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ART. I.—CHRISTIAN MONARCHY.


3. 'The Imperial Coronation at Moscow.' By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Peterborough. Cornhill Magazine, September 1896.

Mr. Figgis's learned but lucid dissertation is one of many signs of the revived importance of the monarchical idea. Revolutionary hatred of everything regal vented itself, a century ago, even in the baiting and starving of the lions caged at the Jardin des Plantes. In the Reform era of sixty years since, monarchy was half-contemptuously tolerated as a pallid survival of a dying past. William IV. even proposed that his coronation should be omitted. Now the setting century leaves no political institution more strongly seated. In France itself a bourgeois republic dons the pomp and equipage of deposed royalty to welcome an autocrat. 'A hundred years' (it was said during the Czar's visit to Paris) 'after the Revolution which it was fancied destroyed the vitality of the monarchical principle, Europe is breathlessly studying the character and words of a young man of twenty-eight, whose only claim to that awed attention is the power which comes to him from his birth.' ¹ Even across the Atlantic, though President Harrison in 1891 spoke of the 'sympathy which binds the hemisphere that is without a king'—άσφαλευρον—photo-

¹ Spectator, October 10, 1896.
graphic agents tell a different tale; for there is no country in which so many portraits of royal personages are sold as in the United States. In England the throne is absolutely beyond question. This remarkable recovery of monarchical institutions might perhaps have been looked for in an age of reaction from unhistoric and unimaginative utilitarianism. It is due still more to the expansion of empires—how different from Plato's civic state, ἰκανὴ καὶ μία,¹—and the growth of vast armies. The 'dim, common populations' feel themselves incompetent to conduct war or delicate diplomacies. Democracy, says De Laveleye, is possible only where, as in Switzerland, there can be no imperial policy. It was a vaunt concerning Elizabeth that she was crowned 'Empress from the Orcade Isles unto the Mountains Pyrene.'² And to-day the sun never sets on that Empire. But European thrones would not now be so strong had they been occupied by rulers of feeble or odious character. The myriad subjects of Queen Victoria hope next June to celebrate the close of her sixty years of noble sovereignty. 'The Queen,' it has been finely said, 'has outcrowned and outlived everyone and everything save only the love and fidelity of the nation. She received the flower of loyalty bruised, battered, and half ruined from her Hanoverian predecessors; but in her hands it has revived and grown to what we see it now.'³ But the Queen's virtues have given scope for reverence to revive for her office, as well as ever-increasing devotion to grow up to her person. It is a happy coincidence that in the same month the nation will also commemorate the thirteen hundredth anniversary of King Ethelbert's baptism. It is a critical opportunity for stamping a permanent impression on the English mind. Not many months ago we were strangely fascinated by the majestic ceremonial of the imperial coronation in the sacred city of Moscow—a great religious rite consecrating with fitting splendour and solemnity an epoch in the life of what is at once a nation and a vast family. The whole atmosphere of that great scene 'seemed charged with a simple, childlike earnestness and intensity of faith and hope.' Here in the far West men looked on with a kind of wistful envy, half wondering that such feelings could still exist on the threshold of the twentieth century, and even Philistinism was hushed and awed. Afterwards came the impressive ceremony of the procession of the

¹ Republic, p. 423.
³ Spectator, September 16, 1896.
Regalia at Buda-Pesth. A Presidential election has since taken place, representing the more modern conception of national existence. England yet retains some consecration of her corporate life by the Catholic Church of Christ, and sees law personified in a sovereign who is crowned and anointed with rites more ancient and even more richly symbolical than those of Russia. If our future as a nation is to be strong, serious, Christian, it is imperative that we should realize, rescue, and conserve the ideal elements still remaining in political institutions.

Supernaturalism in politics is not necessarily bound up with those features of the 'Divine Right' doctrine which led Sir F. Pollock to declare that it is 'not even ancient.' Indefeasible primogenitary birthright and unlimited monarchy were, as rounded theories, developments of the later mediæval period. But that authority is from above, and that the office of kings is an image of the Divine, is a doctrine as old as human society:

Σκυπτούχος βασιλεὺς, ὄτε Ζεὺς κύδος ἐδωκεν.

Mr. Balfour wrote with less than his usual emancipation from popular preconception when he described the Divine Right of kings as a 'theory of extraordinary absurdity,' invented to prop up decaying loyalty to authority. No scholar can understand the growth of modern political speculation who does not study attentively the 'much sorry stuff' on the subject which, Carlyle said, 'moulders now unread in the public libraries of this country.' This, by the way, is a description of the treatises of the chief European thinkers from Aquinas, Dante, Ockham, Wyclif, to Hooker, Barrow, Hobbes and Locke, to say nothing of thoughts and emotions which inspired men on the battle-field and the scaffold, ennobled civil strife itself, and transfigured a century with the glamour that still finds an answer in human hearts. Carlyle adds: 'I will say that the Divine Right of kings did mean something; something true, which it is important for us and all men to keep in mind.'

A doctrine of the unchanging East, where, as Mr. Birkbeck lately pointed out in a letter in the Guardian, the Czar's relation to the Church is no Caesaro-papalism, cannot be described as Anglican or Gallican. But it re-emerges in the Middle Age in the form of an anti-papal polemic, as

1 History of the Science of Politics, p. 65.
2 Leslie declared: 'All the ancient Fathers are full of it; and they took it from the Holy Scripture.' The Good Old Cause, § 2.
3 Foundations of Belief, p. 217.
4 Hero-Worship, 'The Hero as King.'
the assertion of the Divine Right of temporal government. As Christ's haeres ex asse and Vicar, the Pope claimed pleni-
tudinem potestatis—'in terra Imperia, Regna, Principatus, et omnium hominum possessiones pro meritis tollere uni-
cuique et concedere.'1 The very existence of secular govern-
ments was ascribed by Hildebrand to the Fall.2 This
provoked the counter assertion that temporal rule is an 'emanation
from the Deity.' The Prince also is (in the words of the
Laws of St. Edward3) 'Vicarius Summi Regis,' and must be
obeyed, not because Christians are taught to 'resist not evil'
and to turn the cheek to the smiter, but as the 'Minister of
God.' The 'ordered conduct of life'—in the fullest sense of
'life'—was imagined as bodied visibly in a perfect State or
City of God, ruled harmoniously by His two vicegerents. The
Kingdom of God upon earth was deemed to be at last realized
—στείρα but not στεπάνον—no 'artificial contrivance for
satisfying ephemeral needs,' but a preparation for eternity.

'The Emperor and the Pope were invested with a divine mission,
and confirmed by sanctions of a kingdom other than the kingdoms
of the earth. They did not, in theory, owe their place to any
excellence of blood, or any unanimity of popular suffrages. In
their own interpretation of their power, and by the consent of those
they governed, that power was sovereign by reason of a superhuman
mandate, and in coherence with a transcendent arrangement of the
universe, pre-established and immutable. They stood above the
rest of men, uplifted and upheld by omnipotent hands; neither of
them could have an equal or competitor. In the one God had
bestowed a captain on the whole congregation of His people; in
the other He had sent to all men the apostle of His Gospel. Beyond
the range and sweep of these two, His revealed and indisputable
emissaries, men were out of reach of God's government of the world.
An Emperor or a Pope acquired an awe of himself; he had become
an implement through which the finger of destiny determined the
laws of mankind; he was the repository of a wisdom and a will
which were in him, but not of him.'4

The Holy Roman Empire, however, save fitfully under a
Charlemagne or Otto, remained a noble and unrealizable
dream. The chosen captains, or at least the natural leaders,
of God's Church encroached on one another's province, as the
thought of Christ as the personally directing Head and Lord
of the Christian Commonwealth faded. Even before the

1 Gregory's VII.'s bull deposing Henry IV.
2 'Dominium peccati occasione introductum.' Gerson, De Potest.
Eccles.
3 Wilkins, Concilia, tom. i. p. 312.
4 Quarterly Review, 'The Transition from Mediæval to Modern
Politics': April 1875, p. 543.
Donation of Pepin, A.D. 755, the Popes were virtually temporal princes. The Pope’s pastoral staff gradually swallowed up the sceptres of kings, as Aaron’s verge devoured the other rods. Hildebrand claimed for St. Peter’s successor both the swords of the Apostles—entire secular as well as spiritual power. If the lunar orb rules the night, it is as ‘lesser’ and as borrowing its glory from the solar or pontifical light. Against this claim Dante in the *De Monarchia* argues for the Divine Right of Emperors, being *custodes utriusque tabulae*. Later writers on the Roman side do not deny that civil rulers, in their proper province, ‘Dei vices gerunt.’ As God’s vicars, says à Lapide on Romans xiii., reverence and obedience must be paid them, under pain of everlasting damnation (so he understands κρίμα). But their power is from God ‘mediatè.’

Both in this island and in France the prince’s *jus dividum* had also to be defended against an upstart ecclesiastical domination, lacking all the historic dignity and impressive prescription of St. Peter’s chair. The school of Knox and Buchanan in Scotland, of Travers and Cartwright in England, taught that the civil magistrate is bound to be the executant of the decrees of ‘the ministers of the blessed Evangel of Jesus Christ,’ and that at the bidding of ‘the trew and holy Kirk’ the people may depose and execute judgment upon an idolatrous sovereign, such as Mary Stuart. A republican theocracy strove to set its heel on Monarch and Parliament. Equally at Geneva, under the caliphate of Calvin, all the forces of the State were to be at the disposal of ‘the Discipline.’

Those who upheld the ‘dangerous and divelish’ doctrine that kings excommunicated by Pope or consistory may be deposed and murdered by their subjects may well have seemed the ‘almesmen of Antichrist.’ A deposed king, being ex-rex, had lost his sacrosanct character, and so could

1 St. Gregory the Great complains: ‘Whoever occupies my pastorate is so overwhelmed with business as often to doubt whether he be a bishop or an earthly prince’ (*Epist. lib. i. Ep. 25*). Socrates (vii. 11) speaks of ‘τῆς Ρωμαίων ἐπισκοπῆς πέρα τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐπί δυναστείαν ἢδη πάλιν προ- 

2 In the *Glory of Generositie*, p. 140, Ferne says that the King holds his crown ‘immediately of the Lord of heaven and earth, without any meane segneorie or attendancie of corporall or bodely allegiance to any other worldly potentate.’

3 Luther also had declared: ‘Turpe est et iniquiter servile Christianum hominem, qui liber est, aliis quam celestibus et divinis subjectum esse legibus’ (*De Sacr. Ord.*). Jackson complains: ‘The Anabaptist will not acknowledge that the coercive power of magistracy is any otherwise from God, or ordained by God, than murder, cruelty, and plagues are; none of which can befall men without God’s providence.’
be without sacrilege assassinated—Suarez says, 'by any private man whatsoever.' The Council of Constance, however, condemned extra-judicial regicide. Paræus, the Heidelberg professor, commented on Romans xiii. that a chief magistrate who 'commits an open rape, as it were, upon privilege and property' is to be treated like a highwayman. After 1660 English Puritan and Jesuit put off on one another the now unpopular doctrine of regicide; but their opponents regarded them as twin brethren. 'The Puritans,' says Leslie, 'were mere tools to the Jesuits.' It is fair, however, to endeavour to look at things with their eyes. James I., disputing with canny erudition against Cardinal Perrone, and adducing a thousand Scriptural and patristic reasons for throwing doubt on the right of his disaffected subjects to store gunpowder in the vaults of his palace, 'ungrudgingly acknowledges' that the Churchmen, without consulting the laics, may 'hurl sacred censures against Princes who, breaking the oath by which they have bound themselves, wage war on Jesus Christ.' The deposing power of the Papacy, an institution resting on moral rather than physical force, was but the extreme assertion of the rights of conscience—not conscience of private men, but conscience as directed and put in motion by Holy Church. It is difficult to maintain that subjects may take arms against a high-handed sovereign and not against an heretical one: that they may resist by force the payment of ship-money, but may not take part in a Pilgrimage of Grace to restore the ancient customs of religion to the realm.

In denying then the 'damnable position' which absolved subjects from allegiance to an excommunicated king, royalist writers were a fortiori contesting a general right of rebellion. The majesty and sacredness of the monarch's office, depressed, like the bishop's office, by the later Papacy, but more able than episcopacy to recover itself, was extolled. It was not enough to show that civil authority has a divine sanction. The king is something more than the First Magistrate of a secular State. His crown is the very regality of Jesus Christ. He has been invested in his kingship with awful religious rites. It has been conferred on him, not by popular favour, but by the grace of God. His right is hereditary, according to divine appointment. Monarchy, especially unlimited monarchy, is the most God-like form of polity, and the king is not only God's vicegerent, he is the very Imago Dei. Such is the fuller doctrine of Divine Right. First directed against an overweening

2 Declaratio pro Jure Regio, 1616, p. 59.
clericalism, it is later championed by the clerically-minded, and passive obedience becomes the 'doctrine of the Cross,' asserted against Papal and Puritan innovation by saints, martyrs, confessors, and mystics—by a Ferrar, a Laud, a Ken, and a Law. Originally an assertion of right against a tyrannic claim, it becomes a preaching of Christ-like submission to Christ-given authority. The attitude of the Church of England in the seventeenth century, it is argued in Lux Mundi ('Christianity and Politics,' p. 326) was a fatal error as a matter of policy, for it was the losing side. (Mr. Morley, on the other hand, speaks of the unwisdom of Charles I. in protecting the unpopular and losing cause of the Church.) But further, 'it was contrary to the tradition of the Church.' The Middle Age theologians supplemented St. Paul's teaching [about non-resistance] by showing the possible right of resistance to an unlawful government, or to one that failed to perform its duties. We have already seen that such 'supplemental' teaching was advanced in the interests of the Hildebrandine claims. The only authorities quoted are a defence of tyrannicide by Becket's secretary, and Aquinas's argument for the duty of insurrection 'in certain cases.' Everything from St. Thomas is to be received respectfully; but to suppose that the great Papalist wrote on behalf of the Rights of Man is ludicrous. The Original Compact views of Hooker are also adduced to prove that the great Caroline divines had departed from 'the spirit of Catholic antiquity.' Herin, it is said, Hooker 'anticipated Hobbes and Locke'—who are not usually quoted on the side of Catholic antiquity; and it might have been added that he was anticipated by the special pladders on behalf of papal despotism. Hooker, moreover, goes perilously near to basing the Church on the same foundation.

