my table a large collection of extracts from the writer just named, from the once famous Mr. Binney, and others, which show that in their days the communities they had to do with were just what might have been expected from the system of Independency, as it was then called, and the sort of people who worked it. This was a long time ago; but I myself once saw a letter from a worthy Congregational minister in which he said he had watched the work of the Church of England in one of our large towns, and was satisfied that it was good and sound, while he was weary of the pretentiousness and unreality among the people he had to do with. Ministers of strong character and great ability may no doubt lift their hearers to a high level; but Church organization should take account of the average minister; and pure democracy, on the scale of the single congregation, cannot do that. To compare the Congregational ideal with the actual working of Church and State is as much beside the question as a comparison of King Edward VII.'s Coronation Service with Salem Chapel.

The fact is that our divisions in religion are only very partially founded on "the truth" in the sense that Dr. Horton uses that expression. They are, at least, as much social as theological or ecclesiastical. In a small market-town which I knew very well some years ago there was a Primitive Methodist Chapel, attended almost entirely by labouring folk and very small tradespeople; a Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, attended also by working folk, but with the larger shopkeepers as its distinguishing feature; a Congregational Chapel, attended also by some working folk, but also by a professional man and his family and some well-to-do farmers from neighbouring villages. In the parish church there were no gentry, in the sense of county family people, because there were none in the parish; but while all the actual classes were represented, there were some churchgoers who, for reasons more or less social, would have hardly liked to be regular attendants at either of the chapels. Take another illustration. I once

read a report of an address by the Chairman of a County Congregational Union to this effect: "I notice that when ministers come to us from other denominations, they usually come from the minor forms of Methodism, but that when ministers leave us, they usually go to the Established Church or the Presbyterians. Are we to suppose that all those who join us do so from purely spiritual motives, and that all those who leave us are worldlings, or is it not all alike one social drift?"

There is no one complete form of Church government laid down in the New Testament as obligatory upon all Christians in all places and at all times, and there is no one form of organization at the present time which has a monopoly of good Christians. It may be prejudice, but my experience, now long, though not extensive, leads me to the conclusion that a good Churchman, when you get one, is a finer article than a good Dissenter. And I see no sufficient reason for calling upon Churchmen to adopt the Congregational organization in their local Churches as of exclusively Divine authority, with or without a diocesan system superadded, than for claiming the like exclusiveness for Methodism or Presbyterianism. It is not true that the local Churches mentioned in the New Testament were as self-contained as Dr. Horton seems to think; and it is certain that, if episcopacy was not actually instituted by St. John, it sprang up in his time or immediately after to meet real needs. No doubt the hundred and twenty at Jerusalem filled up the vacant apostleship by election, but Peter first defined the kind of man that was required. When deacons were needed, the people elected, but subject to appointment by the Apostles. When Philip had formed a Church in Samaria, the converts did not proceed at once to elect a pastor, but Peter and John were sent by the Apostles to confirm them. When the dispute arose at Antioch about Judaizing, the local Church did not settle the question, but a Council was called for the purpose at Jerusalem; and the decrees of this Council were regarded as authoritative, not only at Antioch, but in other Gentile Churches. St. Paul's Epistles bear witness, no doubt, to a very large autonomy at Corinth and elsewhere, but they also bear witness to a large authority vested in the Apostle. He can even appoint deputies, both as messengers, and as temporary, if not permanent, overseers. Even in the Revelation, where each of the seven local Churches is represented by a golden lampstand standing on the earth, distinct from the other six, and by a distinct star in the Lord's right hand, they all receive the messages of Him who walks in their midst from the hand of His servant John, and the stars together form a wreath.

In the final vision of the Church—a vision of the ideal of the true Church as it was shortly to be when St. John wrote, and as we ought to be trying to make it now—the local separation is no longer discerned. All is one grand city compact together, standing four-square, very different from the stragglewise conglomeration that we see now. No *ναὸς* is therein, and therefore no *ἱερεὺς*. But the nations are walking in its light, and they and their kings are bringing their honour into it—an important detail which Dr. Horton ignores. I cannot say that he ignores the strong and repeated demands for unity in the New Testament, or the equally strong denunciations of division. But he assumes, unconsciously perhaps, that any member of a local Church, if he does not think it sufficiently like the first Churches in its constitution or practice, may forsake it, and set up a new Church in the same locality, independent of the first, and drawing its members from the same population. From this it follows that if a member of the new Church thinks he can improve upon it, he has the same liberty as the first seceder, and so on. I once had a talk with a Congregational minister on this subject. "Of course," he said, "if I saw in my congregation any tendency to division, I should think it my duty to warn them against the sin of schism." "But," said I, "as soon as they had actually split into separate bodies, each with its own chosen officers and organization, you would have no further fault to find with them?" "No," he said, "I cannot say that I should." It reminded me very forcibly of the couplet:

"Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?
When it doth prosper, 'tis no longer treason."

I do not say there may not be places where the local Church has ceased to be a Church of God altogether. But a Christian man, with the New Testament as his guide, should be very slow in coming to such a conclusion. We read there of some very corrupt Churches; but in these cases the rule is always "Strengthen the things that remain," and never "Set up a rival community." Can anyone honestly say, with all the facts before him, that all or any of the cathedral and parish churches of England have passed beyond the point of unchristliness which had been reached by the Church of Sardis, which was dead?

Of course, the relations of Church and State in England have become anomalous through the change from a Parliament of Englishmen and Churchmen to a Parliament which represents Presbyterian Scotland, Roman Catholic Ireland, and the Nonconformity, Indifference, and Unbelief of the

three kingdoms, as well as the avowed members of the Church of England. But England is still the predominant partner, and in England the Church is far ahead of any one of her rivals, and, including her nominal adherents, who do not wish to upset her, ahead of them all together. No doubt the choice of our Bishops by a Premier "flung to the top by the turn of a party wheel" is what no body of Christians who had to start afresh would wish for. But the Premier is, for the time being, the representative of the United Kingdom, and especially of the predominant partner. Hitherto he has always been at least nominally, and sometimes very sincerely, a member of the Church. And the *congé d'élire* is not the blasphemous thing which Dr. Horton calls it. There is, I believe, no such prayer offered as he speaks of for the Divine guidance; and the election is by no means a farce. Every Premier, in making his choice, knows that if he chooses a man obviously unfit, the Dean and Chapter may refuse to elect, and that the country would probably support them in their refusal. There have been abuses in the appointment of Congregational ministers quite as great in their way as any that have occurred for a long time in the appointment of Bishops in the Church of England. I do not uphold our system as a model; but I say it is not a sufficient cause for those appalling divisions which have destroyed the very idea of a Church as a Divine institution—or, in Dr. Horton's good phrasing, "the sanctity of the Church meeting"—in the minds of the bulk of the English nation. When once you have told a man that he may choose his Church among an endless number of competitors, you have told him he may find his cathedral in his own armchair.

A Congregationalist might perhaps reply that he does not allow such choice, and that the only true Churches are Congregational. Dr. Horton draws a glowing picture of a Congregational Church:

"The life of the Church destroys the false individualism of the monastery; it corrects the introspection of Pietism. In the organism the member lives; the personal is merged; even as Christ pleased not Himself, so the members of the mystic body live for one another and the world, not for themselves," and much more to the like effect. And then he goes on to contrast with all this "the Donative of Constantine, the support and patronage of the State, the crumbling strength of an imperial organization," till he comes to Queen Elizabeth and James I., and at last to Mr. Balfour, and breaks out: "Oh what a falling off was there! For spiritual power, the mean omnipotence of States! For the reliance on the invisible Lord, the bare clinging to visible rulers! For the riches in

glory in Christ Jesus, the grudging tithes and endowments, clutched by a faithless Church from a faithless people."

It never seems to strike Dr. Horton that there must be a very close connection between the Church and the State if the nation is to walk in the light of the holy city, and with its kings—that is, in its corporate and political capacity—to bring its glory and honour into it. That this connection has not been always what it should have been, and that both parties have been at fault, is only to say that the ideal has not been realized. But how does Congregationalism realize the Divine ideal? First, it deliberately rejects all that difficult connection of Church and State which Scripture prescribes and we have inherited. Then it places its strength in one particular class of citizens—that class which is making money in trade. It cannot live in poor neighbourhoods, and those of the higher classes who are sincere Christians find themselves repelled not by the realization of Christ's ideal, but by characteristics merely sectional. In villages Congregationalism is, and must be, a failure, not only for lack of funds, but for the same reasons as have made village School Boards a failure. There is much in the Congregational ideal which is both scriptural in itself and suitable for these times. But so there is in the system of the Church of England. Each has its good points; each has its bad ones. For my own part, I cannot but admire Dr. Horton. In order to meet him half-way, let us work more and more for "a more complete development of the constitution and government of the Church, central, diocesan, and parochial, and especially the admission of laymen of all classes, who are *bonâ fide* Churchmen, to a substantial share in the control of Church affairs." This is a quotation from a paper signed by Dr. Westcott and most of the leading Churchmen at Cambridge seventeen years ago, and the subject has not been allowed to sleep. We might have expected some notice of the Church Reform movement in Dr. Horton's address. Let him and his friends look to facts as well as theories, and, instead of threatening us and hindering us, help us to win from the State a reasonable autonomy, *such as by their help might be had to-morrow*; and when we have wrought into our system the best parts of theirs, let them, as he suggests, "remerge" their Churches in the Church from which they ought never to have separated, but whose shortcomings have, I fully admit, supplied much excuse for their separation. As a practical suggestion, I would say let the Committee of the Church Reform League try to arrange a conference with a few men of like minds with Dr. Horton, and then let a society to pray for reunion be formed, such as already exists in Scotland. Reunion is in

the air, or, as Dr. Horton says, "we are agitated by a Divine unrest"; and I cannot but hope that the Spirit of God is leading men of diverse minds by different paths to a union nobler than Christians have ever yet seen, not excepting the by no means ideal union of New Testament days.

