

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

OCTOBER, 1929.



One
of the
Special Needs
adopted to be helped by the
Anniversary Fund

is the care of
Aged and Infirm Armenian Widows
Many blind, paralytic and otherwise helpless.

75TH
YEAR

Thanksgiving and
Thankoffering

Also the unprovided Orphans, including the blind, crippled, epileptic and the like.

In Syria the matter is urgent.

In Greece it is more so as the Greek Government has definitely refused to help.

It cannot be denied that in the past years thousands have died from starvation and exposure because relief did not reach them.

IT MUST NOT HAPPEN AGAIN.

Please help

Armenian Massacre Relief

At the office of

Bible Lands Missions' Aid Society.

S. W. GENTLE-CAKETT,
Hon. Relief Commissioner.

HARRY FEAR, Esq., J.P.,
Hon. Treasurer.

76^P STRAND,
LONDON, W.O.2.

EVERYONE interested in Church Work and what our Missionaries are doing should read

The
**Church of England
Newspaper**

If you wish to
BUY OR SELL
anything, or
LET A HOUSE OR APARTMENTS,
or should you
REQUIRE DOMESTIC SERVANTS

Advertise your wants in the
Classified Columns of

The Church of England Newspaper

17 Tavistock Street, London, W.C.2.

A Copy of the Paper, with Advertising Rates,
gladly sent free on application to the Advertisement Manager.

**JOHN BUNYAN
IN RELATION TO
HIS TIMES.**

By **BISHOP KNOX.**

Articles published in "The Record" with four additional chapters, "Bunyan and the Church," "Bunyan and the Bible," "Bunyan and Fox," "The Secret of Bunyan's Vitality."

Longman's, Price 3/6.

This book is a study of the place of Bunyan in relation to religious problems still in process of solution to-day.

To be obtained from
THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM
7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

PAMPHLETS ON REUNION.

Intercommunion. By the REV. J. P. S. R. GIBSON, M.A.,
Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. 2d. net.

The Ministry of the Church. By the REV. GEORGE F. IRWIN,
M.A., B.D., Vicar of Wandsworth. 2d. net.

The Confirmation Rubric: Whom does it bind? By the
REV. H. M. GWATKIN, D.D. Second Edition. 2d.

Steps Towards Reunion. By BISHOPS W. G. PEEL and J. J.
WILLIS. 1s. net.

Kikuyu Tracts. 1d. each.

"THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE." By BISHOP H. C. G. MOULE.

THE MINISTRY AND UNITY. By the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.
EPISCOPACY IN SCRIPTURE. By the REV. H. M. GWATKIN,
D.D.

EPISCOPACY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the REV.
H. M. GWATKIN, D.D.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH ? By ARCHBISHOP D'ARCY.

CO-OPERATION AT THE HOME BASE. By the REV. H. U.
WEITBRECHT STANTON, D.D.

To be obtained from :

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,
DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Telephone: 0602 HOLBORN

**EDE & RAVENSCROFT**

Founded in the Reign of William and Mary, 1689.

*By Appointments.***CLERICAL
TAILORS****CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, HOODS.****93 & 94 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.****Spanish & Portuguese
Church Aid Society,****CHURCH HOUSE, DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1**

Chairman of Committee . . . W. H. Patchell, Esq.

THE SPANISH & PORTUGUESE CHURCH AID SOCIETY endeavours to help the work of the native Evangelical Churches, whose members are unable to accept the unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome. Their work is self-denying and progressive. In town and country they have congregations and schools, and conduct Mission Services. Never at any time were the countries so open to their efforts, and they report sympathy where they formerly met open opposition and persecution. Spain and Portugal were for centuries closed to the circulation of the Scriptures. Through the influence of the printed page and faithful Evangelistic efforts the Churches have come into existence, and all who have visited them testify to their zeal and devotion.

CONTRIBUTIONS, which are urgently needed, will be gratefully received by W. J. MacANDREW, Esq., Hon. Finance Secretary; or by the Rev. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, Editorial and Consulting Sec., Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1.

The
Church of England Zenana Missionary Society
 (FOUNDED 1880)

1930 Will be the Society's **JUBILEE YEAR**

It is hoped during the present year the sum of

£100,000

will be raised of which

£75,000 represents the normal annual income, and £25,000
the JUBILEE THANKOFFERING FUND

to be allocated as follows:—

To meet deficit of last two years	£10,000
„ purchase of freehold premises for the Society's head-quarters (thus saving large Annual Rental)	8,000
„ needed increase annual Subscriptions to maintain existing work in India, Ceylon, China and Singapore	7,000
	£25,000

Will you send a JUBILEE THANKOFFERING to the Secretaries
Church of England Zenana Missionary Society,
 27 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.

OUTSTANDING MISSIONARY BOOKS.

Just Out.

FORESHADOWINGS. By ELEANOR PREGG. Author of "Star Maiden," "Red Pepper," etc. Well Illustrated. Hard Linen Covers. 2s. 6d. Postage 4d.

Vivid and true stories of Indian women, told by one who obviously knows India and her customs thoroughly—showing how the Gospel grips one here and another there, and foreshadowing what it will mean to India when the Message is accepted in all its fulness.

SOME WOMEN OF SINDH : In Home and Hospital. RUTH WESTERN, M.D. Illustrated. Hard covers. 2s. Postage 3d.

Introduces the reader to real Indian women, intimately portraying their joys and sorrows and vast needs.

CHOPSTICKS. By F. I. CODRINGTON. Author of "Children in Blue," etc. Profusely illustrated by HELEN JACOBS. 2s. 6d. Postage 4d.

The most outstanding of recent missionary books for children. Miss Codrington's "Children in Blue" ran into eleven editions. This new book bids fair to do likewise.

Readers of THE CHURCHMAN who are interested in the women of the East should also read the Society's Magazines:—

INDIA'S WOMEN AND CHINA'S DAUGHTERS.
 2d. monthly. 2s. 6d. per annum post free.

HOMES OF THE EAST. With 8-page Inset for children.
 Published every other month. 1d. 9d. per annum, post free.

Publications Department

Church of England Zenana Missionary Society,
 27, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS	255
The Bishops and the Prayer Book. The Change of Doctrine in the Revised Prayer Book. The South India Reunion Proposals. The Interpretation of Scripture. The Misuse of Scripture. Editorial Note.	
THE REFORMATION AND REUNION. By G. G. Coulton, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.	259
SANCTUARY. By H. P. Palmer	268
THE FUTURE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS. By W. Marshall Freeman	280
GILES FIRMIN: A PURITAN DIVINE. By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D.	290
THE PILGRIMAGE OF HATE: AN ESSAY ON TIMON OF ATHENS. By G. Wilson Knight	298
LIGHT FROM AN OLD RUBRIC. By the Rev. C. Courtenay, M.A.	310
BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS. By G. F. I.	322
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	328
The Primitive Church, studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry. Dogma: In History and Thought. Six Great Anglicans: A Study of the History of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century. Religion and the Thought of To-day. Disestablishment. The Lure of Simplicity. The Antiphonal Psalter.	

All articles appearing in THE CHURCHMAN are the copyright of the Proprietors, and must not be reprinted without permission.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY

NEW BOOKS

	Price.	By Post
EUGENE STOCK: A Biographical Study GEORGINA A. GOLLOCK.	3/6	3/10½
Notable men have served at home on behalf of the overseas work of the Church, but biographies of them are rare. This book contains boldly conceived studies of Dr. Stock's contribution in this sphere, as Churchman, historian, editor, administrator and speaker. He is seen against a background of the larger movements of his time, and in his relations with the younger generation, to have been not merely a bridge-builder, but a bridge.		
TUCKER OF UGANDA: Apostle and Artist A. P. SHEPHERD. Series of Modern Missionary Biographies.	5/0	5/4
THE WORLD-WIDE PRAYER V. F. STORR. With devotions arranged by E. S. Woods.	2/0	2/3
THE C.M.S. POCKET BOOK FOR 1930	2/0	2/1½

From Booksellers, or direct from
The Manager, Publishing Department,
 Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, London, E.C.4.

Incurable

- ¶ Men and Women of the **Middle Class** are daily incapacitated by incurable disease brought on by innumerable causes, such as overwork, worry, anxiety, accidents, &c., &c.
- ¶ Such sufferers have been the care and concern of this Institution since the year 1861.
- ¶ There are 103 patients in the Home and Hospital at Streatham. The number of pensioners each receiving £26 a year is 311.
- ¶ Increased funds are greatly needed. Will you not help in this work of mercy? It is for a most deserving class—for those who have lost their all in fruitless efforts to regain health and retain independence.

Contributions will be gratefully acknowledged
by Edgar Penman, Secretary,
72 Cheapside, London, E.C.2.

British Home and Hospital for Incurables

Patron: H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.
Patroness: H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF YORK.

THE COLONIAL & CONTINENTAL CHURCH SOCIETY

The outlying regions of the Empire are calling for
the blessings of the Gospel

The Witness of the settlers is the most effective
weapon in the Missionary Campaign. Without it,
a great deal of the Church's Missionary Activity is
wasted

New areas are being opened month by month. **Help
to lay foundations that will abide**

Men and means are urgently needed. Make **your
offer of service or support to—**

**The Secretary,
9, SERJEANTS' INN, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.**

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1929.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Bishops and the Prayer Book.

THE policy of the Bishops in regard to the Revised Prayer Book, although not altogether unexpected in view of their previous deliberations, has caused widespread disappointment throughout the Church. Hopes had been entertained after the decisions of the House of Commons, which indicated so clearly the belief of the representatives of the people that the doctrine of our Church was being altered by the alternative service for the Holy Communion and by the legalisation of the practice of Reservation, that it would have been found possible to omit these retrograde portions of the revision and provide the Church with a Prayer Book suited to the needs of the twentieth century. There is ample evidence that there is no demand for the alternative Communion Office, and it is equally clear that the desire for Reservation is not merely to meet the needs of the sick, but is a step towards the use of the reserved elements for purposes of worship. Portions of the revised Book have been printed obviously with the intention of providing for their use in Church. There would have been little difficulty in securing the sanction of Parliament for the use of most of these portions. It is regrettable that the Bishops should place themselves in a false position by giving their administrative consent to the illegal use of portions of the revision which most church-people would be glad to employ, when there was open to them a simple method of securing full sanction for them.

The Bishop of Exeter has been one of the severest critics of the decision of the majority of the Episcopate. He describes it as practically a declaration that the Church's agreement with the State is "a scrap of paper." He adds, "We fought for the maintenance of a scrap of paper in the Great War; all law-abiding citizens abide by their signature to a scrap of paper—and it is left for the Bishops, in the words of one of their number, to tear up a solemn document as if it were nothing more than a mere scrap of paper."

The Change of Doctrine in the Revised Prayer Book.

As the revised Prayer Book is more thoroughly studied it becomes clearer that it involves a change in some of the fundamental doctrines of our Church. The departure from "the sure warranty of Scripture" as the accepted basis of doctrine—one of the essential principles of the Reformation—has opened the way for the introduction of teaching and practices unknown in our Church for the last three hundred years. Some of these doctrines have been either actually pronounced to be false or have fallen into desuetude as bringing the purity of our Church's teaching down from a high level of spirituality, to a form of reduced Christianity associated with materialistic conceptions. The Bishop of Norwich was quite emphatic in his view that the Deposited Book of 1928 did alter the doctrine of the Church. A similar declaration has been made on more than one occasion by the Bishop of Worcester. The Bishop of Birmingham has drawn special attention to the materialistic conceptions contained in the Book. The Bishop of Exeter has been quite definite in his view that the revision has opened the way for many abuses, and that the changes "are in sympathy with an aggressive and successful movement like the Romeward movement in the Church of England." The opinion of the laity of the Church is on the same side, and they are opposed to any innovations which will restore medieval ideas or methods of worship. At a time when there is a determined movement to introduce the Mass and the doctrine associated with it, and thus to destroy the Protestant character of our Church, it would be fatal to allow our Prayer Book to be made a subtle means of subverting the truth.

The South India Reunion Proposals.

The Proposals for Church Union in South India are assuming a greater importance as the time approaches for them to be submitted to the Lambeth Conference of Bishops. Strenuous efforts will be made by the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church to secure their rejection. We have already pointed out the serious position in which the missionary work of the Church in South India would be placed by the refusal of the Bishops to give their approval to the movement. The only theoretical ground on which the proposals can be rejected, is that of the rigid theory of Apostolical Succession accepted by those who follow the errors of the Tractarians. This excludes the recognition in any way of non-Episcopal ministries. But the past history of our Church shows that such ministries have been recognized, and the Bishops at the last Lambeth Conference adopted the view brought into prominence, we may point out, by the first Cheltenham Conference that "these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." They also acknowledged "the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the Episcopate." This is in harmony with experience and common sense. We may also add that scholarship supports

this view, and we recommend to the careful study of our readers Canon Streeter's recent book, *The Primitive Church, studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry*, which is reviewed in this issue of THE CHURCHMAN. It destroys any assumptions of an exclusive single type of ministry based on Apostolical Succession, and shows that it had no place in the Primitive Church.

The Interpretation of Scripture.

The doctrine of the Church of England is based on "the warranty of Scripture." The exact translation and accurate interpretation of the Bible has therefore always been one of the chief aims of Protestant scholarship. It has generally been accepted that our great Protestant scholars have sought to reproduce the exact meaning of the original Greek or Hebrew without bias or prejudice. No one could associate with the names of such scholars as Westcott, Lightfoot and Hort any intention of manipulating texts to support already accepted ecclesiastical theories. In a number of crucial texts the interpretation of Protestant divines differs from that of the Roman Church which is based on the Vulgate version. Until recent years the scholars of our own Church were in general agreement with other Protestant scholars as to the meaning of these passages and against the Roman authorities. A tendency has appeared with the growth of Anglo-Catholic influences to seek to find some means of either smoothing out these differences or of boldly adopting the Roman renderings. One of the best-known examples of this tendency is found in the interpretation of the words "Do this" in the passage on the institution of the Lord's Supper: "Do this in remembrance of Me." Anglo-Catholics with the Romanists endeavour to make it signify "Sacrifice this," although all the great Protestant scholars of the past were agreed that there was not sufficient evidence throughout either the New Testament or the Septuagint to show that the word "do" when used by itself in this way could bear such an interpretation.

The Misuse of Scripture.

In a pamphlet recently issued—*The Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*—the Archdeacon of Chester has exposed an attempt to deal in the same way with several important passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews in a commentary issued some time ago under Anglo-Catholic auspices. He first refers to the difference between the significance of "repent" in our Authorized version, and the mechanical "do penance" of the Roman version. Then he deals with Hebrews i. 3. In our version it runs "When he had himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." The translation of the Vulgate is "making purgation of sins, he sat." Westcott pointed out the error in the Vulgate, but the new Commentary suggests the Vulgate rendering as a possible alternative to that in our version. Again in Hebrews x. 12, "When He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right

hand of God." The Douay Version renders it "But this man offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God." These and other passages are, in the hands of Anglo-Catholics, made to bear the interpretation that "Christ is continually offering Himself to the Father and that the Holy Communion is the earthly counterpart of that offering." The Church of England, as the Archdeacon points out, knows nothing of such a doctrine, yet the new Anglo-Catholic Commentary attempts to find Scriptural authority for it, and the commentator on the Epistle seeks to make it bear this interpretation. The whole tenor of the Epistle is against it. It is one of the most puzzling signs of our times to note the decline of some Anglican scholars from the height reached in the pure research of the great scholars of the past, to the mental condition produced by the biassed efforts to bring the doctrine of our Church into some resemblance of harmony with that of the Church of Rome.

Editorial Note.

Dr. G. G. Coulton, who is our greatest authority on the medieval ages, contributes to this number of *THE CHURCHMAN* an address which he recently gave on "The Reformation and Reunion." He views reunion from a fresh angle and he deals with some difficulties which must be considered when practical proposals are put forward. Mr. H. P. Palmer, who has given the results of his researches into the past history of some of our English institutions and customs in previous issues of *THE CHURCHMAN*, gives an account of the use and abuse of the ancient privileges of "Sanctuary" in sacred buildings. "The Future of the Ecclesiastical Courts" will soon be one of the most important problems before the Church. Mr. William Marshall Freeman gives our readers the benefit of his legal opinion on recent proposals. Dr. Harold Smith contributes one of his characteristic historical studies dealing with Giles Firmin: A Puritan Divine of the Seventeenth Century. Mr. G. Wilson Knight, of Dean Close School, Cheltenham, has made a study of Shakespeare's plays on special lines which deserve the attention of students of literature. He deals with the tragic movement in the story of Timon of Athens in an article on "The Pilgrimage of Hate: An Essay on Timon of Athens." An old contributor, the Rev. Charles Courtenay, M.A., in his treatment of an obscure rubric, under the title "Light from an Old Rubric," brings out in an interesting way a number of facts which need special emphasis at the present time. The pages devoted to notices of books will, we hope, help our readers to estimate the value of recent publications, especially of those likely to be of special interest to *Evangelical churchpeople*.

THE REFORMATION AND REUNION.

BY G. G. COULTON, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Honorary Fellow of St. Catherine's.

I HAVE been asked to speak on the Reformation in its bearing upon the present-day problems of Reunion and Intercommunion.

Intense life and union were characteristic of early Christianity ; but this living union gradually stiffened into mechanical union. Disunion came with the Reformation ; and even those who are most convinced of the necessity of that revolution in the sixteenth century, and who would insist that there may be far worse evils than disunion, are yet agreed that disunion in itself is an evil. How, then, can the experience of these four centuries help us to reunite without abandoning, on either side, those principles which made union real in the Early Church, or those other principles which made men willing, in the sixteenth century, to shed their blood in a quarrel which has divided Europe into two opposite religious camps ?

To begin with, let us recognize that this contrast between union and disunion has in it a good deal of epigrammatic exaggeration. Neither was the consent of early Christians so complete, nor is modern dissent so absolute, as is sometimes assumed. Some points which common opinion would perhaps single out as especially characteristic of modern nonconformity are not only primitive but even medieval ; nay, more, are characteristic of the strictest Roman orthodoxy at the present moment ; for instance, the reprobation of dancing and of the theatre. However, even when all this has been counted, the Reformation breach was enormous, and the recognition of that breach is our necessary starting-point.

How, first, can we sum up the essence of the Reformation ? In two words : *Private Judgment*. Some historians have taken great pains to show that Luther had no idea of Wyclif's pet doctrine of Dominion, nor Wyclif any idea of Luther's pet doctrine of Grace ; nor could any two of the great early reformers agree upon certain points of supreme importance. All this is perfectly true, but it is irrelevant. Upon one essential point all Reformers agreed in theory if not in practice ; implicitly if not explicitly : they agreed upon the soul's direct responsibility to God and, by implication, the subordinate importance of all human mediators. The orthodox Roman Catholic admits private judgment once, and once only. To the outsider he says : " Question your conscience honestly before God ; probe to the very bottom ; discover there that ours is the One Infallible Church ; thenceforward Private Judgment ceases ; it is no longer a question of what you think or believe, but of what the Church tells you to think and believe." The Reformer, on the other hand, may often, in practice, have been

as intolerant as if he had been infallible. In theory, even, he may have supported doctrines hardly reconcilable, in strict logic, with the claim for Private Judgment. But these anomalies in theory and in practice tend more and more to cancel each other out; meanwhile the root doctrine of the Reformation was, and still remains, the doctrine of Private Judgment. Nor has that doctrine produced the hopeless anarchy which was often predicted. It is true, we wash a good deal of dirty linen in public. It is not counted for righteousness among us Protestants that all should say the same thing in the face of outsiders, while we speak more freely in the closet. Many wonderful and horrible things may be committed among us, but not that particular iniquity which Jeremiah rebuked, of organized unanimity in falsehood as a foundation for priestly rule. We err rather in the opposite direction, and that is the past error which we implicitly confess by the mere fact that all Protestant parties are now so deeply concerned for reunion. Yet the error is not so great as to force upon us impatience, with that risk of still greater errors which impatience involves. Church Reunion would be an enormous gain, as Disarmament would be an enormous gain among nations, but in both cases we need to assure ourselves by careful examination that we are quietly possessing ourselves of the substance, not grasping hastily at a delusive shadow.

Our Reunion of the future must be based, essentially, on that Union of the remotest Christian past. Yet, in some senses, we shall never fully understand that Union, however hard we strive to recapture it. Always, in history, when men thought they were returning to the past, they were also creating a future that had never yet been. With this necessary reminder, however, I take it we are unanimous in an attempt to reunite on the basis of earliest Christian agreement. Can we define that agreement more exactly than by saying that it rested upon a sense of the uniqueness of Christ's person, the uniqueness of His message, and therefore His unique demands upon our obedience? Can we precise much farther than this—I would even ask, can we precise at all farther than this—without falling into divergences which it would need another Nicene Council to deal with? At Nicæa, as Professor Gwatkin showed very plainly, the great majority of the bishops deplored all too exact definition on a subject which had been so long open among Christians; and it was Nicæa which provoked the greatest of all pre-Reformation revolts. To speak quite freely—as you will doubtless wish me to speak—I cannot see how we can recapture pre-Nicæan unity so long as we insist upon more than Nicæan precision of statement upon many metaphysical problems.

Some years ago, I met for the first time one of the most original theologians of our generation, Father Neville Figgis. It was at dinner; and I asked as we lit our cigarettes: "Is it fair to ask you a 'shop' question?" He replied rather wearily (for he had had a long day in the University Library): "Yes." I continued

then: "You always tell us we must listen to the voice of the Teaching Church; but where are we to hear that voice? Does it mean, after all, more than this, that tradition is a very important thing, that we must pay very serious attention to it, and not depart from it on any point unless we are prepared to give very definite reasons for that departure?" He replied rather wearily again: "Perhaps it doesn't come to more than that." And our host, a distinguished theological professor, summed it up: "Yes; how are we to define the Church so as not to exclude the Quakers?" That, I think, admirably states our problem of this afternoon from one very important point of view. No Christian reunion can be complete which does not include the Quakers; from which again it follows that we must not insist upon more than the minimum of agreement—the uniqueness of Christ, of his message, and of our obedience.

It is a common habit to sneer at undenominational religion; and too often, in individual cases, the sneer is more or less justified. Yet it is not often sufficiently recognized that one of those men whom we count among the most definite champions of one denomination, and the noblest martyrs for that religious denomination, did also look forward, ideally, to undenominationalism. Sir Thomas More represents the Utopians as having come more nearly to the solution of the religious difficulty than any nation of his own day. In Utopia, he writes, "all the kinds and fashions of [religion], though they be sundry and manifold, agree together in the honour of the divine nature, as going divers ways to one end; therefore nothing is seen nor heard in their churches, but that [which] seemeth to agree indifferently with them all. If there be a distinct kind of sacrifice peculiar to any several sect, that they execute at home in their own houses. The common sacrifices be so ordered, that they be no derogation nor prejudice to any of the private sacrifices and religions. Therefore no image of any god is seen in the church, to the intent it may be free for every man to conceive God by their religion after what likeness and similitude they will."

How can we explain, then, that the man who wrote those words was ready, later on, to go to the scaffold in defence of Papal Supremacy, with its strict ideal of religious exclusiveness? It is not enough to answer that Utopia is the work of an irresponsible young man, flinging paradoxes about for his own and for the public amusement. There is a method in all the madness of Utopia; and these words represent, if not the conviction, at least the hope, that the world might some day trend in this direction, as in the direction of Plato's communism. Nor, again, can we entirely explain the contrast between this earlier and this later Sir Thomas More by his opportunism as expressed in those final words of the whole book: "So must I needs confess and grant that many things be in the Utopian weal public, which in our cities I may rather wish for, than hope after." We must recognize as the real cause, the root cause, the fact that More, in spite of all his natural

freedom of thought, was strictly fettered when the crisis came for translating thought into action. He was inextricably involved in perhaps the strictest system that is recorded in all world-history. It needed the Reformation to break those bonds ; and, now that the world has tested the fruits of the Reformation for 400 years—now that some, at least, of the Reformers' contentions are practically admitted even by the Roman Church, no complete reunion is possible until that Church has abandoned her most exclusive medieval claims. It is possible that, without giving way, she may gain in numbers ; she may conceivably swallow up so many among the present outsiders as to become incomparably more numerous and powerful than all other Christian denominations put together. That, I think, will be the result, and will justly be the result, if we non-Romanists all assert our private judgment as uncompromisingly as Rome asserts her institutionalism. But, in that case, the minority, though dwindling in numbers, will grow in intensity of opposition and in real importance. For, as education grows, it will be increasingly possible for a minority of students (it is only a minority, after all, who can find time for these things) to realize that the Reformation, which was a many-sided movement, was on one side a revolt of scholarship against conservative ignorance. Gwatkin has put that very well in his comment on Henry VIII's appeal to the Universities of Europe on the Divorce question. Eight of the greatest Universities in Europe declared for Henry's divorce ; and, do what we will to discount their verdict by suggestions of undue influence and of bribery, we cannot believe all these men to have been so venal that the appeal to their learning must be rejected as a mere farce.