It is well, however, briefly to sift the true from the exaggerated features of Caroline teaching about kings. That monarchy is of the esse of a State was not held by royalist writers generally, but merely that it is closest to the Divine ideal. Authority in a 'popular estate' is also from God. To the Church, as itself a hierarchical kingdom, a monarchic atmosphere is most congenial, but not essential. Jackson says:

'That this nation should be governed by a king, another by peers and nobles, another by the people, or by magistrates of the people's choosing, either annual or for term of life, this is not determined

1 Aquinas defines Democracy as 'iniquum regimen per multos' (De Regimine Principum).
Since, however, it is frequently in these days assumed that, however much a republic may be for the present undesirable and outside the range of practical politics, the goal of progress must be popular self-government—which, after all, only means the absolute government of forty-nine persons by fifty-one—and that Russia may one day be civilized enough to adopt transatlantic institutions, and substitute the hand-shakings of the White House for the mystic ceremonials of the Kremlin, there is need to interrogate the spirit of Christianity. If popular sovereignty is the highest form of human society, the Throne of David which is to last 'for ever and ever' must some day be an anachronism, an old-world relic, and instead of educating mankind towards the Kingdom of Heaven the Gospel ought to be training them into ripeness for a celestial republic. The angelic 'thrones, dominations, princedoms, powers' and the 'reigning' of the saints in glory round the enthronized Lamb must represent a defective ideal. Under the ancient covenant the Almighty led His people like sheep by the hand of Moses and Aaron. Before the giving of the visible monarchy 'The Lord your God was your King.' Afterwards, 'in the Jewish theocracy the king was emphatically the anointed of God, His vice-gerent upon earth. He was to be the witness for a Divine Government, the pattern of the Divine righteousness, filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding.' The constitution of Man himself is monarchical, and kingship is the order both of Nature and of Grace. Further, there is a moral element in monarchy which is lacking in any isocratic system, viz. personal fealty and allegiance. The secret of the religious life is devotion to a Person, a Prince whose lightest whisper should move us more than all the ranged reasons of the world. It is the obsolescence of this personal dutifulness and loyalty from which have resulted low and shallow views about sin and about misbelief. If sin is merely the transgression of impersonal law, a man will think lightly of offences which do not hurt his

1 Treatise of Christian Obedience, Works, iii. 963.
2 Perowne, on Psalm lii.
3 Rex est in regno sicut anima in corpore, et sicut Deus in mundo (Aquinas, De Reg. Princ. c. 12).
4 'Subordination is by a secret instinct of nature observed by creatures void of reason; by all such creatures as are sociable ... by divers fishes in the sea which go in shoals, by the cranes amongst the fowls of the air, and amongst other domestic creatures, most remarkably by the bees' (Dean Jackson).
neighbour, and Society will easily excuse offences that are not against itself. In the vast universe of things, a breach of abstract law more or less can signify little. And why concern myself greatly about my own or other people's orthodoxy or heterodoxy or even absence of belief? Suppose I do find at life's close that I was mistaken, not much harm is done, and in the illimitable hereafter the error of a few years will be ignored as unimportant. No one could reason thus if the thought of love, fidelity, and duty denied to the King who gave His life as an atonement and ransom for His people had not grown cold. Impersonal law binds no heart. But the Ruler, says a Lapide, is 'lex viva et sancta.' How poor and thin our own national life would be without our 'loyal passion for our temperate kings,' above all for the Lady in whom a thousand claims to reverence close. The golden link which binds our colonies to ourselves is no mere ornamental jewel. To awake such feelings hereditary and ancient right, indeed, is not essential.

'Arthur sat
Crown'd on the dais, and his warriors cried,
"Be thou the King, and we will work thy will
Who love thee." Then the King in low deep tones,
And simple words of great authority,
Bound them by so strait vows to his own self,
That when they rose, knighted, from kneeling, some
Were pale as at the passing of a ghost,
Some flush'd, and others dazed, as one who wakes
Half-blinded at the coming of a light.'

Nevertheless, mere natural leadership, the Divine Right of the

Who is not moved by that account of the German sailors sinking into a watery tomb with cheers for their Emperor? M. Lockroy, the late French Minister of Marine, tells us that men trained in the navy of France, with their personal loyalties and old-fashioned religious ideas, will never make good republicans.

Mr. Ruskin (Val d'Arno, p. 162) says: 'There is perhaps no more curious proof of the disorder which impatient and impertinent Science is introducing into classical thought and language, than the title chosen by the Duke of Argyll for his interesting study of Natural History—"The Reign of Law." Law cannot reign. If a natural law, it admits no disobedience, and has nothing to put right. If a human one, it can compel no obedience, and has no power to prevent wrong. A king only can reign; a person, that is to say, who, conscious of natural law, enforces human law so far as it is just.' But fidelity does not cease when injustice begins. The judges had unanimously decided that allegiance is due to the person of the king, not to his politic capacity, (Coke's Reports, vii. 25, a). The non-jurors held that their oath had been taken to James II. personally. The other view may have been nearer to modern ideas, but it was also more convenient.

The Coming of Arthur.
Carlylean König, does not by itself set forth the religious value of monarchy. The Christian king must be known to represent the Regal office of the Ascended Lord, as the Christian priest represents His Sacerdotal function. Mr. Figgis is somewhat contemptuous of the 'hotch-potch of texts' by which a king-hedging divinity was supported. Yet the truly permanent element in the Divine Right doctrine is the kingly Session of the Virgin's Son. 'Omne dominium creaturae,' writes Aquinas, 'a Deo dependet sicut a primo dominante et primo ente.' As God Almighty, our Saviour has His principium or ἀρχή from the Father. As Man, self-humbled and obedient to Law, the only Potentate who sitteth at the helm of sovereignty, immense and omnipotent, hath exalted Him, and given Him a title of dominion at which every knee shall bow. By Him kings reign, and He is the fountain of all jurisdiction, honour, and magistracy, since all Βασιλεία is committed to Him in heaven and in earth. The majesty of the law is Christ's majesty, and the Queen's most excellent honour and dignity, before which we bare our heads, is a splendour from His crown. In one of Dr. Charles Reade's novels, Hard Cash, he well says of an inexperienced witness in a law-suit, that she entered the court of justice as though it were a church. Canute hung his diadem over the head of the Crucified at Winchester, and Henry II. offered his to Christ upon the altar at Worcester. But the ruler in his royal array does not represent the self-assumption of earthly pomp. 'Not a king merely, this crowned creature in his sworded state,' says Mr. Ruskin, in St. Mark's Rest, 'but the Justice of God in His eternal Law.' Whereas the authority of the bishop's cathedra is pastoral and disciplinary, that of the regal solium is vindicative and majestic. The sceptre of Christ's kingdom is primarily in the Church a guiding and directing wand, in the

1 De Reg. Princ. lib. iii. c. 6.
2 Barrow, Sermon xxxi.
3 The Name of Jesus, not the name JESUS by itself (see Lightfoot in Phil. ii. 10). To speak of 'Paul' and 'John' jars on the ears of Churchmen. But should not a stand be made against the irreverent democratic habit of speaking and writing familiarly the Name 'Jesus,' without His regal title? For He is now ascended, throned and crowned. We fear that bowing at that Name is becoming the mark of an 'old-fashioned high-churchman,' in days of ever-increasing hurry and unceremoniousness.
4 Knyghton, De Event. Angliae, lib. i. c. v.
6 The punitive power of the Church consists in withdrawing supernatural protection. This is the delivery to Satan. Beyond this, as in the writ De contumacie capiendo, it must use the aid of the State.
realm a rod of iron. Four swords are mentioned in the rubric of our Order of Coronation. One, in a scabbard of purple velvet, is delivered to the Archbishop, and after the 'Oblation of the said sword' upon the Altar—

'Then the Archbishop takes the Sword from off the Altar, and (the Archbishops of York and Armagh, and the Bishops of London and Winchester, and other Bishops assisting and going along with him) delivers it into the Queen's Right Hand, and, She holding it, the Archbishop saith:

"RECEIVE this Kingly Sword, brought now from the Altar of God, and delivered to You by the hands of us the Bishops and Servants of God, though Unworthy. [Until William IV.'s Coronation this followed: 'The King standing up, the sword is girt about him by the Lord Great Chamberlain . . . and then, the King sitting down, the Archbishop saith: "Remember Him of whom the royal Psalmist did prophesy, saying, Gird thee with thy sword upon thy thigh, &c."] With this Sword do Justice, stop the Growth of Iniquity, protect the holy Church of God, help and defend Widows and Orphans, restore the things that are gone to decay, maintain the things that are restored, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good Order: that doing these things You may be glorious in all virtue; and so faithfully serve our Lord Jesus Christ in this life that You may reign for ever with Him in the Life which is to come. Amen."

Stanley speaks of the rails of the galleries in the Abbey quivering with the emotion of the spectators. As it has the supernatural order for its sphere, ecclesiastical rule is elevated far above temporal. But in respect of the Father's majesty Christ's regnal office is more awful than His priestly. It is therefore fitting that a king should in his functions be encompassed with a greater ceremonial dignity and more solemn ritual and outward marks of reverence than a prelate. It is kings who are called Elohim in Holy Scripture. Herein doubtless we find the secret of the poetry and passion which even still encircle the kingly idea. The Old Chevalier awakened a devotion which never clave to Sancroft or Ken, and the romantic scapes and heroic endurance of St. Athanasius gave birth to no literature of song and legend like the wanderings of Prince Charlie. For even Popes in captivity or exile hearts have not throbbed with that passionate cry,

'Ô Richard, ô mon roi,  
L'univers t'abandonne.'

1 Wyclif argues that the king reflects the Godhead of Christ, the priest the Manhood (De Officio Regis).
2 Blondel's song in Grétry's opera, Richard Cœur de Lion, first performed in 1785.
Though, then, all lawful authority, however acquired or conferred, is held in lieutenancy of Jesus Christ, a higher and more mystical doctrine of kingship marks the transition in England from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century. For one thing, it was impossible for Henry or Elizabeth to insist on a God-given pure hereditary title. For another, the Reformation had brushed away the romance of Authority. The king in controversy is usually called 'the magistrate.' The theory of Society as based, not on a supernatural provision, but on human compact was commonly accepted. The royal power, however absolute, was, as a matter of fact, broad-based upon the people's will, and the Tudor monarchs were like good riders managing a proud but willing horse. Hooker, who has been styled 'the first Whig'—though Doctor Johnson put the origin of Whiggery much further back—speaks of 'power which the whole body of the realm being naturally possessed with, hath by free and deliberate assent derived unto him that ruleth over them.' In the Catholic revival under the Stuarts, though less extravagant and servile language is used of and to monarchs, and the royal supremacy over the Church is held within due limits, the office of the king as the Lord's Anointed is magnified, and it is positively denied that the people are the source of government. This was by way of opposition to the theories of Puritans and 'jesuited-Romans,' who ploughed with the same heifer.

The Jesuit Doleman's Conference about the Next Succession not only served the Puritans in 1647, but was reprinted in 1680 by those who wished to shut out a Popish prince from the throne. Romanist writers, however, carefully excluded the Congregationalist logic, that the Church also rests on a basis of popular rights. Compact, indeed, is consistent with absolutism, as may be seen from the case of an enlisted army. The despotic system of Hobbes rested on original consent. Nor is contract necessarily revocable, for consensus facit nuptias and the husband's headship. But regarded as an historical account of the beginning of all government the Original Compact is ridiculous. It might be argued with

1 James I. said: 'I never did nor will presume to create any Articles of Faith, or to be judge thereof, but to submit my exemplary obedience unto [the spirituality] in as great humility as the meanest of the land' (Apol. for Oath of Obedience, p. 269).
2 Per contra, the hopes of a Romanist dynasty depended now on the support of Anglican believers in Divine Right.
3 'If all Commanding and Obeying had been an Humane artifice or convention, then was there a time when Men lived out of Society and in a parity or equal condition. But ... there never was any man born
more reason that a pact is implied in the coronation oath, and that the coronation rites preserve traces of popular and military choice. ¹ "Levare in regem," 'ἐπαλάφεως," and 'sublimare' were expressions derived from the elevation of a new leader upon a shield. Similarly the corona, or στέφανος, as distinct from the Oriental diadema which Julius Cæsar put from him, was once the wreath or fillet set by the soldiery on the emperor of their choice. ² The Recognition, again, writes Taylor (Glory of Regality), was 'a ceremony in the earliest times of national election in the fullest sense that is compatible with descent in a single family.' The Oath has been diversely regarded as a compact between king and people, and between king and Church. It was the Church that exacted the promise, and it may be questioned whether his or her engagement leaves the Sovereign free to consent, against the protest of the Spiritual Estate, to any parliamentary deposition of the Catholic Church of England from its constitutional position, or forcible confiscation of its consecrated patrimony, or to any laws injurious to the discipline and independence of the Church.

Grosseteste, when Henry III. asked what is the special grace of regal Unction, replied, 'with some hesitation,' that it is the sign of the king's special reception of the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit, 'as in Confirmation.' ³ Vows, after all, despite the common belief, are not Confirmation. Royalist writers inclined to minimize both Oath and Anointing. A king, James I. argued, is what he is the instant his predecessor dies (Declaratio pro Jure Regio, p. 79). A Theebaw or other 'King of naked Affrick' was 'as much a King as the Emperor with his three crowns' (Majestas Intemerata, p. 120). The coronation rites were deemed to add religious sanctity to an office already assumed, much as the Church's benediction on marriage is not essential to it, but hallows what else might lack a blessing. 'Consecrare in regem' ('hallowing to king'), therefore, or 'ungere in regem' need not imply that the king was no king till that moment. Moreover, a man uncanonically but was born in subjection . . . To command and to obey is natural . . .

It is the silliest thing in the world to dream of a Golden Age in which men lived in a promiscuous herd or rout' (Roger Coke, Elements of Power and Subjection).

¹ See Stanley, Memorials of Westminster Abbey, p. 110.
² Consult the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, art. 'Coronation.'
³ The Abbot of Westminster used to prepare the king for the Coronation as for a Confirmation, warning him to shrive and cleanse his conscience against the holy Anointing (Glory of Regality, p. 134). Our Coronation Service distinctly specifies the Sevenfold Gift as the grace accompanying unction.
consecrated to be bishop is a bishop, though lacking jurisdiction. But it cannot be supposed that every regal anointing, by whatsoever bishop performed, impresses on every recipient an indelible character of kingship. And Jacobites did not regard 'the King over the water' as any the less entitled to allegiance because he was unanealed. Yet a rigid legitimist theory is not logically defensible. The hereditary principle may mirror the continuity of the Divine government. How morally impressive are the long centuries from Egbert to Victoria, compared with the French governments, changed from season to season as a vesture.¹ The king never dies. Few events of recent years have appealed to the imagination more than the showing of the new-born King of Spain to his subjects. But absolutely indefeasible birthright is impossible. The Apostolical College traces itself historically back by unbroken succession to our Lord and the Twelve. Where does the heraldry of Stuart or Nassau begin? 'If Adam himself,' says Sir R. Filmer, 'were still living and now ready to die, it is certain there is one man, and but one in the world, who is next heir, although the knowledge who should be that one man be quite lost.'² In that case no existing dynasty reigns de jure.³ For what proof could there have been? Milton desired that the Long should be the Eternal Parliament. 'I affirm that the grand or general Council, being well chosen, should be perpetual' (Free Commonwealth). ² Patriarcha, c. i. § 9. ³ In England, within the limits of the blood-royal, a certain right of choice, in less settled ages, was exercised by the Witan or Council of the Nation. Thus John succeeded in despite of primogeniture. Edward I., however, was the last king elected by the barons. The need of a fixed principle of succession was felt, and this was influenced by the law of feudal inheritance; for the king had become the supreme landowner, and was no longer Rex Anglorum but Rex Anglia. The territorial phrase, even in our own day, has marked the distinction between one who claims to reign through 'Dieu et son droit,' or at least by territorial conquest, and one who frankly derives his title from below. Napoleon III. was 'Emperor of the French,' but Victor Emmanuel refused the title of 'King of the Italians.' The mystical doctrine that 'only God can make an heir' was already in vogue among lawyers in the thirteenth century. Certainly there never was a time when primogeniture was not considered to carry a certain claim. By the time of Richard II. it was a rule firmly established as 'the law of God.' The Lancastrians themselves did homage to the principle of legitimism, which finally overthrew their Red Rose. Even Henry Tudor could not dispense with it. In the next reign absolutism triumphed over legitimism, and Henry VIII. obtained power to designate the order of his successors. Yet that order, if we can suppose Mary and Elizabeth both to be legitimate, followed the natural rule. Under the shadow of the Scots Queen's heirship apparent, Elizabethan writers inclined to deny an indefeasible right of succession. At Elizabeth's decease, however, her rival's Anglican son ascended the
be that Charles II., *e.g.*, was, in Britain, Adam's legal representative? Filmer is obliged to fall back on prescriptive right (which Hooker ignores) and the *jus primi occupantis*. Roger Coke affirms, 'Dormit aliquando, numquam moritur, jus.' But it must be, he adds, *jus apparent*. All that the legitimist can say is that primogenitary succession is the most natural and beneficial, or at most (with Bilson) that it 'has the manifest subscription of God Himself.' Yet Macaulay's attempt¹ to convict the High Church writers out of the Scriptures to which they appealed is unsound. For *exceptio probat regulam*. The elder serving the younger, and the younger preferred to the elder, is in every case presented as a striking departure from a normal rule. Nor can we forget the mystery of 'the church of the first-born,' 'Israel My firstborn,' and the 'First-Born among many brethren.'