The problems before us are largely social problems, and if they are to be solved by organized Christianity, they will be better solved by the long pull, the strong pull, and the pull altogether of a National Church, than by the overlapping and irregular, if not fratricidal, efforts of self-centred societies. Dr. Horton in his opening remarks referred to the appalling fact that nearly a million of people in one city are living under such conditions that they simply cannot obey the plain precept of Christ to enter into their chamber and shut the door for prayer, because there is no chamber for them to enter, and no door to shut. This is only one small sample of what all Christians should be thinking of, and preparing to deal with in Christ's name. Let us only believe what we profess to believe, that we all are brethren, and we shall see our way. Till then, the more "we are agitated by a Divine unrest," the better. The world is watching us, and if we delay much longer, it will try to do our work itself.

J. FOXLEY.



ART. IV.—THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE MASSES.

WE may well bewail the materialistic instinct which inspires the multitude. It is customary to regard the millionaire as the incarnation of the desire for wealth, and to regard the toiling masses as those who desire merely the pittance which will sustain life in more or less—probably less—comfort. This is an utter fallacy. The whole aspiration of modern trade-unionism is materialistic in its coarsest sense. That movement, which took its rise in a reasonable desire to protect those who were under the heel of a tyranny, has now become an aggression towards an equal, not an equitable, division of wealth. It has been notably reluctant to undertake efforts for the furtherance of less materialistic aims. Only in respect to the curtailment of hours of labour has it shown any sympathy with aims which cannot be directly estimated in the coinage of the realm, and it is to be feared that in its desire for the curtailment of hours of labour the trade-union movement has been impelled by an impulse from without—the same impulse which urged men, but fifty years ago, to smash machines and to hate inventors, the impulse which is timid and fearful lest the few should

succeed and others fail. Organized labour has seen, in the industrial zone, the death of the one institution which fostered sweetness and light—the Mechanics' Institute; it has seen the decay of the old "penny readings," and the ascendancy of the cheap music-hall; it has witnessed the triumph of spectacular athletics and the decay of honest sport; it has seen the conquest of minds by the scrappy paper, and the wholesale neglect of the book, until free libraries are as neglected as churches, and intelligent reading has been lost in the thirst for sensation. The trade-union movement is not directly responsible for this change in the mind of the masses, but the materialism which it has preached, in season and out of season, has been one of the forces which have acted in this direction.

It would be possible, and it would be justifiable, to paint a darker picture. Materialism in political aim has its counterpart in materialism in moral ideal. Those who are anxious to draw the attention of the public to the state of morals in the villages of England would be shocked did they but turn their attention to what we may call industrial villages—those grimy assemblies of monotonous rows of monotonous houses. He who has listened, as a student of social affairs, to what happens at the last few days of the criminal assizes at Liverpool and Manchester and York will be saddened and subdued. Such human depravity as is there revealed would seem to be incredible; certainly it is unmentionable in public print. Even the daily papers, to their infinite credit, are silent in respect to these last grim days. Here it can only be indicated, but it is a fact that little girls of twelve years step into the witness-boxes and prattle of wickedness—their own wickedness—with such glibness as is appalling. It is no fancy picture. At Liverpool, in February, Mr. Justice Grantham expressed himself as appalled by the story of juvenile depravity then laid bare—at children selling themselves to vice, and being shamefully intimate with the full meaning of their acts. There must be a strangely degrading atmosphere surrounding these black towns and villages; it is a miasma of immorality; it is a fog which stinks with Satanic influences. There is rampant heathendom on every hand. It is not the mere absence of church- or chapel-going that we have in mind; it is something far deeper. It is the absence of a moral basis upon which character may be builded. The materialism of to-day has percolated through the strata until it has permeated all. Morals are coarse appreciations of delights, and most frequently delights which money can procure. There is an utter lack of valuation of the vague and indefinable joys which come from literary communion, or artistic elevation, or intellectual cultivation. That herein lies the problem of the

hour is the contention of this paper. What worth that every member of the proletariat receive twice a living wage if he spend it on that which is but the life of a brute beast? We have tried to regenerate mankind by an adjustment of incomes, by Housing Acts, by Licensing Acts. So far we have succeeded. Creature-comfortism is largely assured. In the human sties there is abundance of clean straw. There is enough of food and of clothing; and of tawdry jewellery—far more than enough. But can it fairly be said that the lives of the proletariat are in any real sense one whit nearer worth the living?

It is at this point that we must bring our main topic forward. We set out by regarding a University as a repository for the best influences of all kinds—mind-broadening, refining, edifying. Whatever form a University may take, its purpose is to strengthen and to feed and to cultivate the human mind. It is not sufficient that it turn out equipped professional men. Of such the world has enough and to spare. But meantime the minds of the masses are ill-nurtured; indeed, they are, contrariwise, nurtured with evil, which is a very different and a far more serious matter. It is but the feeblest reply that here and there to a promising boy a scholarship has been given. That serves in most cases to help the promising boy to despise the unpromising. We come back to the main question: What are Universities doing for the masses? It is a pertinent question to-day. By the stroke of a pen the Privy Council has established three new Universities in the North, in the very heart of densely-populated industrial England. To these unborn Universities we may address our question most pointedly, though it is by no means restricted in import to them. Nor need we forget what has been done. University Extension and University Settlements have been the manifestations of the work of the past. They are both laudable enterprises. They partake of the missionary character, inasmuch as they go forth to convert the less fortunate. They are emanations from the University influence rather than that influence itself, and consequently those whom they help have the feeling—and cannot but have the feeling—that they are a lower grade of person, for whom but the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table are destined. Giving full credit to these movements, we may point out that they are small spasmodic efforts on the part of individuals, and do not represent any fervid desire on the part of University authorities to bring the light to earth's darker places. We have all heard the pearls-before-swine argument. It is as unsound as it is insulting.

In what directions can the Universities—and especially the

new Universities—proceed if they are to undertake the mission of checking the advance of materialism, and of fostering in its place those loftier and sweeter aims which alone are worthy of mankind? It may seem at the very outset to be a hopeless enterprise. The Universities may well say to the world that it is their function only to give to them that seek. It must be admitted that this is a secure position to take up. The trouble is that there are many seeking—and earnestly and sincerely seeking—of whose existence the Universities are officially unaware. The collier—and he is not a phantasm—who is spelling out Henry's First Latin Book somewhere in the background of his village; the grocer's assistant—I knew him—who could read, with reasonable fluency, his Greek New Testament: these know not a University, nor does a University know them. But they are, *in potentia*, the very elements which will prove to be the salt of the whole labour movement. Here and there, in hidden byways, there are those who have toiled, who have spent their hard-won leisure, who have sacrificed their pet desires, that they might buy a coveted book. They are not a numerous body. In the forefront of labour movements to-day, of dictatorial trade-unionism, there are not the cultured men who have learned to look at all questions with an openness of mind, an appreciation of argument and counter-argument, which makes the opinion, when at length it is arrived at, of enhanced value to the world and of enhanced influence over those who are to be led. Already it has been said of one labour leader that he is intolerable, that he must be "kicked out"; and one of the reasons urged for this enlightened procedure is that he is too much respected "by our enemies" for his culture and his learning. It is to the interest of the grosser trade-unionism that everything in the direction of refinement should be negatively, if not positively, discouraged. The deeper knowledge, which manifests itself as culture, is always regarded as a mark of the "gentleman," and there is a constant danger of a reactionary movement which will regard coarseness and ignorance as the characteristics of the "plain, blunt, hard-working man." So long as this scorn of culture prevails, so long as Universities are regarded as the exclusive property of the upper classes, so long as it is recognised that for ordinary walks in life the higher knowledge is rather a disqualification than an advantage, so long will the materialistic side of trade-union and labour movements be manifested. The question arises whether the blame is altogether to be attached to the masses themselves. Since the dawn of the industrial era up to comparatively lately it has certainly been generally accepted by the intelligent community that the Universities comprised Oxford and

Cambridge, to one of which everyone who was anyone sent his son to be educated. At rare intervals London was heard of, and, maybe, Durham; but as a general rule, in ordinary conversation—and, indeed, in ordinary literature—the other Universities were practically of no account.

Is it to be wondered at that the great class below, feeling its need for something which money could not buy, began to wonder within its own heart why a University, with all its helps and influences, could not be founded in its own neighbourhood? Out of that inchoate desire arose the demand for a University, and in reply the Victoria University was founded, having colleges at Liverpool, Manchester, and Leeds. Now the University spirit, as I would call it, has still grown, and Liverpool and Manchester are to separate and to have a University each for itself. So far so good. But does this in any way check the materialism of which I have spoken? I fear not in an appreciable degree, and yet it is a movement in that direction. University Extension has done much in its own way, and by the help of the earnest men who energize the movement in the North, to arouse an interest. Something is wanted far more definitely—a portion of the work of the Universities themselves. The University itself stays cosily within its own narrow bounds, and is indulgent if this or that of its children dares to stray without the garden walls. Now let us put the issue quite plainly. In the industrial zone there is rampant materialism. Souls which are capable of great things are being stunted in the deadly atmosphere. Worse than this, the sole direction of mental energy and of aspiration is towards increase of wages and fighting "capital." No one has offered, to any considerable extent, any other occupation for the millions of minds in South Lancashire, and nearly all that has been done has been the work of two great municipalities. We need therefore to take these new Universities by the buttonhole, and to make it quite clear to them that their duty is to this vast community of mankind. No doubt the Universities in question will teach technical science, and all the arts necessary to professional equipment. No doubt in this respect they will perform, and more than perform, their duty. But so long as a collier or cotton-spinner can say to himself that he would so much like to know something about history, if only he knew someone to give him advice—so long as there is one such artisan, and to-day there are thousands—the new Universities have not finished the work which they take in hand. It is not so foolish a dream as it may appear to be, but one can picture all these Lancashire towns, packed as they are with humanity, being linked together in a precious chain of influence with the Universities. It has

been said that the succession of aspirations of a provincial city is to have a Lord Mayor, a Cathedral, a University. It is to be feared that in such an estimation the three are regarded rather as ornaments than as utilities. There is a danger lest provincial Universities should content themselves with mere existence—should say that since they are established all is well, and the last diadem has been placed on the brow of this or of that city.