For, long before this, learning had begun to sap the papal position very seriously. Marsilius of Padua, two whole centuries before this Divorce question, had shown extraordinary command of facts, and extraordinary penetration, in his analysis of the steps by which the Papacy had arrived at its world-power. If More, or even Fisher, had studied Marsilius in his youth, and had heard the book discussed by people who were free to speak their mind, it is difficult to believe that either of them would have felt it his duty to die for Papal Supremacy ; the Forged Decretals, again, which even Marsilius had been compelled to accept as genuine, were finally exposed by at least two scholars at the end of the fifteenth century. The Reformation fixed and sealed these and similar historical discoveries ; and it is impossible to imagine that the clock will ever go back again here. There can never be Reunion except on a foundation of free and sane scholarship. By this I do not mean that the intellectualists are to be in command ; on the contrary, even in other departments of human activity, character counts for more than intellect in the long run, and more especially so in religion. But religion cannot make intellect into a definite enemy, or try to build without it ; a Reunion entirely void of learning could never be true and solid. We must build upon the Early Church, or rather upon the foundation stone of

that Church, Jesus Christ. But we must not be afraid of hard work in getting down to that foundation. No true and abiding Church will ever give us ninepence for fourpence; one of the strongest points in the strongest modern apologist for the Roman Church (Anatole von Hügel) is his insistence on that word *cost*; our creed must cost us something. No soul, therefore, and no society of souls can come into the great Reunion of the future (if such Reunion is ever to take a bodily form) unless this soul or this society is willing to clear away all encumbrances, down to the actual foundation—down to the real Christ, the real Early Church. Here again, then, may we not find one Reformation principle which, by this time, has plainly come to stay? The Romanist says: "I have no need to explore; I know I am on the bed-rock already; if I doubt this for one moment, from that moment I have ceased (if only for a time) to be an orthodox Catholic." The individual Reformers themselves may sometimes have been as dogmatic as this, though I do not think it has ever been proved against any of our great men. But the Reformation, as a movement, made it impossible for such dogmatisms to survive in the mass, even if they survived in the individual. The Reformation took its stand on the Bible, the most difficult book in the world to interpret with unanimity in all its details. At the same time, the Reformers swept away, if only temporarily, the idea of one recognized authority which should secure uniformity by imposing its own interpretation of the Bible upon the multitude. That was a deed which could never be entirely recalled. Short of continuing to accept the Pope as universal arbiter, the question of authority was now in the melting-pot; even those who hated the idea of individual interpretation could no more agree as to where they should find the interpreting authority, than the individual interpreters could agree about the meaning of the sacred text. That is the strength of Romanism; its consistency, or at least its outward show of consistency, though it were only consistency in error. That, again, must always be the weakness of anti-Romanism, that by its very essence it proclaims inconsistency, that it cannot profess as yet to be actually consistent, but only to be struggling towards consistency. To be sure, here is a disadvantage which St. Paul, for his part, is content to shoulder very frankly (Phil. iii. 12): "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." If, therefore, von Hügel asks us what is the cost at which we are trying to buy the pearl of price, I should say, at the cost of perpetual vigilance, lest we think we stand where in fact we are on the point of falling. Vigilance not necessarily unquiet; for, if we are true to that Pauline word, we realize that we are not only striving ourselves to apprehend but, in that very act, we are ourselves being apprehended of Christ Jesus. But vigilance perpetual, and therefore, if not exactly restless, yet not exactly restful: "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Some men

feel that this is a hard saying ; at that price, they will walk no more with us ; and there, again, is part of the cost at which Protestantism buys such religion as it can attain to.

But, short of accepting Reunion at Rome's own price ; short of agreeing with Newman's answer to those who sought some modification of the terms—"Beggars," he said, "cannot be choosers"—short of that, seek we must, and try to get down to the very foundations of Jesus and the Church.

What, then, do we find ? The disciples of John Baptist came to him with a question, simplest and most momentous of all that can be imagined : "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another ?" Did our Lord answer them as He should have done if He wished to give authority to the strict idea of a Teaching Church ? Did He not simply throw them upon their own Private Judgment, though a single word *Yes*, from Him, would have settled their doubts at once ? Did He not thus clearly imply that Christianity is not so much to impose things upon us as to elicit things from us ; that, in religion even more than in other kinds of education, Ruskin's words are true ; you educate a man less by teaching him things which he did not know, than by making him that which he was not.

Pass on a few centuries, and look at that controversy in the Early Church about heretical baptism. St. Cyprian, and many conspicuous bishops of his time, were firmly convinced that heretical baptism was null ; a person thus baptized had not even crossed the threshold of the Kingdom of Heaven ; dying thus, he could scarcely fail to be damned. The Pope disagreed with them, but they repudiated the Pope's verdict with contempt.

Only 150 years later was the question decided, not by the solemn pronouncement of any recognized supreme authority, but by the arguments of a local bishop, St. Augustine of Hippo, who fixed public opinion by much the same means as those by which Darwin convinced the world of the mutability of species ; that is, by appeals to reason and common sense. Yet, for five generations before this general consensus, Christendom had been fluctuating in utter doubt upon one of the most important questions which it is possible to conceive ; moreover, one of the simplest questions and least metaphysical, an issue which the merest child can understand. Is this historical fact reconcilable with any theory of an absolute certainty imposed from above by a teaching authority universally recognized by the faithful, and drawing its doctrines, on every important point, in a direct unpolluted channel from God's own word once spoken to the Apostles, with the Holy Spirit to guide unerringly whensoever advance and expansion became necessary ?

Still more important, perhaps, when we seek to get down to the bare rock for our foundation of future unity, is the story of the Bible. Very few students, even among professed medievalists, seem to realize how Bibliolatry, like many other things which we label now under the general heading of Puritanism, was a creation not of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but of the Middle

Ages. Medieval writers who allow exceptions to the verbal inspiration of the Bible are highly exceptional. St. Thomas Aquinas may be taken here, as in most cases, as typical of the classical medieval conclusions. He insists that the Bible is infallible even in its smallest historical statements. He supplies a concrete illustration: if any man should deny that Samuel was son of Elkanah, that man would contradict the Holy Ghost, and be in heresy. William of Oakham, who was in many ways so independent, and who certainly was not sorry to find excuses for differing from Aquinas, is if possible even more emphatic; he returns frequently to the subject and gives many concrete examples: it is heresy to deny that Solomon was the son of Bathsheba, because this fact is explicitly stated in St. Matthew's genealogy. Here, then, was a collection of books absolutely unique in their inerrancy, divided by an impassable gulf from all other books. Yet for fifteen centuries there was no authoritative decision as to fourteen of these books; were they on the inerrant side of the gulf or not? And, when a decision was finally risked by the party which represented roughly one half of Christendom, that decision flatly contradicted the views of the large majority of the past Fathers of the Church. Does not Church history teach us, as plainly as the Gospels, "The kingdom of God is within you"?

We must not for one moment suggest that no able and honest person, in the face of these and similar historical facts, can believe in the strict theory of an infallible teaching authority in the Church, or can honestly find that infallible authority in the Pope. Such a suggestion would conflict with patent facts around us. But we may say, perhaps, that such a reconciliation of the Ultramontane claims with historical fact is so difficult as to make it incredible that all scholars, or even an overwhelming majority of scholars, will ever support those claims. And so long as any considerable proportion of those who devote themselves to this subject feel bound to reject the Ultramontane claims, those claims will continue to present an insuperable bar to Reunion. If it is incredible that Romanists should ever treat on equal terms with non-Romanists, and that Rome should ever be content with asserting herself to be *prima inter pares*, then Reunion is incredible. Indeed, I have lately heard a learned and candid Romanist declare publicly that he sees, humanly speaking, no prospect of Reunion.

Yet is there not one way, far less likely to occur to an orthodox Ultramontane (and, as things stand at present, there is no orthodoxy in Romanism without Ultramontanism), but easier for us Protestants to contemplate? It will be a long way, yet is it not a possible path? When Newman went over to Rome, Pusey reeled at first under the shock; but then reflection seemed to show him the smiling face behind this frowning Providence.¹ He wrote to Newman himself: "Your case is that of a peculiar providence. I suppose that God has taken you from us for some special office which he reserves for you." And again, in a letter to a friend

¹ H. Brémond, *L'Inquiétude religieuse* (Perrin, 1901), pp. 87-9.

which was published in the papers: "That such a man as this, thus shaped in our Church and accustomed to find in that Church the presence of the Holy Spirit, should pass over to Rome, is perhaps the greatest event which has happened since the separation [of the two Churches]. If anything can open Romanist eyes to what good there is among us, or can soften the prejudices which we nurse against them, it will certainly be the presence among them of such a man, child of our Church, grown up within her and risen to so high a position among us." There, says Abbé Brémont, Pusey showed his invincible optimism. Well, there is something after all in invincible optimism; and one of the worst of practical mistakes—perhaps even of spiritual mistakes—is to shake one's head beforehand at the suggestion of happy possibilities.

The problem of our Reunion on the other side, with the other Protestant Churches, seems far more simple. When we are asked: "How will you include the Quaker," may we not answer, "Woe is me if I include not the Quaker," the person about whom Bishop Gore has noted that, while each of us thinks his own Church the best, a general referendum of all Churches would probably put the Quaker next highest in general respect. What is there in a Quaker Meeting to shock the sincere religion of the most convinced sacerdotalist? And, on the other side, one of the most distinguished of modern Quakers, the author of *John Inglesant*, argued publicly that no Quaker need be repelled by anything in the Anglican Communion service. Who will dare to affirm that Christ is on the side of those who would say, "Master, we found one kneeling by our side at thine own Breaking of Bread, and we forbade him, because he followeth not after us"? Take the question of Transubstantiation, that which would generally be specified as the deepest line of cleavage. We ourselves kneel, in foreign churches, side by side with men who make Transubstantiation a cardinal point of their faith; men whose spiritual forefathers consigned to hell all disbelievers in Transubstantiation; men who themselves, if they allow us a chance of heaven, can only do so by explaining away some of the most solemn official utterances in their Church. Are we harmed by kneeling with them, or they by our presence among them? If any orthodox Romanist says to himself, "My neighbour here in church is conforming with us in most details, in order not to shock us, but there are other details whereby I recognize him as one of the thousand Protestants who visit our churches in the tourist season, and therefore my devotion is hindered by his presence," would not that man write himself down as one of little faith, rather fearing to be infected himself with heresy than hoping to kindle the heretic with something of his own religion?

And, in a less degree, must we not plead similarly with the extreme Anglo-Catholic? When these men say: "It is all very well, but you ask us, as preliminaries to peace, to begin by giving up some among the most essential points of our creed," may we not answer, "Has any man the right, before God, to build exclusive-

ness into his creed as one of its corner-stones? Has any man the right to say, 'If you remove exclusiveness, my whole religion will fall'?' Not long ago, the watchword for unity within our own Church was *Trust the Bishops!* To get true Reunion we must go a long way deeper than that; we must say hourly to ourselves, *Trust God, who willeth that all men should be saved.*

THE LURE OF SIMPLICITY. By the Rev. Prebendary A. W. Gough. *Eveleigh Nash & Grayson.* 3s. 6d. net.

Prebendary Gough is known as a strong and vigorous advocate of any cause which he takes up. In the present book he treats with his usual vigour and courage some of the movements of a reactionary character which he regards as fatal to the future life of this country. The common cause which he finds in them all is a desire for simplicity, but he distinguishes between the false and the true simplification. Socialism is an attempted simplification, but it is at once the most untrue and the most influential that has ever been propagated "for increasing the miseries of mankind." In the Christian Socialist Movement he finds again an untrue effort at simplicity. In some of the missionary movements of to-day he sees a mistaken simplicity and in Mr. Bernard Shaw he finds an outstanding example of misguided enthusiasm. Prebendary Gough has no hesitation in expressing views which run counter to much current popular sentiment, and it is well, as a corrective of excess, to have a statement so clear and forcible of views, such as he presents.

Bishop Pakenham-Walsh has issued through the Diocesan Press, Vepery, Madras, *The Antiphonal Psalter.* Its purpose is to bring out the antiphonal arrangement of the Hebrew poetry. The main object is to help Indian Christians to a richer interpretation of the Psalms in their public worship.

The A.E.G.M. series of penny booklets "Everyday Christianity" has added as its later numbers, *Do you find Church Dull?* by Rev. W. H. Heaton-Renshaw, *Why Religion at all?* by the Ven. J. W. Hunkin, and *Houses of God, or Everyman's right to a Home* by the Rev. R. Richmond Rayment.

Among the latest additions to the S.P.C.K. series, "The Teaching Church" papers, are *An Understanding Faith* by Canon Raven, *The Parish as a School of Religion* by Miss Catherine Newby, *Missionary Schools* by the Bishop of Peterborough, *The Church and the Universities* by Miss Marjorie West.

Dr. Limmer Sheppard has written a brief account of Swedenborgianism which is published by S.P.C.K. (6d.)

SANCTUARY.

BY H. P. PALMER.

THE custom of "taking sanctuary," of which we hear so much in the Middle Ages, is of Hellenic origin. In the Greek communities we are told, "the temples, altars, sacred groves and statues of the gods possessed the privilege of protecting slaves, debtors and criminals who fled to them for refuge." The sanctuary laws of the Greeks were usually respected. There burst forth at times, however, precisely the same defiance of them which we meet not infrequently in the Middle Ages and precisely the same means were adopted of carrying that defiance into effect. Sometimes the victim was forcibly dragged from the temple. Sometimes, again, his enemies invested the sanctuary and prevented food from reaching him, when he was compelled either to starve or throw himself on their "tender mercies" which were probably "cruel." Worst of all, the sanctuary was occasionally set on fire in the hope that the wretch who had trusted to its protection might perish in the flames.

The Romans made the Hellenic sanctuary customs their own. When the Empire became Christian and the ecclesiastical buildings were now sanctuaries, the Church found itself dowered with a great privilege. It clung to that privilege, it battled for it, even though aware that, as actually exerted, it was a menace to the public welfare and that the most absurd inconsistencies existed in the working of the sanctuary rules.

The privilege of sanctuary was greatly modified in England in the reign of Henry VIII, and with trifling exceptions, totally abolished in the reign of James I. It survived, however, for a far longer period on the Continent. Smollett, the novelist, who flourished about the middle of the eighteenth century, when staying at Florence, saw a man "taking the air" on the steps of a church there in the easy style of one at peace with himself and all the world.

Smollett was not a little surprised to be told that this loiterer was one who had murdered his wife but three days before and was now in the security of sanctuary.

The sanctuary regulations of the Anglo-Saxons were favourable to the criminal fleeing perhaps for his life with a crowd at his heels from the grasp of the law. In these early times not only did churches afford asylum, but, even if a fugitive embraced a wayside cross, he was entitled to this privilege. Then also Kings and Bishops, as invested with a sacred character, could for a time protect criminals from their pursuers and give them an opportunity of reconciliation or escape. Monasteries by their charters had rights of sanctuary, and by a law of Edward the Confessor a priest's house was a sacred shelter.

The law of sanctuary was not always respected even in Saxon times, especially in the case of the Danes.

The convent of St. Frideswyde which, when dissolved at the

Reformation, gave to Oxford its noble cathedral church, was always regarded with especial veneration. So great was the reverence for St. Frideswyde that in medieval days the entire University on certain great occasions went in solemn procession to the church of which she was the patronal saint. One of the chests, from which money was lent to the scholars of the University, was called after her name. Yet, when in the time of King Ethelred, Danes under sentence of death took refuge within its walls, their pursuers fired the church and the Northmen met with a terrible end. The Normans established a distinction between chartered sanctuaries and general sanctuaries. The former, by special privilege emanating from the Crown, could alone shelter in case of treason, while every church was a general sanctuary to which a man or woman guilty of any other crime might flee. This distinction seems always to have persisted.

A kind of ritual was gradually evolved in the more famous sanctuaries and to some extent elsewhere. Who has not heard of that prevailing at St. Cuthbert's Cathedral, Durham? The rapping of the fugitive on the bronze knocker, the opening of the door, the ringing of the bell in the Galilee tower and the confession of the crime before witnesses form a little drama not easily forgotten. Anyone guilty of stopping the runaway on his way to sanctuary, even if he were distant so far as six miles from the Cathedral, was guilty of sacrilege and liable to punishment. The miscreant who dared to seize him when seated on the "frith-stool," or chair of peace, was liable to severe penalties from Church and State. Numerous public whippings by a priest were often part of the penalty inflicted by the ecclesiastical authorities for this offence.

The rule, probably far more often honoured in the breach than in the observance, was that no one could remain in sanctuary for more than forty days. Within that time or at its expiration, the "sanctuary man" was compelled to abjure the realm either before the Coroner or other civil officer.

The traveller on a highroad in those days must sometimes have met a singular and disconsolate figure clothed in a long white garment, bearing a cross, and looking like a forlorn spiritual scarecrow. The startling apparition was a "sanctuary man" "leaving his country for his country's good," and bound for the nearest port, whence he was under orders to take ship for the Continent. Many such an offender by no means appreciated the humour of the situation. Accordingly on the first opportunity he flung away his robe and in some busy mart either obtained employment or continued to pursue a trade of crime. It may be added that leaving the realm was impracticable in time of war and that in cases of debt "sanctuary men" seem to have remained where they were until they saw fit to depart.

How, it may be inquired, had the fugitive man lived, and how had he been guarded while still in sanctuary? Village churches were unpopular as sanctuaries, for in them such sustenance as could be procured would be given with sparing hand by the clergyman and some of his parishioners and must have been in the nature of things

SANCTUARY.

BY H. P. PALMER.

THE custom of "taking sanctuary," of which we hear so much in the Middle Ages, is of Hellenic origin. In the Greek communities we are told, "the temples, altars, sacred groves and statues of the gods possessed the privilege of protecting slaves, debtors and criminals who fled to them for refuge." The sanctuary laws of the Greeks were usually respected. There burst forth at times, however, precisely the same defiance of them which we meet not infrequently in the Middle Ages and precisely the same means were adopted of carrying that defiance into effect. Sometimes the victim was forcibly dragged from the temple. Sometimes, again, his enemies invested the sanctuary and prevented food from reaching him, when he was compelled either to starve or throw himself on their "tender mercies" which were probably "cruel." Worst of all, the sanctuary was occasionally set on fire in the hope that the wretch who had trusted to its protection might perish in the flames.

The Romans made the Hellenic sanctuary customs their own. When the Empire became Christian and the ecclesiastical buildings were now sanctuaries, the Church found itself dowered with a great privilege. It clung to that privilege, it battled for it, even though aware that, as actually exerted, it was a menace to the public welfare and that the most absurd inconsistencies existed in the working of the sanctuary rules.

The privilege of sanctuary was greatly modified in England in the reign of Henry VIII, and with trifling exceptions, totally abolished in the reign of James I. It survived, however, for a far longer period on the Continent. Smollett, the novelist, who flourished about the middle of the eighteenth century, when staying at Florence, saw a man "taking the air" on the steps of a church there in the easy style of one at peace with himself and all the world.

Smollett was not a little surprised to be told that this loiterer was one who had murdered his wife but three days before and was now in the security of sanctuary.

The sanctuary regulations of the Anglo-Saxons were favourable to the criminal fleeing perhaps for his life with a crowd at his heels from the grasp of the law. In these early times not only did churches afford asylum, but, even if a fugitive embraced a wayside cross, he was entitled to this privilege. Then also Kings and Bishops, as invested with a sacred character, could for a time protect criminals from their pursuers and give them an opportunity of reconciliation or escape. Monasteries by their charters had rights of sanctuary, and by a law of Edward the Confessor a priest's house was a sacred shelter.

The law of sanctuary was not always respected even in Saxon times, especially in the case of the Danes.

The convent of St. Frideswyde which, when dissolved at the

Reformation, gave to Oxford its noble cathedral church, was always regarded with especial veneration. So great was the reverence for St. Frideswyde that in medieval days the entire University on certain great occasions went in solemn procession to the church of which she was the patronal saint. One of the chests, from which money was lent to the scholars of the University, was called after her name. Yet, when in the time of King Ethelred, Danes under sentence of death took refuge within its walls, their pursuers fired the church and the Northmen met with a terrible end. The Normans established a distinction between chartered sanctuaries and general sanctuaries. The former, by special privilege emanating from the Crown, could alone shelter in case of treason, while every church was a general sanctuary to which a man or woman guilty of any other crime might flee. This distinction seems always to have persisted.

A kind of ritual was gradually evolved in the more famous sanctuaries and to some extent elsewhere. Who has not heard of that prevailing at St. Cuthbert's Cathedral, Durham? The rapping of the fugitive on the bronze knocker, the opening of the door, the ringing of the bell in the Galilee tower and the confession of the crime before witnesses form a little drama not easily forgotten. Anyone guilty of stopping the runaway on his way to sanctuary, even if he were distant so far as six miles from the Cathedral, was guilty of sacrilege and liable to punishment. The miscreant who dared to seize him when seated on the "frith-stool," or chair of peace, was liable to severe penalties from Church and State. Numerous public whippings by a priest were often part of the penalty inflicted by the ecclesiastical authorities for this offence.

The rule, probably far more often honoured in the breach than in the observance, was that no one could remain in sanctuary for more than forty days. Within that time or at its expiration, the "sanctuary man" was compelled to abjure the realm either before the Coroner or other civil officer.

The traveller on a highroad in those days must sometimes have met a singular and disconsolate figure clothed in a long white garment, bearing a cross, and looking like a forlorn spiritual scarecrow. The startling apparition was a "sanctuary man" "leaving his country for his country's good," and bound for the nearest port, whence he was under orders to take ship for the Continent. Many such an offender by no means appreciated the humour of the situation. Accordingly on the first opportunity he flung away his robe and in some busy mart either obtained employment or continued to pursue a trade of crime. It may be added that leaving the realm was impracticable in time of war and that in cases of debt "sanctuary men" seem to have remained where they were until they saw fit to depart.

How, it may be inquired, had the fugitive man lived, and how had he been guarded while still in sanctuary? Village churches were unpopular as sanctuaries, for in them such sustenance as could be procured would be given with sparing hand by the clergyman and some of his parishioners and must have been in the nature of things

far from luxurious. At the same time there were occasions when a criminal almost outrun by the yelling crowd at his heels, faint, weary, panting and at the end of his strength, could find no better shelter than the village church which he saw in front of him. If he found it closed against him, he clutched the door-ring and, not always successfully, defied his enemies to touch him. He was in sanctuary.

A case of breach of sanctuary in a village church is recorded in the register of de Drokenstord, Bishop of Bath and Wells, as occurring at Chedzoy in 1319. The pursuers seized a fugitive called Brinton when actually holding the door-ring of the church and carried him off to Somerton gaol. The Bishop wrote to the King's Justices at Somerton demanding that Brinton should be sent back to Chedzoy church "so as to be within ecclesiastical jurisdiction."

The prevention of the escape of those harbouring in village churches fell on the tithing-men or petty constables.

The criminal then preferred to seek shelter in the great sanctuaries scattered all over the country and belonging to wealthy churches or monasteries where he would be fed, clothed, and guarded from his enemies. The civic authorities were responsible in such cases for preventing his escape.

The actual working of the system of sanctuary may now be illustrated by a few examples drawn from different periods. They may serve to show that the privilege was rarely beneficial except to the rogues who did not deserve it. The Church adopted the mistaken policy of maintaining the usage without modification long after there was even the shadow of a reason for its continuance: though among the higher clergy there were not infrequently those who treated it with contempt. To the King, the Parliament, the Justices, Sheriffs, Bailiffs and other executors of the law it was always odious. The community as a whole showed in a very practical manner that it shared this feeling.