Filmer's *Patriarcha*, however, written before 1647, but first published in 1680, at the time of the Exclusion controversy, marks, Mr. Figgis observes, the shifting of political theory from the ground of pure theology to that of the natural constitution of things. Dominion, as 'the arch-philosopher' showed in the *Politics*, is κατὰ φύσιν. Locke, taught by Suarez, pulled much of Filmer's Scriptural argument about his ears. Adam's lordship was bestowed on him, not at his creation, but after the Fall. It was economical, not political. The charter was not personal to Adam or to Noah, but granted to mankind. It was a dominion over beasts, not over men, unless we are to suppose that princes may eat their subjects. Are we to suppose Adam to have been at once monarch and day-labourer? If even a usurper exercises a right derived from Adam, obedience will thus be due to 'a Cade or a Cromwell'—a *reductio ad absurdum*, in Locke's mouth, which indicates into what universal discredit the doctrine of obedience to all *de facto* rulers had fallen since the Commonwealth, though the clergy in 1603 irritated James I. by affirming it. But, as an account of the rise and throne as the unchallenged heir. Henceforth, hereditary right was so secure that the 1640 Canons do not trouble to assert it. Even Cromwell's power descended on the 'timiduse prince' Richard. The words introduced by James II. into the Thirtieth of January Service—'Their device is only how to put him out whom God will exalt'—are a reminiscence of the Exclusion Bill. But the Revolution had finally to base itself on the legal fiction of James II.'s abdication, and the vulgar fiction of a supposititious Prince of Wales. The Act of Settlement undoubtedly made a clear breach in the doctrine of primogenitary right. Yet, granting the exclusion of Papists, at Anne's death the Brunswick prince was the nearest legitimate heir.

foundation of the State, the patriarchal theory is obviously superior to the rival theory of the *Contrat Social* and State of Nature. In the Family, whether domestic or tribal, is undoubtedly to be sought the origin of monarchy and the implied basis of Society. That the worst kings are God's λειτουργοί, even as the angels are 'liturgic spirits,' was no new doctrine of the Gospel. Locke finds himself obliged to argue that the *patris potestas* rests on the children's consent! It is to be observed that both doctrines, Rights of Man and Divine Right of Kings, assume the idea of Natural Rights. They made way for the modern utilitarian theory—'Whate'er is best administered is best.'

The Divine sway is paternal rather than despotic, and, as resting upon self-imposed laws, is constitutional rather than arbitrary. Arbitrary despotism was no part of legitimist theory. *A Deo rex, a rege lex*; but caprice and self-seeking the only Ruler of princes will punish. The non-resistance writer, Roger Coke, says in *Elements of Power and Subjection*:

'It were a fine may-game to be a king if kings might make their Will the rule of their actions. . . . No question but a king commits a more grievous sin doing any unjust thing to any of his Subjects than if another had done it, in regard of the relations which are between them; as a Father's doing an unjust thing to his Child is a greater sin than if another had done it. . . . God hath forbidden kings to make laws derogatory to his Divine Majesty.'

Only in the 'pestiferous' *Leviathan* was it taught that men should change their faith at the bidding of the magistrate. What royalist writers maintained was that there must be some person or body in the State that is solitus legibus positivis. Οἵκ αὐγάθεν πολυκομανίν. In Roger Coke's words:

'Though government do differ in specie, viz. Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, yet in all of them this power or command is the same and equal, viz. Supreme; and this power or command must be in one thing, viz. in one man, in one court, in one people; but, if it be divided into two or more, it is either superfetaneous or destructive; for those two in whom this divided Empire does consist must either agree or disagree in the same thing. . . . A kingdom divided against itself cannot stand.'

This contention, Mr. Figgis considers, 'has stamped upon the English mind the conception of sovereignty, and thereby rendered a service which can hardly be overestimated by all who value clearness of political vision.' The lawgiver, be he Prince or Parliament, cannot be legally controlled. Who will put a hook in the nose of Leviathan? The Social Compact writers vainly imagined a system of checks and balances,
harping on the idea that a legislature ‘cannot’ infringe rights of liberty and property. In the Whig constitution of the United States the ‘omnipotence of Parliament’ is still limited by the fundamental laws of the Union. But in our own land the eighteenth century ‘glorious Constitution’ idea is really defunct. It has for half a century been a record of constant friction. In order to oust the Upper House from its share in government, democratic statesmen have latterly magnified and employed the enormous prerogatives of the Crown. Yet sovereignty will not remain with any representative Chamber. We gravitate towards a practical supremacy of Privy Council experts guiding and guided by the newspapers. At the same time the political influence of a wise, experienced, and revered Sovereign is very great. The Crown is a force known to be in reserve. Our see-saw party system would have been often intolerable had it not been felt that in the last resort the Queen would guard the honour and welfare of her realm. The social influence of monarchy is still more valuable, for the Crown alone can withstand the vulgarizing plutocratic forces to which even a proud aristocracy is doing homage.

From the Constitutions of Clarendon to the Submission of the Clergy we watch a long struggle on the part of the Kings to make themselves sovereign in their own realm, claiming to be there what the Emperor had been in the world, a paramount basileus. The unity of authority in himself was next asserted by the prince against the great but artificial political institution called Parliament, an uncontinuous representation, in three estates, of a small minority of the male population. He is bound, the ‘King’s men’ said, by God’s word and by the customary or common law of Church and Realm, and will ordinarily guide himself by the laws he or his predecessors have granted. But, says Hammond (on Romans xiii.) the King is τὰνεῖδων, unaccountable

---

1 For example, the abolition of Army Purchase, being defeated in the Lords, was immediately effected, on Mr. Gladstone’s advice, by Royal Warrant. In Ireland Mr. Morley attempted a kind of James II. dispensing power. The Liberals complained that the cession of Heligoland was effected by Act rather than by the Royal Prerogative. The Queen indeed, the fountain of honour and mercy, the executrix of law, might legally cede Kent to France and India to Russia, might create every labourer a duke, and make every village school a degree-bestowing university, might open every prison door and abolish the army and navy. At the same time the ancient constitutional and financial checks on the Crown are nearly obsolete, and insurrection, while the executive has drilled men and guns, impossible.
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to any man or men on earth.' 'Tibi soli peccavi' was often quoted. Even Burnet shudders at the memory of the arraignment and condemnation of 'the Lord's Anointed' by his subjects, as an unexampled 'villany,' 'an omen, perhaps, that the end of the world is near.' Yet royalists denounced the ἀνέκτησεν φαῦλα of tyranny. It is to be observed that all alike, the defenders of the Divine Right of popes, of kings, or of the people, regarded authority, being potestas delegata a Deo, as inalienable. Rights are anterior to the State. But the formation of the State was to the High Churchman an organic process, to the Whig an artificial human arrangement, necessary but regrettable. It is also to be observed that all alike upheld the doctrine of passive obedience to authority. The question in debate was with whom authority resides. Tyndall who was strangled, Latimer who was burnt, and Jewel who was exiled, for religion's sake, forbade all rebellion. Wyclif in allowing rebellion on behalf of God's law was felt to have made a surrender to the Papalists of the whole case. Yet Papalists, like the Whigs, confined the right of resistance to the 'inferior magistrate.' For individuals 'prayers and tears' were the only weapons. The Powers may coerce a Sultan, but may Armenians throw bombs? The question, indeed, de vera obedientia must remain one of Christian casuistry—Under what circumstances may a parent be (1) disobeyed, (2) forcibly resisted? Punitive violence by a son is clearly disallowed. The Venetian republic may have had a gallows for their doge. But the public doing to death by Englishmen of their consecrated Sovereign in front of his own palace long stupefied men with horror, and woke in the national conscience a deep echo to the Church's prayer, that 'the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood may not be visited on us or on our children.'

The Sacring of the English Kings by Dr. Wickham Legg, who has done so much to substitute scientific for fancy ritualism, is a valuable supplement to Maskell's dissertation on the Coronation rites. It is illustrated with collotypes of the chief robes and ornamenta with which the Sovereign is successively vested. Napoleon said that a throne is only

1 They endorsed Aquinas's saying, 'Regnum non est propter regem, sed rex propter regnum.' The tyrant, they said, is Sword-taker, not Sword-bearer, and governs for himself; so no vicar of God, for God rules us 'propter salutem nostram.' Answering to tyranny is capricious and class legislation in a Parliament, whereas law should be 'the breath of God.'

2 Barrow, Sermon x., 'On the King's Happy Return.'
boards covered with velvet. Yet Cromwell had himself installed in St. Edward's Chair. Milton casts an acrid scoff at 'piebald frippery,' and 'gewgaws fetch't from Aaron's old wardrobe.' Here, however, is no theatrica pompa, but an earthly representation of 'the throne and equipage of God's almightiness.' The Whigs of the Reform era made a great mistake in huddling up crown and sceptre in brown holland and green baize. Of all the ritual of national life, the Coronation is the most full of elevating teaching. The form of Service ought surely to be bound up with the Prayer Book, and known to all Englishmen. The ceremonies of coronation, inthronization, investiture per annulum et baculum, the delivery of the Bible, of the rod, of the orb or mound 'set under the Cross,' and other impressive rites, not all in themselves necessarily Christian but to each of which Christianity added a high spiritual significance, follow and depend upon the Anointing, for which is used, in the case of the Kings of England and France, not the oleum infirmorum or oleum catechumenorum, but the more sacred chrism or balm which Shakespeare says not all the water in the rough, rude sea can wash away. This sacrosancta unctio St. Augustine says was of old peculiar to God's covenant people, and is called by him a sacrament. St. Gregory the Great speaks of it as conveying sacramental grace, even as Saul received 'another heart.' The term Christus Domini, indeed, was held by divines to be applicable to all kings, whether anointed or not, and it is actually applied in the Old Testament, not only to 'godly princes,' but to 'Cyrus Jehovah's anointed.' Yet Stanley himself says that the act has 'a more than ceremonial significance.' A rich pall of silk or cloth of gold being held over the Queen by four Knights of the Garter—

The Dean of Westminster taking the Ampulla and Spoon from off the Altar holdeth them ready, pouring some of the Holy Oil into the Spoon, and with it the Archbishop anointeth the Queen in the Form of

1 Of Reformation in England, bk. i.
2 A well printed sixpenny edition was published some while since by Mr. Pickering.
3 King Ina is the first Christian ruler known certainly to have been anointed. From England the rite seems to have spread eastwards. See Goar, Eucholog. p. 928. Pippin, first of Frankish Kings, was anointed at Soissons, A.D. 752, 'imitatus Judæorum reges' (Chiffletius, p. 30).
4 Richard the Second, act iii. sc. 2. Mystical doctrines of kingship reached their height under Richard II.
5 Enarrat. in Ps. xliiv. 19. Contra Lit. Petil. lib. ii. c. 112.
6 Expos. 1 Reg. c. x.
7 Memorials of Westminster Abbey, p. 43 n.
a Cross, On the Crown of the Head, and on the Palms of both Hands, saying,

“BE THOU anointed with Holy Oil as Kings, Priests, and Prophets were anointed. And as Solomon was anointed King by Zadok the Priest and Nathan the Prophet, so be You anointed, blessed, and consecrated Queen over this People whom the Lord God hath given You to rule and govern, in the Name, &c. . . . Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who by his Father was anointed with the Oil of gladness above his fellows, by his Holy Anointing pour down upon your Head and Heart the Blessing of the Holy Ghost,” &c.

After which there are placed upon the Sovereign the *colobium sindonis* or alb, the silk tunicle or dalmatic, the stole or armil, and the *pallium regale*, identified by Dr. Legg and French ritualists with a chasuble. In the Moscow Coronation the only vestment put on by the Czar seems to have been this imperial mantle, thrown over an ordinary uniform. Our Henry VI., however, is described as vested 'lyke as a bysshop shuld say masse.' In 1838 the Queen offered the Bread and Wine at the offertory, the stole being worn deacon-wise. The style 'Dei Gratia' is not used, Selden says, by any laic. In the Latin Church the King receives in both kinds, and in the Eastern is admitted within the sanctuary. The 'cream' was deemed of old to convey certain miraculous powers, but no reigning prince has 'touched for the Evil since Anne. The expression quoted by Lyndwode that the King is 'persona mixta cum sacerdote'—rex idemque sacerdos—has been traced through the law books by Mr. G. A. Macirone, and also the 'reges sacro oleo uncti sunt spiritualis jurisdictionis capaces' cited by Coke. At the same time the canonists carefully distinguish regal from sacerdotal consecration, as is done in Article XXXVII. The subject of the Royal Supremacy and the relation of the Anointed King to the Church is too great for the limits of this article. Nursing-fatherhood has been attended with some grave abuses, and is now parliamentary rather than royal. But it is essentially, let us note, the claim, not of a secular power, but of a consecrated *Fidei Defensor.*

---

4 Ina uses it in his laws, A.D. 700.
5 *Titles of Honour,* p. 92. He quotes a fourteenth century writer, Petrus de Boateriis (*Rosula Novella*).
6 Lib. iii. tit. 2.
7 In some notes with which he has privately favoured us.
8 See Raynaldus, tom. i. ad an. 1204.
Are these topics of interest to the ritualist and antiquary only? The paradox of love and loyalty investing the person of an Official whose function is to enforce obedience and exact revenue forbids us to think so. The enthusiastic acclaim of the multitude in the street, the reverential and august language of law and formula, the ceremonious etiquette of the Court, declare the instinct of mankind that Government is not a mere human arrangement for police and tax collecting, but a reflexion of the Divine. Such a thought is of great practical value in inducing men to surrender the wilfulness of faction to the common good. It puts law-abidingness on a religious footing, it draws together a Nation by family ties—witness the adoption of general mourning after the death of a member of the royal House—and it gives scope for some of the most purifying of the virtues.

ART. II.—TWO ROMAN CONTROVERSIALISTS.


It would seem that a certain essay on The Roman See in the Early Church, which had substantially appeared in the pages of this Review, has not a little 'fluttered' those 'Romans' whom we, to our regret, are obliged to regard as 'Volscians.' Here, in a single number of the Dublin Review, out of two hundred and thirty-nine pages, about thirty-four are devoted to the task of writing down the author of that essay. Mr. Rivington1 himself, as our readers know from our October number, and may have seen previously in the Guardian, had criticised its criticism on his own book in the Dublin for July, and Fr. Sydney Smith had done the like in the Month; Dr. Bright rejoined in the Guardian of September 9 and 16. Both his antagonists wrote again in the number for September 23; he commented on their letters on September 30; the correspondence was then closed by exigencies of space, in view of the Church Congress. Mr. Rivington announced that he would fully reply in the Month;

1 We mean no discourtesy by adhering, in this case, to the usual Anglican practice of restricting the prefix 'Father' to members of religious orders or communities. If Anglo-Romans, borrowing an Irish usage, have extended it to secular clergy, that is no rule for us.
but this, as the editor of that periodical explained in November, was unavoidably postponed until the appearance of the Dublin Review for January. We have now before us, in the second part of its article on 'The Situation,' Mr. Rivington's promised reply to Dr. Bright, and we will take his points in order.  