But to carry out the ideal to which we have referred, to be the focussing medium of all the forces that would tend to relieve the monotony of artisan life, to redeem it from materialism, the thirst for money and coarse delights, these Universities will need a hardier vigour than that conferred by mere existence. They will need to set out at once to inquire into the intellectual needs of the people. Not in a moment can the naked state of the land in this respect be thoroughly realized. We have patted ourselves on the backs in respect to the advance of education, but we have hardly realized how non-educative it really is. The men and women can read; they can write; they can turn into arithmetic such problems as assail them day by day in their ordinary avocations. But reading and writing are only channels to education. They are the instruments only. Who teaches what to read, and how to digest that which is read? Who teaches them the use of the Free Libraries dotted here and there, now, alas! an influence far less worthy than they should be? Here we have the kernel of the whole question. We have put certain intellectual instruments in the hands of the masses, but we have neither taught the right use, nor have we provided the true material upon which they should be used. Imagine teaching a man to read and then setting him adrift on the miscellaneous literature of the day, and then presuming to call the process "education"! One would permit the Universities a wide range of procedure if but they took up the education of the people after the primary school stage. Popular—very popular—lectures might do much, and no one would object to the use of the magic-lantern. Indeed, the saving grace of humour might wield a considerable influence in attracting people, and certainly, as John Wesley said of hymn tunes, there is no reason why the devil should have all the laughter.

But whatever enterprise is attempted, it must be co-ordinated with the general work of the parent body. It must not be capriciously arranged, and provided by a more or less authoritative local body, having a sort of pseudo-philanthropy writ large above their aims and enterprises. The day has gone by for eleemosynary education. The men of the great masses know quite well that they have a claim to

something in the way of higher education, and that it is by no means the property of certain privileged classes. The new Universities will have to face this fact at the outset of their careers. It is no doubt a portion of their functions to confer medical and law and arts degrees upon worthy young persons who have qualified therefor. It is no doubt a portion of their functions to provide for the higher research and the addition to higher knowledge. It is no doubt also their function to choose from the great proletariat those who manifest, either in scholarship examinations or otherwise, some peculiar fitness for what are called the "learned" professions. But there is a higher function for these newer Universities, and there is before them at this moment a grand opportunity to exercise this higher function. There is a right and a wrong sense in which a University is a close preserve. In the right sense, it must carefully safeguard all professional and other diplomas, and must insure their uniformity of value. But it should not make a close preserve of knowledge. The very word "University" connotes a wider regard, a greater readiness of adaptation of means to end, a loftier appreciation of the needs of all men; and the new Universities, close to the threshold of the working man in his thousands, will hear his clamour for some of the sweetness of their influence. It is better that he should clamour for knowledge and insist upon satisfaction, rather than, blind and ignorant, he should clamour for strange political readjustments, and believe that if he and his fellows received in their open hands a larger share of gold weekly all would be well in the land. It is for the Universities to which we refer to break down the materialistic heresy, and this can only be done by inculcating the taste for other delights. There never was a fallacy greater than that which teaches that education breeds discontent; it is not education, but that which masquerades as education, which breeds discontent. The character which is led out of itself, which is educated, may find, and probably will find, injustices around it, for, after all, the world is but human. But it will find some just men and just acts: it will learn that the world is sweeter and better and wiser for the life of So-and-so, even though So-and-so was a capitalist. It will reflect that all processes of social, like other, developments are sadly slow. Above all, it will be impressed by the fact that there are "capitalists" in all grades of society, and that neither money nor might makes the man.

If this lesson be driven home in England in the next few years, it may save us from the consequences of some acts of stupendous folly. Only those who know the innerness of Lancashire life would believe the insensate and revolutionary

materialism which has gripped the hearts of a multitude which ought to be intelligent. Occasionally it bursts into an oratorical threat of mob violence, but, as a rule, it slumbers strangely volcanically, as if ready to pour out its fury at any moment. It does not need counteragent force at this stage to deal with this subterranean menace. It needs enlightenment. Did not an eminent historian say that the French Revolution would have transformed Europe had the first revolutionaries but known what they wanted? We need never be afraid of intelligent revolt, but we have much reason to fear the brute revolt of unreasoning multitudes. Not only to the multitudes themselves, but to the State and the well-being of the Empire, the Universities have a duty which presses heavily upon them; and particularly is that the case in respect to the new Northern Universities placed in the very centre of the industrial district. There could be no greater bulwark for the nation's welfare than an enlightened labouring and artisan class, recognising its social needs, and urging them with such a temper as is the more forcible since it is the less tyrannical. For such a class legislation might yet do much; but it is not legislation which is needed, nor, indeed, is it any action from without. It is the kindling of the inner flames, which, alas! seemed to have slumbered into scarce-glowing embers. This will involve the sweetening and deepening of life. It will substitute the real for the false discontent—the discontent with self for the discontent with everyone else; whilst it will foster an enthusiasm for life and for the unseen glories of which life affords an occasional glimpse, instead of the constant carping fault-finding and the fellowship in quarrelsome.

JOHN GARRETT LEIGH.

ART V.—“THE FIRST BIBLE.”¹

IN this volume Colonel Conder has set himself a hard task. It is to attempt to prove that the first Hebrew records were written on tablets, in the cuneiform script. How far his proof carries us we propose to examine in the following article. He has, to begin with, our sympathy, because he thinks that the general result of the inquiry points to the antiquity and careful transmission, of the Bible text. Anything that helps

¹ “The First Bible,” by Colonel C. R. Conder, LL.D., M.R.A.S., R.E. William Blackwood and Sons, 1902.

to establish these points, if it be built on a sure foundation, is to be welcomed.

But, in the first place, we must demur to his title. What, after all, he is endeavouring to convince us of, is not that the first Bible was in the form of a library, may we say, of tablets collected together, but that the documents upon which the history of the earliest periods of Scripture History as it has come down to us is based, took the form of tablets inscribed in a cuneiform character. This requires to be stated: perhaps, however, it leaves the actual matter for inquiry quite as interesting.

Colonel Conder's small volume is full of learning, but in many parts very discursive. He gives us, for instance, two elaborate genealogical tables, one of languages, the other of alphabets, amongst the vast amount of compressed information at the end of the volume. Such tables may be very good in their proper place, but they do not contribute much to the elucidation of the special subject under treatment.

The results which, it is contended, may be arrived at are summarized at the end of the work (pp. 197, 198). The first of these is thus expressed:

"In the time of Moses the literature of Western Asia was preserved on tablets of brick and stone, and in the cuneiform script."

And this is practically the all-important one.

An initial difficulty that occurs to us, at any rate with reference to the brick tablets, is that Palestine was not, like Egypt and Mesopotamia, a great brick-producing country. There seems to be no sufficient proof of any industry of the kind as indigenous amongst the Canaanites. True, indeed, that a certain number of inscribed tablets have been found at Amarna, containing a correspondence between a vassal court in Canaan and the Egyptian suzerain, in Babylonian characters. But it is very doubtful whether all the hands that wrote the characters were Canaanite at all.

That important laws and events were occasionally inscribed on stone is quite another thing. There were the two tables of stone containing the decalogue, "written on both their sides." Colonel Conder has given us as a frontispiece to his volume "the Ten Commandments in Cuneiform." We are not sufficiently acquainted with that script to say whether what he gives us duly represents the Hebrew or not. But, while he reminds us more than once that the tablets were written on both sides, when he comes to make his restoration in cuneiform script, he puts the Ten Commandments on one tablet, not on two. It is further to be noticed that he puts five commandments on each side of the tablet, and, so far as

we can make out, his tenth commandment is longer than the second.

Whatever the material the letters may have been written upon which Hezekiah received from Assyria—and of one of these be it remembered it is said that he *spread it* before the Lord—it does not follow that the letters which he wrote himself were on similar material or in the like script. The word used of them (אֲבָרְתָי) in 2 Chron. xxx. 6, does not occur in the earlier historical books, and it may well be a loan-word derived from the later intercourse with Babylonia. To say that "the letters which Hezekiah himself sent out were brick tablets" is an unproven assertion. And as to the script, we know of nothing but alphabetic writing—the Semitic alphabet was known even in Babylonia ("Encycl. Biblica," 5357, Art. "Writing")—amongst the Hebrews and other neighbouring Semites, and our knowledge of the existence of such a character goes back to the ninth century B.C. Under these circumstances, we should like to know why "the original Hebrew tablets of the Law . . . could not, it would seem, have been written in alphabetic characters" (p. 56). If the cuneiform script was superseded in Palestine by the alphabetic characters so entirely as Conder would have us suppose, we should have expected something of the same kind to have happened in Babylonia, whereas, as a matter of fact, cuneiform was still in use in Babylonia as late as 81 A.D. The fact is, there is absolutely no connection between the cuneiform and the alphabetic writing, and such a change as Colonel Conder suggests seems almost impossible. The acrostic poems of the Old Testament, of whatever date they may be, point to a long-existing alphabetic writing, as such artificial compositions indicate a late development in literature.