Ralph Flambard, the justiciary of William Rufus, has been described as "a Norman clergyman of obscure birth, of ready wit, dissolute morals and insatiable ambition." He was one who "neither feared God nor regarded man," unscrupulous enough to satisfy the demands of his master, and desperate enough to make exactions which loaded him with the execrations of the people and on one occasion nearly cost him his life. Flambard rose rapidly from one preferment to another and was in due course nominated to the great See of Durham. When, however, William Rufus made this appointment, he took a leaf out of the Justiciar's own book and charged him a thousand pounds, equal perhaps to a present value of fifty times that amount, for the preferment. The new prelate's Cathedral Church was shielded by the special protection of St. Cuthbert and was, as has been stated, a sanctuary of great repute. Flambard found himself in a dilemma. Though bad and irreligious, he had yet a superstitious dread that the Saint might be revenged upon him if he dared to draw fugitives from sanctuary. At the same time, as they were often guilty of raiding

his crops, poaching on his preserves, fishing in his waters and robbing his tenants, he grudged them their refuge. While his mind was thus agitated, the rights of sanctuary were respected. At last Flambard resolved to try the temper of St. Cuthbert by breaking some of the lesser regulations of his church, before proceeding to so extreme a measure as the violation of his sanctuary. He was gratified to find that nothing unusual happened and that the saint did not stir a finger against him, and so he felt quite at ease and was emboldened to draw men out of sanctuary and doubtless to punish them with death.

A prelate with a very different view of the asylum of sanctuary, was Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, in the reign of Henry II, a man of great sanctity of character and possessing extraordinary influence in his diocese. He was, moreover, the intimate friend of the King and carried with him a charm of manner which often subdued the fiery temper of the most petulant of monarchs.

The Bishop's respect for the sanctuary laws was unbounded, he gave them the widest construction, and those who broke them in his diocese lived to repent it. Riding on one occasion through the territory of St. Alban's Abbey, he met a sad procession only too commonly seen in the Middle Ages, when criminals were executed at a distance from their prisons. It consisted of a body of apparitors who were conducting to the gallows, with hands tied behind him, a prisoner who had been convicted of theft. The officers recognized the Bishop and at once knelt to receive his blessing, seated as he was on his horse. The criminal saw his chance. He knelt on the ground and implored the Bishop's compassion. Hugh's interest and pity were excited, and, in spite of the advice of the clergy in his retinue, he demanded the person of the captive, which was at once surrendered. When the Bishop arrived at the guest-house of the Abbey, he was confronted with the judges who had ordered the execution. They seemed disposed to question the legality of his conduct, but were informed by him that if a consecrated building could give immunity to a prisoner, much more could the Bishop who invested it with sanctity. The judges were struck by the remark and remembered that the ancient English law was in exact agreement with this doctrine. The prisoner accompanied the Bishop to London, where he was released.

History repeats itself, and two hundred years later a similar incident is again recorded, when the Abbot of Battle, travelling with his retinue on the London road, met a malefactor, who had been condemned to death in the Marshalsea Court and was on his way to execution. The Abbot intervened, insisting that one of the privileges belonging to his office enabled him to rescue from death any criminal who crossed his path. His wishes were respected and the culprit was spared. King Edward III and his Ministers were greatly incensed by this occurrence, justly considering that it brought the law into contempt. The Abbot, however, laid his charters before Parliament and had the happiness of being told that he had not exceeded his rights.

We pass to a further sanctuary incident recorded of Bishop Hugh which proves that, if he had the virtues of a saint, he could descend to the infliction of gruesome and appalling penalties on sinners.

A thief fled for sanctuary to Brackley Church. He was, however, taken from thence by the officials of the Earl of Leicester, hanged and buried near the place of execution. When this event occurred, the Bishop was on the Continent, but when he returned to England, he exacted a terrible atonement from the perpetrators of the outrage. Wearing only breeches, they were to dig up the body of their victim ; they were to place it on a bier, and then carry it on their shoulders for the distance of a mile to Brackley, where it was to be buried in the churchyard. Floggings before the churches of Brackley followed. As if all this were not enough, the penitents were commanded afterwards to proceed to Lincoln and suffer a similar punishment before each of the numerous churches there.

Among those who had borne part in the breach of sanctuary was the Bailiff of the Earl of Leicester. He had not dared to face the wrath of the Bishop, but had fled to France. While living there, he had been constantly smitten by " the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," nothing prospered with him, he lost his position under the Earl, and worse than all, he was for ever haunted by the terrors of the final doom. The Bishop was greeted at Troyes by this unfortunate man who had refused, in the language of the chronicler, to " give joy to the angels " by dutiful acceptance of a merited punishment. He now placed himself without reserve in the hands of the Bishop, who visited him with a penance demanding seven years for its fulfilment.

A startling contrast to Hugh's reverence for sanctuary is to be found in the conduct of two of his contemporaries, Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, and Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury. The former showed an utter contempt for sanctuary laws in his treatment of Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, the natural son of Henry II, who had fled to St. Martin's Priory, Dover. Though the Archbishop was vested in his pontifical robes and was kneeling before the altar, he was dragged out of the church by Longchamp's myrmidons, hustled through the streets and imprisoned in Dover castle.

Only a few years later, Hubert Walter, the Primate, earned the odium of the church by a gross violation of sanctuary law. William Fitzosbert, who had been at the head of an association of fifty-two thousand disaffected persons, killed with an axe the Archbishop's officer who was trying to arrest him and took sanctuary in the church of St. Mary-le-Bow. Four days afterwards the church was set on fire, and Fitzosbert, though badly wounded in an attempt to escape, was seized by the Archbishop's orders and hanged in chains at Tyburn. The case was brought to the notice of the Pontiff, who in consequence insisted that the Primate should relinquish all his secular offices.

Violations of the law of sanctuary are to be found in the persecu-

tion of Hubert de Burgh, the fallen Minister of Henry III. De Burgh, truly or falsely, was charged with defrauding the Crown when Regent of the Kingdom during Henry's minority, a duty which he discharged with conspicuous success. While making the most determined efforts to escape from the vengeance of his enemies, he had the strangest experiences of sanctuary. At first he fled for shelter to Merton Priory. He was soon threatened with capture ; but eventually was allowed to remain unmolested for some months, and indeed, until he chose to leave of his own accord. Again menaced, he took sanctuary in a chapel at Brentwood in Essex. He was torn away almost immediately by his pursuers and conveyed to London with his feet tied under the belly of his horse. As might have been expected, the Bishop of London was infuriated at this outrage and threatened with excommunication all who had committed it. The King was alarmed and de Burgh was at once sent back to Brentwood by him. De Burgh's enemies, probably with the privity of the King, now proceeded to set guards round the chapel and surround it with a ditch and palisades. As a result of these measures, de Burgh could neither receive food nor escape. He was therefore forced to surrender and was conducted to the Tower. In custody later at Devises, he again gave proof of his resolute spirit by leaping into the Castle moat. When he had reached a neighbouring church for sanctuary, he soon found himself invested by the Sheriff and his officers. A stronger party of his own friends, however, effected a timely rescue.

Frequent cases of escape from sanctuary are recorded in mediaeval documents and were heard by the King's Justices, who reported their opinion to the Crown. Thus the Justices of Henry III are found sitting in the Tower and making careful inquiry of the Mayor and Aldermen about these escapes.

In the fourteenth year of Edward II the Justices, also sitting in the Tower, complained that there was no proper watch set to prevent the flight of "sanctuary men" from the churches to which they had fled. Two definite cases were quoted. The Mayor and Aldermen, who must have known that the duty of preventing the escape of felons fell on the Ward in which the church of refuge was situated, disowned responsibility. They declared that neither they nor the Sheriffs were compelled to undertake the duty of providing watchers. The Justices told the City fathers plainly that they were mistaken. Such neglect, they said, was contrary to public policy, it was an encouragement to crime and made justice ridiculous. The Mayor and Aldermen seem not to have been fined, but to have obtained their pardon from the Crown.

If the community were responsible for the escape of criminals from sanctuary, it was equally so for their flight from prison into sanctuary. Thus the Justices on circuit in Cornwall in 1284, finding that a thief called Margery Wolbeter had fled from Helston gaol, gone into sanctuary at St. Michael's Church, and afterwards "abjured the realm," held that the township was responsible for her escape. The Sheriff accounted at the Assize for Margery's

chattels which were worth 6½*d.* It may perhaps not be altogether wondered at that Margery was a thief.

The great sanctuaries of London were infested with "all sorts and conditions of desperate men," "so weary with disasters, tugged with fortune that they would set their lives on any chance to mend them or be rid of them." So numerous were the "sanctuary men" in the precincts of the church of St. Martin as to require two chapels for the services they were compelled to attend and a prison for the mutinous and refractory. Many of those who sought shelter at this church were accustomed to sally out at night and "commit many riots, robberies, murders and other mischiefs."

The Dean on one occasion complained to the Crown that five men who had just taken sanctuary were seized and taken "chained by the necks" to Newgate. The result of this complaint was an inquiry by Henry VI and his Ministers, which resulted in instructions to the Dean for the better management of the sanctuary. Among these were orders that the gates of the sanctuary should be closed at nine, that goods stolen should be restored to the owners and possession of weapons and knives prohibited. The knives used at meals were to be "reasonable" knives and pointless.

By far the most famous of all our sanctuaries, however, was Westminster Abbey. The precincts, which included the church, the churchyard and the close, have been described by Dean Stanley "as a vast cave of Adullam for all the distressed and discontented in the metropolis who desired according to the phrase of the times to 'take Westminster.'" "What a rabble," men said, "of thieves, murderers, and malicious heinous traitors" were to be found there! "Men's wives run thither with their husbands' plate and say they could not abide with their husbands for beating. Thieves bring thither their stolen goods and there live thereon. Nightly they steal out, they rob and kill and come in again." Thither resorted fraudulent debtors who lived comfortably while their goods were immune from distress. Such men were the despair of their creditors and a scandal to the Abbey. Some little improvement, however, in the law was effected by a famous case, no way concerned with debtors, which occurred in the Abbey Church.

In the reign of Richard II, two squires, Shakell and Haule, were committed to the Tower for refusing to surrender to the Crown a young Spanish prisoner whom they had sent into a place of concealment. The Spaniard was their lawful prize and the Crown had no legal claim upon him. The two squires were resolute men, they overpowered their gaoler and fled to the Abbey for sanctuary. The Governor of the Tower and his guard went to recover the prisoners. Shakell was seized but it happened that Haule was attending the service of Mass. When, in spite of this fact, his arrest was attempted he drew his sword. He was chased round the choir and murdered. Grave results followed this terrible incident. The Abbey Church had been "polluted by bloodshed" and could not be used for public worship until the service of "Recon-

ciliation " had been performed. For four months silence reigned supreme in the great church : it was as if it were widowed and desolate. In the meantime, Sudbury, the Primate, afterwards one of the victims of the Peasants' revolt, excommunicated the Governor of the Tower and all who had borne part in the outrage or been responsible for it. Though the reading of the excommunication was forbidden by the Crown, Courtenay, the Bishop of London, persisted in its recitation each holy day at St. Paul's.

The whole affair engaged the earnest attention of Parliament and their discussion showed a deep dislike of the sanctuary laws, while it was not denied that the murder of Haule was an unwarrantable act. Ecclesiastical influence proved too strong to permit the radical reform in the laws of sanctuary which was so much desired. The fraudulent debtor was, however, to a certain extent dealt with and his wings clipped. He was in future to be summoned to the door of the church once a week for thirty-one days. If he failed to appear, his goods were seized for the benefit of his creditors.

Westminster Abbey is familiar to all readers of English history as twice the refuge of Elizabeth, Queen of Edward IV, so well known under her former name of Woodville. The Queen took sanctuary there in 1470 after the flight of her husband from the kingdom, " when Fortune's malice overthrew her state." It was while she was there that her second son, the Duke of York, the younger of the two princes afterwards murdered in the Tower, was born. It was once again to Westminster that Elizabeth repaired in 1483 with six of her seven children when in terror of the Protector, afterwards Richard III. By no means a man to be intimidated by any scruples concerning violation of sanctuary, the Protector proceeded to Westminster in his barge attended by a large body of armed men. He undoubtedly meant to frighten the Queen by this display of force, and if unsuccessful in this end, to seize his nephew by violence. The Queen saw that she was helpless in Richard's hands and surrendered the prince. " She called for her boy," says Lingard, " gave him a last and hasty embrace and, turning her back, burst into tears."

After the murder of the Princes, Richard grew jealous of their sisters and determined to prevent their escape from England. He therefore ordered the sanctuary of Westminster to be closely watched and guarded.

A letter written in 1426 by the Prior and Chapter of Christ Church, Canterbury, illustrates still further the hatred of the sanctuary laws, which was shared alike by the King, the Parliament and the law-abiding section of the community. This hatred must have been felt with peculiar intensity at Canterbury which constantly drew crowds of pilgrims of all ranks and conditions to visit the splendid shrine of St. Thomas à Becket. These pilgrims were weary of receiving the unwelcome attention of the thieves who infested the city for the express purpose of rifling them. Under a system of police that was primitive and inefficient, it was far

easier for the "Artful Dodgers" of those days to reap a harvest at Canterbury than it is now to pick pockets on a race-course.

The Prior and Chapter stated in their letter to the Archbishop that a young man who had recently returned from the Continent and was charged with a crime had escaped from Canterbury prison and fled for sanctuary to the Cathedral. Whatever the crime may have been, it was probably of unusual gravity to stir almost to frenzy the minds of the citizens. The return of the "young man" from the Continent provokes the suspicion that he was a former "sanctuary man" who had tried once again to exist at the expense of the public.

In accordance with the custom prevailing in those days, the Archbishop while still living, had raised and endowed a chantry in which chaplains "sang," and were to "sing" perpetually, for the repose of his soul. Within the chantry a sumptuous tomb was already prepared for the reception of his remains.

The Prior and Chapter, in an earnest letter, explained to the Archbishop that the "young man" had sheltered himself inside this chantry and gave a circumstantial account of the outrage which followed. He was pursued, they said, by the Bailiffs of the City who rushed into the Cathedral, followed by a large and angry crowd of people who vented their wrath in no measured terms and were by no means sparing in their abuse of the Cathedral authorities. Was a church, they cried, meant for the shelter of evil-doers, thieves, robbers, murderers? Had not the Prior and Chapter been in the constant habit of protecting these miscreants? They were unworthy of their position, they ought to be prosecuted as the aiders and abettors of dangerous malefactors. They were now to be shown that the public patience was exhausted and that sharp means of redress would be adopted.

Having thus stated their opinion of the Monastery, the crowd rushed desperately forward.

It chanced that the Archbishop's official was holding his Consistory Court in the Cathedral. The malcontents were probably still more frantic when they saw him. To them he represented the abuse of Privilege of Clergy which, like sanctuary, was a means of throwing criminals anew upon the world to the damage and hurt of honest people. The Consistory Court was instantly thrown into confusion and business stopped. Fiercer grew the uproar and louder the din as the Bailiffs and their followers reached the choir. Mass was being sung and the most solemn moment of the service had actually arrived. Yet, though it might have been expected that this touching scene would have awed and quieted the mob, it had no such effect. The service was interrupted and broken as the "sons of iniquity" reached the chantry, bent on seizing the person of the man who had aroused their fury. The drama enacted in the Cathedral was probably more extraordinary than any witnessed within its walls since the December day when Becket fell under the terrible blows of his assassins. The "young man," standing within the chantry, was clinging to its railing with a

strength born of despair. The mob were striking him with sticks and fists to tear him away or pull him through the railing. It was impossible that he could hold out against such numbers and against such force. He was compelled to relinquish his hold. His enemies seized him and bore him on their shoulders into the nave. In a few moments he would be dragged away from the Cathedral and must have tortured his mind with forebodings of what might happen when he was outside its precincts. At this critical moment of his fate the Archbishop's official and some of the monks, who had hastily banded themselves together to assist him, made a counter-attack and succeeded in rescuing the guest who had cost them so dear. The Prior and Chapter concluded their letter with an earnest exhortation to the Primate to "gird himself manfully with the sword of St. Peter," and defend the right and liberties of his Cathedral.

A case somewhat similar to that just recorded, but with a different issue, took place in the Church of the Franciscans or Grey Friars in 1528, just on the eve of the Reformation. This church was one of the most magnificent in London. The great and wealthy vied with one another in lavish gifts for its maintenance and decoration. It contained the remains of royal and noble patrons by whom, or by whose representatives, it had been enriched. The heart of Eleanor, wife of Edward I, was interred within its walls. Edward III, "for the repose of his Mother, the most illustrious Queen Isabella, buried in the church of the Grey Friars, repaired the Middle Window."

This beautiful church with its precincts became one of the most famous of the London sanctuaries, the shelter of many of the fraudulent debtors, thieves and homicides who infested the metropolis. There prevailed in consequence much the same feeling against the misuse of its sanctuary rights which we have seen in London and at Canterbury. We are told that after the gaol-delivery at Newgate a prisoner "brake from the hall when the sessions were done and went into the Grey Friars and there was six or seven days." The City officers, however, had by no means lost sight of him. Their delay in attempting his capture was probably due to their desire to take the friars by surprise, and also to prevent the scandal of the assembly of a noisy multitude in the church. It was not then until about a week after the prisoner's escape that the Sheriffs accompanied by their officers entered the church. The Sheriffs at once strode up to the "sanctuary man" and demanded that he should "abjure the realm before the Coroner." This he refused to do, perhaps hoping either to escape from sanctuary and be free once more or at least to remain there beyond the usual time-limit of forty days. The Sheriffs, however, were not to be balked. They seized him "with great violence of them and their officers, and carried him back to prison."

The Friar who has left us this story heard afterwards that "though they sought all the ways they could," they were unable legally to hang him and that he was set at liberty.

The case which follows shows the wide area which sanctuaries might cover and that those living in a city, and even holding office in it, were not always acquainted with them. The office of Proctor in the University of Oxford formerly involved the discharge not only of its present duties, but also of some of those now undertaken by the police.

On August 26th, 1463, an Oxford tailor called John Harry attacked and wounded another man with a knife. He fled immediately and took sanctuary in Broadgates Hall in the parish of All Saints and belonging to the Hospital of St. John Baptist. Broadgates Hall possessed sanctuary rights as the property of this Hospital and adjacent to it. The Hospital itself derived them from a Papal concession.

Walter Hill, the Proctor, knew nothing about the privilege attached to Broadgates Hall, and evidently believing that it was an asylum of Harry's own creation, ordered him to be dragged away. As, however, the tailor protested and declared that he was in sanctuary, the Proctor seemed disposed to believe him and promised that he would restore him to the Hall, if his life were actually in danger. Harry was then haled by the Proctor before the Commissary of the University. The evidence showed that the wound inflicted involved danger neither to life nor limb. The Commissary therefore looked upon Harry's crime as a comparatively light one and fined him ten shillings. A friend of Harry's, who plied the same trade, gave security for the payment of this sum in two equal instalments. Harry, however, was still haunted by misgivings. Nothing could shake his belief that the friends of the man whom he had injured were thirsting for his life. He therefore entreated the Proctor to restore him to sanctuary. The latter, who by this time had become more enlightened on the subject of Oxford sanctuaries and now knew that Broadgates Hall was undoubtedly a *refugium peccatorum*, reinstated Harry in the place which he had quitted with so much reluctance.

A letter written by William Ebersham in the year 1469 and published in the Paston letters shows that if a "sanctuary man" possessed any means, and apparently even if his means were small, he was compelled to pay for his support while he remained in sanctuary. Ebersham gained his livelihood by copying books and manuscripts and among his patrons was Sir William Paston. We do not know Ebersham's place of sanctuary or why he was there, but he seems to have been by no means pleased with his hosts. "I lie," he says, "in sanctuary at great costs and among right unreasonable askers." He follows this statement of his grievances by asking Sir William "to send me for alms one of your old gowns" and requesting payment of forty-one shillings due for his work.

Henry VII, who seems to have been an enthroned calculating machine, thought it expedient to respect the rights of sanctuary and to this decision Perkin Warbeck twice owed his life. When "the little cockatrice," as Bacon calls him, panic-stricken at the

near approach of the King, left his friends, the Cornish rebels, to the four winds, he fled to Beaulieu Abbey and "there he and divers of his company registered themselves as sanctuary men." He was induced to leave the asylum on the promise that his life should be spared. After having been taken to London, "he was conveyed leisurely on horseback to the Tower and from thence back again to Westminster with the noise of a thousand taunts and reproaches."

He was afterwards confined in the Tower, but, says Bacon, "it was not long but Perkin who was made of quick-silver began to stir. For, deceiving his keepers, he took him to his heels and made speed to the sea-coasts. Such diligent pursuit and search were made that he went to the Priory of Shene, which had the privilege of sanctuary, and put himself into the hands of the Prior of that monastery. The Prior came to the King and besought him for Perkin's life only. Many about the King were more hot than ever to have the King take him forth and hang him."

Henry was wise enough to resist these importunities. With an assumed contempt of Perkin, he ordered that "the knave should be set in the stocks."

Perkin's love of sanctuary, however, gave him but a short respite from death. The King was only seeking, and soon found, a better opportunity of ridding himself of this thorn in his side. Sanctuary merely prolonged Perkin's agony.

Macaulay tells us that "when life and when female honour were exposed to daily risk from tyrants and marauders, it was better that the precinct of a shrine should be regarded with irrational awe than that there should be no refuge inaccessible to cruelty and licentiousness."

It is a sorrowful but a true reflection that no such refuge was to be found in sanctuaries. The truth seems rather to be that far too frequently "tyrants" and "marauders" were the very men who exploited the privilege of sanctuary as they were also those who drove others out of the asylums of sacred shelters. "Cruelty and licentiousness" were the marked characteristics of many a rogue who sought security in sanctuary and too often found it. Such men indeed held prisons and not sanctuaries in "irrational awe." To them "sanctuary" was precisely what the pawnshop is to the dram-drinker or the poor-house to the tramp.

The law of sanctuary, as we have seen, was uncertain in its application; it stood for the repudiation of public justice, caused disturbances and scandals and was exploited by the criminal classes. The Mediaeval Church would have rendered service alike to the country and to itself, had it renounced a privilege which wearied and distressed the public.

THE FUTURE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

BY WILLIAM MARSHALL FREEMAN.

ONE of the most potent influences which brought about the rejection of the Prayer Book Measure by the House of Commons was the belief in the minds of many Members that, quite apart from its merits or demerits, the passing of the Measure would not restore discipline within the Church. They argued, not unnaturally, that if the Bishops could not maintain discipline under the existing Prayer Book, there was not much likelihood of their being able to do so within the wider bounds of the other—especially if, as they were given to understand, discipline was to be secured not by legal sanctions, but by moral suasion. Had the House of Commons been told that reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts was to follow, and that a Measure dealing with that subject had already been drafted, it is possible that a different view might have been taken and that rejection would at least have been accompanied by a hint that the scheme for reforming the Ecclesiastical Courts should be produced simultaneously. That, indeed, would have been wiser policy on the part of the promoters of the Deposited Book—more especially after its first rejection. Now it is inevitable that the question of the future of the Church's courts must be dealt with before any further measure of Prayer-Book revision will have the least chance of being considered by Parliament.

It is agreed, practically on all hands, that the Ecclesiastical Courts will have to be reformed and rehabilitated if the Church is to remain an Established Church. Should disestablishment come about, the Ecclesiastical Courts would not merely cease to function but would cease to exist, as in the case of the Church in Wales. The Church of England would then be in precisely the same legal position as are the Nonconformist Churches—possibly nothing more than a corporate body dependent for its legal rights upon trusteeships subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of the land. The view so often heard expressed that the present disorder in the Church is due to failure on the part of the Bishops to enforce obedience is not altogether a correct view. True, there have undoubtedly been instances when Bishops have refrained from taking proceedings when to do so might have been amply justified, but it is generally recognized that something more than spasmodic effort on the part of individual prelates has long been needed to restore harmony and discipline within the Church.

“ The large variety in the presentation of its teaching and in the conduct of its public worship which has marked the course of the Church of England in the last century, and especially within recent years, has been mainly due to the widening of the thought and outlook of men, to the advance of science, to increased knowledge of the history and liturgies of the Church, to

inevitable changes in the social and educational life of the people, to the needs and demands of each new generation. In this respect it is a sign of health in the body and of the inward vitality which prompts a living organism to adapt itself to a changing environment. But there are many indications that this rightful liberty may degenerate into licence. It is not within our province to attempt to discriminate between types of teaching and modes of worship which have been introduced or restored, or to pronounce any opinion upon them. It is sufficient to record the fact that by general admission a position has been or is being reached in which the public sense of the authority inherent in the Church of England is being seriously weakened."