He opens fire with a paragraph in which 'the allowance, on the part of Anglican bishops, of contradictory teaching to the flock committed to their care,' and 'the consent to call oneself ecclesiastically one with others who use the same formularies, but with an avowedly different meaning,' are represented as offences against 'truth.' Now we might refer to the existence of ambiguous language, intended to keep questions open, in the Tridentine documents themselves; but we would not seem to evade the point of the remark, which, of course, is this—that the Anglican status quo allows clergy-men of 'High,' 'Low,' and 'Broad' schools to teach on equal terms, and thus produces 'an uncertain sound' on points of great importance. An adherent of the first of these schools will freely admit that each of the two others is rightly zealous for principles of great value, although he will think that in each case they are misapplied; he is persuaded that to multiply dogmas in order to suppress opinion is injurious to the health of Church life, and from his own point of view he considers that a practical liberty to ignore, or even to deny, what he holds to be true is a less evil than a formal obligation to affirm what he holds to be false, and to do so on the ground of an authority which he holds to be illegitimate. 'Granting,' he will say, 'all that can fairly be urged as to the laxities of our working system, or of the anomalies of our present State connexion, that is no sort of reason for burdening the conscience with Vaticanist Papalism or with the Marian cultus, with the huge mass of beliefs and practices imposed by a living magisterium, with a casuistry which has proved ruinous to Christian veracity, with an ultra-authoritative absolutism which has estranged so many from Christian faith. It is necessary to use plainness of speech. We are by no means

1 It is a pleasure to agree with the Dublin Review, when we can, on a question of doctrine. Dr. Gildea, in this number, describes the so-called 'Kenotic' theory as 'Monophysitism turned upside down,' as if, in our Lord's state of earthly humiliation, the manhood had, as it were, 'prevailed over' the Godhead, and caused a temporary but entire surrender of at least some Divine attributes. He 'trusts that' this theory 'will gain but little acceptance in the Anglican community.' This Review, we may inform him, has all along protested against it, as injurious to the true idea not only of our Lord's Divine Person, but also of the Being of God, for 'God's attributes are He.'
blind to the nobler aspects of the Roman Church's life and work; but while she is all that she is, and imposes the terms of communion which she does impose, we must needs be frankly anti-Roman.

But, coming to closer quarters, we find Mr. Rivington explaining that the theologians whom he follows do not base their distinction between St. Peter's relation to 'the keys' as alone 'possessing' them, and that of the other Apostles as having the 'exercise' of them, either on John xx. 21-23 or on John xxi. 15-17. They rest, it appears, altogether on Matthew xvi. 19 compared with Matthew xviii. 18. Be it so. First, then, as to the sacred words, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

Before discussing them, he assumes that the preceding words, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church,' apply to St. Peter himself, but, we must suppose, on St. Peter as including the line of Roman bishops to whom, on the Roman hypothesis, he transmitted his 'Vicarial' jurisdiction. 'Our Lord promised to Peter three things: first, that he should be the foundation on which He would build His Church; secondly, that he should have the keys of the kingdom given to him; thirdly, that whatever he should bind on earth should be bound in heaven.' Of course we must supply 'and loose,' &c.

Now Mr. Rivington had solemnly pledged himself, when he first submitted to the Roman Church and signed the Tridentine 'Professio Fidei,' in the following words: 'Nec eam [S. Scripturam] unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor.'

This, at any rate, must mean that where there is such a 'consensus,' a Roman Catholic is not to depart from it in his interpretation of Scripture. And surely it is at once notorious and significant that there is nothing like a 'unanimis con-

1 Particularly St. Francis de Sales. But what is the value of that saintly Bishop's opinion on a question of New Testament exegesis? Mr. Rivington also refers to Bossuet; being willing, for once, to claim support from a great Gallican. Leo I. and Gregory I. are, as Popes, witnesses for themselves; and Optatus's dictum (admitting it to be his), that Peter 'claves communicandas ceteris solus accepit,' does not say that, in using the keys, the Apostles were subject to Peter, and is followed by the assertion that after his denials they might have withdrawn from all fellowship with him. Optatus was certainly not St. Augustine's 'master'—as Mr. Rivington suggests—in the interpretation of the text in question.

2 The absence of this saying to St. Peter from the second and third Gospels proves nothing against its place in the first; and although Irenæus (iii. 18, 4) quotes Matt. xvi. 17 simply, his argument does not require him to add vv. 18, 19.
Two Roman Controversialists.

sensus Patrum’ for the interpretation (absolutely vital to the Roman claim) that ‘this rock’ means Peter himself, and with him his alleged successors, Bishops of Rome. On so plain and familiar a fact we need not spend many more words. St. Augustine, after some changes of opinion, rested in the conclusion that the ‘rock’ meant our Lord Himself.1 This, for our part, we cannot accept; it is altogether too forced an interpretation. Nor, on the other hand, do we think that the ‘rock’ is abstractedly the confession that Jesus is ‘the Christ, the Son of the living God;’2 nor, again, that it is Peter’s person simply. It is quite true, as the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford remarked in a recent University sermon on the Papal bull against our Orders, that in Scripture the image of a ‘rock’ has a personal reference. But that there is also a reference in this passage to the words just before uttered by St. Peter, is surely indisputable. The reason given for the special blessedness of Simon Barjona, ‘for flesh and blood hath not revealed it [i.e. this truth] unto thee.’ has a significance which illustrates the next words, ‘And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock’ (πέτρα), &c. And, as has often been remarked, the Roman Church herself admits a reference to the confession; in fact, a more stringent inference might be drawn from her collect for the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul: ‘Præsta . . . ut nullis nos permittas perturbationibus concuti, quos in Apostolice confessionis petra solidasti.’3

Let us see what interpretations must be excluded as unsatisfactory. ‘This rock’ cannot mean Christ Himself; as we have said, that sense is non-natural. It cannot mean the confession of true faith in the abstract. It cannot mean Peter simply as an individual apart from that confession, for there is a clear distinction between ‘thee’ who ‘art Petros,’ and ‘this petra.’ We must combine the following elements: the ‘rock,’ which was both then in existence and capable of permanence, must be something permanent, so that the Church

1 Retract. i. 21.
2 We do not suppose that this confession included a full belief in the august and awful truth; and it is remarkable that the complete recognition of it was made not by St. Peter, but by the one Apostle who had ‘been doubtful’ longer than the rest as to the fact of his Lord’s resurrection (John xx. 28). Cf. Dale, Christian Doctrine, p. 82 ff.: ‘Peter’s words are a sufficient expression of our own faith in our Lord’s true divinity. But Peter’s confession could not have meant for him all that it means for us. . . . The discovery came at last . . . “My Lord and my God.” This was a far greater confession than Peter’s.’
3 It is in the ‘Gregorian’ Sacramentary, which was specially, Duchesne says, ‘the Pope’s book.’
could stand on it from age to age, as a house on a solid foundation; it must, at the same time, be in close relation to St. Peter; and it must also be in relation to the faith which he had just avowed.\(^1\) These elements meet in the interpretation which identifies the 'rock' with a certain type of character, of which St. Peter was, for the moment, a signal representative.\(^2\) We must, unhappily, say 'for the moment;' for immediately after the scene at Caesarea Philippi, Peter so far lost his firmness of trust as to incur the tremendous rebuke in Matthew xvi. 23, and this failure was afterwards exceeded by the grievous threefold denial. But in that scene he had been worthy of his position among the twelve, as 'the first,' and the accustomed spokesman. Our Lord had asked the twelve, 'But ye—whom say ye that I am?' and it was 'Simon Peter' who 'answered.' Did he answer simply for himself?\(^3\) The question really comes to this: Did they mentally disavow him? Did the feeling pass through their minds, 'This is more than we can assimilate and echo'? To answer such a question affirmatively would be an irreverence to the 'glorious chorus' which we are sure that all good Roman Catholics would reject with horror.\(^4\) It follows, then, that St. Peter gave voice and distinct expression to what was, in a less formed state, the belief of them all. This was exactly to fulfil the function which we ascribe to him, to justify the precedency which we not only admit but affirm that he enjoyed. It was to act as \textit{primus inter pares}.\(^5\) And this was doubtless in the mind of Him to whom the hearts of

\(^1\) Cf. Theodoret, \textit{Ep. 77}, that 'our Master Christ, after fixing the confession of the first of the Apostles as a kind of basis or foundation of the Church, permitted him to be shaken and to deny Him, and then again raised him up.' Theodoret is following St. Chrysostom, \textit{In Matt. Hom. 54, 2}, 'on this rock, that is, the faith of [his] confession.'

\(^2\) See Gore, \textit{The Ministry}, p. 223 sqq. ed. 1; Edersheim, \textit{Life and Times of Jesus}, ii. 83.

\(^3\) 'Respondit pro cæteris apostolis, immo præ cæteris;' Ambrose, \textit{De Incarn. Sacram. s. 33}. Chrysostom calls him on this occasion \textit{τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων}.

\(^4\) They had already acknowledged our Lord as 'truly Son of God, Matt. xiv. 33; and Peter had said after the discourse on Capernaum, 'We believe and know' (\textit{i.e.} have made up our minds) 'that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' (or 'art the Holy One of God'), John vi. 69.

\(^5\) We should have no difficulty at all in employing the term 'primacy,' if it were not so persistently turned by an argumentative sleight of hand into an equivalent for 'supremacy.' In \textit{The Tempest}, i. 2, the dukedom of Milan is spoken of as having been at a particular time 'Through all the signiories [of Northern Italy] the first, And Prospero the \textit{prime} duke, being so reputed in dignity;' but no sort of supremacy over other princes is even implicitly ascribed to him.
the Apostles were open, when He, in return, addressed their 'coryphaeus' in the words, 'Thou art Peter.' In what He proceeded to say, He treated Peter as their genuine representative. The character exemplified in Peter was, probably in varying degrees, theirs also. They would have said, and He knew it, 'What Simon has said, we say also.' In so far, then, as they had this steadfastness of faith, they were competent to be constituent parts of the human foundation on which the Church was to arise; and we understand in this connexion the emphatic words of St. Paul in Ephesians ii. 20, and of St. John—for whom, as for the others, Peter had spoken—in Rev. xxi. 14. And this character was to be permanent in the Church at large, and to be especially required in the ministers who, in their several degrees, were to succeed to any part of the Apostolical pastorship. So much, then, as to the first words of our Lord's address.

1 In effect, the question of the import of Christ's words to St. Peter is the question of the character in which he had just spoken to Christ. Either he had spoken for himself only, or for himself and his brother-Apostles. On the former view, they had fallen below the level on which they had stood when Christ asked them, 'Have ye also a mind to go away?' They had not been mentally or morally united with Peter in his affirmation, 'Thou art the Christ,' &c. (Matt. xvi. 16). In no degree, therefore, did they possess the quality referred to as a necessary foundation for the Church; and, consistently, they must be regarded as having no part in the promise to Peter about the keys. This theory is necessary for the Roman contention: apart from it there is no ground for asserting that to Peter, in this context, is promised an exclusive prerogative, a supreme 'vicarial' position differing in kind from that which was to belong to the Apostles as a body. But the difficulties attaching to the theory speak for themselves. No difficulty attaches to the view which both the context and other passages suggest—that Peter, as in other cases, acted as spokesman, and could do so appropriately through the peculiar ardour and expressiveness of his faith, of which our Lord took cognizance when He addressed him as, pro tanto, the typical Apostle.

2 We assure any Roman Catholics who may cast an eye over these pages that we, at any rate, have no inclination whatever to grudge a full recognition of the eminence—in that sense, of the 'primacy'—which is clearly assigned to St. Peter in the Gospels, and in the first half, at least, of the Acts; to detract in the slightest degree from the moral glory which, in spite of two sad incidents, invests his character; or to underrated the preciousness of his recorded Apostolical teaching. Anglicans, who do not believe him to have been in any sense a Pope, can still visit, with deep reverential interest, that shrine under the high altar of his great basilica, where it is at least not unreasonable to think that Caius's statement is still verified—that 'in the Vatican can be found the trophy' of Peter. We say with Bishop Moberly, 'We should be most unfortunate if we were led to conceive any thought disparaging to the great Apostle of the circumcision, the Apostle whom the Lord delighted to honour, and whom the early Church ever designated by every title of affectionate and reverential respect. . . . Throughout his Master's ministry he was the first in speech, the first in act, the first in zeal,' &c. Sayings of the Great
of them had to be stated in order that we might duly consider Mr. Rivington's interpretation of the promise of the keys. For this we must combine what he now says with what he said in the Guardian of September 23 (p. 1458). In both passages he brings out his view to this effect: Peter was to be the chief steward, or 'prefect,' of the Lord's household; he was to hold the keys exclusively; the other Apostles were to be stewards under him, and to 'use' or 'exercise' a certain authority as his subordinates. But Mr. Rivington disclaims, as an 'absurd' inference of Dr. Bright's, the notion that Peter was to 'lend' them the keys, and that they were to 'return' them to him. To us it seems that, absurd or not, this is exactly what Mr. Rivington's view requires. By hypothesis, Peter alone had, or 'possessed,' the keys. By hypothesis, the other Apostles, as being inferior 'stewards,' wanted the 'use' of them from time to time. How were they to get at them but by borrowing them from their chief? And how was he to retain 'possession' of them except by their returning them when the occasion for use was past? Presumably St. Paul had in this way acquired the temporary 'exercise' of the keys when he wrote to the Corinthians, 'If I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ' (2 Cor. ii. 10, R.V.). We are quite serious; this relation between St. Peter and the other Apostles is literally required by Mr. Rivington's theory—or, if that phrase offends him (as it seems to do), by the theory which he adopts and advocates. But the real point at issue is, whether this distinction between St. Peter as head-steward, and the other Apostles as under-stewards, is borne out by the two passages in St. Matthew. If our Lord intended this, it is unaccountable that He did not say so in the second of those passages, when He addressed the Apostles as a body. Now was the time, one would have

Forty Days, p. 190. The whole passage is a locus aureus; and it contains one sentence which we are specially glad to make our own: 'He was blessed by being the one Apostle chosen to represent the whole college of the Apostles in receiving the signal promise of the building of the Church and the keys of the kingdom.'

St. Jerome, in the very place where he says that Peter was made a 'caput' to the other Apostles, says that if the Church was founded on Peter, 'the same is asserted in another place as to all the Apostles; et cuncti claves regni colorum accipiant, et ex aequo super eos ecclesiae fortitudo solidetur.' Adv. Jovin. i. 26. Mr. Rivington seems not to appreciate the distinctive force of 'binding and loosing.' It is not, properly speaking, a power of jurisdiction or government, but of legislation. And if we compare 'what thou shalt bind' with 'what ye shall bind,' we see nothing in the former words suggesting a superior degree of authority to that which the latter indicate.
thought, to safeguard St. Peter's supremacy as 'head' or 'chief steward,' to remind them that they were only to exercise the legislative power of 'binding or loosing' in subordination—or, plainly, in subjection—to him as their Lord's one Vicar. And a like salvo might reasonably have been expected in John xx. 21 sqq.¹ But let us look back to the passage on which admittedly the imagery is based. The assumption that in the royal household of Judah there were to be under-stewards who did not 'possess' the key of the house of David, but were from time to time to have the 'use' of it under Eliakim, and that therefore a similar arrangement was to exist in the spiritual household of Christ with regard to St. Peter and his fellow-Apostles, is altogether arbitrary. We know nothing from the context in Isaiah of one steward who 'had' the badge of the office, and others who 'had' it not,² but might 'use' it on occasion; and certainly we are

¹ Mr. Rivington's gloss on that text is, 'All alike were sent, but they were not sent alike . . . they were sent as a body with an appointed head.' Neither of the previous sayings had given warning of any such future appointment to 'headship,' and the Easter-night saying is just the one in which we should expect such a distinction to be stated if it had been intended by the Divine Speaker—'As the Father hath sent Me, even so——.' The comparison begins by dwelling on our Lord's single person. If He chose a single person among the twelve to be His vicar, that single person must have been 'sent' by Him in a distinctive sense. Why, then, is no such sense even dimly indicated? Why is the other member of the comparison described as a plurality? It has been well observed that 'the words raise each of the persons addressed to a position in which he could have no spiritual superior on earth.' The 'as' and 'so' cover every possible form and sphere of spiritual authority; there is no manner of excepting clause reserving any peculiar authority for one Apostle. If the sense of 'Thou art Peter, &c.,' is disputed, can we do better than look to 'As the Father hath sent Me, &c.?' In the former saying Christ either did, or did not, mean that Peter should be, in the Roman sense, Pope. If He did, His silence respecting Peter in the latter passage is altogether inexplicable. For now, if ever, was the time to emphasize the unique commission, the supreme stewardship, as formerly promised, and now given, to St. Peter. For here was not a promise, but a testowal—a bestowal absolutely comprehensive in its terms, and affecting all the Apostles in its scope. It fulfilled the promise as to legislative authority; it covered all judicial authority, all power of spiritual government, all that the imagery of the 'keys' could symbolize; it involved a mission unsurpassable in dignity or completeness; and its recipients were the Apostles as a body.