Moreover, the Pentateuch, of whose authority the writer of this book is so staunch an upholder, itself speaks of written books, *not* tablets. The curses in the ordeal for jealousy (Num. v. 23) were to be written in a book and blotted out into the water of bitterness. The words of the Law were written by Moses in a book according to Deut. xxxi. 24. The king that was to rule in later days was to write a copy of the Law in a book (Deut. xvii. 18). This does not look as if there was any idea—even if we suppose for an instant that Deuteronomy was a product of the later times of the kingdom of Judah—that the law had been originally written on tablets in a cuneiform script. What "the pen of a man" (Isa. viii. 1; R.V. marg. "common characters") may exactly mean seems very uncertain. Cheyne, in his Polychrome edition of Isaiah, seems to think it only means plain unadorned writing, without any caligraphic

decorations, such as was the Siloam inscription of Hezekiah's time still existing. Moreover, Conder never discusses the question whether some of the tablets mentioned in the Old Testament may not have been of a similar character with that mentioned in St. Luke i. 63—a wooden frame with a waxen surface for writing on, which could be used over and over again.

As to the copying out of the Proverbs of Solomon in Hezekiah's reign, this expression certainly cannot be strained to imply their previous existence in tablets "perhaps not in alphabetic characters" (p. 93). It is clear from the Old Testament that there was a renaissance in the world of letters in the reign of Hezekiah. This led amongst other things to the reproduction of these proverbs, and it may very likely have been from a still lower stratum of old documents in the same old chest that there was exhumed the copy of Deuteronomy made by or for King Solomon himself, in accordance with the law of Deut. xvii. 18 (*cf.* 1 Kings ii. 3).

We need not trouble ourselves with dealing with the question of the pointing of the Massoretic text, its inconsistencies and mistakes. That part of the Hebrew text is more of the nature of a scholiast upon the original text. But Conder would also have us hold that the discrepancies in reading proper names may be due to mistaken readings of a cuneiform script. This requires more careful examination than we have space to give to it here; but it will be clear that there are other equally obvious explanations which may be true, as, for instance, in the case of the names ending with "baal" or "bosheth."

In the last chapter of his book the author deals with a certain number of alleged discrepancies between the Bible narrative and the monuments. He lays down one general condition which is not always remembered that, "If there be a discrepancy between the statements of a Hebrew writer . . . and those of an Assyrian scribe, we have no right to assume that the Hebrew account is the less reliable" (p. 147). We know of particular cases of tampering with the ancient monuments by later kings which prove that the Assyrian scribe was compelled to put down or to substitute for what was already written that which would please his royal master. But all this has nothing or little to do with "The Bible on Bricks," as one chapter of this work is entitled.

A number of notes conclude the volume, followed by two appendices. In the second of these Colonel Conder gives a rough estimate of the number of tablets which would have been required, in his opinion, on which to record what he somewhat curiously calls "the various episodes in Genesis." His

reckoning is rather vague, but apparently he considers that at the most rather more than a hundred tablets would include the whole narrative.

There are several *obiter dicta* of the writer of this book to which we must demur. He leads us to infer that the Jewish rules for writing copies of the Law were of the most binding character from the earliest times. As a matter of fact, these rules do not seem to have been formulated till after the commencement of the Christian era. The Hebrew text behind the Greek Version of the LXX., the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch, and the lately discovered papyrus containing the Decalogue and the *Shema* are surely conclusive proof of this. We cannot accept the derivation suggested (p. 33) for the name Uriah, namely "worshipper of the god Ea," and other suggestions of a similar kind require very careful and discriminating examination before being accepted. Again, it is an exaggeration to say that "Hebrew has either not possessed at any time, or has dropped, the noun-cases of the Assyrian and Arabic" (p. 50). An examination of the section on "Probable Remains of Early Case-Endings" in the latest edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (§ 90) would lead to a modification of this statement.

The statement "that writing was not a general accomplishment, and that Uriah the Hittite in particular could not decipher the message" of his master (p. 86), seems to us like trifling. Even tablets were put in cases and secured—and we can scarcely imagine that the correspondence between a Sovereign and his Commander-in-Chief at the seat of war would take the form of an "open letter."

Colonel Conder has written a very interesting volume; he has taken much pains over his subject, but we cannot say that he has convinced us. There seems to be something lacking about it all. It is rather too much like a piece of special pleading. The way to the re-establishing of the Bible narrative, and especially that of the Pentateuch, in its grand and isolated position towering above all other ancient records, must be sought for in other directions. We think that the way is being made clearer by the deeper study of the oldest versions, and by such discoveries as that of the papyrus of the Decalogue. The minds of men are eagerly looking for any helps to that re-establishment, now that so much of the subjective "Higher Criticism" is reducing itself to an absurdity. The rewriting of passages of the Old Testament to bolster up new theories necessarily brings men back to the old instruction to "ask for the old paths and walk therein, and so to find rest for their souls."

H. A. REDPATH.

ART. VI.—THE USE AND APPLICATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IN THE PRAYER-BOOK.

WE may divide the Scriptural passages used in the Prayer-Book into three classes.

1. Passages read directly from the Bible, such as :

(a) Opening sentences in Morning and Evening Prayer which are from the A.V.

(b) The Lord's Prayer, which is identical with the A.V. of St. Matthew, except for the use of "trespasses" for "debts."

(c) The Canticles, which only differ in a few unimportant words.

(d) The Psalms, which are taken from Cranmer's Bible, and were retained as being familiar and adapted for chanting.

(e) The Ten Commandments, from the same.

(f) The Offertory sentences, ditto.

(g) The Epistles and Gospels from the A.V., and also the gospels in the Baptism services.

(h) The opening sentences in the Burial Service from the A.V., but not so the anthem, "I heard a voice."

2. Phrases incorporated in prayers and exhortations and other parts of the service, as "ministers and stewards of thy mysteries" in the Collect, "One fold and One Shepherd" in the Collect, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, and the words used at the Ordination of Priests.

3. Passages expressly cited in support of doctrine in the Exhortations—*e.g.*, in the Communion Service from John vi., from St. Mark xvi. in the Baptism of Adults, in the Homily in the Commination Service.

The question which we are to discuss as regards all these uses of Holy Scripture seems to resolve itself into two: first, as to whether the English Version used in the Prayer-Book adequately represents the original in the light of our present knowledge; and, secondly, a deeper question, whether the use of some of these passages in the context in which they occur is warranted. In short, were a revision of the Prayer-Book to be carried out, what alteration, if any, would be called for to bring our form of doctrine to a level with our present Biblical knowledge? It is evident, I think, that the last revisers of the Prayer-Book were not very anxious on the subject, otherwise they would not have left in so much of the older versions of the Bible as they did. They seem to have regarded practical usefulness in devotion as more important than scrupulous accuracy of rendering. At the present time, we ask, are the points in question of such importance as to call for further revision? Let us take a few of the most noticeable.

I. Passages read directly from the Bible.

The question of using uniformly the same version in all cases (omitting that of the Psalms) is complicated now by the existence of a R.V., which, though far from universally received, yet has in many cases recommended itself to us. Are there any instances where the various rendering is important in point of doctrine so as to call for change?

1. The Lord's Prayer. Are we prepared to adopt the Revisers' Version of this most sacred and time-honoured formula, and say "evil one" for "evil" in the last clause? Of course, no one thinks of countenancing that fragmentary piece of pedantry which figures in St. Luke, chap. xi. But, as regards this one change in St. Matthew's version, the revisers were perhaps justified in making it. It is noteworthy that in the Liturgy of St. Mark, which, according to Dr. Neale, is as early as the second century, we find in the secret prayer of the Priest, *μηδὲ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πείρασμον, ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ*. This change had, we know, the authority of Bishop Lightfoot. But inasmuch as the general term (evil) includes also the specific (evil one), or, as our Catechism interprets it, "our ghostly enemy," it seems quite unnecessary, as it would certainly be impolitic, to make a change in so well known a formula.

2. The Prayer-Book Version of the Psalms we should be unwilling to change, especially as the practice of chanting them is becoming increasingly popular in all churches. It is always well, however, to remind scholars in our schools that for the meaning of obscure passages and expressions recourse should be had to the Bible.

3. In the Offertory sentences there is certainly an ambiguity in the wording of "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works," which is obviated by the R.V., "Even so let your light shine." But the same purpose is served by omitting the word "so," which really refers to the previous clause relating to the lamp.

4. In the Epistles and Gospels there may be passages which we should prefer to read from the R.V., especially in the case of the Epistle for the first Sunday after Easter, from 1 John v. Other instances are: John x. 16, where one *fold* is substituted for one *flock*; St. Mark xvi. 16, where we read, "He that believeth not shall be damned" (R.V. condemned)—the word "damned" having acquired a peculiar meaning, which does not belong to it etymologically. In 1 Cor. xi. 29, where a still greater objection lies to the word *damnation*, the marginal rendering *judgment* may well be substituted, as is always my personal use, in the Communion Office Exhortation. More will be said of these instances later on.

5. The first two opening sentences in the Burial Service have been spoken of as open to question, as (a) St. John xi. 25, 26; (b) Job xix. 25.

With regard to (a), the verse is also incorporated in the second collect of the same service, and again, partially, in the second prayer of the Baptismal Office.

The R.V. substitutes "though he die" for "though he were dead," but retains "shall never die" for *οὐ μὴ ἀποθανεῖται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

Bishop Westcott is very strong on the propriety of this rendering of *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, as against the older version, "shall not die for ever," or, as in the Burial collect, "shall not die eternally."

The same point arises in the *Te Deum*, where "Ne confundar in eternum" is rendered "Let me never be confounded"; and in Psalm xv. 5, "He that doeth these things shall never fall." It would seem that in these instances, whatever may be said of other passages, the rendering "not for ever" or "not eternally" commends itself very strongly, and the rendering "shall never die" seems to the ordinary mind to convey a wrong impression.