So the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of the Church Assembly reported in April, 1926 (C.A. 200), and in support of that conclusion they refer to the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline issued in 1906, which emphasized two main causes of the difficulty of maintaining and enforcing authority—one, the "impossibility of restricting the continuous life of the Church within the rigid limits of a uniformity prescribed three hundred years ago"; and the other, the allegation that, "as regards the constitution and character of the Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes, it does not command the general assent and confidence of the Church"—

"It is incongruous that the precise and uniform requirements which were in harmony with the Elizabethan ideas of the administration should still stand as the rule for the public worship of the Church under altered conditions, and amidst altered ways of thought. . . . The result has been a widespread disobedience to the letter of the law, which, though acquiesced in in quiet times, has made the enforcement of uniformity, when startling innovations rendered appeal to the law inevitable, difficult and invidious. It has proved impracticable to obtain complete obedience to the Acts of Uniformity in one particular direction, partly because it is not now, and never has been, demanded in other directions."

And again—

"Bishops and others have been naturally slow to appeal to a court, the jurisdiction of which was so widely challenged; clergymen have claimed the liberty, and even asserted the duty, of disobedience to the decisions of a tribunal the authority of which they repudiate; and judgments of the Judicial Committee, though at least the reasoned statements of very eminent Judges, are treated as valueless, because they are Privy Council judgments. A court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above all others, rest on moral authority, if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of clergy, with strong lay support, refuse to recognize the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee, its judgments cannot be practically enforced."

On this question of obedience, it is not without interest to observe that the Bishop of London, in his reply to the twenty-one clergymen in his diocese who recently addressed a letter to him giving reasons for declining obedience to his directions with regard to the use of the reserved Sacrament, made these significant observations:—

"The greatest fallacy of all is the belief that because things have been obtained by disobedience in the past, therefore they will be in the future. It may be urged that Bishops in the past ought not to have forbidden

some of the things which they did forbid, and that the Prayer Book of 1527 was an acknowledgment of the mistake; but it is a fallacy to argue that disobedience will have a similar result if it is directed against regulations which have received the approval of the Convocations representing the only living authority of the Church of England."

What the Bishop of London is dealing with here is the deliberately expressed intention of a section of his clergy to disobey his own episcopal admonition. That discloses precisely the same attitude of mind as is shown by those who object to the jurisdiction of the Privy Council in ecclesiastical appeals. The objection to the Privy Council has all along been based upon dislike of a lay judiciary and an obvious, though not by any means plainly expressed, desire to have ecclesiastics as judges in ecclesiastical causes.

"The principle upon which the objections to the present Court of Final Appeal are based is that the right of 'declaring, interpreting, and showing' the teaching and use of the Church belongs to the authorities of the Church, and not a tribunal which receives its jurisdiction exclusively from the State."

That is the authoritative statement of the basis of objection to the Privy Council as the Final Court of Appeal. In what way does that differ from the objection of the twenty-one clergymen in the diocese of London to obey their Bishop? Their objection was based upon the fact that Bishops are appointed by the Crown upon the recommendation of lay Ministers. Here again let us quote the Bishop of London:—

"Can it really be contended that the fact that the State has a voice in the appointment of Bishops, which it had (as you acknowledge) long before the Reformation, really frees us as priests from the obligation of our oath of canonical obedience? Remember, we knew all about this method of appointment when we were ordained, and still better when we were instituted to livings. In the service itself we promised canonical obedience to our Bishops, knowing that they were nominated by the State. Is it not too late now, when we are placed in important positions on this understanding, to turn round and say that we repudiate the obligations which we solemnly took with our eyes open? I feel sure that the conscience of the laity of the Church will not support you in that contention."

There can be no doubt that this attitude of hostility to lay jurisdiction has been adopted by two different clerical groups. One—happily, it may be believed, a very small group—desires to set up a new ecclesiastical hierarchy with power as absolute within its domain as is the power of the Pope of Rome. With this group there can be no compromise. The thing they aim at is preposterous and impossible. The other group—a very large group—conscientiously holds that there is a limit to State interference in matters of religion: that the Church should have exclusive power to decree her own rites and ceremonies, and full authority in controversies regarding her own faith: that the intervention of the State in the appointment of Bishops is wrong: that "spiritual" causes should be determined by "spiritual" judges: and that,

above all, the intervention of non-Churchmen (as in Parliament) is intolerable.

With the feelings of this latter group it is impossible not to sympathize up to a point. Indeed there is every reason why their views should be heard and considered with the utmost patience and care. Most of us would agree that the *choice* of her Bishops at least should rest with the Church: that their appointment by the Crown should be more in the nature of a necessary ministerial act following upon that choice. Nor would agreement on other points be difficult to reach. But on this "spiritual" jurisdiction there is surely need for clearer thinking. The word "spiritual" is capable of very varied meanings. There are not wanting those who would substitute it for "clerical" as opposed to "lay" in dealing with persons, in the same way as the Church of Rome places the word "religious" in apposition to "secular." So this word "spiritual" must be carefully analyzed. As commonly and loosely used in the present connection, so far as one can judge, the distinction between causes which are "spiritual" and those which are "non-spiritual" would appear to be something like this: an incumbent may conceive the idea of teaching some doctrine either forbidden or not allowed in the rubric. Upon being challenged for so doing, he wishes to be at liberty to say that with him it is a matter of conscience, and that it is not contrary to the doctrine of the Church. It is therefore a "spiritual" matter, and spiritual matters must only be determined by spiritual persons—the lawyer as layman not being a spiritual person. It is very difficult to understand this attitude of mind. It might just as well be contended that a man who has moved his neighbour's landmark should be tried by a "spiritual" court because his conscience makes him believe that there was an error in the original document of title. In each case the question raised is one of fact and legal interpretation. An incumbent is required upon institution to make a declaration of assent and a promise of loyal adherence to the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. In virtue of that promise he is instituted into the temporalities of his living and is preserved therein by the power of the State, whose law he has promised to obey. Now that law, so far as the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England is concerned, has been made by the Church. It was never made by Parliament—it was *adopted* by Parliament as embodying what the Church had decreed and desired, just as much as the Measures recently passed and placed on the Statute Book have been adopted and placed there by and with the consent of Parliament as embodying what the Church desired in her elected Assemblies.

We must also keep clearly in mind in this matter the distinction between legislation and administration. No reasonable person would suggest that judges of Ecclesiastical Courts should be legislators. Like the judges of the civil and criminal courts, they are and should be interpreters and administrators of the law as ordained by the Church herself through her Convocations and

Assemblies. If it should happen that judicial decision should at any time place a construction upon some enactment different from what the Church intended, then the remedy is for the Church to correct it by amending legislation. That is exactly what happens in regard to the civil or criminal law. If a decision of the courts should fix the meaning of some section in an Act of Parliament as being different from what the nation by its legislature intended or does now intend, the remedy lies in fresh or amending legislation. The Church already has power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversy of faith—that is fundamental and incontrovertible, and dates back to the time when its Divine Founder established His Church upon the rock of faith. But the Church must make her own arrangements for declaring what her faith is and shall be in any particular matter, and what are the permissible variations and extensions of that faith. She can only do that through her own legislature—to wit, her Convocations and Assemblies; but having done so, and having sought the acceptance and protection of the State for the upholding of her decrees, she must surely be content that her laws shall be interpreted and administered on the same lines and with the same absence of bias and partiality as are the other laws of the State.

But I shall be told that it is an intolerable affront and injustice that Parliament should decline to adopt and enforce any decree of the Church's Legislature—as, for example, the Deposited Prayer Book which that Legislature had adopted by large, if not overwhelming, majorities. But can we forget that we are dealing with an established Church? The Church of England is the heritage and possession of this nation in a sense far beyond the idea which limits her to her churches and congregations. Thousands, nay millions of the King's subjects rarely, if ever, enter a Church for habitual worship and make no pretence either of knowing her creeds or of being interested in her doctrines. Yet they love her cathedrals and churches, they respect her clergy, and seek their ministrations on occasion. To them the Church in her parochial organization is a living and effective reality—an emblem of stability and permanence. Who shall say that the House of Commons may not give effect to what it believes to be the prevalence of national feeling? That seeming prevalence may be misinterpreted. Let the Church remedy it by patiently correcting aught that is misunderstood. But let her not lose heart and temper, and fly to Disestablishment—changing her great heritage for the mess of pottage that freedom from the existing connection with the State might prove. Certain it is that if Parliament could see the Church's Courts administering the law ecclesiastical with independence and equity, and building up authoritative interpretation of that law, any likelihood of future conflict between Church and Parliament would disappear. True, the legislative power of the Church in Convocation and Assembly will need to be delineated and defined more clearly than at present if the rehabilitated Judiciary of the Church is to be in a position to do justice to that

ideal. That, however, is a collateral theme, into which we must not here allow ourselves to be drawn. The present quest is for the true basis of reform of the Church's Courts.

The first essential of any scheme for the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts is that their sphere of action shall be clearly defined. One very necessary requirement to that end is consolidation of ecclesiastical statute law. The law of the Church is derived from various sources and is intermingled at many points with the law affecting other religious bodies and with other departments of the civil law. Disregarding all "hybrid" enactments and having regard only to the statute or written law affecting the Church of England alone, we shall have (a) the Canon Law; (b) the unrepealed Acts of Parliament on the statute-book of the realm prior to the setting up of the Church Assembly; and (c) the "Measures" added and being added to the statute-book since the Church Assembly began to function. There should be little difficulty in reducing the second group to more intelligible consolidated form, to be administered with the new "Measures" by the Ecclesiastical Courts. As to the Canon Law, that might present more difficulty: but a practical way could assuredly be found of eliminating what is obsolete and contrary to statute, and reducing the remainder to compact form. The Courts should then judicially administer (a) the Canon Law, (b) the Statute Law, and (c) the common and customary law affecting the Church of England. This last-named is outside both the two former. So much for the scope of their work.

How, then, should the Ecclesiastical Courts be rehabilitated, and what reforms are needed in order that they may command the general assent and confidence of the Church and nation which is the basis of all effective authority? As to the Courts themselves, could any system possibly be better than that which now exists? The Diocesan Court as the Court of first instance. Appeal from thence to the Provincial Court. Appeal from that Court direct to the Crown. That is the system upon which our civil judicial procedure is worked—and he would be a bold man who would assert that it does not command the general assent and confidence of the nation. It would seem that this system—as a system—meets with general approval. The Church Assembly Commission indeed treats it as such—following in this respect the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1883 and that of the Royal Commission upon Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906. So it is not a question of setting up new Courts at all, but a question of rehabilitating or revivifying the existing Courts, that the Church has now to face. It may be taken as agreed that the existing Courts are to be rehabilitated. But when we come to the changes—the reforms—necessary to ensure rehabilitation, we are met with the real difficulty of the situation.

Let us begin with a very elementary proposition. A Court of Justice which is to interpret law should be absolutely free and unfettered by control of any sort whatever. The appointment of the judge must therefore be so provided for that he will care

nothing for the favour or the frowns of any person however highly-placed. Apply this rule to the method at present obtaining in regard to the Diocesan Courts—the Courts of First Instance. The Chancellor is the nominee of the Bishop. True, the Diocesan Court is the Bishop's Court by tradition—the Court in which originally the Bishop himself sat as judge and, according to the Report of the Assembly Commission, ought still to sit as judge whenever he is so minded :—

“ We recommend that the Chancellor, as representing the Bishop, should be the judge of the Diocesan Court, but that the Bishop should be at liberty, when he sees fit, to sit in lieu of the Chancellor as judge of the Court. We also recommend that in every case involving discretion, whether as regards the observance of a rubric or the granting of a faculty, the Chancellor should be at liberty to refer any question, with his note of the evidence and of the arguments, to the Bishop, whose ruling shall be binding on the Chancellor.”

But surely this violates the elementary proposition we are considering? It is notorious that the very fact of the Diocesan Chancellor being “ the Bishop's man ” has done more than anything to bring his jurisdiction to the verge of public contempt. Let churchmen consider and reflect what a state of affairs we have arrived at in regard to the *personnel* on the Diocesan Courts. At the present time there are some forty-five dioceses in England, each with its own chancellor. Of the forty-five chancellorships no less than twenty-seven are at the present time held by five men. The remaining fifteen are distributed variously amongst eight or nine individuals. From these facts several very obvious deductions can be drawn. One is, that a separate chancellor is not required for every diocese. The fact that one of the five gentlemen named above, in addition to holding six chancellorships, also holds appointment as Official Referee of the High Court of Justice—a whole-time appointment of an onerous nature—would of itself seem to emphasize this deduction; similar observations in regard to the other four would add further emphasis to the suggestion that the duties of these twenty-seven chancellorships would not overtax the time or the energies of two competent lawyers.

A second deduction to be drawn is that great financial saving might be derived from a drastic reduction of the number of chancellors. As to this, it is high time that an authoritative official return should be published showing the emoluments derived by the holders of these forty-five chancellorships, with an analysis of the sources from which they are derived. The Archbishops and Bishops of the Church owe that as a plain duty to the laity, who are continually being appealed to for funds for Church purposes. Moreover, the sources from which these fees are derived should be made clear. Year after year in many dioceses no Court is held—the faculties are so frequently issued without question or opposition that in the great majority of cases a common form suffices; in numerous other administrative matters the Registrar of the diocese does the necessary work, and rarely is any intervention by

the chancellor called for ; whilst in the matter of marriage licence fees it is generally understood that the chancellor's duty is limited to endorsing the quarterly cheque for his share of them. Put quite plainly, the whole system by which chancellors are remunerated, like almost everything else connected with their office, is mediæval and obsolete.

Yet a third—and in some respects more serious—deduction is to be drawn from this system of “farming” chancellorships. It tends to a grouping of the chancellors into schools of thought correlating to similar groups of ecclesiastics—with the result that uniformity of practice has disappeared. The chancellors are in fact, almost without exception, men bearing distinct labels. Is it not most essential that there *should* be uniformity of practice in every diocese? It would seem that the Church Assembly Commission think otherwise, if we may judge from their recommendation that even the decisions of the Final Court of Appeal are not to be regarded as precedents—

“Theological thought is a living thing, and the interpretation of doctrinal formularies must needs be affected by the movement of the living mind of the Church . . . the statements and arguments of judges must be open to reconsideration in the future by their successors. Moreover, as the nature of the appeal is that it deals with a complaint of lack of justice in a particular case, it is reasonable that only the actual decree given in that particular case should be of binding authority, and that it should not form a precedent. The application of this rule will not always be easy, especially when a judge of a Provincial or Diocesan Court is invited to exclude from his mind a decision which he knows to have been given in the Court of Appeal to the Crown. But, on the other hand, that he should be bound by that decision or its reasons would be inconsistent with the function of the Crown Court.”

It is difficult to believe that a Commission including in its membership several practising barristers could arrive at so strange a conclusion. All legal experience should condemn this proposition. The effect of adopting it would be to abolish law in the Church and to replace it by episcopal decisions varying with each change of episcopate, having no tradition built on precedents, with irregular administration varying in each separate diocese, and governed all through by the power (also advocated in the Report) of every Bishop to veto proceedings at will! The same unhappy idea, however, pervades the views expressed by the Commission in regard to the Provincial Courts: the two central courts to which appeal should lie from the Diocesan Courts—

“We recommend that, like the Bishop in the Diocesan Court, the Archbishop should have the right in all cases to decide whether he himself, or the official principal as his delegate, shall sit as judge of the Court of the Province.”

This is followed by a suggestion that when the Official Principal sits as judge of the Principal Court he should have power to call for “theological assessors.” These theological assessors

“should be selected by the Archbishop or the official principal, as the case may be, from a list consisting of (a) the Bishops of the Province, and (b) other

persons nominated to serve as assessors (when called upon to do so) by the Convocation of the Province."

The whole idea is wrong. The Provincial Court should be a Court presided over by three judges, in precisely the same way as the Court of Appeal is constituted at the Royal Courts of Justice. The judges should be appointed from the roll of chancellors just as the Lords Justices of the Court of Appeal are chosen for promotion from among the High Court Judges. They should, like the chancellors, be absolutely free from any suggestion or suspicion of partisanship or influence. Their duty should be to review the decisions in the Consistory Courts—not as theologians, but as lawyers charged with the duty of interpreting the Law of the Church as they find it—and from their decision appeal should again lie to the Privy Council as the final interpreting authority.

What is the true inwardness of the objections that have been raised to the jurisdiction of the Privy Council—the most august and dignified Court of Justice in the world—for these objections are said to lie at the root of all the trouble that has arisen in regard to the Ecclesiastical Courts? What say the Church Assembly Commissioners? Their attitude seems to be one of meek acceptance of the strange suggestion that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council claims the right of "declaring, interpreting and showing the teaching and use of the Church," which, as the authors of the suggestion add, "belongs to the authorities of the Church, and not to a tribunal which receives its jurisdiction exclusively from the State."

The answer to this is, of course, that it is no part of the duty of the Privy Council to "declare or interpret the teaching and use of the Church." Its duty is wholly different. No such attitude has been or is likely to be adopted by the distinguished Judges who sit at the Privy Council Board. No clearer or more effective reply to the suggestion that this famous tribunal would go beyond its proper sphere of duty could be found than in the judgment delivered in 1850 in the case of *Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter* by Lord Langdale, Master of the Rolls, in favour of the appellant clergyman¹ :—

"These being the opinions of Mr. Gorham, the question which we have to decide is, not whether they are *theologically* sound or unsound—not whether upon some of the doctrines comprised in the opinions, other opinions opposite to them may or may not be held with equal or even greater reason by other learned and pious ministers of the Church—but whether these opinions now under our consideration are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, requires to be held by its Ministers, so that upon the ground of those opinions the

¹ This really great judgment should be read in full by all Churchmen who feel any doubt on this point. The Court was composed of some of the greatest lawyers of the last century. In addition to Lord Langdale, there were present as members Lord Chancellor Campbell, Baron Parke, and Vice-Chancellor Knight-Bruce. The judgment was to the effect that the doctrines complained of—in respect of which the respondent Bishop of Exeter had refused to institute the appellant to a living—were "not contrary to or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England." The report is to be found verbatim in Vol. 7, *Notes of Privy Council Cases*, commencing at page 413.

appellant can lawfully be excluded from the benefice to which he has been presented. This question must be decided by the Articles and the Liturgy ; and we must apply to the construction of those books the same rules which have been long established, and are by law applicable to the construction of written instruments. We must endeavour to obtain for ourselves the true meaning of the language employed, assisted only by the consideration of such external or historical facts as we may find necessary to enable us to understand the subject matter to which the instruments relate and the meaning of the words employed.

" In our endeavour to ascertain the true meaning and effect of the Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, we must by no means intentionally swerve from the old-established rules of construction, or depart from the principles which have received the sanction and approbation of the most learned persons in times past as being on the whole the best calculated to determine the true meaning of the documents to be examined. If these principles were not adhered to, all the rights, both spiritual and temporal, of Her Majesty's subjects would be endangered. . . . This Court has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England, upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and Formularies."

In that pronouncement lies the keynote of impartial administration of the Law of the Church. Directly there is outside intervention by non-legal assessors—especially Bishops—the judicial becomes mingled with the legislative, and mischief enters. You get then the chaos against which the Church was warned by Lord Penzance in the separate Report he signed as a member of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1883, in protesting against the suggestion that judgments in ecclesiastical causes should not be regarded as precedents :—

" Such a system if adopted would result in this. . . . No legal principle would be asserted or established, no general interpretation of the terms and directions involved in the rubrics of the Prayer Book, or of the language in which the doctrine or the ceremonial of the Church has been expressed by lawful authority, could be arrived at or ascertained. . . . In a word, such a system, if acted upon for half a century, would destroy the ascertained law altogether ; and had it been maintained in the temporal courts from early times, it is not too much to say that what is known as the common law of the land could have had no existence."

And so it is submitted that the true method of reforming and rehabilitating the Ecclesiastical Courts lies in reshaping them on the model of the Civil Courts of the Realm. Due regard must of course be had to the particular fitness of the men appointed to preside over those courts—the form of their appointment needs to be carefully reviewed : the methods of giving effect to their decisions should be simplified. These are side-issues, each with an importance of its own, but entirely subsidiary to the fundamental principle that the Law of the Church should be administered as it stands by Judges who are not Legislators, and whose only concern is to give effect to the law as they find it, leaving to the elected and accredited Convocations and Assemblies of the Church the duty of declaring her teachings and her usages, and of varying the same from age to age according to the wisdom derived from her own inherent spirituality.

GILES FIRMIN : A PURITAN DIVINE.

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., St. John's Hall,
Highbury.

IT is much to be regretted that Anglican and even Evangelical circles know so little of the Puritans. Either they are indiscriminately condemned, being judged by their extreme type ; or else indiscriminately and unreservedly praised. Good work was done in setting forth their history and position by older Evangelicals — J. B. Marsden and Bishop J. C. Ryle ; but I know of little since. We should distinguish as far as possible Puritan ideas of Church Government from Puritan doctrine and practice. This last has lain at the root of current English religion ever since, coming up especially in the Evangelical Revival ; and any future revival will probably be in part a further revival of the best elements of Puritanism. A very good specimen of Puritan theology is found in Giles Firmin's work : *The Real Christian*.

Giles Firmin, son of Giles Firmin, apothecary, of Sudbury, entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1629, but did not complete his course there as his family went to New England. There he studied and afterwards practised medicine. He married Susanna, daughter of Nathaniel Ward, who had been deprived by Laud of the rectory of Stondon, Essex ; through him and other sources, besides his own experience, he shows great knowledge of older Puritans. The value of his books for this was recognized by Cotton Mather. Like Ward (who got the living of Shenfield) he returned to England under the Long Parliament, and was ordained about 1648 by Stephen Marshall and others to the living of Shalford, near Braintree. This is probably the one instance of the strict Presbyterian system ever getting beyond paper in Essex. He was ejected in 1662 and resumed the practice of medicine, but in 1672 took out a license to preach in his house at Ridgwell. His skill as a physician seems to have preserved him from troubles under the Conventicle Act. He died in 1697.

He has occasional notices of his own life. " When I was a boy I never cared to play at cudgels with him who was left-handed, and looked asquint with his eyes ; I could not tell where to have him, I might receive a blow where I was not aware of him ; for others I did not much care, unless too big for me, to beat my cudgels to my head." He mentions a voyage to the Mediterranean, where he was in danger from Turkish pirates, and up the river to Seville. He uses this as an illustration of the two kinds of knowledge, that from books and that from personal experience. " If a geographer who has never travelled beyond the smoke of his own chimney writes of the river that goeth up to Seville in Spain, and tells me when you get over the bar which lieth at the mouth of the river, on the starboard side as you sail up there stands a castle, higher

stands the town of Saint Lucar, higher another castle and a monastery by it, higher the Chapel of Bonance, and still on the starboard side ; this man saith true. But doth he know those as I, who have been in the Town, in the Castle, in the Chapel, and seen them ? ”

Firmin wrote a fair number of works. In one of them he defends the memory of his friend Stephen Marshall. But his best known work is *The Real Christian : a Treatise on Effectual Calling* (1670). He was led to write this because of some extravagant positions maintained by some writers of repute, which had caused much trouble to some serious Christians. He speaks with the greatest respect of these writers as faithful and holy men, but “ brings their teaching to the Balance of the Sanctuary,” judging it by Scripture as well as by reason. But his work is far from being merely negative ; it is a full account of Conversion. The subjects of the chapters are (1) Preparation of the soul for Christ, in general. (2) The first work of the Spirit, Illumination. (3) Conviction. (4) Compunction. (5) The Spirit’s work in taking off the soul from Self-righteousness and Self-confidence. (6) Faith in Christ ; how the Spirit draws the soul to Him. This is followed by an application.

Firmin is very far from asserting that all must go through exactly the same process ; he regards the requirement or expectation of this as a great mistake. “ Have we not very often known children grow up, and being under the nurturing of godly parents,—especially when a wise, prudent and godly mother, that knows how to keep her place in government, joins with a godly father—have given evident signs of grace from their childhood ? I have known such families where all the children have been godly ; and that began in their childhood for ought I could learn. . . . Some who lived in a course of sin can tell the time, the day, the text, the sermon, the minister, when God put a stop to their course, opening their eyes, awakening their conscience. But others cannot tell the time when God began to work ; and this hath been to some a long time an objection against the truth of their regeneration, because they cannot tell the time of their new birth ; as if there were any ground in Scripture for such a position, ‘ All that are new born know the time of their new birth.’ Doth not God many times in infancy, in childhood, cast in the immortal seed, which being nurtured by the instruction and care of godly parents at home, and by the lively word preached, springeth and groweth up ? Some Christians finding at some time more stirrings and higher workings or new convictions of some sin, than they did before, will from thence reckon the time of their new birth ; when they are much mistaken, God had begun it before. This is a mere vanity and devil’s delusion, to trouble thyself about the *time* ; look to the work, that it be soundly wrought.”