² The person who was set 'over the house' was like the major domus under the Merovingian kings. We meet with him as a single officer; we hear nothing of under-stewards, set 'over the house' in subordinate positions, as accompanying Eliakim to Rabshakeh or to Isaiah. In the Dublin for July and the Guardian of September 23 Mr. Rivington had actually misunderstood Isaiah xxii. 23, as if it assigned to Eliakim a 'throne' in the palace, and therefore suggested that Peter was to 'reign' over the Church. He could hardly have learned this
told nothing like this in the two contexts to which Mr. Rivington refers.

Or, to put the case otherwise. An exclusive 'possession' of the keys by St. Peter is claimed as proved from 'I will give unto thee.' But our Lord goes on to say, 'And whatsoever thou shalt bind, &c.; and we know that the latter promise was repeated as made to all the Apostles.' We naturally, therefore, look to other sayings of our Lord which seem to refer to the office of stewardship, which address the Apostles as a body, or which illustrate the relation to be established between Peter and his fellows. There is one memorable saying of the former class (Luke xii. 42) which belongs to the period subsequent to the scene in Matthew xvi. 13 sqq.; and there the context makes it plain that the 'faithful and prudent steward' has no specifically Petrine significance. And in regard to the latter class, we certainly seem to read in such sayings the negative of any stewardship either solely or pre-eminently Petrine. And the history of Apostolic action, the language of St. Paul, and the marked absence of any 'papal' claim in St. Peter's own spoken or written words, point to the same conclusion.

But now as to John xxi. 15–17. Mr. Rivington contends that here our Lord fulfilled the promise made in Matthew xvi. 19 to St. Peter, by 'giving' him the chief stewardship. Would any person reading the last chapter of the fourth Gospel without bias, and comparing it with earlier Gospels, imagine that it indicated so unspeakably momentous a mission of St. Peter apart from the rest as the Papal theory implies? But as to 'the pastoral commission,' we are reminded that whereas the flock which St. Peter exhorted his 'fellow-elders' to 'feed' was only that 'flock of God which was among them,' the whole of the flock of Christ, sheep and lambs (presumably, according to the old-fashioned Roman gloss—although Mr. Rivington does not adduce it—'clergy from those 'most recent Hebrew scholars' whom he takes credit for following (as to Eliakim's office) rather than St. Jerome. To admit, as Mr. Rivington does, that the other Apostles were, in a subordinate sense, 'stewards,' impairs the parallelism between Eliakim and Peter. That parallelism holds if Peter receives the promise of the keys as representing the Apostolic college in its unity.

'It will, perhaps, be said, 'The promise is plain enough as made to St. Peter only.' Not so, as we have already shown, unless it is proved that he had not been speaking for the rest; and the prima facie impression from St. Matthew's account is that this is just what he had been doing, only with a peculiar intensity of loyal affiance, the result of illumination from the 'Father.' But his colleagues, in so far as they similarly believed, must have been similarly illuminated.
Two Roman Controversialists.

and laity’), were placed under the charge of St. Peter, in a sense in which they were never entrusted to other Apostles. This, of course, is utterly to ignore the well-known patristic interpretation which represents our Lord as cancelling the guilt of the triple denial by a triple act of confidence in the Apostle who, as He ‘knew,’ was so full of penitence and of love. Dr. Salmon ‘does not know of any respectable patristic authority for understanding the passage otherwise than Cyril of Alexandria does,’ i.e. in that sense.1 This great Eastern Father 2 is so far from seeing in the context the fulfilment of a promise of supreme headship, that he takes it to be the restoration of a simple apostleship, justly forfeited by a terrible threefold fall. But Cyril, it may be said, was an Eastern Father. One would have thought that, on that very ground, he was a more independent expositor than one under Roman influence. But let us take Jerome. Eight years after he had written that letter to Damasus which has been so inordinately utilised by Romanists, he compressed his view of John xxi. 15 sqq. into a sentence of terse Latin: ‘Trinam negationem trina postea confessione delevit.’3 But this, again, is not all. If Mr. Rivington will press the Papal interpretation, he must take it with all that it involves. Peter, he says, was to be the shepherd of Christ’s whole flock. But the Apostles themselves belonged to that flock. Therefore, on this view, St. John or St. James, or any other of the twelve, was, as a ‘sheep,’ equally bound to look up to St. Peter as his shepherd after the Ascension, as any of the ‘hundred and twenty’ or the ‘three thousand.’ Why, then, was Peter rebuked for asking our Lord what ‘this man’ was to do? But the main point is that the theory before us inevitably means that each of the Apostles singly, and all of them collectively, were placed by Christ under the pastoral care of Peter. As to the evidence from the Acts, we shall come to it, in Mr. Rivington’s order, presently. But we must follow him into St. Luke’s Gospel. We do not find him producing that notable gloss on

1 Infallibility of the Church, p. 345. ‘Our Lord,’ says Cyril (in loc.), ‘heals the mischief [caused by the triple denial] and exacts a triple confession as compensating for it, and adapting the restorative act as a counterpoise to the falls.’ Further on, ‘and by the saying, Feed My lambs, we understand that there took place a renewal of the apostleship which had already been given him.’

2 Long before, St. Basil had said that ‘by the words “Feed My sheep,” Christ was constituting Peter a shepherd of His Church after Himself, but was bestowing ἡμῶν ἐκουσία on all pastors and teachers thenceforward’ (Const. Monast. xxii. 5).

3 Ep. 42. So St. Ambrose, Apol. David (the first), s. 50: ‘Dictum est ei trina vice, “Pasce oves meas” ... quasi qui peccatum suum nimia
Luke xxii. 32 which seems to have been first used in the papal interest by a Pope late in the sixth century;¹ but he accounts for our Lord's words in Luke xxii. 26 in the following manner: 'The disciples were 'still 'dull of understanding' as to the mysteries of the New Covenant, and therefore might well desire to be informed concerning the vicarial supremacy.' But this is to assume that such a supremacy had already been spoken of by our Lord; and, on the supposition that it had been, it had in the same words been promised to one Apostle by name. Then Mr. Rivington proceeds: 'Unless the Apostles 'suspected something' like a 'vicarial supremacy' or supreme headship, as intended to attach to one of them, 'why should they ask 'which of them should be accounted greatest—properly, 'greater' than others? Surely they might do so, naturally enough, from their still half-earthly point of view:² and by asking they showed that they had no notion that the words 'Thou art Peter,' &c., had already 'settled' the question in Peter's favour. Had not James and John, many months after the utterance of that saying, presumed that the two chief places in the Kingdom under Christ were to be had for the asking—without the slightest suspicion that there would be one seat of chief authority, which had already been disposed of?³ And if it had been so reserved for a brother-Apostle, towards whom therefore they were to caritate texisset.' And St. Augustine, in the first of his sermons for the feast of SS. Peter and Paul (Sermon 295, 4), says that 'there was a reason for our Lord's commending His sheep to Peter himself to be fed. Non enim inter discipulos solus meruit pascered dominicas oves; sed quando Christus ad unum loquitur, unitas commendatur; et Petro primitus, quia in apostolis Petrus erat primus.' Then, on the thrice repeated question and answer, and the thrice repeated 'commendation of the sheep to Peter,' 'Ter vincat in amore confessio, quia ter victa est in timore presumption.' Here, if Augustine had held the Papal interpretation of the passage, he must have expressed it. Instead of this, he continues the Cyprianic explanation of Christ's speaking individually to Peter (i.e. to give a lesson of unity), with the explanation of 'Feed My sheep,' by reference to the previous denials.

¹ Pelagius II., the immediate predecessor of Gregory the Great: Mansi, Conc. ix. 892.

² On Matt. xviii. 1 sqq. it is suggested that 'our Lord left unanswered the question of official superiority,' and 'taught only what it was more important to know, the path to moral and spiritual greatness.' But surely, on the Papal hypothesis, it was a matter of primary 'importance' for the disciples to 'know' about their future relation to their Lord through one of themselves as His Vicar.

³ It did not occur to Mr. Rivington that this well-known incident was the first of 'the two occasions' to which Dr. Bright had referred; and then (Matt. xx. 25 sqq., Mark x. 42 sqq.) our Lord said, 'Whosoever would become great . . . be first,' &c.
have relations deeply momentous, would not our Lord have told them so? But Mr. Rivington, as we expected, seizes on ὁ ἡγοῦμενος as implying 'that there was to be a leader' or ruler among them. Now, ὁ ἡγοῦμενος and ὁ μείζων are set over against ὁ διακονῶν and ὁ νεώτερος. If, then, some one definite Apostle, individually distinguished from the rest—say Peter—was meant by the two former words, who was meant by the two latter? On Mr. Rivington's showing, there must have been a particular Apostle who was, as such, ὁ διακονῶν. Is it not clear that our Lord is speaking generally of any senior and any junior, of such Apostles as took a lead, and of such as were not prominent? And is it not significant that in this very context He gives a picture of a 'kingdom' with 'twelve thrones' for all the Apostles—not one highest throne for a single Apostle, and eleven ranged below it for the rest?

And now as to the Acts. We quite agree with Mr. Rivington that it is not an exhaustive history of the Apostolic lives, and that, in the latter part of it, the writer specially intends to 'vindicate' and illustrate 'the genuine apostleship of St. Paul.' But in reply to the challenge to produce 'a single text in the Acts or Epistles which would even imply that any of the Apostles recognised a supremacy in Peter and a responsibility on their part to Peter, or that he himself expected them to do so,' Mr. Rivington says, in effect, that St. Luke had no need to 'prove' to his readers 'what was already plain enough—viz. the supremacy of St. Peter.'

This is just one of those broad assertions which form so large a portion of a Roman controversialist's armoury,1 and of which The Primitive Church and the See of Peter contained such remarkable specimens.2 Assuredly St. Luke's Gospel had told Theophilus nothing about it. But we are told that 'the Church's foundation amongst the Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles might conceivably be described without any call arising to narrate the applications for advice made by the

1 Readers of Mr. Keble's Letters of Spiritual Counsel will know how often he charges Roman arguers with 'begging' or 'taking for granted' 'the question' or 'point in dispute,' with 'assuming beforehand certain broad principles which involve the very matter in dispute'—in a word, with petitioprinципii. What would he have said of Mr. Rivington?

2 For instance, 'St. Clement's brief'—i.e. the letter of the Roman Church to the Corinthians, written by Clement—'was at once obeyed' (Prim. Ch. &c., p. 132). 'St. Stephen' (Stephen I. of Rome) 'put St. Cyprian on his obedience' (implying that Cyprian knew himself to be bound to obey Stephen) (ib. p. 95). 'The way, then, in which St. Sylvester elected to govern the Church was by a council in the East' (i.e. at Nicea) (ib. p. 159, &c.). The bishops of Italy referred to by Aurelian were 'the Papal Consistory' (p. 123; here the italics are Mr. Rivington's).
Apostles to St. Peter. 'Hardly so, unless the 'applications' were for 'advice' on points really trivial. Mr. Rivington is so incautious as to describe the supposed 'applications,' naturally made, he suggests, 'by a Phoebe and others, when carrying letters to wherever Peter might be,' as turning on 'private subjects.' But by hypothesis Peter was the public acknowledged superior of all the other Apostles; how, then, could a request for his counsel in their public ministry be called a matter of 'private' business? Not to say that we have in the canon of the New Testament three documents which are called forth by personal occasions, the Epistle to Philemon and the Second and Third Epistles of St. John. Then look at Mr. Rivington's way of slurring over a plain issue. He talks of 'advice;' but, on his own showing, Peter was to be not simply the 'adviser' to be 'consulted,' but the master to be obeyed as Vicar of Christ; and one would have thought that, after the Ascension, when the Apostles, whether working together or on different lines of missionary enterprise, had to exercise their apostolate under his supreme direction, this perpetual obligation to their Master's visible deputy would be the very thing which a narrator would have to illustrate. St. Paul naturally 'went up to Jerusalem to visit' Peter: but he expressly says that he never received any new instructions from him, or from the other two 'pillar' Apostles;1 still less, if possible, does he speak as if subordinated to him or to them. On the contrary, he twice distinctly says (2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11) that he was 'not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles,' and we know how in Gal. ii. 11 he speaks of 'Cephas.' But it would clearly have been necessary for the unity and good order of the infant Church, that an Apostle called under such peculiar circumstances should have exhibited himself as loyal to a divinely ordained 'supremacy.' However, Mr. Rivington claims 'plenty of texts which fit in with supremacy.' Let us see, then. The speech before the election of Matthias, the words and acts recorded in Acts ii.—v., the phrases exhibiting Peter as 'the prominent figure,' are referred to as adequate.2 But who doubts that he was then 'the

1 Gal. i. 18, ii. 6. Observe the force of ἵνα ... ὁδεῖν προσκαταλέθη. The case, then, is not as if he had had no occasion to mention his own apostolic relation to Peter. He does mention it, and as a relation of pure equality, such as excludes the idea of any 'Petrine papacy.'

2 Mr. Rivington, inter alia, refers to Peter's 'visitation' in Acts ix. 32. 'Other Apostles visit places where they have preached; Peter's visitation includes all the churches ... was, so far as it could be, œcuménical.' This is a good deal to make out of διὰ πάντων, which is understood quite
prominent figure’ or then acted as ‘leader of the band’? No Anglican divine, no fair-minded reader of the Acts, would question it. What we ask for, is some indication that the other Apostles, and the believers in general, regarded him as what on the Papal theory he was. To offer us less than this, and to try to pass it off as equivalent to this, is the merest trifling. Mr. Rivington says that he held the keys in ‘quite a unique sense,’ because he opened the door to the Jews at Pentecost, to the converts in Samaria, and to the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius. In the first case he certainly appears as spokesman for his brethren; in the second he acts with St. John, and Simon Magus addresses his naturally of all the brethren in ‘Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria’ (ib. ix. 31). So Tillemont: ‘tous les fidèles des environs’ (Mém. i. 160). But there was already a Church, or at least a number of believers, in Cyprus; and no one would gather from the Acts that St. Peter inaugurated the Church in Antioch; or rather, such a notion is excluded by Acts xi. 20. Mr. Rivington is so carried away by his Petrine-Papal zeal as to say that in the Acts ‘the Apostolic college is described as consisting of “Peter and the rest,” “Peter and” (“with”) “the eleven,” “Peter and the Apostles”’ (a phrase in Acts vi. 29 which is clearly an abridged form of the fuller phrase in Acts ii. 37), ‘just as before the Resurrection it was “Jesus and the disciples.”’ He cannot, we feel sure, have considered into what hands this parallelism would play.

Mr. Rivington says that Dr. Bright’s argument from the non-production of any text in the Acts or Epistles which even hints at a subjection of the Apostles to Peter may be shown to be ‘absolutely worthless’ by a reference to the Epistle to the Romans. Not, this time, as in A Reply to the Church Quarterly Review, by a reference to 1 Cor. xii. 21, ‘nor, again, the head to the feet’(!). But let us look at the argument as thus put forward in regard to the Acts. It comes to this—the Epistle to the Romans contains ‘no single text which gives a clear statement of that fundamental doctrine of the Holy Trinity which distinguished the Roman Christians from all who were not Christians.’ Now, not to say that Rom. ix. 5 is usually considered a tolerably ‘strong’ text for Christ’s divinity, let us observe, first, that the special doctrinal purpose of this Epistle was to present Christianity as procuring deliverance from sin, and a state of acceptance with God; and next, that a book like the Acts is not parallel to an Epistle. It is a narrative of the official proceedings of Apostles, notably of St. Paul. On the Roman hypothesis, they were all, as we have said, working, at every step, under St. Peter; and therefore it was to be expected that the narrative would represent them as so working. Of St. Paul’s Epistles enough has been said. But to return for a moment to the Acts. ‘We see Peter acting as head of the Apostolic college.’ In what sense ‘head’? Mr. Rivington proves what nobody denies—a Petrine ἡγεμονία in the earliest times of the Church. But the thing to be proved was a Petrine ἀρχή—a very different matter. This is a good instance of ignoratio elenchii.