The second sentence from Job xix. is much disputed as to its rendering and as to its reference to a future resurrection of the body. The R.V., however, does not differ very essentially from the A.V.; and though we cannot press the words "Redeemer" and "in My flesh," the general reference to a future vindication and a vision of God in another state warrant the use of the passage in this connection. The Vulgate rendering, which has "Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum; et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum meum," may well have influenced the ecclesiastical mind, and associated the passage with a more definite hope than the original could warrant.

II. Scriptural phrases incorporated into the language of the Prayer-Book. The following have occurred or been suggested to me:

1. *One fold for one flock* (Good Friday Collect).
2. *Comfortless for orphans* (Latin) or *desolate* (R.V.) (Collect for Sunday after Ascension Day).
3. "The brother whose praise is in the Gospel" applied to St. Luke (Collect).
4. St. John vi. 54, 56 applied to the Holy Communion. (Long Exhortation).
5. *Damnation for judgment* (Long Exhortation).
6. The rendering of *ὑπερέχουσα πάντα γούνα* in the Blessing after Holy Communion.

7. *Our vile body* in the Burial Service for *body of our humiliation* (R.V.).

8. *Everlasting* for *eternal* death (Catechism), *damnation* (Litany), *life* (Collect).

9. *Goodwill towards men* for *Among men in whom God is well pleased* (*Gloria in Excelsis*).

10. The use of Jas. i. 1 for the Epistle for St. Philip and St. James's Day, as identifying the Apostle with the writer of the Epistle. This instance does not really come under any of the three heads, and may be classed with the provision of Gen. xxviii. for St. Bartholomew's Day, as identifying the Apostle with Nathanael (*cf.* John i. 51).

Of the above, the most important are 1, 4, 5, 8, 9; 3 and 10 are matters of ecclesiastical antiquarianism; 2 is an inaccuracy endeared by association; 6 is also consecrated by use, and has the authority of the R.V.; 7 is hardly of the highest importance. To take most of these in order:

1. The substitution of *one fold* for *one flock* in John x. 16, though it may have been harmless at first, and indeed, if not unduly pressed, may be harmless still, has derived an importance from its being rooted in the phraseology of the Roman Church, and, to a mind unacquainted with Greek, from its appearing to assert the necessity of outward fellowship of Gentile and Jew under one human pastor, who is assumed to be the Bishop of Rome; or if the *human* pastor is not pressed, at any rate it lays stress upon the oneness of the organization of the Church, instead of upon the intercommunion of the members of the Church, who are the flock. So deeply is this version of our Lord's words ingrained into the minds of those who have been brought up in the Roman Communion that even Dr. Döllinger, in his lecture on "Reunion," written from a point of view as far as possible removed from being ultramontane, quotes the text thus at the conclusion of his last lecture, in which he has been expressing the most sanguine hopes of intercommunion between members of separated Churches, not of their incorporation into or submission to the Roman Church. One would have thought this the very opportunity for laying stress upon the original language. We naturally ask how it came about that this error of the Latin version came to remain in the English Bible. One would have supposed that a passage so liable to be abused would have attracted the attention of the various scholars, who from Tyndale onwards rendered directly from the Greek. Tyndale (1525-35), in fact, did correct it; but so strong was the influence of Wycliffe's Bible, which simply perpetuated the Latin error, that it was introduced into the Bible of 1539, and

actually retained its place in 1611. When Erasmus and even Beza retained *ovile* for the Greek *ποιμνη*, one sees how strong is the power of old associations. The error seems to have originally arisen from the carelessness of Jerome, the old Latin version distinguishing *ovile* and *grex*. Cyprian makes the correction; Augustine, in his commentary on the passage, does not note the distinction, though elsewhere he reads the passage correctly. The standard text of the Vulgate perpetuated and consecrated the error, which stares one in the face in letters of stone on the façade of the cathedral at Rouen.

5. The use of the word *damnation* in connection with the reception in an unworthy manner of the Elements in the Lord's Supper is a calamity too familiar to need much discussion. The word really conveys no more than the Latin does, and therefore is equivalent to condemnation in some penalty not defined, but varying. The English word, however, has come to have only one meaning, and that the most awful. The threat of increasing their damnation by receiving without due preparation, which is held out in the first warning in the Holy Communion, must therefore have acted as a deterrent beyond what was needed; and the repetition of the word in the Long Exhortation to actual communicants, derived from 1 Cor. xi., where only *κριμα* (not even *κατάκριμα*) is used, and where temporal judgments are expressly referred to in the context, is a blemish upon our Communion Office, which I think we may justly remove ourselves in reading it, because the word is manifestly an archaism, and not intended to convey what it signifies to common men.

The use of *everlasting* (instead of uniformly *eternal*) for the Greek word *αἰώνιος* is a stumbling-block to some. It may perhaps be supposed from the use of them both at once in the Burial Office, "thine eternal and everlasting glory," that the two words do not mean exactly the same thing; and there is no doubt that the latter is to most people synonymous with *endless*, whereas *eternal* is to be regarded as an equivalent for *αἰώνιος*, which has no corresponding word in English, and can only be rendered by the Latin word *eternal*. As, however, it is usual in the Prayer-Book to employ two words (synonymous or nearly so) when one is more intelligible to ordinary people than the other, it is quite possible that these two words were in the idea of the compilers of the Prayer-Book identical in meaning. It is only, therefore, in deference to recent controversies and distinctions that one would advocate the use of the word *eternal* in all cases—*e.g.*, eternal death in the Catechism, eternal damnation or condemnation in the Litany, and eternal life in John iii. 16 and other texts used in the

Prayer-Book, just as in Matt. xxv., last verse (R.V.), we have now *eternal* life and *eternal* punishment.

9. The version of the *Gloria in Excelsis* found in the Communion Office tallies with the A.V., and not with the R.V. and Vulgate, because it is a Greek hymn taken from the Codex Alexandrinus, which reads *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία, not εὐδοκίας*. There is much to be said in favour of both readings, but for myself I think the revisers have done well in adopting the reading of *Ν* and B, and assimilating our version of the angelic hymn to that commonly used in the Latin Church—*hominibus bonæ voluntatis*—though this latter phrase very inadequately expresses the original. *Goodwill towards men* does not convey any idea of the *εὐδοκία* of God towards man, but it is taken vaguely in the sense of good feeling between man and man, such as is associated with the season of Christmas.

We now come to (3). The collect for St. Luke's Day contains the phrase from 2 Cor. viii. 18, "whose praise is in the Gospel," assuming that the brother mentioned is St. Luke, though he is not expressly named. The point is argued at great length by Wordsworth in his edition of "St. Paul's Epistles," and he decides in favour of St. Luke by a process of elimination, there being only five other persons who answer to the description of the brother given in verse 19, as St. Paul's fellow-traveller and helper in the administration of the collection made for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem. These five are Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius of Derbe, Tychicus, and Trophimus, none of whom were such constant fellow-travellers of St. Paul on his journeys as St. Luke was, and none of whom, we may add, were of such note as to be described in such terms. The application of the words to St. Luke is supported by Origen, Primasius, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom (but not always), Pelagius, Anselm, Cajetan, etc. Alford suggests Trophimus, and altogether rejects any reference to the written Gospel of St. Luke. It is plain that the expression in the Greek is a very strange one to bear this reference. If it were *διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*—"through his Gospel"—*ἐν πασαῖς ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*—"in all the Churches"—reversing the prepositions, it would have sounded more like the Evangelist. It is more in accordance with New Testament usage to refer *εὐαγγέλιον* to an oral Gospel, as in Phil. iv., "who laboured with me in the Gospel." Enough authority, however, is found in Christian tradition to warrant the use of the expression in the collect, though one would hardly quote the Prayer-Book as an authority in the controversy. The date usually assigned to St. Luke's Gospel is 58-60 A.D., that of

2 Corinthians 57 or 58 A.D. This disposes of the reference to the written Gospel.

10. With regard to the use of the Epistle of St. James in connection with St. James the Less, our Prayer-Book adopts the conclusion that the Apostle was the same person as the Lord's brother, afterwards Bishop of Jerusalem and the writer of the Epistle. Though Bishop Lightfoot and Alford both distinguish these persons, the Article in Smith's "Bible Dictionary" concludes that they are the same. We cannot, therefore, say that the usage of the Prayer-Book has been discredited by later critics.

6. The rendering of *ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν* by *passing all understanding*, is no doubt liable to misconception. Lightfoot prefers "surpassing every counsel (or device) of man"—*i.e.*, "which is far better, and produces a higher satisfaction than all punctilious self-assertion or anxious forethought." The A.V. and R.V. are supported by another passage (Eph. iii. 20), "above all that we ask or think" (*νοοῦμεν*). Other interpretations are given by Alford from Calvin, Estius, Chrysostom, etc., but he adopts Erasmus: "Res felicior quam mens humana queat percipere." The alteration of so time-honoured a formula would be open to objection, even if more could be said against the usual rendering.

III. Passages expressly cited in support of doctrine.

1. St. John vi. 54, 55 in its application to the Eucharist.
2. St. Mark xvi. 16, cited in the Exhortation contained in the Baptism of Adults.
3. 1 Peter iii. 20, 21, in the same.

To these might be added the use of John iii. 5 in the same service. But it is hardly possible for anyone but a Quaker to dispute the reference to baptism in the words "born of water and the Spirit," whatever explanation of the words he may prefer.

1. This question is too long and important to come within the limits of this paper.

2. The citation of Mark xvi. 15, 16, not only contains the word *damned* before objected to, as conveying a wrong impression, but perhaps may be a stumbling-block to some, as involving a belief in the non-salvation of all the unbaptized. It is, however, to be noticed that the comment made on these words in the Exhortation goes no farther than this: "Which also showeth us the great benefit we reap thereby." Possibly also the doubt thrown upon the last twelve verses of this Gospel, owing to their omission from the two reputed oldest MSS. and on other grounds, would make us now unwilling to apply them to the doctrine of Baptism. Few, however, can doubt that, though they do not form part of the original

Gospel, the verse existed at a very early date and had a wide acceptance.