He gives an account of the younger days of John Rogers, the famous lecturer of Dedham (predecessor of Matthew Newcomen) to illustrate his position that “ Great sinners, and men of great parts, great spirits, whom God intends to make of great use, these are the men, the persons, who usually, if not always, meet with great bruis-

ings, terrors, fears and sorrows." "An old man that used in his young time to frequent the house of Mr. Richard Rogers of Wethersfield, would tell me this story of him oftentimes, which my grandmother, who was wife to Mr. Rogers, told him several times. Mr. Richard Rogers did send and help to maintain Mr. John Rogers, being his kinsman, in Cambridge; it seems he proved so bad that he sold his books and spent the money; my grandmother moved her husband to buy him some books and send him to Cambridge again; she being a prudent woman prevailed; Mr. John Rogers spent his books again; Mr. Richard Rogers then would cast him off utterly; but my grandmother renews her request once more and at last prevails, to send him again; then he held. That he was wild enough I conclude by a speech of Mr. Richard Rogers, which he often used, when he saw what God had done for his kinsman, 'I will never despair of a man for John Rogers' sake'; it seems then he was bad enough. God intended this man to make him of great use, and a chosen vessel he was of God for conversion of many souls, few men like him; but God handled him accordingly, bruised him to purpose; he would get under bushes in fields, pray and cry; he became an experimental preacher of legal workings, making good what Bishop (then Master) Brownrig said of him to my father Ward, which was this: 'John Rogers will do more good with his wild note than we shall do with our set music.' Those that knew his manner of preaching and actings in preaching, well knew what the bishop meant by the *wild note*; but it was very true, though such actions and speeches in other men would have been ridiculous, yet in him, being a man so holy, grave and reverend, they went off with as much awe, upon a very great and reverent auditory."

The three main points on which Firmin disagrees with some predecessors are:

I. They made *preparedness* for faith in Christ to include contentment to be disposed of as God pleases; content and quiet through God will never work Grace, never manifest Grace, never pity or help the soul, never give it His love. In fact, if the soul be rightly humbled, it is content to bear the state of damnation. They quoted Scripture for this, but Firmin asks: "How shall we interpret texts? Must we not consider the coherency, observe what the Spirit is treating about, and interpret it accordingly?" and shows that their texts do not really suit. Among other arguments he urges, "That condition which neither Christ Himself nor any of the apostles in their preaching and calling home of souls to Christ did ever require, is not requisite and true preparation for Christ"; and "The condition that is cross to the nature of man *as man*, to a Christian as a Christian, cannot possibly be requisite to faith and right preparation for Christ. In all God's Bible there is not one duty that God requires of His creatures which is contrary or cross to His creatures' happiness."

II. "We must not," they said, "lay hold on Christ to seek our own salvation, which is a form of self-love; but simply for the

honour of Christ and the glory of God's grace." Firmin lays down, "Never did God declare against self, or call a man to deny himself, in such a way as to hinder his own salvation and happiness, lying in union and communion with God by Christ. I know he has given me commands to deny myself, but in those commands obeyed myself (that is, my happiness and salvation) is preserved safe and sound. Do not all the promises in the Bible regard a man's self? Self-love doth never prove destructive to a soul till it cross a commandment of God."

III. Their definition of saving faith identified it with personal assurance, "a particular persuasion and assurance, that Christ with all his redemption is mine, that I shall have life and salvation by his means"; or "assurance of God's favour to me in particular and forgiveness of my sins." Firmin among other objections urges that they make Saving Faith to consist simply in an act of the understanding, not of the will. His own definition is that it is "That grace whereby we receive Christ as he is offered to us in the Gospel (in all his offices) and so, resting upon him, salvation." He is strong on Faith being quite as much an act of the Will as of the Understanding. (It may be noticed here that Dr. Tennant in his recent book distinguishes 'Belief' from 'Faith'; 'Belief' serves to emphasize the cognitive, and 'Faith' the conative side of experience involving *venture*.)

Firmin is far from undervaluing Historical or Dogmatic Faith; he condemns those who when they hear what books Stillingfleet and Baxter have written in defence of the Christian religion have said that they wonder they should busy their heads about such needless subjects. "Lay by these principles, that we have been in possession of these truths for sixteen hundred years; this was our grandfathers' and fathers' religion; it is the religion of our nation, all men are of this faith—our King, our rulers, our ministers who teach us; what other reasons of their faith can the greatest part of those who call themselves Christians, and do assent to these truths, give you?"

He speaks elsewhere of the ignorance of many nominal Christians. "When a man hath a child born, he prepares a barrel of strong beer, if he be but a poor man; others prepare some bottles of wine; withal they prepare good meat and good junkets; the child is then christened, made a member of Christ in its baptism; then home they go, and eat up their good meat and drink up their liquor before prepared, it is well if none be drunk; and this is the preparation and union with Christ which many thousands of those who are called Christians know, and they know no other preparation for Christ or receiving of Christ but this. When they grow up to years they go to church as neighbours do, they must be Christians because they know not what to be else, they must go whither the crowd carries them; if you will call them Christians you may, but they know no more of Christ, saving the name which they hear a minister talk of, than a heathen. As their parents made them Christians, so because it is the fashion of the country, they will do as

their fathers did by them, and their neighbours do by theirs, if they have children. I have given instance of one in Essex, a county famous for the Gospel, who of late years coming to my father Ward to baptize his child, my father asked him, 'Why will you have your child baptized?' He answered, Because others had their children baptized. Then he asked him, How many Gods there were? He answered, Ten. Then he asked him, How many Commandments there were? (supposing his mistake). He answered, Two. Which is the First? He answered, Salvation; the Second I know not, but he gave him a Second. My father asked him if he gave him these answers to cross him? The man answered, 'No, truly, Mr. Ward, if I knew better how to answer you I would.' If ministers did but inquire into the knowledge of all their parishioners in England, they would soon find I have spoken but the truth. Thus for want of catechizing and Gospel discipline, abundance of Christians, so called, differ but little from heathens."

Firmin is a man of considerable theological reading. He has a quotation from Ignatius on his title-page, and occasionally quotes the Fathers, especially Augustine, and the Schoolmen, especially Bradwardine, besides more recent writers, including Alvarez and Jansenius, besides English divines. He has but one poetic quotation, from "that divine poet, Herbert." In his Introduction and towards the end of the work answers the Socinians, whose doctrine he fears to be spreading in England; naturally he most objects to the Socinian doctrine of Christ's death (which is so popular at present).

He occasionally speaks of his experience as a physician, and once speaks of the changes in his own day. "In physick we find that those things which have gone for principles for above a thousand years, none so much as questioning them, within less than thirty years are turned out of doors, very few of the ancient principles standing."

He insists on the duty of showing diligence and conscience in one's particular calling. "Do you lay your Lord's rule to your buying and selling, to your commerce and dealings with men? Alas, these are low things, say you; then, say I, they are easily observed of you, I hope, if they be so low in your esteem. . . . Diligence in our callings is a thing that light of Nature as well as light of Scripture, doth teach. Some think it a high attainment in religion that they can go up and down to duties, to meetings, though through their laziness and idleness in their particular callings their families at home do suffer. . . . An honourable and virtuous lady was once commending of her gardener to Mr. Dod, what a good man he was, how much good discourse he had, how helpful to others in the family, to teach them to read, etc. 'But, Madam,' said Mr. Dod, 'What is this man in his particular calling? for God looks on us as we are in our particular callings.' Here the good lady could not give any answer, being new come; but was forced soon after to turn him away, being an idle Jack. I do not speak of any poor Christian that may be abused by their own darkness and

Satan's subtilty ; as one good woman, because the text saith ' Pray continually,' she could never be satisfied, but must be in secret at prayer and reading, and the family neglected, her children not dressed, but went forlorn. Christians could not take her off, till at last Mr. Richardson hearing of it, and having occasion to go that way, went into the house and seeing the children how they went, spake with a loud voice and very terribly, ' Is there no fear of God in this house ? ' and other words to the purpose, that there could be no true grace, when there was such negligence in the particular place where the woman was set. The poor woman hearing this language, comes out of her private room from her duties, with trembling, and now was taught another lesson—if she would prove her grace, to show her diligence and care in her particular place where God had set her, and carry on that with her duties in secret."

He urges tenderness to poor and tempted Christians. " Ministers and other Christians may think that such or such corruptions and temptations are strong (yet I observe some have not so much judgment) ; but no man knows what they are as those who lie under them, those who feel them and are combating with them." This in particular holds good in preaching contentment. " Another minister inviting me to dinner, we had a dry pudding and salt fish (not like your London fish), only we had mustard ; ' and here,' said the good man, ' we are better on it than Christ was, for though we read he ate fish, yet we read not of any sauce he had, and we have mustard to our dry fish ' ; our drink was good Adam's Ale, spring water, and well content. Now though ministers must preach of contentment in all conditions, yet I had rather hear *those* ministers preach and read their books about contentment, than those who know nothing of these temptations. It was a good speech of a gracious woman to an eminent Christian who told me of it ; she was under a hedge picking up sticks in a cold morning : the man passing by and speaking to her, calling him by his name said she, ' O pray that God would save you out of straits.' "

Firmin has much to say in answer to the old charge that religion makes men " melancholy, mopish and sad, if not mad." His attitude is not that popularly associated with Puritans, but is well supported by their biographies.

" That sadness and fears should seize upon a person when he comes to see himself under that woeful state of sin and misery, is this such a wonder ? Is this irrational ? Wouldst thou not have rational mirth ? What, were you never sad in all your life ? Were you ever upon the merry pin ? To meet with the man who was never in his dumps, as you phrase it, is a strange sight ; if ever sad, it was upon some *evil* apprehension. Was it rational for you to be sad under an evil infinitely less, and is it irrational to be sad under this ?

" You are mistaken very much in thinking that Religion, or the power of it, only serves to make men mopish and sad, though you do see Christians sometimes dejected. It is not Conversion or the power of Religion that makes them sad, but the want of Religion

and fuller Conversion ; they do *not* put Religion in sour faces. It were to be wished indeed that others might not see the dejected countenance of Christians ; hide them always they cannot. If any worldling or irreligious person have his countenance dejected for being crossed in something he desires, as it is their lot oftentimes, this is nothing ; but if one that is set for God and Religion do at any time show such a countenance, by and by the fault is laid upon religion. It is far from my thought to plead for levity, frothiness, among Christians ; I am afraid some take too much liberty ; but yet I think a cheerful, affable, courteous behaviour in Christians, avoiding that mopishness, austerity, morosity, which some Christians express, especially towards carnal men, would better become the Gospel and convince men of the goodness and content that is to be found in the ways of God. None rejoice more heartily than those who rejoice in the Lord, to which Christians are so much exhorted ; this joy is spiritual, heavenly. Yet there is another joy lawful, as we are rational animals, have bodies as well as souls ; these bodies call for many things, and whilst we do enjoy things that support and comfort them, we may rejoice in the goodness God conveyeth by them. Some Christians, that think we should rejoice only in the Lord, and are persons of a more sour melancholy temper, how offended are they if they see others laugh ! As if risibility were an evil quality, that befell us after our fall from God ; but surely being an essential property, having its emanation from the rational soul even in our creation, it belongs to us as rational animals ; and so Christians may laugh upon other causes, provided no sin be mixed, besides that joy they have in God. Grave deportments, especially of ministers and men in places, I honour ; but that a minister must always be so grave that he must speak nothing to make others laugh (according to his monkish divinity), as if gravity and cheerfulness ordered with prudence were inconsistent, receive this who will.

“ That gentleman I mentioned before, at whom his companions took such great offence when he was under the workings of God in conversion, being then sad, who before in time of his vanity was as vainly merry ; after God had settled him in good hope of his love, he proved an excellent Christian, and now returned to his cheerfulness again, but purged from his former sin and froth ; he grew so merry that he feared he was too merry ; so he and I rode to old Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, and after the Lecture he puts his case to Mr. Rogers, and relates what God had done for him, and now he was afraid he was too merry ; to whom Mr. Rogers gave this answer : ‘ Take heed you mix nothing that is unsavoury with your mirth, do not break in upon the Word of God, or on His line, and be as merry as you will ; for it is the cheerful Christian that glorifieth God and commendeth His ways unto men.’ The nature of man as man cannot but incline to cheerfulness unless some predominant melancholy humour or cold distemper of body or other accidental evils, keep him under ; both as risibility is proper to man, flowing from the rational soul, in its purest state, and as cheerfulness, especi-

ally when not defiled with sin, is the sunshine of a man's life, 'A merry heart doth good like medicine,' (Prov. 17, 22), and more good many times than many medicines, which sometimes do little good, through 'Heaviness in the heart of man which maketh it stoop' (Prov. 12, 25)."

DISESTABLISHMENT. By Herbert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham. *Macmillan*. 4s. 6d.

This book has much that is valuable in the practical directions given to the Clergy for the exercise of their Parochial ministry and in its reflexions on contemporary morality. But most readers will be attracted by the *Apologia pro sua Vita* put forward with fervid eloquence by a Bishop who maintains that he is most consistent when he appears inconsistent. His principles have not altered—the expression of them has taken another form and this form has been forced on them by the pressure of contemporary events. A changed environment means new adaptations. What did well under one set of circumstances will work evil under another, therefore what was to him in the past a bulwark of the faith, becomes now a crazy edifice. We have all been misled in our ignorance by the forceful one-sidedness of expression, for if we had looked a little deeper we should have found that when we were most in agreement with the Bishop, we had really misunderstood him. It may be so, but really the defeat of the Deposited Book with the approval of the great mass of English Churchmen does not warrant the *volte face* made by Dr. Henson.

We have re-read his book and have failed to find it convincing, for the old arguments he brought forward in defence of the Establishment seem to us to have gained strength rather than lost force by reason of what has happened. Take Dr. Henson on his own showing. The Bishops had been brought face to face with a situation very largely of their own creation. The Report of the Royal Commission was before them, and like other distinguished people they selected what seemed to warrant a certain course of action and closed their eyes to what they did not like in the Report. By this one-sided policy they intensified an evil and precipitated an inevitable conflict. Now Dr. Henson advocates burning the crazy edifice of the Establishment in order that what he describes as an unrepresentative Assembly may have its own way, in prescribing the worship of the unrepresented, by reverting to a type of worship, which the Representatives had in many cases followed when they had sworn not to do so. It was easier to legalize the notoriously illegal than to repress it. And because the plan failed the Church is to be disestablished and disendowed. We do not follow the argument.

THE PILGRIMAGE OF HATE : AN ESSAY ON TIMON OF ATHENS.

BY G. WILSON KNIGHT, Dean Close School, Cheltenham.

IN this paper I attempt to indicate the nature of a tragic movement more precipitous and unimpeded than any in Shakespeare ; one which is conceived on a scale even more tremendous than that of Macbeth and Lear ; and whose universal tragic significance is of all most clearly apparent. My purpose will be to concentrate on whatever is of positive power and significance in the main theme, regarding the imaginative impact as all-important however it may appear to contradict the logic of human life. I would reiterate what I have said elsewhere, that we must be true to our æsthetic appreciation of tragedy : our interpretation must preserve that positive element implicit in our imaginative enjoyment.

Timon is first shown as a noble and generous character, whose guiding star is universal benevolence. He has no pleasure but in giving, it is an obsession. He asks no return—Ventidius offers to repay a loan, but he answers :

O, by no means,
Honest Ventidius ; you mistake my love:
I gave it freely ever ; and there's none
Can truly say he gives if he receives.

(I, ii. 8.)

Charity is instinctive to him, and knows no limit :

'Tis not enough to help the feeble up,
But to support him after.

(I, i. 107.)

His life appears one festival of entertainment and bounty, surrounded with display—music, masques, gorgeous banquets. His heart radiates goodwill, and looks ever outward, giving : the world of men outside him is as the reality of his own soul. Artists, poets, merchants crush round him, their patron ; his peers join him in feasting, give and receive gifts ; to the senate, as to the world, he is "noble" Timon. Timon uses his heritage of wealth with the bounty of a god : moving among the riches of art and trade as a being to whom these are inevitable, he appears as the perfected product of civilization might be were civilization to become perfect, a man of taste, culture, and pleasure, using his wealth to establish a harmony of love and happiness around him. His nobility and richness of nature are as an alchemist transmuting things of sensuous enjoyment to the deep gold of real worth. If man ever attains his aspiration of centuries towards universal ease, refinement, altruism, and art, then—but not till then—a Timon can find his home on earth. He is a universal lover. His charity is never cold, self-conscious, or dutiful : it wells up from the erotic richness of his

soul. He withholds nothing of himself. His praise to the painter (I, i. 154) is sincere appreciation ; his jests with the jeweller (I, i. 164) kind and not condescending ; his chance of doing good to his servant whose lack of wealth forbids his desired marriage is one of those God-sent adventures in kindness that make the life of Timon a perpetual romance. His heaven is to see the young man's eyes brimming with joy. He hates the least suggestion of insincerity and scorns ceremony :

Nay, my lords,
Ceremony was but devised at first
To set a gloss on faint deeds, hollow welcomes,
Recanting goodness, sorry 'ere 'tis shown ;
But where there is true friendship, there needs none.
Pray, sit ; more welcome are ye to my fortunes
Than my fortunes to me.

(I, ii. 14.)

He does not doubt that his friends would, if occasion called, reciprocate his generosity, and an excess of emotion at the thought brings tears to his eyes :

. . . Why, I have often wished myself poorer, that I might come nearer to you. We are born to do benefits : and what better or properer can we call our own than the riches of our friends ? O, what a precious comfort 'tis, to have so many, like brothers, commanding one another's fortunes ! O joy, e'en made away ere it can be born ! Mine eyes cannot hold out water, methinks : to forget their faults, I drink to you. (I, ii. 104.)

There is no shame in this confession of tears : he lives in a world of the soul where emotion is the only manliness, and love the only courage.

Now contrasted with the brilliance and gaiety of Timon's feast is the philosopher of cynicism, Apemantus, who sees through the deceit of society to the beast within man's nature. He is from the start a discordant element, dark omen of tragedy. Though labelled " a churlish philosopher " in the dramatis personæ, he is, we must note, in his own way, a sincere one. His sincerity is a bitter poison of cynicism. Timon shows him the picture :

Timon : Wrought he not well that painted it ?

Apemantus : He wrought better that made the painter ; and yet he's but a filthy piece of work. (I, i. 200.)

Thus swiftly is condemned God, man, and man's aspiration and endeavour. The pregnancy of this answer is amazing in its compactness and the poignance of its sting. As he watches the observances of respect, the greetings and smiles attendant on Alcibiades' entry, he comments :

So, so, there !
Aches contract and starve your supple joints !
That there should be small love 'mongst these sweet knaves,
And all this courtesy ! The strain of man's bred out
Into baboon and monkey.

(I, i. 257.)

Entertainment is a mockery to him, for his thoughts are centred on

friends, without success. His generous nature is only momentarily disturbed by the first evidences of baseness : he recovers himself and, typically, tries to excuse them :

These old fellows
Have their ingratitude in them hereditary :
Their blood is caked, 'tis cold, it seldom flows ;
'Tis lack of kindly warmth they are not kind ;
And nature, as it grows again towards earth,
Is fashioned for the journey, dull and heavy.

(II, ii. 223.)

But all his friends are alike : each offers a different excuse. Baseness is stripped of its covering. As his creditors grow unruly Timon's soul is wrenched by the agony of his knowledge. Creditors swarm in his own house :

Timon : The place where I have feasted, does it now
Like all mankind show me an iron heart ?

(III, iv. 83.)

They press round him, insistent :

Timon : Cut my heart in sums.

Titus : Mine, fifty talents.

Timon : Tell out my blood.

Lucius' Servant : Five thousand crowns, my lord.

Timon : Five thousand drops pays that. What yours ?—
And yours ?

First Varro's Servant : My lord—

Second Varro's Servant : My lord—

Timon : Tear me, tear me, and the gods fall upon you !

(III, iv. 93.)

This is all we see of the transition : when next Timon appears the iron of enduring hate has entered his soul. True, he has one more banquet ; invites his friends to it ; withholds his rage till he has made one speech of withering scorn—then volleys the titanic fury of his kingly nature in hate sovran as tremendous as his sovran love. There is no tragic movement so swift, so clean-cut, so daring and so terrible in all Shakespeare as this of Timon. We pity Lear, we dread for Macbeth : but the awfulness of Timon, dwarfing pity and out-topping sympathy, is as the grandeur and menace of the naked rock of a sky-lifted mountain, whither we look and tremble. Deserting Athens, he steps from time into eternity. The world of humanity tilts over, and is reversed. We see now, not with the vision of man, but henceforth with that of the aspiring Spirit of Love that has scorned mankind for ever. The inhumanity of Timon is the inhumanity of the aspiring soul of man : the splendour of a god takes form before our eyes.

Outside the walls of Athens Timon voices his utterance of hate. His curses issue like the hot fury of a volcano. They are directed against the whole social harmony and idealism of mankind : purity, manners, kindness, health—all are banned. Timon prays for hideous ruin upon earth, for chaos to level humanity with foulness and disease and death. May man continue to infect man and society thus die

of its own poison. He tears off those symbols of civilized humanity, his clothes :

Nothing I'll bear from thee
But nakedness, thou detestable town !
Take thou that too with multiplying bans !
Timon will to the woods ; where he shall find
The unkindest beast more kinder than mankind.

(IV, i. 32.)

The inrush of the exposed uncleanness of man has left Timon still pure. He is risen above them, and his naked fury is the exact measure of his spiritual stature. The world is now inadequate ; he, whose generous soul is of another kind, has turned his back on it and sets his face to the future. Henceforth he is to walk in a super-human loneliness, to converse alone with nature, with the spaces of the night, the sun, the stars : and when they too prove false, to commune alone with his own soul in death. Timon does not stay among mankind, creating confusion and disharmony like Hamlet, like Apemantus. He will tolerate no disorder, within and without his mind, like Lear, torn betwixt love and loathing, division which is madness. The chaos which his imprecations call on man are as a concord within the soul of him whose love is reversed, and who is no longer of this world. Thus Timon preserves the grander harmony of loneliness and universal hate, and fronts his destiny, emperor still in mind and soul, wearing the imperial nakedness of Hate.

Timon is in the deserts of rock and wood, embittered, alone. His companions are the "blessed breeding sun," the wide earth, the air. He feeds now, like Apemantus, on roots. But, digging for food, he finds gold :

What is here ?
Gold ? Yellow, glittering, precious gold ? No, gods,
I am no idle votarist : roots, you clear heavens !

(IV, iii. 25.)

The continued nobility and richness of his nature is magnificently reflected in this finding of new wealth where he least expects it : but the spirit of lavish enjoyment ungrafted on love is as nothing to him—he has no use for gold now. Whoever visits him receives only curses and gold, now synonymous with damnation. Alcibiades is told to

Be as a planetary plague, when Jove
Will o'er some high-iced city hang his poison
In the sick air . . .

(IV, iii. 108.)

Timon urges Alcibiades, who is leading an army against Athens, to use ruthlessness, brutality, and slaughter ; and urges Phrynia and Timandra, who accompany him and whom Timon curses as "whores," to infect mankind in their trade of prostitution as he would have Alcibiades infect them in his trade of war. He hurls gold at them :

There's more gold :
Do you damn others, and let this damn you,
And ditches grave you all !

(IV, iii. 164.)

After they leave him there follows one of those grand undertones of harmony that characterize the tremendous orchestration of this play :

Timon : That nature, being sick of man's unkindness,
Should yet be hungry ! Common Mother, thou,
Whose womb unmeasurable, and infinite breast,
Teems and feeds all ; whose selfsame mettle,
Whereof thy proud child, arrogant man, is puff'd,
Engenders the black toad and adder blue,
The gilded newt and eyeless venom'd worm,
With all the abhorred births below crisp heaven
Whereon Hyperion's quickening fire doth shine ;
Yield him, who all thy human sons doth hate,
From forth thy plenteous bosom, one poor root.

(IV, iii. 176.)

Timon's thoughts are already set beyond the world of man, in the silence of Eternity : yet he is not beyond the world of nature, he is, incongruously, hungry. As in this speech, Timon's utterance when he is alone is often addressed with a deep recognition, and intimacy—not toward man, but toward the vast forces, the stillness, the immensity, of nature, clear springs which the intellect of man has muddied. These are innocent, they wake responses in his soul. But then again he rises beyond this to awareness that, if one attributes personality to nature, his curses must be levelled not alone against man, but also against the earth itself : then his indictment stretches to the whole cosmic mechanism :

I'll example you with thievery :
The sun's a thief, and with his great attraction
Robs the vast sea : the moon's an arrant thief,
And her pale fire she snatches from the sun :
The sea's a thief, whose liquid surge resolves
The moon into salt tears : the earth's a thief,
That feeds and breeds by a composture stolen
From general excrement . . .