Mr. Rivington insists upon St. Peter’s ‘speech’ (Acts ii. 14 sqq.), and on his ‘ruling the question as to whether the enquiring crowds are to be admitted to the sacraments.’ But he does not remind his readers that after the ‘speech’ was delivered, the crowds put their question not to the speaker only, but ‘to Peter and the rest of the Apostles’ (Acts ii. 37).
request for intercession to both; in the third he acts under a special divine oracle. And here we may note, in passing, that Cornelius and his friends, like the ‘Greeks who desired to see Jesus,’ and like the Ethiopian eunuch, were Gentile proselytes, ‘men who feared’ the true ‘God.’ They might truly be called Gentiles, as in Acts xv, 7, 14, for they were of non-Jewish blood: but they were not in the condition of those pagan ‘Gentiles’ to whom Paul and Barnabas preached at Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, and Lystra. It was doubtless a great step which Peter took, a step for which a special inspiration was necessary, and which required the excision of a deep-seated prejudice; but it was not the final step. We know that it was to Paul, not to Peter, that ‘the Gospel of the uncircumcision was entrusted; and it is at least remarkable that it is to the ministry of Paul and Barnabas that St. Luke applies a phrase which reminds us of ‘keys’—‘that God opened to the Gentiles a door of faith’ (Acts xiv. 27). Mr. Rivington should read St. Luke’s narrative more carefully before he denounces as a ‘monstrous paradox,’ ‘a manipulation of the inspired text,’ what is evident from its language, that it was not St. Peter who opened the door to the ‘Gentile world as a whole,’ to Gentiles such as are described in

1 It is quite true, of course, that the sending of Peter and John, in Acts viii. 14, by ‘the Apostles’ proves no inferiority in those two members of the ‘college.’ But it certainly suggests no superiority in one of those ‘sent’ to the college as a whole. Mr. Rivington says, ‘The initiative may have lain with Peter himself.’ It may; but what then? Next we are told that ‘it is Peter who excommunicates Simon Magus.’ That is hardly the verb that we should use; but when this is followed by the statement that, so far as St. Luke’s narrative goes, ‘Peter does it all,’ we remark that Simon Magus does not seem to have thought so (Acts viii. 24). Nor is a spokesman always, as such, regarded as a supreme agent; the Lystrans took a ‘principal speaker’ for Hermes, but his companion for Zeus.

2 Cornelius... a devout man, καὶ φοβούμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ (Acts x. 1, 2, cf. 22, and Acts xiii. 16, 43, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, xviii. 7).

3 The reading Ἐλληνος in Acts xi. 20 appears to be practically established; but it is not certain whether these ‘Greeks’ or ‘Gentiles’ were, like Cornelius, half-converts to Judaism, or whether they were pagan Gentiles.

4 Mr. Rivington does not discuss the speech of St. Peter at the Council of Jerusalem. It has, however, a good deal of significance. He had evidently become convinced that the Jewish ceremonial requirements ought not to be laid on Gentile converts to Christianity. But, on the Papal hypothesis, one would surely have expected him to assert his own special authority as Vicar of Christ. We think that some Anglican writers have pressed St. James’s ἐγὼ κρίνω too far. But it is manifest that the decision as formulated would have been, as a matter of course, stamped with the decisive fiat of the Pope-Apostle, had such a thing as a Fetrine Papacy been in existence.
Eph. ii. 12, iv. 17. In regard to Acts xi. 2 sqq. Mr. Rivington observes that those who contended with Peter were not Apostles, but 'they who were of the circumcision'—which he glosses as 'ill-informed members of the Church, contending with their infallible teacher'; and that this proves nothing against any Petrine prerogative, unless it also proves that Peter, as an Apostle, was not infallible in teaching. But Peter had not been 'teaching' in this case; he had been acting. On Mr. Rivington's own showing, he had been using 'his' keys; he had been exercising his supreme jurisdiction; and yet, it appears, the general voice of the Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem (of course, not including the Apostles)—that is, of a large body of believers, some of whom had probably been original 'disciples,' and all of whom, by hypothesis, would have known that he was their divinely appointed chief pastor and ruler—'entered into a disputation with him,' and explicitly questioned the rightfulness of his official conduct. Is it, we ask, conceivable that (not some foolish objectors, as Mr. Rivington would suggest, but) oi ἐκ περιτομῆς, at the head-quarters of Apostolic Christianity, would have dared thus to say to the Pope-Apostle, 'What doest thou?' in reference to an exercise of his sole 'vicarial' supremacy?

Here ends Mr. Rivington's argument. We submit that he has utterly failed to prove from Scripture the two propositions which, thus far, are essential to his case; they may be stated in the words of Dr. Salmon. The first is, 'that Christ gave to St. Peter a primacy over the other Apostles not merely in dignity and precedence, but in authority and juris-

1 'The believers at Jerusalem'; Dollinger, First Age of the Church, E. T., p. 50.
2 On the Roman theory the Petrine Vicariate was the very pivot of all Church action. The idea of it was extremely simple. How then could there be, in the very birthplace of the Faith, where, by hypothesis, it had continually been exercised, any Christians 'ill-informed' about the matter?
3 The oi ἐκ περιτομῆς at Jerusalem are here distinguished from the oi ἐκ περιτομῆς who had 'come with Peter from Joppa to Cæsarea' (Acts x. 23, 45).
4 Mr. Rivington refers to St. Chrysostom as 'seeing in this incident, not what Dr. Bright sees in it, but an instance of Peter's humility in descending to explain that he had had a special vision from heaven, justifying him in admitting a Gentile into the Church.' Chrysostom was not concerned to meet a Papalist interpretation of St. Peter's acts or words. Perhaps some readers of the Dublin Review will infer that he held the doctrine of a Petrine supremacy; but what he held as to St. Peter was that he had a pre-eminence or presidency, as 'coryphaeus' among the Apostles, &c. In this sense he calls him their 'head' and 'summit.' None of his sayings reach or approach the point of 'supremacy.'
diction, constituting him their guide and teacher and ruler.' The second is, 'that this prerogative was not merely personal, but designed to be transmitted to successors.' Mr. Rivington's contention, as set forth in the article before us, depends on three pieces of exegesis—that in saying 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' our Lord promised to make Peter, in one word, the Pope of the Apostolical Church; that by bidding him 'feed,' or 'act as shepherd of, His sheep,' He fulfilled that promise; and that the language of other passages bearing on the point in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, either falls in with, or definitely supports, the two preceding assertions. We contend that he has not come near proving any one of the three.

To sum up—the Papal doctrine, be it always remembered, consists of the Vatican Council's doctrine on the two points of universal supreme jurisdiction and infallible magisterium in ex cathedra utterances; it is this, neither more nor less, which is in question. Evidence which does not go as far as this is wholly irrelevant; and all arguments which logically fall short of it must be set aside as confusing the issue. Is this doctrine, then, indicated in, or supported by, the New Testament? We say that it is not: that it has to be read into the Sacred Text, for it cannot be drawn from it; and that the phenomenal confidence with which some Roman arguers claim Scripture in its support is but another proof of the imperiousness of their dominant preassumption.

1 Infallibility of the Church, p. 331. Mr. Balfour words these propositions somewhat less fully: 'that the meaning of the words, "Thou art Peter," &c., and "Feed My sheep," is (a) that St. Peter was endowed with a primacy of jurisdiction over the other Apostles; (b) that he was to have a perpetual line of successors similarly endowed with a primacy of jurisdiction' (Foundations of Belief, p. 224). Cf. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 73. Mr. Rivington concludes by exhorting 'a thoughtful Anglican' to hearken to 'the unvarying voice of that See to which England looked for so many centuries as her mother and mistress, appointed so by our Lord Himself when He said, "To thee will I give the keys."' He must have forgotten, we suppose, what 'thoughtful Anglicans' are like. If we may refresh his memory, we will tell him that they have an instinctive repugnance to—are simply repelled by—the bluster of mere assumptions.

2 'We must recollect what sort of "primacy" it is that a Roman advocate 'has to prove for St. Peter.' It is, in a word, a vicarial primacy, a position which makes St. Peter the Vicar of Christ. 'Any passages, therefore, which can be fully accounted for on the theory that St. Peter was primus inter pares, the most prominent and first among his equal brethren, is irrelevant to' such an advocate's 'purpose, and must be put aside accordingly.' Christian Remembrancer, April 1855, p. 389.

3 A footnote is the best place for dealing with a note which is merely
We now turn to another writer in the same number of the *Dublin Review* (p. 88 sqq.), who undertakes to tell the story of personal in its bearings. Mr. Rivington complains that in *The Roman See in the Early Church* Dr. Bright 'represented the argument' of *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter* 'as admitting the possibility of an *ex cathedra* decree' by Sylvester of Rome, on the Arian question, 'having been issued and lost'; whereas 'not a sentence, not a line in the whole book [*The Primitive Church, &c.*] countenances such a supposition.' But in *The Roman See* (p. 67) reference was expressly made not only to the 'book,' but to the subsequent pamphlet called a *Reply to the Church Quarterly,* of which also it was said in the preface, 'Due notice has here been taken of a pamphlet,' &c. Mr. Rivington now makes a point of a mention of the 'book,' instead of the 'pamphlet,' in Dr. Bright's letter to the *Guardian* of September 16, 1896. He remarks that he had, in the *Guardian* of September 23, called on Dr. Bright, 'as a man of honour, either to justify or to withdraw his misrepresentation'; and he might have added that he made this challenge with a great show of 'indignation.' He now says that Dr. Bright 'persists in discovering in the book the remark about Papal letters having been lost.' A strange oversight: for Dr. Bright had distinctly said, in the *Guardian* of September 30 (p. 1500), 'It was in the *Reply* that the remark was made,' and had thus corrected the slight inaccuracy of the earlier letter. But the correction does not improve matters for Mr. Rivington. For the pamphlet was virtually a postscript to the book, and presumably contained the author's mature thoughts; and in it, by way of reply to the *Church Quarterly Review*'s statement that 'Sylvester did nothing, that he left Alexandria to work and send out encyclicals, but he uttered no warning, he issued no encyclicals,' we read—'The reviewer seems to be entirely oblivious of the crucial fact that almost all Papal letters, decrees, and encyclicals, up to the time of Siricius, are lost.' What could such a remark mean if it did not mean to answer the objection that no pronouncement by Sylvester against Arianism was extant, or was referred to in documents of the period? Mr. Rivington now says that it was in reply to 'another and a larger complaint made by Dr. Bright against Sylvester (i.e. that he did nothing).' Now, not to say that it is absurd to represent Dr. Bright as making any 'complaint against Sylvester' at all—inasmuch as on the Anglican view Sylvester had not, and never imagined himself to have, the gift of official infallibility—the distinction here set up is purely imaginary. That Sylvester 'did nothing' was merely a summary way of saying that he made no pronouncement—never attempted to discharge, in so tremendous a crisis, the function of 'instructing the Church on the question of faith in our Lord's Divinity.' Anyone who will refer to the *Church Quarterly Review,* xxxix. 16, will see that the objection made was one; that is, the single question asked was, Why, on the Papal hypothesis, did not Sylvester pronounce *ex cathedra,* either by 'decrees,' or by 'encyclicals,' or otherwise? The context shows this; and compare *The Roman See,* p. 67. We have seen nothing like a real answer to the question: Having, by hypothesis, a full power to decide controversies in Christ's Name at so awfully momentous a crisis, why did not the Roman bishop use that power? why did nobody ever ask him to use it? We do not care to refer again in these pages to the long series of errors, fallacies, and misrepresentations which impress a character on Mr. Rivington's 'book'—a character, we must repeat, of exceptional untrustworthiness. We will not, for instance, repeat the story of his extraordinary blunder about *directi,* and of his attempt to get
the relation of 'the Holy See' to Pelagianism. The writer, Dom J. Chapman, is a Benedictine monk, who ten years ago was an Oxford undergraduate, and who seceded to Rome during the year of his Anglican diaconate. He shows the biassed reading and facile confidence of a proselyte still intellectually young. He begins by saying, 'It is not to be gainsaid that the African Church looked upon the Roman Church as ever free from heresy, or as possessing an especial gift of faith.' This is presently (more Papali) assumed to be equivalent to an 'incapacity of error,' which is further illustrated by a promise to show that the Bishop of Rome was regarded 'as the final and inerrant judge of questions of faith,' the proposition to which the writer is bound. Now for the historical proofs of African opinion:

'Tertullian signalled [?signalized] it among Apostolic Churches as that into which the Apostles poured forth their faith with their blood.'

The quotation is not accurate; it should be, 'their whole teaching,' &c. The translation is also misleading if it means that no other Apostolic Church received the full Apostolic teaching. According to the context they all did, and the Roman is taken as a convenient sample for Westerns. But out of the quagmire in which it plunged him (see the Guardian of September 16, p. 1419). But it may be noted that of eighteen corrigenda which he printed on a separate fly-sheet (not that the list is at all exhaustive), eleven were due to the criticisms of the Church Quarterly Review. For his own sake, we hope he will be more careful in the future. We are glad to see how plainly he abandons the False Decretals, which unfortunately imposed on the framers of the Tridentine Catechism, and which, according to Gratry, Pius VI. would have willingly seen burnt. They are not, however, altogether disowned in Roman argument. We have seen within the last few months an English manual called Catholic Belief (6th ed.), by a certain Joseph Faa di Bruno, who spent thirty years as a missionary priest in England, and who says (p. 113), 'For the first seven hundred years the whole of Christendom united in believing and proclaiming and submitting to the supremacy of the Roman see.' In proof of this thesis he quotes a 'letter of Pope Sixtus I. as ruling that no bishop shall go back from Rome to his own diocese without a littera formata [sic].' This grotesque forgery will be found in Hinschius's Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae (p. 108). On a less important point he quotes the 'third epistle of Anacletus' and the 'third of Marcellus' (Hinschius, pp. 83, 223). Now the thing to observe is, not that a well-meaning Italian priest repeated in good faith what probably he had learned as a seminarist; but that an official letter of approbation, standing next to the title-page, expresses thanks to him 'for giving us one of the most complete and useful manuals of obedience, devotion, and elementary information;' and that the writer of that letter is Cardinal Manning. The copy which came into our hands bore tokens of circulation among the poorer members of the Anglo-Roman body: which is, to say the least, observable.

1 Dublin Review, p. 89.
what then? Was the Ephesian Church, in Tertullian's view, 'incapable of error' because St. Paul 'had not shunned to declare unto it all the counsel of God'? Did Tertullian believe that the Roman Church could not err, when he complained of the influence of Praxeas over its bishop? But Cyprian, it is added, spoke of the Romans as 'inaccessible to heresy.' Hasty words again, from a writer who criticizes certain Church Quarterly articles as 'apparently hasty'; it is 'faithlessness' in Cyprian's text, which also does not say that this privilege was grounded on the position of the Roman Church as 'ecclesia principalis' (by which word he seems here to mean 'original') 'unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est'; nor are these words equivalent, as Dom Chapman takes for

1 Dom Chapman says that Romans i. 8, which Cyprian practically quotes, is 'constantly quoted by the Fathers, Eastern or Western, in this way.' In what 'way'? The only 'way' which is to a Romanist's purpose is the 'way' of inferring Papal infallibility. Did the Fathers, Eastern or Western, so use it? Did they imagine that any such gift of inerrancy, belonging not to 'those that are at Rome,' but to the Roman see, was in St. Paul's thoughts when he wrote his Epistle? Dom Chapman should remember the warning, 'Be not too bold.'