3. We now come to St. Peter's reference to Baptism in the third chapter of his first Epistle. The allusion to Noah's Ark was adopted in the first prayer of the Baptismal Office, and the passage is expressly cited in the Exhortation to which we have been referring; in the Office for Adults "even Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ." The R.V. reads, "which also after a true likeness (or, in the antitype) doth now save you, even Baptism," the relative referring to the *water* going before. However disputed the reading and the rendering of the passage may be, it seems to make little difference to the general sense, which attributes saving virtue to Baptism. Only the Apostle is careful to qualify his words to guard against the idea that the washing of the body is meant, and by the introduction of the clause "by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ" points to the real source of salvation, upon which the efficiency of Baptism rests. The use of the word *ἐπερώτημα* for *answer* seems to point to a question and answer such as is used in Baptism.

On the whole, then, does it not appear that little would be gained by a revision of the Prayer-Book in respect of its use and application of Holy Scripture? Ought we not rather to depend upon increased Biblical knowledge to guard against misconception than to risk changes which, if they rest merely upon the present state of critical science, may, after all, be only provisional? The ancient and primitive instincts and traditions which our Prayer-Book has preserved and enshrined for us are not necessarily erroneous because they have been associated with texts which, to the severely critical eye of the nineteenth century, do not appear necessarily to substantiate them. The Prayer-Book, after all, is not merely for the learned, but for the simple, and we may do more harm than good by suggesting doubts on serious subjects, when we are only anxious to remove misunderstandings. The history of the R.V. of the New Testament contains, in my opinion, a plain warning against this danger. In our exposition of Holy Scripture we are free, as long as we do not make one passage contradict another. Our teaching should certainly be of a piece with the services of which our sermons form a part; but it is difficult to see that any advance in Biblical knowledge impairs the substantial unity of Church doctrine and Bible truth. Rather, indeed, the more closely we study the original of the New Testament, the more we shall find that the doctrines of our Church are

in accord with the real sense of Holy Writ, whereas the tenets of sects are too often based upon the private interpretations of individuals.

CARLETON GREENE.



ART. VII.—WILLIAM BLAKE: SEER AND MYSTIC.

“**A** MAN perfect in his way, and beautifully unfit for walking in the way of any other man.” So Mr. Swinburne sums up his fellow-poet, and the phrase is more illuminative than many of the volumes, biographical and critical, which centre round the name of William Blake. For unlike other men as he undoubtedly was, unaccountable as his friends thought him, and unfit for the ordinary duties of life as his wife must often have found him, he was, after all, “beautifully unfit,” and in that qualifying word lies the whole point of the description.

The son of a London hosier, born and brought up in Golden Square, it might have seemed that his prosaic surroundings must inevitably weigh down the soaring pinions of his soul; but the boy's mind was fixed, not on the outward circumstances of his life, but on things unseen, and from his earliest years his visions were more real to him than any natural objects. Coming home one day from a walk to Dulwich, he told his father that he had seen “a tree filled with angels, bright wings bespangling every bough like stars”; and when in 1771 he was apprenticed to James Basire, the engraver to the Society of Antiquities, the boy of fourteen, being sent to make a drawing in Westminster Abbey, “suddenly saw the aisles and galleries filled with a great procession of monks and priests, choristers and censer-bearers, and his entranced ear heard the chant of plain-song and chorale, while the vaulted roof trembled to the sound of organ music.”

Such fancies have been shared by many precocious children, but Blake's artistic career was characterized by one peculiarity which is probably unique. “I assert for myself,” he says, “that I do not behold the outward creation, and that to me it is a hindrance.” Natural objects stood, as it were, between him and their spiritual essences, which alone he desired to express. “What?” he says, “it will be questioned, when the sun rises do you not see a round disc of fire, somewhat like a guinea? Oh no, no! I see an innumerable company of the heavenly host, crying Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty! I question not my corporeal eye, any more than

I would question a window concerning a sight, and I look through it and not with it."

These visions make up, in fact, the whole of Blake's life. His skill as an engraver gave him a means of livelihood by which he could support himself, but his spirit roamed at will among the clouds, and his earthly experiences no more affected his work than the flittings of a butterfly affect the exquisite colours upon its wings.

What Blake would have been without his wife we can only conjecture. To most women he would have been the most exasperating, even if the most lovable, of men, but to Catherine Boucher, the daughter of a market-gardener at Battersea, whom he married when he was twenty-five, he was, if unfit, yet "beautifully unfit" for walking in the ways of other men. Never once through all the long years of their married life do we read of her love failing or falling short of his requirements, although these requirements were certainly somewhat exacting! Fierce inspirations sometimes seized on him at night, "which seemed as though they would tear him asunder," and in these paroxysms of sketching or writing his wife would rise and sit beside him that he might feel the support of her presence, neither moving nor speaking for hours at a time. His younger brother, Robert, who lived with them, was one day offended by a speech of Catherine's, and made a complaint to him. "Kneel down," said Blake, "and beg Robert's pardon, or you shall never see my face again." She knelt down obediently, saying, "I was in the wrong," to which Robert, with tardy remorse, replied curtly: "Young woman, you lie!"

The poet's experiences at Felpham must have been a hard trial to his wife. A wealthy man, by name Mr. Hayley, invited Blake to come to this lovely seaside village in Sussex, promising to give him employment. At first the place seemed to him a paradise, and he wrote to a friend: "The sweet air and the voices of winds, trees, and birds, and the odours of the happy ground, make it a dwelling for immortals—work will go on here with God-speed." "Felpham," he writes again, "will be my first temple and altar; my wife is like a flame of many colours of precious jewels whenever she hears it named."

But poor Catherine's pleasure was soon alloyed by misunderstanding and friction between her husband and Mr. Hayley.

"He approves of my poems as little as he does of my designs," writes Blake. "I have been forced to insist on his leaving me, in both, to my own self-will, for I am determined to be no longer pestered with his genteel ignorance and polite disapprobation. His imbecile attempts to depress me only deserve laughter."

When things had come to this pass the position was clearly untenable, but we hear of no lamentations on Catherine's part when Felpham was left behind and they were installed in the restricted space of a small London lodging.

"What do we do, Kate, when the visions forsake us?" was his question, when Richmond, the young artist, came to consult him about the temporary lapses of inspiration to which every artistic temperament is subject. "We kneel down and pray," was her simple answer, though no one knew better than herself that these visions would never be to them a course of worldly gain. When their purse was exhausted, she would quietly place an empty dish before him at dinner-time, and at this eloquent hint he would take up his graving tools again; but as soon as the need was supplied, she allowed him to go back to his dreams without remonstrance.

Her housewifely skill was the admiration of all his friends; although the same room served them for bedroom, kitchen, and parlour, it was always exquisitely neat and clean, and their visitors would find Blake at the table with his pen or pencil, and Catherine at the window with her sewing, as calm and self-possessed as though they were receiving their guests in a palace. To reproach him for keeping her in such poverty seems never to have entered her thoughts; only one complaint did she ever make of him—that though they were never separated, yet he was little with her, for he was "incessantly away in paradise." The parting of death was thus to her no real parting. She herself related that on his deathbed he told her that he would always be near her to take care of her; and when her own time for departure came four years later, she lay calling to him as though he were only in the next room, to say that she was coming to him and "would not be long now."

And yet, though it is evident that Catherine Blake did not find her philosopher "gey ill to live with," there must surely have been moments when her practical spirit found it hard to discern between the fine frenzy of genius and the aberrations of madness. "Milton, the other day, was saying to me," he once remarked to a friend, and after detailing the course of the argument, he added: "I tried to convince him that I was wrong, but I could not succeed."

"Draw me Moses," or "draw me Julius Caesar," his friend Varley would say to him, and Blake would look up as though a real sitter was before him and begin to portray the features that no one else could see. "I see him now; there, there! How noble he looks!" he cried one day, on being asked to draw William Wallace; but after a while he suddenly stopped, saying: "I cannot finish him; Edward I. has stepped in

between him and me." "That's lucky, for I want the portrait of Edward, too," replied his friend; and having made a sketch of Edward, and, as it were, got rid of him, Blake was able to finish the portrait of Wallace.

His drawing of the Ghost of a Flea is one of the most extraordinary productions on which human eyes ever rested. He told his friends that he had some difficulty in finishing the portrait, as the sitter "would not close his mouth"; but he was much interested in the conversation that took place between them, the ghost telling him that fleas were the spirits of blood-thirsty men, and that it was providential they were not larger, "else were I the size of a horse I would depopulate a great part of the country."

"Did you ever see a fairy's funeral, madam?" was the startling question once put by him to a lady. "Never, sir!" "I have," he replied, "but not before last night. I was walking alone in my garden; there was great stillness among the branches and flowers, and more than common sweetness in the air; I heard a low and pleasant sound, and I knew not whence it came. At last I saw the broad leaf of a flower move, and underneath I saw a procession of creatures, of the size and colour of green and gray grasshoppers, bearing a body laid out on a rose-leaf, which they buried with songs and then disappeared. It was a fairy funeral."

The voice of the wild visionary speaks even in his private letters. "You, O dear Flaxman," he writes to the artist, "are a sublime archangel, my friend and companion from eternity. In the Divine bosom is our dwelling-place; I look back into the regions of reminiscence and behold our ancient days before this earth appeared in its vegetated mortality to my mortal, vegetated eyes. I see our houses of eternity, which can never be separated, though our mortal vehicles should stand at the remotest corners of heaven."

And again, writing to Mr. Hayley, who had lately lost his son, he says: "I know that our deceased friends are more really with us than when they were apparent to our mortal part. Thirteen years ago I lost a brother, and with his spirit I converse daily and hourly in the spirit, and see him in my remembrance, in the region of my imagination. I hear his advice, and even now write from his dictation."