(IV, iii. 438.)

This sweep of the fanciful imagination is profound : it involves the knowledge that the meanest of man's vices are yet due to his ascension to a moral responsibility. Thus the mind of Timon ranges the interstellar spaces of night and finds no home. Nowhere but within the spaceless silence of the deeper night of Death will he be at peace. So they all come to Timon, captain and prostitute, servant, and philosopher, bandits, poet, painter, and senators : the reasons of their coming may be various, but all come to the naked form of the apostle of Hate, as to a prophet, or a king, humbling themselves. The richness of Timon's heart still holds its old sovereignty over lesser men. Two of these visits must receive separate attention.

Apemantus comes to Timon, the philosopher of hate to the

prophet of hate. The incident points the difference between them, and is important. Apemantus first advises Timon to return to mankind, to turn flatterer himself. He points out that this life of hardship serves no purpose of revenge, and that nature will be no less cruel than men :

What, think'st
That the bleak air, thy boisterous chamberlain,
Will put thy shirt on warm ? will these moss'd trees,
That have outlived the eagle, page thy heels,
And skip where thou point'st out ?

(IV, iii. 221.)

Will the creatures, he continues, hardened in nature's battle with a cruel heaven, come at your bidding, and flatter ? Timon, however, angrily bids him depart. Apemantus shows signs of desiring friendship :

Apemantus : I love thee better now than e'er I did.

Timon : I hate thee worse.

Apemantus :

Why ?

Timon :

Thou flatter'st misery.

(IV, iii. 233.)

Which turns a shaft of light inward on Apemantus' meanness. Timon reveals him to himself as a flatterer like the rest : a man to whom loathing is an enjoyment, not a terrible destiny—who comes to receive the bounty of Timon's hate as others to receive of his wealth ; who was now hoping to join Timon in a dilettante festival of cynicism. Hence Apemantus is lashed into anger and spite—then, recovering himself, he defends his philosophy as compared with Timon's passion. He points out that to adopt the hard life which Timon has embraced from a considered philosophy would be well enough—but that Timon does it “enforcedly.” His own, however, is a “willing misery,” which “outlives incertain pomp,” and is thus the highest good, since contented poverty is richer than the wealthiest discontent. If Timon's misery is unwilling, there is nothing for him but death. Thus Apemantus states the case with admirable logic. Timon answers that Apemantus' philosophy is born of the marriage of poverty and a mean spirit. Had he been favourably placed by fortune, he would have lived luxuriously and in vice—have “melted down” his youth with lust : but, having been “bred a dog,” he has evolved a philosophy out of envy. Apemantus has no cause to hate, since he has not been flattered and deceived : whereas Timon, once the centre of man's supposed love, is now left

bare
For every storm that blows.

(IV, iii. 265.)

If Apemantus had not been born “the worst of men,” he too would have been knave and flatterer. Timon, too, speaks truth. Apemantus and Timon hate with a difference : one, because he is less than mankind—the other because he is greater. Hence Timon is

particularly disgusted with Apemantus, who apes, and enjoys, the bitter passion of his own enduring soul.

This dialogue is most important for our understanding of the essential meaning of the play. The two hates are juxtaposed. Apemantus upholds the worth of his as a thing of judgment, systematized into a way of life. To Timon that is abhorrent, and witnesses a gross nature. Now Apemantus is right when he tells Timon that death is the only hope left for him. Apemantus has scorned humanity, but lives on with them, feeding his scorn: he continues "vexing" men, which is, says Timon, "a villain's office or a fool's" (IV, iii. 237); and he enjoys doing it, which proves him "a knave" (IV, iii. 238). Apemantus has hated life, yet loves to live. But for Timon, who has uncompromisingly broken from mankind, and whose sweeping condemnation includes not alone humanity and the beasts of nature (IV, iii. 330-49) but even the sun and moon: for Timon there is only death. Apemantus confesses that the universal destruction he would like to see he would yet postpone till after he himself was dead (IV, iii. 394); and Timon's final curse on Apemantus is that he may live and love his misery (IV, iii. 396); that is, continue to be himself—than which there is no bitterer imprecation. From these considerations the difficulties of this dialogue will be made clear.¹ Timon's especial loathing, and Apemantus' vulgar rage, are both inevitable: Apemantus' soul is here stripped naked as Timon's body. He sees himself in his meanness, as a creature less than those he has loved to despise. But Timon is weary of curses. He turns from Apemantus and speaks to himself:

I am sick of this false world, and will love nought
But even the mere necessities upon't.
Then, Timon, presently prepare thy grave;
Lie where the light foam of the sea may beat
Thy gravestone daily.

(IV, iii. 376.)

In the other visit to be noticed, Timon's hate is pitted against something of a very different kind. Flavius, Timon's steward,

¹ Mr. A. K. Chesterton considers the treatment of Apemantus here to prove the hand of another author: ". . . our cynical philosopher, our self-sufficient and highly-courageous lasher of parasites, our worthy Apemantus, is revealed as a mongrel cur, with bared teeth, snarling back at Timon with an abandonment to fury that brings our previous estimate of his character hurtling to the ground. The man is no longer sane, or reasonable, or cased in the armour of his philosophy: he—is—well, simply meaningless." (*The Shakespeare Review*, June, 1928.) It is strange to find such admirable criticism (to which I acknowledge a debt) thus misapplied. The whole point has been missed. Once again Shakespeare is right, the critic wrong. I do not blame Mr. Chesterton—for whose comments on Shakespeare I have a deep respect—for not seeing the solution in this instance: Shakespeare is often obscure. But I would emphasize, in the light of this example, that the dismissal by a sensitive criticism of a speech or scene on any other grounds than *style* to an hypothetical collaborator is nearly always the sign of the presence of some especially significant point, often crucial—as it is here—to the play's meaning.

Timon is thus of the greatest importance, the crowning majesty of the play's movement. Timon speaks to the Senators :

Why, I was writing of mine epitaph.
It will be seen to-morrow : my long sickness
Of health and living now begins to mend,
And nothing brings me all things.

(V, ii. 188.)

The nothingness of death becomes "all things" to Timon who passionately desires that "nothing." No conceivable symbol of desire will now serve that love, therefore in desiring death it desires nothing but its own unsatiable love : there it will, as it were, turn back within its own richness. Timon, embracing this ineffable darkness with joy, is already outside himself, viewing his own tragedy, as we do, with objective delight. He thus looks toward death, and imagines his end, and sees it, as we do, to be good—to hold the gift of "all things." Consciousness that thus derives joy from the death of consciousness is already, as we who watch, outside the dying and the death. It is but another aspect of the living force of Timon, the vivid, dynamic, swift thing of passion which is in him : the heat of it unsatiated by the mode called "life" has been excruciating, an expanding, explosive essence prisoned, and in death it will burn the enhampering body to fling upward its invisible brilliance in the illumination of "all things." "Health and living" have been to Timon as "a long sickness." In so far as we have been aware of this reversal of significance during the action, we shall know that we have long walked with Timon in death. Life and death have interchanged their meaning for him, and he now voices that paradox which is at the heart of all tragedy. Therefore the grand death speeches at the close come not as a super-added adornment, a palliative, but rather as a necessary and expected continuation, consummation, satisfaction. Timon, in these speeches, is pure essence of significance, beyond the temporal, in touch with a conquering knowledge of his furthest destiny : for, as blindness heightens the sense of touch, so it will be found that annihilation of the secondary and personal consciousness in "death" will tend to enrich the primary and impersonal mode with which Timon identifies himself in desiring his own extinction. So, too, we, from the same angle of objectivity, find, as Timon's sense of life's significance narrows to the point of death, that his grandeur yet increases to the end, and after. Nothing will be proved the largess of all things. Therefore, he speaks :

Come not to me again : but say to Athens,
Timon hath made his everlasting mansion
Upon the beached verge of the salt flood ;
Who once a day with his embossed froth
The turbulent surge shall cover : thither come,
And let my gravestone be your oracle.
Lips, let sour words go by, and language end :
What is amiss plague and infection mend !
Graves only be men's works and death their gain !
Sun hide thy beams ! Timon hath done his reign.

(V, ii. 217.)

Again is emphasized the completeness with which Timon's love is reversed. It is not alone a turning away from mankind ; rather a turning inward from the very idea of actuality and manifestation, from the cosmic scheme. He would wish the race die out, the sun blackened, the glass of time exhausted. Only the rhythm of the tireless beat of waves, the crash and the whispering retraction, these alone signify some fore-echoing of the thing which is to receive Timon. This is only the last step, into the dark adventure of death, of the movement we have been watching all along. It is truly spoken that

Timon is dead who hath outstretch'd his span.
(V, iii. 3.)

His hate of man was ever but one aspect, or expression, of the turning inward of his soul toward death, and since he flung back titanic curse on Athens, his being has been centred not in time but throughout the otherness of eternity.

I ought to reply, before closing, to two objections which may be raised to my analysis. First, that I have unwarrantably set my sympathies throughout with Timon, and ignored, to choose a typical example, the moral of warning that careless expenditure of wealth may lead to spiritual disintegration and death ; second, that I have concentrated on a few lines of poetic commonplace at the end of the play to serve as a basis for a mystical rhapsody not already implicit in the text. Both are unsound. First, we are not always at liberty to take any side we wish in interpretation of Shakespeare's characters. His tragic technique in maturity clearly points us by a variety of means towards certain points of view to the exclusion of others, and we should be guided solely by this technique instead of the customary vague hazards as to the author's "intention." Where the play, as it stands, does not justify a partial judgment, even though the poet's "intention" may seem to demand one, I am careful to point the fact.¹ This, however, will be the matter of another essay on Timon.² And, second, I analyse the death-speeches not as solitary units of philosophic utterance, but as living thought precipitated by the momentum of the tragic theme as a whole, gaining their impact from the force that has driven Timon from ease and luxury to nakedness among the naked beasts and trees and planets of the night, and beyond these to the unbodied "immortal nakedness"³ of death. We have watched a swift unwrapping of fold on fold of life's significances—civilized man, beasts, the earth, the objective universe itself, till we reach the core of pure and naked Significance, undistorted by any symbol, in the nothingness of Death. Yet at every step in what many commentators would call Timon's "downfall," we have been aware, not of a lessening, but of an increase of his grandeur ; that is, at every stripping of the soul of Timon we have known that what was

¹ See my essay, "The Technique of Hamlet." *To be published later.*

² "The Poetry of Hate : an essay on the Technique of Timon of Athens."

³ The phrase is Browning's : it occurs in *The Ring and The Book.*

taken is but another rag, what remains, the essence, the reality ; which feeling of tragic grandeur survives his death. Thus have I attempted an exposition of the meaning of this tragedy. The " criticism " of tragic poetry which concentrates only on what may be conveniently abstracted to its own rational plane is a mockery and were better left unwritten. The logic of tragedy varies inversely as its grandeur ; so that the totality of a story such as Timon's is as a gathering force, accelerating toward the climax, working up to and including both death and the reverberations which it awakes. The commentators who refuse to risk a full interpretation of the whole mystic grandeur,¹ as well as the incidental facts, of the story, may indeed write volumes on a single play, but their work beside the thunder of the original signifies no more than the seaman's whistle in the tempest of Pericles, which

is as a whisper in the ears of death
Unheard.

¹ I have shown how the mystic element of tragedy accounts for the plots of Shakespeare's Final Plays in my essay " Myth and Miracle," Burrow & Co. 2s.

After the holidays parochial activities will be starting again and we would draw attention to one or two useful little publications of the Church Book Room designed to help the clergy and other churchworkers : *Short Liturgies for Women's Services*, compiled by the Rev. W. E. Daniels, Vicar of St. George's, Deal, 2d., or 12s. per 100 ; *Young People's Services : Three Forms with Prayers for Special Occasions*, by the Rev. R. Bren, Vicar of Leyton, 2d., or 12s. per 100 ; *A Form of Service for Use in Sunday Schools, Children's Churches, Mission Services, etc.*, compiled by L. C. Head from the Book of Common Prayer, with Children's Hymns, 2d., or 14s. per 100 ; *Prayers for Children at Church Services in Sunday Schools and in their Homes*, compiled by the Rev. Henry Edwards, Vicar of Watford, 3d. ; *Communicants' Union Service*, arranged by Canon A. E. Barnes-Lawrence, 1d., or 5s. per 100 ; *A Manual for Communicants' Unions*, compiled and adapted by Archdeacon C. W. Wilson, Vicar of Bradford, 1d., or 7s. per 100 ; *My Weekly Message*, by Deaconess Oakley and Deaconess Ethel Luke, designed for distribution to young children, 2d., or 12s. per 100 ; *About the Feet of God*, by Canon E. R. Price Devereux, a manual containing morning and evening prayers for a week, 2d. ; *Family Prayers*, by the Rev. A. F. Thornhill, 2d., or 12s. per 100 ; *A Girl's Week of Prayer*, by E. M. Knox, late Principal of Havergeral College, Toronto, 2d. A sample copy of each booklet will be sent on receipt of 1s.

LIGHT FROM AN OLD RUBRIC.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.

HIDDEN away within the folds of our Prayer Book lies a momentous and startling Rubric. Few seem to know it ; fewer appear to be interested in it ; still fewer are found to use it. And yet, it yields a bright light for these dark times.

We must not be too sanguine in controversial matters. Yet, optimism being the salt of life, I dare hope that even one out-of-the-way Rubric may charm away some of our darker clouds. At any rate, we shall do well to give it a fair consideration, and then hope for the best.

"But it is only a Rubric," some will say.

It is true that, with some, Rubrics have lost much of their old seriousness. We see them bandied about like light shuttlecocks. They have, many of them, fallen into sad disesteem, and are treated as if they were of doubtful validity. Men sift them out, select what they prefer, and ignore the rest.

And yet, they are nearly all we have in the shape of ecclesiastical marching-orders. They are still supposed to be genuine guides in matters of doctrine and devotions. And if such sign-posts are uprooted, how shall sincere souls find their way ? It is safer to respect them, I think. Better, too, to observe them ; because loyalty lies that way, and self-respect, and honesty.

So, I will assume their acceptability, and accept this special Rubric, which is the only one in evidence just now, as valid and binding ; and, most certainly, as reflecting the mind of our Church. Accepting less than this will run us into rebellion, and riot, and chaos.

THE SETTING OF THE RUBRIC.

Our Rubric ushers us into a sick chamber, where a sick man is lying in weakness and distress. The pains of the body are matched, we must suppose, by the pains within, in his spirit. He is on a slope, which may lead anywhere ; and he fears the worst. Do we not all recognize the scene ? And can we not, ourselves, recall his sensations of uncertainty and apprehension ?

Naturally, he would fain get relief of some sort, and fetch, from somewhere, light in his darkness. There must be some remedy for such a need as his. Is there not a Great Physician able to prescribe for such a man as he, and for such a need as his ?

It is suggested to him that there is possible consolation in the Holy Communion ; that a Minister should be called in ; that, what others have found consoling, might also pacify his soul. Ready to snatch at any help, from any source whatever, he assents, and the Minister is duly summoned.

I am warranted, I think, in imagining such a position as this

from the unreadiness and rush which pervades the atmosphere of the case. It is not the case of a ripe old saint, who had often received the Holy Communion before.

* * * * *

But the situation is less simple than it seemed. Unexpected difficulties arise, simple regulations have been forgotten. So, in spite of the call, and the coming, the Chalice and the Paten must be laid aside.

What hinders ?

As every instructed Churchman knows, the Church is exceedingly jealous concerning her Sacraments, and fearful, lest they be misapplied. And who shall blame her ? "The corruption of the best is the worst," we are often told. Devotions which should be of the greatest help may easily become serious and fatal hindrances. This is the aspect of things presented to us here.

THE CHURCH'S PROHIBITIONS.

We must eliminate from our minds the notion of a fussy Church, insisting on empty formalities, and hard to please. The situation is far more serious than this. Her regulations are tests of fitness, are intended to uncover unrealities, and to probe sincerities. She has clear views as to the fittest recipients, and dares to exclude the unfit and the doubtful. So, if she throws up any barriers here and there, who shall blame her ?

Neither must we be forward to judge her too hastily, as if her conditions were trivial and flimsy, however much they may look like it. Better far that we look below the surface, and try to find the reason of any prohibitions she may make.

We must take heed, too, that we do not yield to that common notion that the Church of England is behind the times ; antiquated, and over rigid. Truth is, after all, no modern finding. The Blessed Sacrament was not instituted yesterday. Fashion and taste never presided over her Creeds. Neither does her machinery show signs of rust or wear. It has answered its purposes for many a long year, and it is somewhat late in the day for objectors to arraign her methods. There has been one great Reformation ; we do not see any need of another.

* * * * *

But let us see for ourselves what prohibitions she thrusts into the hands of her Ministers. Our Church, we are sure, has never lacked for common sense, and has always been ready to give a reason for the hope that is in her.

1. There will be no controversy over the first of the prohibitions, namely, "the extremity of sickness."

Who among us would venture to present the Sacramental elements to a man in extremity, scarcely conscious, wholly incapable ?

And if a sick man's physical condition forbids either eating or drinking at all, would not this be a bar too ?

Our Church has never lent herself to the view that magical powers

are inherent in the Bread and Wine. Such superstition has always been abhorrent to her.

Neither does she aggrandise one Means of Grace to the detriment of another ; or treat the Holy Communion as if it were a last resort—that or nothing.

2. The second prohibition will meet, I imagine, with much less ready support. Namely, "the want of warning in due time to the Curate."

There is no denying that it presents a somewhat harsh and trivial front. At the first, we are inclined to traverse it as unworthy of a great Church. But remembering her reputation for reasonableness, we are constrained to suspect that there must be something rational beneath it. This, I think, we shall find.

And we are confirmed in this presumption by re-calling the fact that the demand of notice does not stand alone, but has its fellow in the General Communion Service. There, too, the due notice is insisted on. In that Rubric a time is stated : "At least sometime the day before." It is then plain that we must look for the same reason in both.

And the reason is, I imagine, simple enough ; nothing less than the prevention of haste in so solemn a transaction. We all, the most experienced of us, require some little leisure before-hand, if we are to receive our Communion profitably. How much more shall a sick man, perhaps unfamiliar with the Service, make a pause between the intention and the act ?

Moreover, the danger of a panic Communion is not very remote at such a time. The spirit of a drowning man, clutching at a straw, is not the best spirit for a man clamouring for the Communion. For the act of reception is valueless unless it be accompanied by repentance and faith, those spiritual attitudes of the soul which so rarely function in times of fear.

So there are good reasons, after all, for this our second prohibition.

3. But what are we to say concerning the third prohibition ?—"the lack of company to receive with him" ? Where is the reasonableness of this ?

From the fact that a solitary Communion is a violation of its very nature and name. You cannot have a co-union with only one. It is "the company" which makes a Holy Communion possible.

Moreover, to be associated with other Christians in so holy a function makes for strength and reality. It takes off from the strangeness, and the loneliness, of the, perhaps, novel action. Do they not help to preserve the warmth and the life of the Sacrament ?

Besides this, a confession needs witnesses ; and is not this reception of the Sacred Feast a testimony of profession and faith ? A religious act, performed alone, does not imply much ; but, brought out into the open, and done in the sight of men, and you elevate the whole transaction.

We have an instance of this violation of unity in the case of

the Corinthian Christians, who, in their Love Feast, and in their Communion, ate and drank lavishly and selfishly, and ignored their hungry brethren who, in their poverty, were obliged to go hungry away. You will remember the ground on which the Apostle condemned them? Because they did not "discern the Lord's Body," i.e. the Church.

Thus, we see, what a sound foundation there was for this third prohibition, too.

4. There is a fourth prohibition—a general one this time—giving the largest discretion to the Minister, to give, or to withhold, the Sacred Elements.

"Or by any other impediment."

What other impediments can there be? It will not be difficult to answer this question.

Suppose a sick man is grossly ignorant of the purpose and significance of the Lord's Supper. Can he be a worthy Communicant? To such a man the whole service would be one long puzzle.

It is true, ignorance has been glorified, in the past, by those who should have known better. Ignorance has even been declared the "mother of devotion." But no enlightened Church has ever asserted such a preposterous notion, or ever will, knowing full well that ignorance is the mother of superstition only. Such a claim sprang from the Dark Ages, and can only exist where darkness reigns.

It is not possible, then, for such a Church as ours to justify any presentation of the Sacred Elements to irresponsible and unprepared subjects. The Church does not deal in charms; repudiates magic, and insists on some measure of intelligence on the part of a recipient.

Suppose, too, the sick man lacks the disposition of a good Communicant; has neither repentance, nor faith. Should we account him eligible for a penitent's Feast? Not so long as the writ of Christ still runs, and the declared mind of the Church persists. To waive such essentials as faith and repentance would be to play the traitor to the Christian Creed.

Can there be any doubt about it? Read over the full Service of the Holy Communion, and do we not overhear a long moan of compunction and confession? The true Communicant is seen, all the way along, clinging to the skirts of the Saviour, and sheltering under His merits. From beginning to end, he is never allowed to forget the two great twin realities of sin and the Saviour. And how can we, in the face of all this, allow an impenitent, careless, and distrusting man, participate in a Communion of which these are the very basis of fitness?

"But will not," some will say, "the Service of the Holy Communion awaken all these good dispositions in the sick man's heart?"

Shall we do evil that good may come? let us reply. The Lord's Supper was not so intended; let us also reply.

"But, perhaps, he has deeper feelings, and truer thoughts, than we suspect." It may be so. But can we not easily find out?

Charity is an excellent virtue, but we must not let it overreach itself, and land us in perilous places. On such a ground we must throw our Table open to the wide world.

"Well, if it does no good it will do no harm," still others may say.

Let us not be too sure of that. It is easier to harm a soul than some people fancy. What if, by administering the Holy Communion to the wrong subject, we drug his soul into a condition of false hope? Spiritual narcotics are ever noxious, and the sleep they produce is often an eternal one. We may not be privy to this raising of delusive hopes for which there is no true warrant.

So, on this last prohibition also the faithful Minister will use his discretion wisely, and not be afraid to say "No."

* * * * *

It must be clear to everybody that our whole field of prohibitions is overspread with difficulties and problems. It is certain too that the Minister who is brave and faithful enough to act upon them, is faced with awkward consequences. What can he do to resolve matters?

He can only fall back upon his Church, and say, frankly, that his hands are tied; and that, under the authority of his Church, he must withhold the Communion; at least for a time.

Does this seem a lame and futile conclusion? Well, it does, if it is allowed to stand alone. But, fortunately, our Church has afforded a way of escape. The sick man need not, after all, go empty away.

THE RUBRIC.

"But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness . . . do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate shall instruct him, that, if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed His Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

* * * * *

It is all in order. The Minister, being endowed with a double office and with a double qualification, should he be debarred from one can fall back upon the other. For is he not a minister of the Word as well as the Sacraments?

Thus we see that, if the Rubric ties the Minister's hands in one direction, it unties them in the other.

It explains, too, the Church's rigidity in exercising her prohibitions; for, has she not, kept in reserve, a way of escape? Her seeming cruelty is amply matched by her real charity. If she closes one door, she opens another just as good.

What a flood of light this concession throws upon the liberality and common sense of our Church! There is nothing narrow or

restricted about her methods. In the best sense, she faces every lawful way, and deals with every situation bravely and sanely. If she raises some barriers she is careful to lower others.

Neither is she over cautious, wincing at possible misapprehensions and dangers. At the same time, she is never reckless. With sure step she moves serenely along her appointed way, and, if she takes risks, takes them wisely and soundly.

SOME IMPLICATIONS.

Let us now see how far this Rubric commits our Church ; and what reasonable inferences we may draw from it.

It is possible, then, to receive, under special circumstances, a valid Communion, in the absence of consecrated Bread and Wine. And it is possible to do this without any suspicion of inferiority or incompleteness. So long as we keep within the ring-fence of necessity, no sick man need worry about the inadequacy of such a Communion. It is, in every way, a true Communion.

And, just as the natural accompaniments of the Holy Sacrament are dropped, so also is any intermediary Priest. Looming somewhat largely in the Public Celebrations of the Holy Communion, he here subsides into comparative insignificance. From being perhaps too much in evidence, he ceases necessarily to be in evidence at all. So far, however, as the Minister is a man of spiritual experience, he still has his place to fill in the Ministry of the Word.

Our Rubric also implies that the inner is of larger significance than the outer ; the Spirit above the Form. Indeed the Form being, in this case, denied, only the Spirit remains.

It is implied, moreover, that what is so essential in the sick-room, and for the sick man, is no less essential in Church. If spirit is the vital element in one, it must also be the vital element in the other. The Bread and Wine in his case were *not* vital matters ; are they any more vital in the public ministration ? That priests declare them so, is clear enough. But have they any warrant for it ? Is it allowable to shift the emphasis in either ?