2 Like Mr. Rivington, Dom Chapman takes Tertullian's scornful irony about 'Pontifex Maximus, quod est episcopus episcoporum' (de Pudic. 1) with a grave literalism, as if the Catholics of the time seriously assigned such titles to the individual Roman bishops, as if, that is, they had actually borrowed for their prelate the official title of the head of the pagan priesthood—as if they believed that all other bishops stood to the Roman bishops in the relation in which clergy or laity in general stood to bishops in their several churches! As to Tertullian's language, it must be remembered that he wrote the De Pudicitia as a Montanist, and that his vehement temperament would combine with his sectarian position to make him exaggerate invidiously the 'peremptoriness' of the 'edict' to which he refers. It would be absurd to take such a writer's description of an episcopal ruling au pied de la lettre. And Döllinger reminds us that 'the power of a bishop, and even of a Roman bishop, was then by no means (nichts weniger als) absolute, but rather restricted in its exercise by regard for the feeling and wish of the clergy, especially of the presbytery, and even of the laity' (Hippol. und Kall. p. 126).

And after Tertullian's death, as Dom Chapman admits, St. Cyprian (with his brother prelates) was stirred to 'wrath' by a letter of Stephen's, which seemed to them virtually to claim for him the position of a bishop of bishops. If the Africans in Innocent's time 'approved of' a like claim on his part (as Dom Chapman thinks), they had strangely departed from Cyprian's ground. But of this more presently. To do Innocent I. justice, his language, to be presently considered, does not approach this altitude; although the reviewer thinks that the letter of Tertullian's contemporary (Victor or Zephyrinus) was (1) 'as from a Pontifex Maximus,' and (2) was 'just in the style of' Innocent. Dom Chapman writes as if he approved not only of the title 'Pontifex Maximus,' which was not formally adopted by popes until many centuries later, but also of 'Episcopus Episcoporum,' which, as yet, no pope has dared to assume, and which Gregory the Great, we may be sure, would have denounced.
granted, to describing the Roman Church and the 'locus' or 'cathedra Petri' as 'the divinely appointed centre of unity, and consequently incapable of error.' Is a source identical with a centre? And how is the 'consequence' in this case proved? And if Cyprian believed Rome to be 'incapable of error,' why did he apply the term 'error' to its 'human tradition' or 'custom' as to heretics' baptism? and why did he stand out so determinedly against the rulings of the supposed 'centre of unity' on that point? Optatus did indeed imagine that the material chair in which St. Peter sat was 'visibly' preserved at Rome; but that is a minor point. In the passage usually quoted, where the 'chair' is spoken of in connexion with 'unity,' he is attacking the pretensions of a Donatist succession which claimed to be the true Roman episcopate; and what he says is, that 'Peter, the head of the Apostles,' 'was the first to receive an episcopal chair at Rome,' 'in which one chair unity was to be preserved by all, lest the other Apostles should claim chairs for themselves' (i.e. in the same place), 'so that he would be a schismatic and a sinner who should place another chair against that single one' (i.e. another see at Rome). St. Augustine, in his fifty-third epistle, has the same object in view—to put out of court the rivalry of Donatist Roman bishops. And when Dom Chapman claims Augustine's 'ballad' (the earliest of his anti-Donatist works) as interpreting 'this rock' of the Roman 'chair,' he forgets, we suppose, the fact which we have already dwelt upon, that Augustine's final opinion on that text was very different—that, some thirty-five years after he wrote his 'psalmus,' he interpreted the rock (we do not say rightly) to mean Christ Himself. Even in the fifty-third epistle (as often elsewhere) he treats Peter as 'representing the whole Church' when

---

1 See, e.g., Cypr. Ep. 74. 9, 'Consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est.' Dom Chapman, in his airy manner (accentuated by a sneer), charges Anglicans with 'explaining away St. Cyprian's words.' We answer that Roman writers gloss St. Cyprian's view of St. Peter as a symbol of Apostolic unity by transforming it into an assertion of a Petrine supremacy, of which Cyprian says never a word; and when they come to Cyprian's plain statements (de Unit. 4) that Christ, after His resurrection, gave to all the Apostles parem potestatem to that which He had promised to Peter, and that they were 'quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædicti et honoris et potestatis,' we know how this is 'explained away.' But, leaving the discussion of words, let us look to what, in a man like Cyprian, can best interpret them; and we distinctly challenge any Romanist to show from Cyprian's acts that he believed himself bound to obey the bishop of Rome.

2 The important clause, 'ne cæteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defendent,' shows what Optatus was thinking of. He could not mean that Peter's was a single chair of supremacy over the whole Church.
addressed by our Lord in that great context; on which view, the whole idea of an infallibility either in the Roman Church, or in its bishop, is put clean out of the question.¹

But now as to the Pelagian history. It is suggested that the appeal of Cælestius to 'the Apostolic see' was regarded as 'natural,' because the 'case was one of faith'; that 'no one made the slightest objection to this appeal; that Cælestius was even blamed for not daring to follow it up.' But did the bishops at Carthage treat this announcement as serious, or write to Rome to explain their proceedings? 'It does not appear,' says Tillemont, that they ever 'dreamt of' doing so. As for Jerome's letter to Demetrius about the suppression of the Origenist 'heresy' by Anastasius of Rome,² it is by no means equivalent, in its bearings on the question, to the impassioned letter written years before to Damasus: for

¹ The words 'semper apostolicae cathedrae viguit principatus,' in Ep. 43.7, do not prove anything like a Papal supremacy; and nothing short of such supremacy is relevant. St. Augustine speaks of several 'Apostolic sees' in c. Faust. xxviii. 2, &c. No doubt the Roman was in his view, as in that of Irenæus, the most eminent, and might well be taken as representing the succession in all Christian sees, as c. Epist. Man. 5, de Uit. Cred. 35; compare these passages with c. Faust. xi. 2, 'ecclesiæ catholicae auctoritas, quæ ab ipsis fundatissimis sedibus apostolorum usque ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibimet episcoporum serie, et tot populorum consensione, firmatur.' Further on, Dom Chapman refers to Aug. de Bapt. ii. 1, s. 2, as affirming that Peter's 'apostolatus principatus' was higher than any 'episcopate'—e.g. Cyprian's. Naturally; but the eminence or primacy of Peter is never regarded by Augustine as a supremacy; and in this same section 'primatus' is used for seniority. But, we are reminded, the 'semper viguit' passage shows that the Petrine primacy was, in Augustine's view, continued to the Roman bishops. Yes, but again, what was that 'primacy'? In one sense no Anglican is concerned to dispute it; and to say that, 'however much Dr. Bright may object, St. Augustine finds the primacy of Peter in Scripture'—without attempting to prove that the 'primacy' there 'found' was more than such 'eminence or leadership' as had been recognized in The Roman See in the Early Church as attaching to St. Peter—may be rhetorical, but is hardly ingenious. Further on we have a quotation from the De Vocatione Gentium, that Rome has 'per apostolici sacerdotii principatum' gained greater dignity 'arce religionis quam solio potestatis.' This is Roman or quasi-Roman language, used at a time when the primacy of eminence was being elaborately developed into a supremacy, though it had not yet reached the imperial dimensions of a spiritual 'kingship' or 'empire.' But such language does not prove that this development was legitimate. Dom Chapman represents Dr. Bright as 'repeating Mr. Gore's and Mr. Puller's feeble contention' that Jerome, when he wrote his Ep. 15 to Damasus, 'was young and foolish.' What Dr. Bright said (and can it be questioned?) was, that he was then a layman 'of little more than thirty,' repeating what he would naturally have heard before 'in religious society at Rome' (The Roman See, &c., p. 106).

² Cf. Jerome, Ep. 130, 16.
Rufinus, as an Italian, might well be the subject of a judicial inquiry at Rome; and Anastasius, in condemning Origen's writings (of which beforehand he had known nothing), was acting in accordance with representations from Theophilus of Alexandria. There is nothing in this whole incident to support the present Papal claims.

Passing on through the Palestinian stage of the controversy, Dom Chapman comes to the Councils of Carthago and Milevis, or Milevum, in 416. He fastens on two passages in their letters to Innocent I. One is to the effect that the truths which they urge are 'preached' by Innocent 'majore gratia de sede apostolica.' Again, what then? Of course the primatial see of the West had, as such, a greater weight (auctoritas) than bishops assembled at Carthage; and they are professedly asking it to bring in that auctoritas in addition to their decisions (statuta). The 'grace' which they refer to may mean a Divine influence, such as they had just been speaking of in an anti-Pelagian sense, and of which they courteously presume that Innocent enjoys a special measure; or it may mean simply the Divine favour which had placed him in the highest of bishoprics. The other phrase is in the Milevitan letter, which Augustine signed with other Numidian bishops: 'We think that they [the Pelagians] will give way auctoritatis sanctitatis tuae, de sanctarum Scripturarum auctoritate depromptae.' The question is, what does auctoritate mean? Does it mean, as Mr. Rivington and Dom Chapman wish it to mean, that Holy Scripture supported the Papal claim of final doctrinal judgment? In plain English, that is what they are aiming at. Now the letter had summarised the Scriptural argument against Pelagianism, and

1 Jerome, Ep. 88. Anastasius's letter in Mansi (iii. 943) is extremely unlike what would have come from a bishop conscious of his own official infallibility. He trusts that divine 'providence' will cause his conduct to be universally approved, &c.

2 At the Jerusalem conference, Bishop John's final proposal to refer the question to Innocent of Rome is explained by preceding words, which Dom Chapman fairly quotes—Orosius's plea that the heresy, being Latin, could be best 'dealt with by Latin judges.'

3 Thus, 'ut...nullum relinquant locum gratiae Dei, qua Christiani sumus... Illam vero gratiam qua,' &c. They quote 'Gratia Dei per Jesum Christum' (Rom. vii. 25); 'secundum gratiam qua data est nobis' (ib. xii. 6); 'Gratia Dei sum id quod sum, et gratia ejus,' &c. (1 Cor. xv. 10).

4 They quote several passages from the New Testament, and proceed: 'Ut ergo alia omittamus qua contra sanctas scripturas plurima disserunt,' &c. This shows the drift of the subsequent words, 'de sanctarum scripturarum auctoritate.' Dom Chapman says that 'Dr. Bright knows that the Africans really did regard the authority of Rome as founded in Holy
had not said one word about any text of Scripture as creating any peculiar jurisdiction for a bishop of Rome. The natural sense, then, of the passage is that they look forward to a declaration of doctrine from Innocent which they are sure will be derived from the teaching of Scripture as to grace, and that they hope it will secure the conversion of those who misinterpret or pervert that teaching. It may be added that ‘depromptæ’ is exactly the natural phrase to be used in reference to a solemn declaration which should produce Scripture warrant for its doctrinal statements, and not a natural phrase in reference to a supposed antecedent Scriptural basis of the general authority of the person making the declaration, especially when no such basis has been even referred to in the letter.

It is admitted by Dom Chapman that the next letter, that of the five bishops to Innocent, does not state explicitly that his judgment is final or infallible. But the last sentence, he says, ‘suggests something of the sort.’ Does it? Let us see. The bishops speak of their own teaching or opinion on the Pelagian question as a ‘rivulus exiguis,’ whereas Innocent’s is a largus or abundans fons. Surely Dom Chapman is thankful for small mercies. Are courteous expressions to the chief bishop of the West analogous to a recognition of his infallibility? We shall get to strange conclusions if we thus strain the old-world language of respect—or, for that matter, modern language either. But can such phrases as those in question be seriously adduced as meaning ‘something’ like the Vatican dogma of infallibility? Dom Chapman should have recognized a certain characteristic of the whole preceding tenor of the epistle. In highly respectful language, no doubt, they distinctly tell Innocent what he ought to do in the affair of Pelagius and Celestius; and they draw for him, so to speak, the Scriptural lines on which they think he should found his pronouncement.

Now as to the replies of Innocent. Acting in a manner which was becoming traditional with Roman bishops, he gives the largest interpretation he can think of to the request of Scripture. Then, by way of proof, he quotes three sayings about the Petrine and Roman precedency. Is this a proof of ‘authority’? And is all authority ‘supremacy’?

1 In 420 St. Augustine sent his C. duas Ep. Pel. to Boniface I., ‘to be corrected wherever anything did not please him.’ This, again, is not unnatural in the circumstances; but ‘what would St. Augustine have said’ if Boniface had censured his theology? He well knew that Boniface would not be so foolish as to do anything of the kind.
made to him from Africa. The writer before us assumes that the Africans accepted all that he chose to say about his own powers, as well as on the question really in hand; and even ventures to affirm that 'the doctrine of St. Innocent as to the rights of the Apostolic see is more explicit but hardly wider than that of' the African letters. We answer, Let the letters and replies be read together and compared. But Dom Chapman proceeds to contend that Anglicans may be 'defied' to show on the warrant of 'any ancient authority that in the view of the Africans' their 'decisions were a coordinate element with the letters of Innocent in the condemnation of the heresy.' We suppose he considers that the Africans wrote to Innocent just as Anglo-Roman bishops

1 Here, in a footnote, we are told that 'the Church in the fifth century' must be supposed to have believed what Socrates and Sozomen understood to have been acknowledged in the days of St. Athanasius as to the veto of the bishop of Rome on all ecclesiastical decrees. Anyone who has read Julius I.'s genuine letter to the Easterns knows that it does not justify the gloss of the two Greek historians. But as to the general Church opinion in their period, there are events of the fifth century which, to say the least, tell in another direction than that of their gloss. Innocent himself claimed no such powers in the case of Chrysostom. He knew that the Easterns would not have acknowledged them. And we know how the Eastern Emperor in 430 was obeyed in his summons of a Council to decide a question on which Rome had already pronounced. As for Socrates, he mistook the sense of the last part of Julius's letter, and Sozomen followed him in the mistake. In ii. 15 Socrates (again mistakenly) represents Julius as acting on another 'privilege,' which the Easterns refused to admit. But Socrates makes another important statement—that at the accession of Celestine I. the Roman bishops, like the Alexandrian, had long been accustomed 'to go beyond the area of episcopal administration into that of secular lordship' (vii. 11), a censure reminding us of the warning addressed to this same Celestine by a Council of Carthage in 424 (cf. The Roman See, &c., p. 140).

2 There is nothing in the African letters at all equivalent to Innocent's language about 'a decree of the Fathers that nothing should anywhere be done without the authority of the see of Peter.' We are told indeed that 'Innocent knew more than Dr. Bright about the frequency of the appeals to Rome, and the principle involved in them.' Very well; what, then, was the decree of the Fathers which he relied on? Not the Sardican, Dom Chapman admits. 'Possibly Innocent is referring to something else.' Was there ever a feeble suggestion? If there had been real evidence in 416 of such a decree, would the Roman Church have allowed it to become 'non-apparent'? The truth is that Innocent was acting 'on a principle which has been all but invariably followed by his successors, that of making . . . demands far in advance of the rightful claims of his see, on the chance of their being allowed, in which case they would be all clear gain, while, even if rejected, the mere fact of having made them would serve . . . as a precedent,' &c. (Church Quarterly Review, xii. 183); and this principle he had inherited from Siricius, in whose letter to Himerius (quoted by Dom Chapman) it appears fully-formed. Of its moral character we need say nothing.
might write to Leo XIII. for a doctrinal decision which should be final because simply *his*. It is at any rate remarkable that they did not say so in their letters. We have already seen what the writer can produce as 'something of that sort' from one section in one of the three letters. Well, but did they *afterwards* attribute no weight to their own decisions, and rest the whole matter on the replies of Innocent? Dom Chapman obviously wishes to defend Mr. Rivington for having twice called 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est,' the 'exact equivalent' of what Augustine says at the end of his 131st sermon.¹ He observes that in that passage the Roman replies are called *rescripta*, and that elsewhere Augustine, and also Marius Mercator, use the same verb, *rescribo*, in a like connexion. Why should they not? *Rescribo* is to write back, to reply, and Mercator uses it of the Africans' reply to Zosimus;² why should any such writing back be assumed to possess final authority simply in case it comes from Rome? No doubt they made much of a decision which enlisted on their side the most powerful and illustrious of all Churches; they could not foresee the future development of its claims; and it has been said truly enough that 'they wished to establish the influence of the Roman chair, if for no other reason than that its great power made it the best available agency for putting pressure on the civil authority in the West in any ecclesiastical crisis.' But St. Augustine and his brother prelates in Africa would have been somewhat astonished if it had been inferred that they and all bishops were in the relation of mere subjects and mere disciples of a bishop invested, as the Vicar of Christ, with supreme jurisdiction and official infallibility.³ Here, we must

¹ 'Jam enim de hac causa duo concilia missa sunt ad sedem apostolicam; inde etiam rescripta venerunt; *causa finita est.*' Dom Chapman's affectation of 'amusement' with 'Dr. Bright's indignation against' Mr. Rivington's assertion on this point is just a little too transparent.