It was this brother, Robert, whose spirit Blake declared that he saw rise from his dead body and ascend through the ceiling, "clapping its hands for joy," and it was from him and from St. Joseph that he believed that he obtained directions for his work. But though all this savours of madness, Blake was no madman. Being asked by a lady where he saw these visions of which he spoke, he touched his forehead and

replied : " Here, ma'am." A madman confuses the conceptive and perceptive faculties, but Blake never failed to distinguish between them, even though his conceptions were as real to him as tangible objects to ordinary men. To a young painter he said : " You have only to work up imagination to the state of vision, and the thing is done;" but though he possessed the power of actually seeing his thoughts and ideas, he was conscious all the while that this visualizing faculty was but a supreme effort of imagination.

Mr. Swinburne eloquently describes those qualities of soul which gave Blake the name of the Interpreter among his younger friends :

" To him the veil of outer things seemed always to tremble with some breath behind it, seemed at times to be rent in sunder by clamour and sudden lightning. All the void of earth and air seemed to quiver with the passage of sentient wings and palpitate under the pressure of conscious feet. Flowers and weeds, stars and stones, spoke with articulate lips and gazed with living eyes. Hands were stretched out towards him from beyond the darkness of material nature, to tempt or to support, to guide or to restrain. His hardest facts were the vaguest allegories of other men ; to him all symbolic things were literal, all literal things symbolic. About his path an infinite play of spiritual life seethed and swarmed : spirits imprisoned in the husk and shell of earth consoled or menaced him ; every leaf bore a growth of angels, the pulse of every minute sounded as the falling foot of God."

On such a man as this the restrictions of outward circumstance could have no effect. In his MS. notebook appear the following striking lines :

" The angel who presided at my birth
Said, ' Little creature formed of joy and mirth,
Go, love without the help of anything on earth.' "

Worldly possessions seemed to him, in fact, mere obstacles to spiritual and mental advancement :

" This life's dim windows of the soul
Distorts the Heaven from pole to pole,
And leads you to believe a lie
When you see with, not through, the eye!"

But here the question confronts us : Was Blake only a seer, dreaming dreams and beholding visions, or was he also a prophet, charged with a message for his fellow-men ?

That he believed that he had such a message is clearly proved by his own words :

" Trembling I sit day and night ; my friends are astonisht at me ;
Yet they forgive my wanderings. I rest not from my great task,
To open the eternal worlds ! To open the immortal eyes
Of man inwards, into the worlds of thought and eternity,

Ever expanding in the bosom of God the human imagination.
 O Saviour, press upon me Thy spirit of meekness and love,
 Annihilate selfhood in me! Be Thou all my life!
 Guide Thou my hand which trembles exceedingly upon the Rock of
 Ages."

The "Book of Thel," one of the most mystical of his writings, conveys a distinct lesson. Thel, the youngest daughter of the Seraphim, laments over the transitoriness of life, and is rebuked in turn by the Lily, the Cloud, and the Worm, who speak of the fostering care of God, who doeth all things well. But here, as in all his other works, the ideas are so overlaid with imagery, so unusual in themselves and so confused in their expression, that it is a hard task to discover them, not to speak of understanding them! A description of his drawings by one of his biographers is equally applicable to his writings, and it shows how well-nigh impossible it would be for any "wayfaring man" to try and find a rule of life in his pages.

"Flowers sprung of earth and lit from heaven, with chalices of floral fire, and with flame-like forms growing up out of their centre; sudden starry strands and reaches of breathless heaven, washed by drifts of rapid wind or cloud; serrated array of iron rocks and glorious growths of weedy lands or flowering fields; reflected light of bows bent and arrows drawn in heaven, dividing cloud from starlit cloud; stately shapes of infinite sorrow or exuberant joy; all beautiful things and all things terrible, all changes of shadow and of light, all mysteries of the darkness and the day, find place and likeness here."

Yet through these strange wild shapes of whirling cloud and shifting lights Blake's message is clearly discernible—a message that may be briefly described as "the building of Jerusalem," or, in ordinary phraseology, "the establishment of a kingdom of truth and righteousness in his own land."

Thus, at the end of the poem called "Milton" he writes:

"I will not cease from mental fight,
 Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
 Till we have built Jerusalem
 In England's green and pleasant land."

The doctrine is further brought out in the poem called "Jerusalem":

"The fields from Islington to Marybone,
 To Primrose Hill and St. John's Wood,
 Were builded over with pillars of gold,
 And there Jerusalem's pillars stood.

"Her little ones ran on the fields,
 The Lamb of God among them seen,
 And fair Jerusalem, His bride,
 Among the little meadows green.

“Pancras and Kentish Town repose
Among her golden pillars high,
Among her golden arches, which
Shine upon the starry sky.

“What are these golden builders doing
Near mournful, ever-weeping Paddington,
Standing above that mighty ruin
Where Satan the first victory won ?

“Jerusalem fell from Lambeth vale
Down through Poplar and old Bow,
Through Malden and across the sea
In ever-howling death and woe.

“England, awake, awake, awake !
Jerusalem thy sister calls ;
Why wilt thou sleep the sleep of death,
And close her from thy ancient walls ?

“Thy hills and valleys felt her feet
Gently upon their bosoms move,
Thy gates beheld sweet Zion's ways,
Then was a time of joy and love !

“And now the time returns again,
Our souls exult, and London's towers
Receive the Lamb of God to dwell
In England's green and pleasant bowers !”

Blake's mystical writings, embellished with his still more mystical illustrations, brought him neither money nor reputation. “Take them away !” was George III.'s sole comment when some of the drawings were shown to him, and there are many in the present day who would probably echo the remark. Even to those to whom he is more than a name, it is chiefly by his Songs of Innocence and Experience that he is known. “Little lamb, who made thee ?” or “Tiger, tiger, burning bright,” have a haunting music in their very simplicity; while his verses on “The Sweep” and “The Charity Children at St. Paul's” are familiar to all :

“'Twas on a Holy Thursday, their innocent faces clean,
Came children walking two and two, in red and blue and green ;
Gray-headed beadles walked before with wands as white as snow,
Till into the high dome of Paul's they like Thames' waters flow.”

But though Blake himself is only to be discovered in his mystical works, their very mysticism makes them sealed books to the general reader. If a complete edition, with the fullest annotations, were published to-morrow, it could never make him a popular author. And yet, with all this obscurity of expression, his spirit was as clear as the day. “God make this world to you, my child, as beautiful as it has been to me !” were his words on one occasion as he laid his hand on the head of a little girl. The child, beautifully dressed and surrounded by every luxury, looked up in amazement at this

wild and shabby old man, thinking his words were folly, "but afterwards," she says, "I understood them."

There were many, no doubt, who looked upon his perfect contentment as folly. The poorest of the poor, as far as this world's wealth goes, he could yet say :

"I have mental joys and mental health,
Mental friends and mental wealth ;
I've a wife that I love and that loves me,
I've all but riches bodily.
Then if for riches I must not pray,
God knows its little prayers I need say ;
I am in God's presence night and day,
He never turns His face away."

This was the secret of his contentment, and this also was the inspiration of all his work, artistic and poetic. Earth was to him the house of God, and life but an emanation of the Divine.

"He died in a most glorious manner," wrote a friend of his after he had passed away. "He said he was going to that country he had all his life wished to see, and expressed himself happy, hoping for salvation through Jesus Christ. Just before he died his countenance became fair, his eyes brightened, and he burst out into singing of the things he saw in heaven."

"I have been at the deathbed," said the nurse who assisted his wife in his last hours, "not of a man, but of a blessed angel!"

ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

THE past month has been marked by an interesting incident in the proposal by a committee of clergymen, at the instance and under the presidency of Mr. Russell Wakefield, the Rector of St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, of a declaration of opinion, of which the professed object was "to maintain the Faith, promote the peace of the Church, strengthen the hands of the Bishops in securing obedience to the Church's laws, and to reassure the minds of those of the faithful laity who may be disquieted by present difficulties." The propositions put forward with these laudable objects seem, however, to be singularly ill-adapted for the purpose. In the first place, the signatories "affirm their sense of the sacred obligation imposed by the Declaration made by the clergy under Canon XXXVI. not to alter the services in the Prayer-Book by unsanctioned omissions, or by any additions which hinder the service or which suggest its insufficiency ; nor to introduce other services or prayers without

the authority of the Bishop." Upon this first statement, which in some respects may be deemed satisfactory, it is nevertheless necessary to remark that matters must have come to a strange pass when clergymen find it necessary, for the reassurance of the laity, to state that they really regard as sacred the promises they made at their ordination. But apart from this, it must be assumed that these protesting gentlemen are making a protest against practices which really exist; and, consequently, that in this statement we have a formal admission from all who sign it that there are clergy, sufficiently numerous to require repudiation, who do alter the services in the Prayer-Book by unsanctioned omissions, who make additions which hinder the service or which suggest its insufficiency, or who introduce other services or prayers without the authority of the Bishop. A clearer justification for the "disquiet" of the laity, which it is the aim of the declaration to appease, could not well be afforded. It is some satisfaction that such practices should be formally disavowed by such a body of High Churchmen, not a few of them by no means Moderate, as those who have signed this declaration; but that the mere disavowal of action so flagrantly disloyal can hardly suffice to reassure the laity is at once rendered manifest by the second clause of the declaration.