Neither is it doing dishonour to the Blessed Sacrament to treat the Symbol so, and to look beyond it. Is it not the fate of all symbols to be used, and then ignored ? They are, indeed, stepping-stones to higher truths ; but who lingers over a stepping-stone ? To stay at the Symbol is to miscarry fatally.

In the face of such implications as these, how foolish to quarrel over the mysteries of the Holy Communion, over Objective or Subjective, or over the Real Presence—so long as Christ the Lord be inwardly received.

Do we not all agree that the final destination of the Christ is the human spirit, and that only by feeding on Him can we make a good Communion ? Why then stay midway ? Why linger over the pathway ? Why not feed on Him "by faith with thanksgiving" ? This is the sick man's way ; and, as have been taught, his Communion is real and true.

And why make comparisons between the Divine Means of

Grace? Why initiate a conflict between the Word and Sacrament? To call one the principal, and to treat the other as inferior, is as puerile as it is false. Each has its place. Both emanate from the Lord of Life. Both, in their own sphere, are supreme. Do they not, like beneficent trains, travel in the same direction, on parallel lines? To call one an Express and the other a Parliamentary, when both are equally sure and well furnished, is a pastime for small, not large minds.

Certainly in our sick-room we see no such conflict. The Word was as effective in its place as the Consecrated Elements. Denied the one, the other naturally takes its place, and becomes in effect the same thing.

PRECEDENTS.

There may be, in some scrupulous minds, a suspicion that, in our Rubric, our Church is not playing a fair game; and, that she is, in fact, a little irregular. With such a doubt in our minds, we must needs be uneasy. No one likes to be planted on unfamiliar ground, or to be privy to a break with the past. But if we can be shown that our Church is on the ancient lines, and in the true order, we are all the more ready to accept her Rubric.

We need not be afraid. All is in strict order. She is *not* violating precedent.

The appeal to St. Augustine is always satisfactory, for he holds the unfeigned respect and admiration of all Christians, past and present. And this is what St. Augustine assures us concerning this Spiritual Communion:

“Believe, and thou hast eaten.”

Is not this assertion a repetition of the Rubric we are considering?

We may quote, too, an ancient Liturgy; one which had a large voice in the construction of our own Prayer Book. This is the position of the Sarum Liturgy on this spiritual reception:

“Brother, in this case your true faith and good will sufficeth.”

The ancient sick man is no otherwise treated than our modern one.

The very Schoolmen are found asserting the same consoling truth. St. Thomas Aquinas assures us, that:

“There are two ways of eating: one sacramentally, and the other spiritually. An effective Sacrament is made when a man is spiritually conjoined to Christ.”

Our Church, then, has not broken away from the past, or perpetrated some new thing, when she inserted our Rubric into her Prayer Book. So far as the past was in error she broke with it; but so far as the past findings were Christian and Scriptural, she steadily adhered to them all.

SOME EXTENSIONS OF OUR RUBRIC.

How far is this Rubric of ours of general application? Now that it has emerged, are we to bury it quickly out of sight again?

Why should we? We shall do better to give it as large an application as it will reasonably bear.

But only in analogous cases, where similar conditions are found. In such conditions the principle may be applied vigorously.

The problem before us, then, is:—Supposing we can find needs so great and so pressing as that sick-room revealed, how far may this provision for a spiritual Communion be justifiably used?

A man in banishment, for instance, cut off from every Means of Grace, may honestly fall back upon this provision, may he not?

We can imagine St. John in Patmos taking refuge in this spiritual way of escape from lack of outside helps. And was not this precisely what he did when he was “in the Spirit on the Lord’s Day,” and “saw Jesus,” and was touched by His pierced Hand? There can be no starvation for any such man who has learned the secret of spiritual Communion. Nor is there for the solitary soul who, in spirit, remains true and faithful, and who leans back upon the unseen bosom of Jesus, for company, and for solace.

There are spiritual banishments, too, no less distressing, when Christian souls are physically remote from the Public Means of Grace. There are wilds even in old England, where the chances of Communion are few and difficult, and where a Minister can only find his way infrequently. In the Canadian wilds, such a lack must be commoner still.

What can such men do in their isolation but lift their own barriers, and commune with their Lord by acts of personal faith and devotion? They may not be physically sick, but they are suffering from a malady worse than sickness. They may well then claim the Rubric consolations for themselves, and apply them.

May we not apply our principle to desert parishes, too? I know it is the proud boast of the Church of England that nobody in the land is beyond the ministrations of her clergy; and, geographically it is true, more or less. But what if the ministrations are not acceptable, and are repellent to the true and simple Christian? It is no good dubbing them straitlaced and narrow; no good declaring that they ought to get used to such new ways and new doctrines. In many cases it cannot be done except at the cost of principle and honesty. Besides, the ritual extravagances, perpetrated in many parish churches, are illegal, unauthorized by any law of the Church. So what can we expect but that many earnest Christians will be shocked by ritual changes and their doctrinal implications, and be driven away? Are not such men as much cut off from their Lord’s Table as if they were living in desert wilds?

I suggest that, for such, our Rubric provides clear satisfaction. If man has scattered them, may we not expect the Blessed Lord to gather them again by His own ministrations, and by His direct blessing? Let them, then, hold spiritual Communion with their Saviour, and embrace afresh those holy promises which are their life’s mainstay. Let them, in their privation, hold up the Cross of the Redeemer, and, by faith, clasp it to their hearts. Repenting

again, and believing again, they shall find Him blessing them again, and filling them with all the benefits of His passion.

To those who disagree with this application, and who, it may be, are the authors of the whole confusion, we can only say "Find a better way." Imagine a Saviour who will not welcome His banished ones, and accept this spiritual Communion so valid and so justified.

SOME PATENT PERILS.

We are well aware that not everybody can be trusted with so spiritual a method. Some will most surely misapply it. So much the more reason then to dissociate ourselves from such perils, and to point out the dangers attending it.

A few plain considerations will set the matter on a right footing.

In the first place, we cannot formulate a rule out of an exception; a general rule out of a particular remedy. If you are a sick man, unable to participate, in a palpable state of unreadiness, or, ignorant of the very elements of the Sacrament, then you may be the exception, and require the Gospel rather than the Sacrament of the Gospel.

As it happens, we have illustrations of this very violation of a plain command in two great Christian Bodies, both of whom reject the Holy Sacrament as binding in any literal sense.

The Quakers, for instance, have raised the spiritual idea into a system, and assert that the spiritual aspect of the Lord's Supper is the only admissible one. It would be wrong to say that they deny the necessity of the Lord's Supper. They accept the Ordinance, and believe that, in their spiritual way, they are obeying the command of their Master. To their own Master they stand or fall. But, for ourselves, and as a Church, we have no such misgivings concerning the duty of a literal reception, and only in one particular do we follow them, namely, where our Rubric leads. The Quakers stand, rather, as beacons of warning, to show us the danger of unduly pressing the spiritual and so deviating from the general mind of all other Churches.

The Salvation Army have also tabooed the Holy Sacrament; but for a different reason. Conflicts over the Sacrament have produced such a sense of repugnance in them that they fear to admit into their body so disruptive an influence. We do not agree with them; and it seems to us cowardly thus to shelve the matter. But probably they do not consider their Army as a Church at all.

The peril, then, is real enough, and we do well to emphasize it. At the same time a remedy is found in the very statement of the danger. The danger, however, is found, not in the spirituality of the Holy Communion, but in the ultra-spirituality which denies the letter in the supposed interests of the spirit. So long as we are in the flesh, with our feet on the material earth, we can hardly expect to be independent of the latter. We are rather driven to use the material as a foundation on which to raise the spiritual structure. Because some foolishly make a God of the material, there is no reason why we should not make a stepping-stone of it.

We may not then wisely, or Christianly, convert a particular Rubric into a general rule, making it applicable to the whole of life, public and private.

A similar temptation was seen assailing our soldiers during the late campaign. The commissariat issued to them emergency rations, necessary when supplies, through the exigencies of war, were lacking. It was, however, against military regulations to consume them at other times. That was an indictable offence, and was severely punished. This is just what our Rubric was intended to be, an emergency ration only.

As well might the population, for whom Emergency Shelters were provided, during the Zeppelin raids, use them at all other times. They were not so intended, any more than our Rubric was intended for every-day use either.

The truth is, human nature has vagrant tendencies, too ready to swerve from the orthodox and prescribed; and nowhere are these tendencies so markedly present as in the spiritual spheres of life. It is this tendency which impels men to imagine emergencies, and also to multiply them. It stimulates, too, that spirit of independence which kicks against authority, and insists on going its own way.

And when you add the lazy propensities of some Christian men, you have an amalgam which is fatal. Anything to save fuss and worry, and to make one self-sufficient is their more favourite maxim.

Only, let us remember, that perils do not militate against the proper use of our Rubric. They only warn us to be on our guard against its abuse. That stands, peril, or no.

OUR RUBRIC AS AN ACT OF RELIEF.

There is still another rôle which the Rubric can play; it can minister help to the clergy themselves. They may, or may not, make use of it; but, whether they do or not, it is there for their deliverance when the need becomes acute. We all need extrication sometimes.

For instance, have we not all, at some time or another, been attacked by fears concerning the fitness of some for the Holy Communion? This hesitation is not only natural but praiseworthy; for we cannot but share the apprehensions of our Church concerning the danger of unworthy partaking. Perhaps, among some, there is too little apprehension. The modern tendency to admit all and sundry, and to ask few, if any, questions, is a bad sign of the times.

Supposing, then, we find ourselves in grave doubt concerning a would-be communicant, or, it may be, a Confirmee, shall we admit them or not? If not, what shall we do? Well, there is our Rubrical way; why not fall back upon that way? Ply them with the Word of Life; press the claims of Christ upon them; deliver to them the Gospel with all plainness and simplicity. More than probably, by adopting this method of our Church, we shall see the unreadiness resolved into the best of ripeness for the Holy Communion itself in its public form. For the Gospel is more than a substitute; it

is also a preparation for that larger confession at the Table of the Lord.

Concerning the merits, or demerits, of Fasting Communion, I do not profess here an opinion. I only know that some scrupulous clergymen more than hesitate to communicate after a meal. For the same reason they would prefer not to administer to others unless fasting.

Most of us will see no dishonour to Christ in such a Communion and at such a time; but scruples are too tender growths to be trampled on. And so we say to such: why not accept the relief given in the Rubric? If you cannot administer the Holy Elements, then give them the Word of the Gospel. I do not know whether this would be a fair application of the Rubric which refers only to the sick man who is unready; unless he admits himself to be a sick man who requires the concession. It will not stretch the terms of the Rubric overmuch.

Then there is afforded here a real relief in times, and cases, of urgency.

A life is passing; and the call is insistent for a Minister's presence and help. Moments are precious, and the time is short. But there is nearly always time for a whispered message of Christ, and the telling of the old, old story, even when there is hardly time for the ordered service. Neither will the Reservation of the Communion facilitate matters much, if at all. Besides, it must be noted that it was for such cases as these that our Rubric was provided; to relieve doubt, and to meet an emergency.

And if any deny that the spoken Word is as salutary as the Blessed Sacrament with its material accompaniments, and that the reception of the heart is altogether different from the eating and drinking with the mouth; then we can only say: "Then you are at issue with your own Church, which declares that one, as well as the other, are both a feeding upon Christ effectually."

If, however, we decline to enter the Church's harbour of refuge, nothing more can be said.

* * * * *

Such is our Rubric; and such, I think, is a fair interpretation of it.

I have tried to play the game, and to play it fairly. If I have offended, it has been done unwittingly. Religion is no sphere in which to snatch unfair victories; and I have no wish to do so.

But, whatever be the true interpretation, the voice of our Church is not uncertain; and the Rubric utters it clearly. The kernel is more than the shell, and the rind of less importance than the fruit. And, so true is this, that, when occasion demands it, we may rightly dispense with the shell altogether. There is no confusion in her mind about the relationship between letter and spirit, nor is there any tendency to incorporate them into one indissoluble unity.

At the same time, no slight is ever attached to the symbol, as if it is only formal and unmeaning. Christ has brought them together, and no man can lightly sunder them. But, if there be

a need, then the symbol may be intermitted without loss. Bridges have their important use, and no sane man will disregard them; but, if they are broken down, then it is legitimate to cross some other way. The sick man, for instance, crosses along the highway of faith.

Is it too much to expect that around this solid core men may be reunited; and that, on this ground, as in a sanctuary, we may live together in peace? To thus concentrate upon essentials, is to call in the scattered from the outskirts to the centre. There we may drop our battle-cries, and clasp hands in true unity. What we gain by fighting we lose in spirituality. It is only in the region of the Spirit that discordancies disappear.

Two more volumes in "The Study Bible," published by Messrs. Cassell & Co. (3s. 6d. net each), are *St. Matthew*, by the Bishop of Ripon and J. A. Findlay, M.A., Professor of Didsbury College, Manchester; and *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs*, by Professor Hector Maclean, of Ormond College, Melbourne, Professor W. A. L. Elmsie, D.D., of Westminster College, Cambridge, Professor D. Russell Scott, Ph.D., of the Congregational College, Edinburgh, and Professor H. Ranslow, Litt.D., of the Methodist College, Auckland, New Zealand.

The plan of these little commentaries is original. First an appreciation of the Book dealt with is given, then a series of quotations from well-known writers of various ages on consecutive passages, and finally an analysis. On *St. Matthew* the Bishop of Ripon writes an Introduction, "The Gospels: Why Four?" The selection of notes is excellently made by the General Editor, Mr. John Sterling, and include selections from the writings of Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustus, Thomas Aquinas, Thomas à Kempis, Luther, Jeremy Taylor, William Law, Hooker and Stanley, Newman and Keble. Mr. Findlay's analysis of the Gospel brings out its characteristic features.

The Old Testament books in the second volume lend themselves to this special method of treatment, and the authors, who are all specialists in their various departments, have done their work excellently. These are small handbooks, but they provide a most useful selection of material for private study, for devotional use, or for teachers and preachers in their work of preparation.

The Life of Helen Hanson, by E. Louis Acres, with a Foreword by Lady Barrett, C.B.E., M.D., and an Introduction by the Dean of Peterborough (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 2s. 6d.), is the record of a career of singular earnestness and attractiveness, and of service as a Missionary Doctor in India and during the war.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE *Biography* of Francis James Chavasse (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 10s. 6d. net) will be welcomed as the record of a great Evangelical teacher and leader whose influence was widely felt during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and the first twenty-eight years of the twentieth. It has been entrusted to Canon J. B. Lancelot, Vicar of St. James', Birkdale, who has admirably succeeded in carrying out the three behests which, as he tells us in the Preface, friends laid upon him. "He was the people's Bishop. See that you make it the people's book." "Remember we want to see his *soul*." "I am sure that your book will be rich in affectionate understanding." Canon Lancelot has been assisted by the Rev. Christopher M. Chavasse, the Bishop's eldest son, who has supplied him with most of the intimate details.

The home in which the future Bishop was brought up was in many ways representative of the simple but deep religious fervency of the nineteenth century. His father, a doctor in Birmingham, was a man of devout life. The Bishop used to recall the "Communion Sunday" once a month of his boyhood, when "My father would be extra quiet all day, and shut himself up in his room both before and after the service. I have seen him come down from the rails with tears in his eyes." He would add, "I am not sure that it did not mean much more to people then than it does now. Communions to-day are more frequent, but I do not see more saints." His mother was the Doctor's second wife and Francis James was the eldest son of a second family. It was his early intention to become a soldier and he joined the Army Class in Chesterfield Grammar School, but curvature of the spine due to prolonged debility frustrated these hopes. At sixteen he went to a business house in Birmingham, but soon relinquished this, and with improving health the decision was reached that he should go to Oxford. A diary kept at this time gives an interesting insight into his inner life. It shows that "the prevailing interest of his mind is personal religion." It reveals the sense of shortcoming and the earnest desire to make the best use of every moment, which was characteristic of the Evangelical religion of the day. In many cases it led to disappointment from a feeling of failure, but in the case of young Chavasse it inspired him to habits of regularity and rule which marked the daily routine of his future life. At Oxford, where he entered Corpus Christi College in October, 1865, he was the friend of Bishop Knox and the Rev. A. C. Downer, both still with us. The diary at this time is "largely a record of self-examination on the one side, and of evangelistic work in the hamlets on the other. Prayer meetings are incessant, as also are lamentations over pride, reserve, moroseness, timidity, depression, weariness and so on." The intensity of Evangelical fervour and striving for the highest has the defects of its qualities. It can only be judged by the resulting type of character, and in the case of F. J. Chavasse it

produced a saintliness to which general testimony was borne. Sir William Forwood wrote of him just after his death: He came nearer to my ideal of a Saint than any man I have ever met or heard of, and I saw him under the most trying conditions; yet he never varied, but always looked upwards, and even Heaven itself is to-day richer for his presence. The late Prime Minister spoke of him in similar terms.

He was ordained for the curacy of St. Paul's, Preston, in 1870, and after three strenuous years he was appointed Vicar of St. Paul's, Upper Holloway, where he spent four years of equally devoted work. He then returned to Oxford where his work lay for the next twenty-three years until his appointment as Bishop of Liverpool in succession to Dr. Ryle in 1900. At Oxford he was first Rector of St. Peter-de-Bailey for twelve years, and then Principal of Wycliffe Hall for eleven. Of his work in these two spheres, especially in Wycliffe Hall, the best testimony is in the lives of the members of the University who came under his influence either as members of his Greek Testament class or as students of the Hall. His twenty-three years as Bishop of the important diocese of Liverpool were marked by development and progress along many lines. The Bishop's simplicity of character, his religious fervour and his gift of sympathy won him a position of almost unique influence, and helped to the carrying out of his many schemes, of which the foundation of the Cathedral was the most outstanding.

At the outset of his career as a Bishop he stated his own position—an Evangelical by inheritance, by education and by conviction; and he made clear his attitude towards "the lawlessness which sets up a Church authority of its own, which on the one side refuses to obey in spiritual matters a secular court because it is secular, and on the other side a spiritual court because it is not constituted according to its own liking, or because its decisions do not coincide with the laws of a 'Catholic Church' which it is most difficult to define and still more difficult to discover." In strong terms, he describes the results of such lawlessness in Church and State. The years of his episcopate included the period of the Great War in which he had the sorrow of losing two of his sons, one of whom had won the exceptional distinction of the V.C. with bar. After his retirement in 1923 the Bishop lived at Oxford where he resumed some of his old activities, preaching, lecturing at Wycliffe Hall and holding his Greek Testament class. His closing years were disturbed by the Prayer Book revision controversy. He held very strongly that the alternative Communion Service, and the legalization of the practice of Reservation altered the doctrine of the Church of England, and introduced teaching for which there is no sure warrant of Holy Scripture.

We are grateful to Canon Lancelot for the picture which he has given us of the Bishop both in the outward circumstances of his active and successful career and in the more intimate details of his inner life, from which came the power and influence so widely and beneficially employed.

The Mission Field has provided some of our finest examples of Christian biography. The heroic deeds of the pioneers of Mission work have been an inspiration to the Church. Conditions in many parts have changed since the missionaries led lives of adventure and had to face great physical dangers. The Mission Field does, however, still demand lives of heroic mould fully consecrated to the service of God. The conditions of the work may change, but the same spiritual qualifications are needed in the workers. The *Life of Temple Gairdner* by Miss C. E. Padwick (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d. net) gives an inspiring account of such a consecrated life in the midst of the difficulties presented by some of the modern conditions of missionary work. The account of his early life and his call to the work constitute a powerful appeal which should be placed in the hands of young people. Many a life may be guided to self-surrender and to the work of the Church overseas by reading the various steps by which Gairdner was led to his great decision to devote his life to Christ in the foreign field. He was born in Ardrossan in Ayrshire in 1873. His father, Sir William Gairdner, was a distinguished Professor of Medicine in the University of Glasgow. He was educated at Rossal and went to Trinity College, Oxford, with a classical exhibition in October, 1892. A graphic picture is given of the life of the University in those days, and of the members of the O.I.C.C.U. who in the fullness of their zeal went "bawling down the High Street" to a totally undistinguished tune, such words as these :

It is better to shout than to doubt,
It is better to rise than to fall,
It is better to let the glory out
Than to have no glory at all.

The impression which he made upon his fellow-students is indicated in such testimony as "he was the greatest man among my contemporaries." "He was at Oxford with Sir John Simon, Lord Birkenhead and Hilaire Belloc, and he was the greatest of them all, and the most richly endowed," but he decided early that "the only thing in the world worth living for is to find out the will of God and to do it." The death of his brother Hugh marked a time of decision for him, "When I knelt by Hugh's bed I first felt the necessity of putting Christ first and the rest nowhere. . . . And then I knew that henceforth there could be but one duty for me, to follow where I heard Him calling."

It was not without much heart-searching and many inward struggles that he settled the sphere of his future work. Missionary interest was becoming strong in Oxford at the time and men like Dr. John R. Mott and Mr. J. C. Oldham were bringing a new spirit into it. The Student Christian Movement began and Gairdner became one of its most active workers. He threw himself heart and soul into it as he did into every work which he took up. He was ordained in October, 1898, at St. Paul's Cathedral for work in Egypt, and with his friend Douglas Thornton began his long association with that country to which both of them gave their lives. The

hopes, the fears, the joys and the disappointments of the work especially in the early years as they are recorded here give an insight into the conditions of a missionary's life. His marriage with Miss Margaret Dundas Mitchell, also a worker in the Mission Field, brought him the companionship and support which largely aided in the development of his powers. The picture of his home life is specially attractive and the part which music played in it showed the blessing which an unusual gift and artistic talent can be. Gairdner's abilities marked him out for special work among the educated Moslems. Special knowledge was required for dealing with the language and literature of Islam. His gifts were recognized and he was set apart to study for a year in order to equip himself fully for the work. He spent the year in contact with the leading Arabic scholars of England, America and Germany. Yet the tragedy of the situation was that on his return to Egypt he never had the time or the opportunity of doing the special work for which he was thus so thoroughly prepared. The calls of the routine work of the Mission, the shortage of staff and the immediate demands on his time made it impossible for him to carry out the plans for the more difficult and more important work for which he and he alone was specially gifted and equipped. The lesson of such a life ought to be learnt by those responsible for the use of the human material placed in their charge. There are many instances throughout the Church of men qualified for highly specialized tasks who are engaged in humdrum duties which could be equally well or even better performed by men of ordinary abilities. Gairdner's noble choice of a life devoted absolutely to the service of God and the failure to make use of his special gifts to the full are the two outstanding features of a biography which will be received first as a record of a remarkable life and secondly as a valuable contribution to the records of missionary work. Miss Padwick has performed her task with distinguished success, and with a wonderful sympathy and understanding of the spirit of the man whose character and work she depicts so admirably.

There was a time when, next to the Bible, Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* was probably the best-known and most widely read book in the English language. It was first issued in Latin, of which language Foxe was one of the greatest stylists of his time, in 1554. The earliest edition in English appeared in 1563. It rapidly passed through several editions. It was ordered by the Convocations in 1571 to be placed in the Churches and in the halls and houses of the bishops and archdeacons to be read and studied by the people. It is recorded of Bunyan that the two books which he took with him when he went to Bedford gaol were the Bible and Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. It is easy to understand its popularity in ages when religion was the chief interest of the people. It introduces the reader to the most interesting characters of the most interesting ages in the history of the Church, and in a way provides a conspectus

of the Church's life. It is *An Universal History of Christian Martyrdom*. It passes from the early persecutions of the Primitive Church, through the sufferings of the Waldensians, the atrocities of the Inquisition and the trials of the Reformers in Bohemia to the martyrdoms in England under Queen Mary. It has been the custom in some quarters, especially those in which Roman Catholic influence prevails, to represent Foxe as an inaccurate historian, and to speak of his "credulity and bitter prejudice." Dr. Maitland, one of the Tractarians, spent much ingenuity in a series of pamphlets issued between the years 1837 and 1842 to prove Foxe's accounts untrustworthy, but with little success. Those who are best able to judge declare that Foxe has been most unfairly treated, and agree with Professor Pollard's opinion in the *Cambridge Modern History*, that Foxe's work "contains a vast number of facts and documents, and its errors are certainly not greater than in similar works." The *Book of Martyrs* has frequently appeared in abridged editions and in consequence much of its value has been lost. It is satisfactory therefore to find that a new and unabridged edition has recently been issued by Messrs. Chas. J. Thynne and Jarvis, Ltd., at the very moderate price of six shillings. It runs to nearly eleven hundred pages, and contains a number of illustrations and a useful index. It has also an Essay on Roman Catholicism by Dr. Ingham Cobbin, revised and enlarged by that indefatigable scholar, Dr. C. H. H. Wright. This is in itself a valuable piece of work as it gives an accurate account of some of the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Church drawn from authentic sources. Dr. Wright also contributed an Introduction which gives an account of Foxe's life and answers the aspersions which have been cast upon his character as an historian. Of the text of so well known and authoritative a work it is needless to say anything. English Churchmen would do well to revive their acquaintance with some of the important facts which it contains. It would enable them to form a better judgment on the great foundation facts of our Church's teaching.

Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock's scholarly work is well known to readers of *THE CHURCHMAN*. His biblical studies are always based on his own research work and exhibit independence and originality of thought. His book on the Atonement and Modern Thought has been recognized by those most competent to judge as an important contribution to the study of the subject and as an able defence of the teaching more particularly associated with the Evangelical School of Thought. It is therefore a pleasure to find him turning to the devotional side of Christianity and using his powers and his knowledge in commending the Christian Faith as a guide of life and thought for those who are thinking out the problems of to-day. In a small book, *Christ's Answer to our Questions*, published by the Religious Tract Society (1s. 6d. net), he suggests the answers which Christ gives to the three fundamental questions of human thought—What can I know? What shall I do? and What may I hope?

In a preliminary survey he points to the connection of Christ with the thought of progress and shows that "we are making progress so long as we are advancing to Christ; so far as we are making His ideal life the ideal of ours: so much as we are drawing the inspiration of our conduct from the living waters of Christian love and truth." In short, the practical test of progress may be summed up as the approach to the serene summits of the Sermon on the Mount. He also shows that the true principle of success does not lie in any conception of outward prosperity, but in learning the lessons of the moral and spiritual ascendancy of Christ. The three concluding chapters on "Christ and Life" develop the thought that the three onward steps in the Christian life are "In Christ, for Christ, and to Christ."

In *The World Wide Prayer* (C.M.S., 2s. net), Canon V. F. Storr has given us a fresh treatment of the Lord's Prayer in a series of studies in its missionary aspects. We have all experienced the wealth of meaning that the Lord's Prayer opens out to us as we use it in the interpretation of our own prayers. Canon Storr has applied the various familiar petitions to the Mission Field with its World Wide Call to-day, and has shown how fully and exactly it expresses the situation and its prayer needs. Each clause yields its appropriate significance. From the divine Fatherhood and its correlative in the brotherhood of man, through the purposes of God as revealed in the Old and New Testaments, and the meaning of "Thy kingdom come" to which special attention is given, to the use of our means and the obligations implied in membership of the Christian family, the whole prayer is shown to be suggestive of appropriate intercessions for the opportunities of to-day. Although small the book is rich in thought, and will be found helpful for those who wish to conduct a course of missionary intercessions or give a series of addresses on the World Call. Some Devotions arranged by Canon Edward S. Woods on the petitions of the Prayer form a useful addition to the book.

Canon Odom is the doyen of the Sheffield clergy. He has spent most of his life in the city, and has written a number of interesting books on historic places and personages connected with the city. His latest book issued in his eighty-third year gives an account of two Sheffield poets, James Montgomery and Ebenezer Elliott. James Montgomery was the son of a Moravian missionary and had a long and successful career as a journalist in Sheffield. He is best known as the author of many well-known hymns, including "Go to dark Gethsemane," "Hail to the Lord's Anointed," "For ever with the Lord," "Jerusalem, my happy home," "Sow in the morn thy seed," and perhaps the best known of all his noble verses on prayer beginning "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire."

G.F.I.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CANON STREETER ON THE ORIGINS OF THE MINISTRY.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, STUDIED WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
THE ORIGINS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. By B. H. Streeter.
Macmillan. 8s. 6d.

Much depends on the view we take of the origins of the Christian Ministry, and it is not too much to say that the course of the Reunion movement depends on the results of their investigation by impartial scholarship. If the ministry depend for its validity on devolution from above through an unbroken line of descent from the Apostles, there can never be an acknowledgement of the validity of non-episcopally transmitted ministry. If on the other hand the threefold order which we possess in the Church of England be the result of the survival of the fittest through natural evolution of the Church organism in relation to its environment, then we can discuss Reunion on the basis of accepting that form of ministry which most unites, divides least and has most of the evidence of history in its favour. And there will be no difficulty in the admission of temporary aberrations from the accepted order, until a regular ministry of the same type be established in the united Churches.

Canon Streeter holds that the teaching of the facts known to us in the history of the Primitive Church proves that the contention based on one and only one form of apostolic ministry, is not borne out and that the ministry was in existence in various forms before it settled down to non-episcopacy. He holds that this ought to be a matter for universal rejoicing among the Churches, "for there will be but few of those unfortunates, to whom it is no satisfaction to be right unless they can thereby put others in the wrong." We do not know whether this remark is the fruit of the *idée fixe* of the scholar that when once truth is discovered it is universally acceptable, or is due to an ignorance of human nature which unfortunately always takes a pride in possessing something to which others can lay no claim. But this is a minor matter, for the real question is whether or not he has proved his case. We believe that he has done so and that his conclusion is irrefutable, for it has behind it the witness of the documents and of facts, and can also appeal to similar conclusions reached by Bishop Lightfoot and other independent investigators of the evidence.

One thing must be got rid of by all who examine Christian origins. The fallacy of unanimous tradition cannot be accepted as necessarily true in historical research, especially in the growth of institutions that become of first-rate importance in the minds of men long after they have become general. One statement

made by an authority a century after the event recorded becomes frequently the ground of its repetition in many quarters, and whereas scholars would not think of accepting other statements by the same authority with equal assurance of their truth, the statement that fits in with predilection is at once believed to reach an infallible level. Canon Streeter will have none of this. He treats the evidence as a whole, submits it to cross-examination and weighs it in the light of all known facts. And his conclusions are, as a rule, those that suit the facts.

But we must not be taken as agreeing with the dates he assigns to the New Testament documents. We know that his opinions on these dates are of first-rate importance, but we are convinced that many of them will be revised when we know more than we now have in our hands. These dates are not a necessary part of his argument, although if accepted they remove the idea of a long tunnel between the books of the New Testament and the literature of the Apostolic age. And we are not prepared to admit the large editing assigned to the Pastoral Epistles by Dr. Streeter, as we believe that it is probable that St. Paul was able to envisage a Church order such as is described in them. For St. Paul's mind was a growing mind and he could see from his knowledge of the development of the Churches and from his observation in Rome of the value of centralized power, that order and good government is the backbone of a permanent and expanding institution. While Canon Streeter holds firmly that because something is not in the Scriptures it must necessarily be true, we think at times he is prepared to assign the unexpected in Scripture to a date later than is warranted.

His argument may be briefly described as the contention that in the primitive Church there was no uniform ministry of grace. In various centres different systems of government prevailed—here the prophet was the prominent and authoritative personage—there the college of presbyters who ruled the Church as a Committee and in other places a centralized government came into being probably through the election of a ruling presbyter who was clothed with the authority of a Bishop. Then throughout Christendom non-episcopacy became the rule, but the example of Alexandria shows clearly that there was no idea that only by episcopal ordination could the validity of the Sacraments and Holy Orders be guaranteed.

We cannot follow Dr. Streeter through his chapters and appendices, every line of which demands weighing and thoughtful study.

Two matters of great interest make a special appeal, for the description of the mind of Ignatius and the development of the Roman Church are of primary importance. Ignatius believed in episcopacy because he found it to have settled the difficulties of his own Church and thought that only through its adoption could order and growth be assured. This accounts for his emphasis on the subject, for he writes as a man with episcopacy on the brain, due to its recent development and its gift for preserving the rights

of the clerical order as against the laity, i.e. for the supremacy of the general Church officers as a body. When he reached Rome he found the Roman Church without Mon-episcopacy and he, by his influence and martyrdom, laid the foundation of a movement which developed into the Papacy. With great ability Dr. Streeter shows that the Epistles of St. James and to the Hebrews were closely associated with Rome and had great influence in the Capital. The Roman claims for a Petrine episcopate are set aside and the whole discussion leads us to believe that the residence of St. Peter in Rome has very little historical foundation. Whether this be the case or not there is the strongest reason for believing that Mon-episcopacy was not adopted in the Roman Church until after the visit of Ignatius in A.D. 115. We advise all who wish to know the facts of early Church History on Ministerial Origins to read and keep by them a book which is certain to play a great part in the controversy of the next nine months. It is a real contribution to the solution of a great problem on which many ignorantly have taken sides.

DOGMA : IN HISTORY AND THOUGHT.

DOGMA : IN HISTORY AND THOUGHT. Edited by W. R. Matthews, D.D. *Nisbet*. 8s. 6d.

“Religious dogma seems to be essentially symbolical truth. Most of the dogmatic statements with which we are familiar bear their symbolic character plainly upon them. ‘Who for us men and our salvation came down from Heaven’: in that phrase of the creed we have the heart of the Gospel: it contains the thought of the divine condescension for man’s redemption apart from which there is no gospel at all. Yet the phrase is a string of pictures.” “The men of religion have something to learn from the men of science. Loyalty to fact and experience and honest thought will lead us to the reconstructed faith which is the old faith better understood.” These words by the Editor fairly describe the collective outlook of the Lectures contained in this fascinating and important volume. But they are by no means interpreted in the same sense by all the contributors. The reader will find himself in different atmospheres as he studies the thought of men who are by no means at one among themselves, as to what may be considered true “dogma.” And we think that a great deal depends on the meaning given to “symbolical.” A symbol may or may not be a true expression of reality, as reality is understood by men of different convictions. It is very easy to make play of the imperfection of pictures and to argue that because a pictorial representation involves a conception which from one point of view is inaccurate, the underlying idea is therefore to be rejected. Human thought is necessarily exercised under conditions of space and time, and truth and untruth must be judged in agreement or

disagreement with these conditions. The Fact of Christ upon Earth in time and space is dependent upon the existence of a spatial Heaven above His head. And it is this fact that matters, not the inadequacy of the pictorial words "came down from Heaven." They have only a qualifying connotation—the central fact is that our Lord came from God to earth for our Salvation. And we hold firmly by the facts of His life here on earth. We cannot free ourselves from its supernatural incidents and say we are Christians when we only accept them in a symbolical sense, meaning thereby a poetical sense. They are events for us and as such we build on them our Salvation. In one sense all scientific fact is symbolical—in another sense it is real and definite. We may not understand and we do not understand all the bearings of scientific fact or religious fact, but that does not necessitate our jettisoning either. The great dogmatic conflict to-day rests finally on the reality as historical events of the major incidents of the Christ life. For us, we cannot reject them as facts without being false to our Faith and to explain them as the poetry of Revelation is to reject them as real in anything but a symbolic sense, which robs them of their efficacy as the basis of faith.

We by no means imply that the writers of these Lectures hold the extreme view of symbolism, but we wish to put readers on their guard against a possible pitfall. Bishop Gore has much that is admirable, endorsed by us, in his address on "Dogma in the Early Church," but he implies that some things were primitive truth which we cannot accept as such, for we do not find them in the New Testament or in Apostolic Christianity. Broadly we are in agreement with the contention that Christian experience preceded Christian Dogma, but here again we have to distinguish between subjective experience and objective fact, although it may be contended that objective fact is only appreciated in subjective experience. But the root of the matter lies in, e.g., was the Resurrection an objective fact, symbolized by the Empty Tomb and the appearance of our Blessed Lord to the Apostles, or was it merely a reconstructed symbolism from the subjective experiences of visions which had no reality as reality is commonly understood by reasonable men? Were the visions simply the outcome of subjective faith in the reality of what in the last resort, was an objectified subjectivity? We are aware that this may seem a playing upon words, but so much depends on what is meant by words that it is essential to have our minds cleared of ambiguities.

The contributors and their subjects are, "The Nature and Basis of Dogma," by Dr. Matthews; "Dogma in the New Testament," by Dr. Bicknell; "Dogma in the Early Church," by Bishop Gore; "Dogma in Medieval Scholasticism," by Mr. Hanson; "Dogma in Protestant Scholasticism," by Dr. Franks; "The Decline of Dogma and the Anti-Dogmatic Movement," by Dr. Claude Jenkins, and "The Reconstruction of Dogma," by Dr. Relton. We have read and learned much from all the writers and believe that the study of the book as a whole will be helpful to many minds. But

it is essential to bear in mind the real meaning of Dogma as the expression of objective Truth, in order to derive the utmost value from the study of a most suggestive volume.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY PASTORS.

SIX GREAT ANGLICANS : A STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By F. W. Head. S.C.M. 6s.

Canon Head chose as the subject of his Cambridge Pastoral Theology Lectures, six men who made their mark in the last century. It may seem strange that a series of addresses delivered to candidates for ordination on the work they are about to undertake should centre in those who had to face conditions different from those that surround us to-day, but the Lecturer could not possibly have chosen a plan that would prove more illuminating in the light it sheds upon the difficulties and opportunities of the times. For the nineteenth century brought our fathers face to face with the main problems we encounter and it is well for us to see how they met them. And Canon Head never loses sight of the environment in which men will have to work and never conceals his own opinions and convictions. There is a self-revealing frankness in these addresses that at once wins attention and a hopefulness that must have proved infectious to his audience. We who have only had the opportunity of following his thought in cold print caught something of the spirit of the writer and felt that he must have been an inspiring speaker.

The Anglicans chosen are typical. Simeon—the great Evangelical ; Keble—the Tractarian ; Hook—the Parish Clergyman ; Robertson—Poet, Preacher and Prophet ; Kingsley—fearless writer and social reformer, and Barnett, the creator of the settlement movement. All left their mark upon their age and their influence continues to this day. Simeon had to meet the strongest opposition in Cambridge and he overcame it by his piety and consecration. Canon Head truly says, "When action followed (in France) to carry out the ideas of Rousseau, as it came with the cry of 'Liberty, Fraternity and Equality' in the French Revolution, it revealed the elementary passions of men in a wild desire for selfish gratification and revenge. Instead of this in England had come the teaching of Methodism and Evangelicalism. Objections may be made against it, but the facts are these. England with a new industrial class, rough, out of reach of the Church and refinement, was won and kept for Christ by this revival of Christianity." Canon Head remarks with truth, "I suggest that one of the real dangers of a strong active Christianity to-day is the belief among the people that God is closer to us in the Church, than He is at home. The Evangelicals of a century ago found Him as close to them at home as anywhere else." He discovers weaknesses in Simeon's Evan-

gicalism. It tended to belittle the Church, laid stress on the emotions and on an "infallible Bible" based on verbal inspiration. Owing to the last-mentioned reason "Evangelicalism lost touch with the best Christian scholarship and Christianity in England lost by what seemed to be a breach between the devotional and intellectual sides of religion."

Canon Head lays down definitely throughout these Lectures that our Church is based on Holy Scripture and the test of the Sixth Article was applied by the Reformers, and by it they swept away abuses and retained what they believed to be right. "I find it difficult to believe that all the Catholic doctrines which Keble found in the early Fathers and in some of the medieval divines can be proved from Holy Scripture." "The great subject for our preaching and teaching in the Church of England is the Bible. . . . The Bible remains the authority of our teaching as much as ever because we learn from it to trace the gradual revelation of God which reached its fulness in Jesus Christ. We need to preach the Bible in the light of the new knowledge we have received since Simeon's time." "It is interesting to see how the great preachers of the nineteenth century, including Robertson, have found in a careful exposition of Scripture the secret of their success." In our opinion there will be a continued decrease of the power of the pulpit until preachers take Canon Head's advice and make Holy Scripture a living oracle for themselves and the authority on which their congregations must trust if they are to know the truth.

There is no half-hearted acceptance of the Reformation settlement by the lecturer. Again and again he returns to it and shows how it established a new orientation of thought that brings us back to the Catholicity of the Primitive Church. Writing on the rejection of the Deposited Book by the House of Commons he tells us "the English people still look to the Reformation as the guarantee of its national religion and distrusts any movement or act of worship which seems to seek its inspiration in the Middle Ages. Kingsley, Robertson and Hook are found to be true prophets." As was to be expected, Canon Head urges his hearers to give themselves to reading, for nearly all who have done great work as clergymen have been readers. The lives of the Six under review were all men who devoted long hours to study. But we must close with the confession that this book has fascinated us by its Evangelical spirit, its balanced judgements and its whole-hearted enthusiasm. Canon Head believes in the Church of England as a great instrument for spreading the Kingdom of God in this land. He is eager to see its power for good increase and to see its extension throughout the world. He centres his faith in the Saviour and we are conscious as we read his pages that he never loses sight of the fact that man needs a Saviour and in the Lord Jesus Christ alone can he find his longings satisfied and his sins forgiven.

PROFESSOR WEBB ON RELIGION AND THE THOUGHT
OF TO-DAY.

RELIGION AND THE THOUGHT OF TO-DAY. By C. C. J. Webb.
Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

Professor Webb is Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of Religion and is well known as a philosophical thinker who brings an independent mind to bear on religious questions. It was natural that he should be chosen as the First Riddell Memorial Lecturer and his addresses on *The Study of Religion: problems and methods: the Debt of Modern Philosophy to the Christian Religion*, and the problem of Religion in contemporary thought, well merit the most careful study. If we devote our Review to the third Lecture and to one section of it this does not mean that the rest of the book is of secondary importance. Such a conclusion would be entirely wrong, for we are convinced that no student of current thought can afford to overlook what is so tersely said by a first-rate authority.

Professor Webb tells us that the application of critical and scientific methods to the criticism of the Bible probably involves a more momentous break with tradition than the Reformation in the sixteenth century. It is certain to affect the whole of Christianity and the striking characteristic of its influence is that it is unmarked by spectacular changes in the outward forms of worship or in the constitution of the churches. He briefly summarizes the changes. The fact that a statement is found in the Bible does not guarantee its truth. Scripture has no authority to override in matters of science or history evidence which in all other respects would be held sufficient to prove truth. The authority in matters moral, spiritual and religious possessed by the Bible is derived from the agreement between this teaching and our intuitions. He admits that our sense of rightness and wrongness on these matters is very largely derived from the Bible, but this does not mean that all contained in the Bible is necessarily true even in these domains.

We have but one remark to make. It is perfectly true that our Lord contrasted "I say unto you" with "it was said to them of old time," but it is also true that again and again our Lord is reported in Holy Scripture to refer to the Scriptures in proof of His mission. We believe that much of our present religious apathy is due to a feeling that the Bible is no longer authoritative and that its teaching can be discarded. Mr. Webb says: "Religion is only itself when it is the worship of a living God, at least as real as his worshipper, and so not lacking that concrete reality for himself which we are conscious as possessing in our own measure as *persons*." But we need a guide to the living God and we have that Guide in our Lord, whose life and words are alone found in the New Testament. Unless the record be true we are of all men most miserable, for we have no other Revelation of God that speaks with authority to us.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT,
FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Sunday School Lessons.—A companion volume to *Stories for the Little People in Sunday School and Home*, by Deaconesses Oakley and Ethel Luke, entitled *More Stories for the Little People*, is now ready. Each book is published at 1s. 6d. net (postage 3d.) and contains a year's lessons for children from 4 to 7 years of age. In connection with the new series a set of coloured picture cards (size 4½" by 3½") has been prepared, illustrating the Lessons. The cost of these 52 pictures is 1s. for the whole year, postage and packing 4d. A slip-in Album costs 3d. per scholar for the 52 pictures. Large size pictures (20" by 30") for 38 of the Lessons are obtainable at 8d. per copy, postage and packing extra—viz., on single copies, 4d., up to 12 copies, 6d., above this number, 9d. An illustration Album has also been prepared (price 4d.) containing 52 drawings to be coloured in crayon or water colours, or copied in pencil or crayon, as desired.

In response to repeated requests the Rev. G. R. Balleine's *The Young Churchman* and *Heroes and Holy Days of the Church Calendar* have been reprinted. The first book gives distinct Lessons on Church Teaching and the significance of Church Membership. Mr. Balleine's lesson book for this year is entitled *Christianity as St. Peter saw it*. His other books now obtainable are *Boys and Girls of the Bible* and *Lessons on the Acts of the Apostles*. All Mr. Balleine's books are issued at 2s. net each (postage 3d.) and contain 52 Lessons for the Sundays of the Church's year. For youth, we would mention again *The Complete Christian*, by the Rev. Cuthbert Cooper, containing full notes for a year's Bible Class, 2s. (postage 3d.).

Sunday School Lessons on the Collects, Illustrated from the Epistles and Gospels, edited by the Rev. W. H. Flecker, D.C.L., and the Rev. L. E. L. Roberts, are still obtainable for Senior and Intermediate Classes, price 6d. per quarter, or bound together in cloth at 2s. net. It should be stated in ordering whether Senior or Intermediate Lessons are required. The lessons are spiritual, scriptural and evangelical in their teaching, and are constructed upon the lines of modern Sunday School methods. For those who desire pictures a special set of booklets has been obtained for the lessons. These are supplied at 4s. per box, which is sufficient for ten children for the year. A card-case in which to keep the year's booklets is also provided.

Parochial Church Councils.—Royal assent having been given to the Representation of the Laity Measure, 1929, many of the Forms and Notices previously used in connection with the Electoral Roll have had to be altered, and the following new Forms have been issued by the Church Book Room :—Application for Enrolment on Church Electoral Roll ; Form of Notice of Revision of Church Electoral Roll ; Notice of Enrolment of a Non-Resident ; Notice to cancel Entry in another Parish ; Notice of Removal to another Parish ; and Notice of Annual Parochial Church Meeting. Full particulars and prices are advertised in this issue. It will be noted that only one Application Form for Enrolment is now required for resident and non-resident electors.

An excellent pamphlet, entitled *The Position of the Laity in the Church of England*, (i) From the Legal Standpoint, by R. E. Ross, LL.B., (ii) Historical

and in *Outlook*, by F. W. Davy, M.A., has recently been published, price 4d. (postage 1d.). These papers were read at the Islington Ruridecanal Conference, and will be found of considerable service to members of Parochial Church Councils, Churchwardens, etc.

Reunion.—The Rev. C. H. K. Boughton's valuable book entitled *The Meaning of Holy Baptism*, which was published a few years ago and is now on sale at 1s. (postage 2d.), will be found of considerable service at the present time when the question of Reunion is occupying so much thought in the Church. The book is really a contribution to the discussion which arose in regard to the First Interim Report of the Faith and Order Subcommittee in which the members agreed that Our Lord ordained the two Sacraments, but felt that difficulties regarding them required further "study and discussion." Mr. Boughton sets forth, with constant reference to Scripture and with much clearness and freshness and skill, the prevailing Evangelical view of Baptism and Regeneration. The book is admirably written and is suitable, not only for the reading of students, but for parents and Church people generally.

Lectures on Church History.—As clergy and others will be preparing lists of lectures for the coming season mention may be made of a valuable *Lecture on English Church History*, by the Rev. Herbert Crossland, Vicar of Houghton, Carlisle, price 3d. (postage 1d.). The Lecture deals in an interesting way with Church History from early times to the present day, and can be illustrated by lantern slides, a list of which is appended to the pamphlet.

Children's Services.—In order to encourage attendance at Children's Services a specially designed card in colours has been issued by the Book Room. The picture depicts children entering church, space being left for printing the name of the particular church in which services are to be held, and on the back of the card special notices can be printed. The text "Jesus called a little child" appears at the bottom of the picture. In order to make it possible for clergy to make a wide use of these cards, they are issued at the very low price of 1d. each or 5s. per 100. We feel that the cards will be of special use for recruiting. They have also been welcomed as Christmas cards or otherwise for distribution in Sunday Schools, etc.

Historical Stories.—Certain of Miss Deborah Alcock's historical tales have been out of print for some time and we are glad to see that the R.T.S. has republished four at 3s. 6d. each (postage 6d.). The latest issue is *Under Calvin's Spell* (illustrated), an interesting story of life in Geneva in Calvin's time and the persecution his followers had to undergo. The book ends with the passing of Calvin. Other books are *The Spanish Brothers*; *Crushed Yet Conquering*, A Story of Constance and Bohemia; and *Dr. Adrian*, A Story of Old Holland.

A remarkably interesting and able book, entitled *The Netherlands*, by Mary Macgregor, with twelve reproductions from original coloured drawings, has been remaindered, and is obtainable from the Book Room at 3s. (postage 6d.). It gives an account in simple form of the life of William the Silent. The descriptions of life in the Netherlands at the time, the Inquisition, Alva's Reign of Terror, and the Siege and Relief of Leyden are vividly portrayed.