That clause declares the belief "that the Ornaments Rubric contains the ceremonial system which was lawful under the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., and that for the peace of the Church this ought to be frankly recognised as a lawful inheritance in the English Church, while at the same time the lesser ceremonial usage which has so widely prevailed ought, as resting on custom, to be equally recognised." A more extraordinary proposal for promoting the peace of the Church could hardly be put forward. If there is one course more than another which would be likely to provoke open and violent dissension, it would be any authoritative recognition of what is probably intended by "the ceremonial system which was lawful under the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI." It is not quite clear what that "system" would include; but, at least, it would include the vestments at the Holy Communion, and there are thousands of clergy in the Church of England and a vast and resolute body of laymen who would regard such an authorization as offering the gravest menace to their position within the Church. If the result of a suit on the question was to declare the legality of the vestments, they would have to consider seriously whether they would leave the ministry, or even lay communion, or whether they would set on foot a determined agitation for the alteration of the law. Either alternative would be disastrous to the peace,

and perhaps to the continued unity of the Church; but one or other would, we are confident, be adopted. Numbers both of clergy and laity who cannot be reckoned among the extreme Protestants regard the vestments, with good reason, as a symbol of distinctively Roman doctrine and practice. For the first six centuries and more the only vestments worn by the ministers of the Church were white, and coloured vestments were introduced in the ages in which Roman perversions of doctrine grew up. Accordingly, a statement was promptly published in the *Times*, signed by the Deans of Canterbury, Norwich, and Peterborough, and by such sober Churchmen as Canon Bernard of Wells, Mr. Dimock, and Mr. Grey of Wycliffe Hall, simply stating "that any such recognition would be so far from promoting the peace of the Church that it would involve the gravest danger of disruption, as we are confident that it would be resisted to the last by a large body of both clergy and laity."

This statement was simply put forward as a note of warning, and no attempt was made to collect other signatures. But others have been offered, such as that of Archdeacon Kaye of Lincoln, an honoured and venerable representative of the best Churchmanship of the past and present. The Council of the National Protestant Church Union have stated that "they desire unanimously to associate themselves with the views set forth in the letter signed by the Dean of Canterbury and others in reply to Mr. Russell Wakefield's declaration, and at the same time to express their heartfelt thanks to the Dean and his co-signatories for their action in the matter." If anything could add to the provocation afforded by this claim for the recognition of the ceremonial system in question, it would be the cool suggestion that the established ceremonial system of the Church of England for more than three hundred years should receive only a sort of secondary recognition, as resting on custom. That established system holds at present the position of the "lawful inheritance" of the English Church, and will not be dispossessed of that position without the severest possible struggle.

Another clause of the declaration points to a question of the greatest gravity, which is to be submitted to a joint meeting in committee of members of the Convocations of Canterbury and York and of the Houses of Laymen of the two Provinces on the 9th and 10th of this month. This clause expresses the further belief "that the future welfare of the English Church largely depends, under God, on the complete restoration of the synodical action of the Church," and the signatories "would welcome any measures for promoting this end which may be taken constitutionally, safeguarding the duties and rights of

laity and clergy alike." The proposal to be submitted to the joint meeting of the Convocations and Houses of Laymen affirms, first of all, "that it is desirable that provision should be made for the calling together of a council representing the Church of England, and consisting of clergy and laity of the Provinces of Canterbury and York." The public will await with some anxiety the result of these proposals, but the first question which will have to be faced is whether they prove to be such as may be taken "constitutionally," having regard to the constitution of the Church as well as that of the State. It will be a very grave matter to propose any supersession of the existing constitutional rights of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and is quite a distinct thing from the mere question of reforming their constitution. It seems, moreover, to be involved in the scope of the scheme that the laity of the Church of England should for the future be regarded as represented in this new council, and not in Parliament. That is a question on which, we may be sure, that a great deal will be said in Parliament itself when, as will be requisite, the propositions ultimately adopted come before it to be sanctioned.

It seems to us in the highest degree improbable that the House of Commons will consent to transform "the Church of England as by law established" into the Church of England, as its practices, and perhaps its doctrines, may be modified by such a council as is proposed, subject only to the veto of Parliament. It is conceivable that the new council might become an instrument for formulating the wishes of the dominant party in the Church of England for the time being, creating a formidable agitation in favour of changes in the Prayer-Book for this purpose, and then challenging the veto of Parliament, and thus presenting the issue of the moment in the acutest possible form. We ought to be told, in the first instance, for what purposes this new power is required. Except for such purposes as the "recognition" of a long-disused ceremonial system, we do not know what further power is needed than already exists. The Act of Uniformity Amendment Act—which is itself a strong proof of the possibility of carrying reasonable reforms under the present system—has afforded great elasticity in our services, and the Bishops would be supported in allowing reasonable adaptations to the real needs of modern times. But the most dangerous consequences may be apprehended from the creation of an assembly in which proposals would be practicable for altering the formularies on which the various parties and schools in the Church now rely for their position within her, and thus menacing the security of one or the other

We cannot hope for the restoration of peace in the Church

from any of these methods. Peace will be restored when the Reformation and its work are more cordially appreciated in the ranks of the clergy, and when attempts, like those of Lord Halifax, to exclude or eliminate genuine Protestant principles from the Church are frankly and finally abandoned. The disquiet of the laity will never cease until they are assured that the clergy of the Church, as a whole, are loyal to the principles of the Reformation, or—which is the same thing—to the principles of the Church of the first few centuries, before medieval and Roman abuses obtained a hold in doctrine and ceremonial. Everything else is, at the best, a mere palliative, and it only remains to hope that the authorities of the Church will realize that the only way to maintain the confidence of the English nation is to assert by all their influence that which is the only true “Catholic” position, the position, namely, of the English Reformers, and the authority of the Church during those centuries when it was really Catholic.

Notices of Books.

History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY, M.A., Hon. LL.D. In three volumes. Vol. II. : “From the Renaissance to the Decline of Eighteenth-Century Orthodoxy.” Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons, 1902. Price 20s.

Some time back, when criticising the first volume of this work in the *CHURCHMAN*, we called attention to one grave fault—the frequent uncouthness of its style. We much fear Professor Saintsbury, despite his encyclopædic learning, is in that point incorrigible, for the same uncouthness crops up again in the present volume; and, indeed, some of the sentences do not appear to be constructed on the usual grammatical principles. If Professor Saintsbury’s work were intended for a work of art—which it is not—such a stricture would be serious indeed; as it is, however, the uncouthness aforesaid matters less, because the book, if found valuable at all, will be valued for its vast array of facts, and its varied and interesting sidelights on critical history—or, perhaps we should say, on the critics. As a storehouse of erudition, Professor Saintsbury’s work is not likely soon to be rivalled; as a history from the outside it is exceedingly useful; but of the true inwardness of literary criticism the Professor does not seem to us to be entirely cognisant. Nor is it too much to say that one may learn more of the right relation between literature and life from a single essay of (for example) St. Beuve than

from all the ponderous pages of this literary colossus. It may seem somewhat ungracious and ungenerous to say this with Professor Saintsbury's two volumes in our hands; but it is, we think, necessary to emphasize where, in our estimation, the work falls short. There is one section of the work in which (*ni fallimur*) Professor Saintsbury's peculiar powers seem to do themselves full justice—we mean the section devoted to Renaissance critics, Scaliger and the rest. It would be a pious work if the Professor would write a life of Scaliger—on the whole the greatest scholar of whom we have any record—worthy to be put beside Mark Pattison's "Casaubon."

Nothing has struck us more in glancing through the pages of this volume than the immensity of the field covered; yet the author moves with singular confidence over this field, and apparently has read—if he has not always assimilated—everything great and small that in any way bears on his subject. *Audaces fortuna juvat*. We shall look forward with uncommon interest to the concluding volume of this work.

The Way, the Truth, the Life. By A. G. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

Mr. Girdlestone has won distinction in other fields than those of authorship. The "King of Zinal" is known not only in his favourite French-speaking valleys of Switzerland, but wherever climbers most do congregate. We notice that he dates his preface from Arolla, and begins it with a parable drawn from his Alpine experiences. We wonder if it is fanciful to think that his forty summers in the Alps have helped to give his book the breezy and bracing atmosphere of devout common-sense that is its great characteristic. Perhaps it is not altogether unreasonable to think so. Mr. Girdlestone claims that his handbook for Confirmation classes is practical. It is eminently so in its arrangement, its treatment, its method, and even in its printing. Only one side of each page is used, so that, as Mr. Girdlestone serenely observes private censors can cut out any parts they may reject. But we really think that very little of that need be performed by anyone; it is more likely that here and there the blank pages would be used to supplement Mr. Girdlestone's condensed extract, for we must not be thought irreverent, but complimentary, if we remark that this little book is a very Bovril of Confirmation teaching.

Mr. Girdlestone asserts that his volume "is written on frankly Reformation principles, especially in reference to the Church, the Bible, conscience and the Sacraments. Beside a tendency, especially among the clergy, towards the superstitions of Rome, there is at present, even among many Christians, a general 'shakiness' about the very foundations—the reality—of Christianity, along with a microscopic attention to points of little or no importance to it. The vigorous manliness of the great Reformers has become decrepit. New thoughts, as then upon the Church, so now upon the Bible, Nature, and other religions, unsettle men, and we need

more than ever to stand fast upon the higher solid ground, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.'"

Mr. Girdlestone here strikes the right note, and defines, as we think, the only way of meeting the vague agnosticism which is prevalent among rich and poor, each in their widely different manner of expressing it, which lies in teaching experimental Christianity—that is, belief in a Person, and guidance by the action of a Person upon the conscience. Having this principle in view, he treats his different subjects in a manly and reverent spirit, with a refreshing absence of that vague use of shibboleths which is often employed to obscure a real difficulty. We like very much, *e.g.*, his remarks on the Bible in Paper XV. ; the Holy Trinity, in Paper IX. ; on Christian Prayer, in Paper XVIII. But it is all good ; and even if, as we have said, from limitations of space, one or two topics seem to require a little amplification, that can very easily be supplied by an experienced teacher. We certainly think that Mr. Girdlestone's book conveys the right teaching of the *essence* of Christianity, and, as a practical handbook, is in advance of anything we have previously used.