² *Op. p. 134. Refero,* &c., might similarly be used of the African bishops' 'reference' to Innocent, without implying more than the eminence of his position—his 'primacy of influence and honour.'

³ We are indeed referred to some other passages in St. Augustine. He and Alypius say (*Ep. 186, 2*) that Innocent 'had answered them *ad omnia* as the prelate of the Apostolic see was bound to do.' Very well; *omnia* means the representations they had made on the subject of grace, the question then at issue. Another passage in the same letter is claimed for the principle 'of submission to the Apostolic See' as such: 'Si autem cedunt sedi apostolicae, vel potius ipsi Magistro et Domino apostolorum, qui dicit...' What saying of our Lord's is quoted? Not (as a reader might infer) Matt. xvi. 18, 19, but John vi. 53, as bearing on the Pelagian question. In *C. duas Ep.*, ii. 5 (wrongly cited as *C. Julian*, iii. 5), Augustine says that 'Ccelestius answered [Zosimus] that he agreed
repeat, is the question for Dublin Reviewers. They prove nothing until they prove this. Reference indeed is made to the reply of the African bishops to Zosimus, 'decreeing that the sentence' of Innocent, given from the see of Peter, 'should remain firm until' those whom Zosimus had described as having always been orthodox should confess the true doctrine in terms which the bishops took care to prescribe. This is rather an awkward bit of evidence for Papalists to handle. It was not only an ingenious mode of baffling Zosimus, but also a significant precedent for appealing from the 'present' Roman Church to the past, from the living to the dead, for a procedure, that is, which in Roman eyes is essentially heretical. But the great Council of May 1, 418, did not content itself, as on Roman principles it certainly should have done, with citing the 'irreformable' decision of the late 'sovereign pontiff'; on the contrary its doctrinal decrees begin with an authoritative placuit, and there is not even an allusion to Innocent's letters; nay, they are not even mentioned in the opening speech of the primate Aurelius. This, it will be remembered, is the Council which forbade, under pain of excommunication, any appeal by African clerics to 'transmarine' tribunals, i.e. to Rome. And its decrees were passed about a year and four months after Innocent had written, and rather more than seven months after Augustine had preached the sermon referred to above. How, then, can it be maintained that the Africans believed their own action to have no effect on the actual settlement of the controversy? But this is not all. The very expression causa finita est was used by Augustine three years after the death of Zosimus, in a sentence not quoted by this Dublin Reviewer; it has probably been overlooked by him. Addressing the Pelagians, and contending that their demand for a new synodical inquiry was unreasonable, Augustine says: 'Vestra vero apud competens judicium communium episcoporum with the letters of Innocent quibus de hac re dubitatio tota sublata est.' This is claimed as 'alone sufficient proof.' What it proves is that Innocent's letters were deemed with reason entirely clear on the Pelagian question. And why might not Innocent be called a 'minister of the Catholic faith' (Op. Imp. vi. 11), simply because he was an orthodox teacher, and without any implication of 'inerrancy'? Dom Chapman himself quotes passages in which Innocent is ranked along with eleven other theologians, Jerome included, or we may add, from the same context, with 'a multitude of Catholic bishops' (C. Jul. ii. 33, 36). Prosper's reference to the 'sword of Peter' (C. Collator. 57) comes from a writer strongly attached to Rome. Its curious infelicity does not strike Dom Chapman.
modo causa finita est,' referring, of course, to the general acceptance by the episcopate of the condemnation of Pelagianism by Zosimus (after discovery of his grave mistake), and by the Emperor Honorius, in 418.

Dom Chapman informs his readers that on a future occasion he will tell the sequel of the story. After these specimens of his mode of dealing with documentary evidence one can pretty well guess beforehand how he will treat the unlucky blunders by which Zosimus accepted the libelli of two heretics as completely satisfactory on the question at issue, and as exhibiting absoluta fides and 'most abundant' proof of soundness, and thereby seriously damaged the prestige of his great see. It was not unnatural that, after he had come right, Augustine should minimize his temporary error. But history must neither minimize nor exaggerate.

Meantime we must say of both these Roman controversialists that they suggest to us some memorable words once used by a great man, who afterwards, as a writer in the Christian Remembrancer for April 1855 puts it, 'acted in the way which he has himself described':

'A Romanist assumes his Church's conclusion as true, and the facts or witnesses which he adduces are rather brought to receive an interpretation than to furnish a proof. . . . Let us then understand the position of the Romanists towards us: they do not really argue from the Fathers, though they seem to do so. They may affect to do so in our behalf, happy if by an innocent stratagem they are able to convert us; but all the while in their own feelings they are taking a far higher position . . . They claim and use all documents of antiquity as ministers and organs of that one infallible Church,'

which, as a matter of course, they simply identify with the communion of Rome. Pleading under such conditions, they seem incapable of giving to a fact or a document its proper argumentative rights. Their Church's assertions are,  

1 C. Jul. iii. 5. Mercator says that Zosimus's circular was 'strengthened by the signatures of holy fathers all over the world.'

2 They offered to have their statements 'corrected' by the Roman bishop; but the point of importance is that the statements themselves were accepted by Zosimus as unobjectionable—as, in fact, sound. Zosimus, as a Greek, was ill-qualified to understand a 'Latin heresy,' and prematurely desirous to pose as a judge when invoked in respectful terms. By the way, Paulinus's memorial sent to Zosimus on November 8, 417, does not 'openly profess belief in the inerrancy of the Apostolic see.' He says, 'Nunquam fides vera turbatur, et maxime in ecclesia apostolica . . . fides quam apostolì docuerunt, et Romana cum omnibus catholica fidei doctoribus tenet ecclesia.' By the very act of writing, he declines to obey Zosimus's summons to Rome.

3 Hence, also, they are apt to fix on a word which seems controver-
as Mr. Rivington has plainly said, the 'key' to their study of ecclesiastical history. Hence comes a flood of exaggerations and understatements, of assumptions colouring and distorting evidence, of glosses foreign to the plain drift of a context, but required by the foregone Papal conclusion. We suppose they cannot help it. But it is this which makes historical discussion between Romans and Anglicans so unsatisfactory—that the former claim, in effect, a dispensation from its rules.

ART. III.—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY.


This is a very able and painstaking book. Taking immortality in its wider sense as including all that relates to that future brought to light in the Gospel, the author's object is to find out what is the teaching of Scripture, and more especially what is the teaching of Christ Himself on the subject. His inquiry is purely historical and exegetical. He does not deal with belief in immortality in its relations either to science or to philosophy, but confines himself solely to ascertaining what was as a matter of fact taught by Christ and His Apostles. The general purport of the inquiry, and the spirit in which the author has addressed himself to his task, may be gathered from the expression: 'The words of Christ are to me the highest authority, beyond which I seek no other.' It is an expression which we know how to appreciate in these days when so many loose and baseless views in regard to Christian doctrine are being propagated.

But it is impossible to limit the inquiry simply to the words of Christ and His Apostles. For the teaching of Christ and the Apostles cannot be interpreted aright without taking into consideration the opinions and beliefs of the Jews of the period, and more especially the teaching of the whole Old Testament revelation. It was upon the Old Testament sially serviceable the most absolute sense that it has ever borne. They forget that, in estimating the force of a term, one must take account of its historical setting and of the connexion in which it occurs, as of circumstances which may produce very various degrees of import.

1 'History, as the Catholic Church '(i.e. the Pope)' gives it us, placing its key in our hands, is one thing; history without that key may easily become a labyrinth,' &c. (Prim. Ch. and the See of Peter, p. 148).
revelation that the teaching of Christ was based, and it frequently has reference to beliefs of the period. Thus the inquiry enlarges itself. It has to trace the doctrine and teaching of the Old Testament on the subject, and its later developments among the Jews up to the time of Christ. Nor can the inquiry end even here. The Old Testament doctrine was more or less allied to, if not influenced by, the beliefs prevalent among the nations of antiquity. Hence to determine its character it has to be brought into comparison and contrast with the beliefs of the nations, and in a more general sense with the beliefs of the human race.

This determines the shape which the work takes. It is divided into six books. The first, consisting of seven chapters, is headed ‘The Ethnic Preparation’; it embraces in successive chapters, first the beliefs of the lower races of mankind; then those of the higher races, viz. the Egyptians, Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks. The second book, consisting of five chapters has for its title ‘The Old Testament Preparation,’ and it deals successively with the negative and positive aspects, and with the notes of that Preparation. After that it considers the contributions of the Poetical Books, the Prophets and Ecclesiastes. In the third book the teaching of Christ is considered, and it is dealt with in six chapters under the heads of His doctrine of Return, His doctrine of Judgment, His doctrine of Resurrection, the Intermediate State, and His doctrine of Final Destinies. The fourth book is devoted to the general Apostolic doctrine, and in three chapters deals with, first, the Apostolic doctrine and the non-canonical literature; then it treats of the doctrine of James, Jude, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, the last chapter being devoted to the doctrine of St. Peter and St. John. The fifth book is devoted to the doctrine of St. Paul. It consists of three chapters, the first giving a general statement, the second the particulars of St. Paul’s doctrine, and the third his doctrine of the Resurrection. Lastly, we have a concluding book, in which the results thus obtained are applied to present views and controversies. The first chapter has for its subject the contribution of Christianity to the hope of immortality. The second deals with the doctrine of Annihilation and conditional immortality; the third with Restorationism and allied doctrines; and the concluding chapter with the alternative doctrine.

It will be seen from this summary that the work is planned and marked out with remarkable clearness and ability. And now a word upon the author's method. As
has already been noticed, it is a purely historical and exegetical method. All would be agreed that this would be the only method which could be pursued satisfactorily in dealing with the faiths of the ethnic nations. But in regard to Holy Scripture itself, opinions may be different; at all events, a different method has from time immemorial been pursued. Under the belief that the whole Bible has been in the fullest sense inspired, it has been the custom from the days of the early Fathers up to the present, to collect promiscuously from different parts of Scripture the texts bearing upon the particular subject inquired into. In contrast with this, the historical method has been introduced, mainly by advanced critics who have no clear idea or belief in a real revelation or inspiration. For this reason the historical method has been apt to be looked upon with suspicion. Yet a calm consideration of the matter will show that there is no ground for this suspicion. In fact, the historical method, when considered on its own merits, will be seen to be a real improvement; nay, to be almost necessary if we would sound the depths of the Sacred Books. For clearly it has not been the will of God to reveal to us in Scripture a finished theological system. Rather He has chosen 'at sundry times and in divers manners' to speak to His people, and to guide them onwards by His Providence. How can we arrive at the real meaning and aim of the several Divine words spoken unless we take into consideration their place in the Divine economy, and the circumstances under which they were uttered? When the Divine revelation is thus considered it is seen to be a progressive unity, beginning in remote antiquity, and advancing in clearness till it culminates in Christ. More especially in regard to the question of immortality is this advance in revelation manifested.

In regard to the first book, which deals with the Ethnic Preparation, we are sorry we cannot linger over it. We must pass by altogether the chapters which deal with the advanced peoples, only remarking that the student will be grateful to Dr. Salmond for them. They are well and ably done, giving a clear account of the present state of our knowledge on the subjects, with copious reference to authorities. All we can do is to signalize some of the results arrived at by the author from a study of the lower and primitive races. As bearing on belief in immortality these results have an importance far greater than the beliefs of the more advanced peoples.

The first conclusion at which the author arrives is that belief in immortality is the catholic belief of mankind. It is
true that a formidable list of authorities of great eminence might be quoted on the other side; but it is also true that the instances on which they mainly relied have in so many cases broken down on further investigation, that there is a probability the remainder would break down if examined with more light. The truth is, the negative reports of travellers are liable to great suspicion as hasty and imperfect. Even philosophers like Darwin, explorers like Sir Samuel Baker, historians like Niebuhr and missionaries like Moffat have gone conspicuously astray in their observations, and have shown us how easy it is to err in this matter. Nearer acquaintance with suspected tribes has shown that these tribes have not only their own ideas of immortality, but that these ideas are richer than we might have supposed. Hence our author, after examining the whole question, comes to the conclusion that belief in some sort of immortality is normal to the human race, and that practically it is as universal as religion itself.

This great fact that mankind as a whole have looked forward to a future life is of immense moment. We are thereby enabled to quote in favour of immortality the time-honoured argument derived from the consent of mankind. It is an argument of the greatest weight, notwithstanding all the criticism to which it has been subjected. And its weight lies in this, that it proves that there are, and must have been from the beginning, causes sufficient to create and keep alive the belief. What are these causes? We cannot tell. It is indeed very easy, as many have done, to imagine the causes, and to prove that they are delusive, or insufficient to carry the conclusion. But how can we tell that these imagined causes are the real ones? They are all taken from the conscious side of man's present being. But it may be that the real causes lie deeper than that. There is, in addition to the conscious side, another side of our present being, which is shrouded in mystery. It may be, and we think it probably is the case, that the real causes lie there. At any rate, universal consent proves that there are real and perennial causes creating and keeping alive this belief; and that is really the great point.

But our author's first conclusion is to a slight extent modified by his second. He finds, in the second place, that this practical universality of the belief does not exclude belief in an absolute cessation of being for some. Many tribes, as for instance the Tongans, have limited immortality to their men of rank, and have held that the souls of common people become extinct on the death of the body. Others, as the
Nicaraguans, have regarded immortality as reserved for the good, and absolute cessation of being as the destiny of the evil. And yet others, as the negroes of Guinea and the Greenlanders, have supposed the soul to survive the event of death, but to be liable on its way to the other world to be overtaken by a second death, which is its end.

A third conclusion at which the author arrives has reference to the nature of the future state. Opinions on this point have been various, and they have been to some extent shaped and coloured by the climate, geographical position, and circumstances of the different races. The home of the departed has been placed by some on the earth itself, and by some in the skies. Many savage races have thought of it as some deep or distant part of the earth. The Baperi of South Africa believed it to be a cavern—that of Marimatel; the Maori figured it as at the base of a great precipice. The Australians thought of it as an island beyond the sea in the far west. The Finns also believed it to be an island—the island of Tuoni beyond the river Tuonela. In America the Mexicans and Peruvians, as well as many lower races, believed the sun to be the abode of the distinguished; while among tribes like the Polynesians of Tokelau and the Guaycurus, the moon has been similarly regarded.

But the idea which has prevailed far beyond all others is that the abode of the departed is a Hades, or subterranean receptacle. This idea is common to the ancient German tribes, to the savages of North and South America, to the Zulus of Africa, the Italmen of Kamtschatka, the Samoan islander, and the Asiatic Karen. It was also the conception of the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Greeks, and Romans; and what is especially noteworthy, it was the belief of the ancient Hebrews.

The fourth of our author's conclusions is the most important of all. It has reference to the idea of a retributive future, and how far it has prevailed. The question, however, is one of extreme difficulty. It is very difficult to get at the genuine native belief, for the reason that it has in many cases been modified by the ideas of more advanced races which have been taken over. Another difficulty arises out of the fact that different students have applied different standards of morality. Of course, if a very high standard is applied, it will be found that many races have been destitute of the idea of retribution, while a lower standard, more suitable in the case of primitive peoples, would show at least the germs of the belief coming into play.
The conclusion at which the author arrives is this: The higher races have had a distinct doctrine of a retributive future all along the line of their history. In some it has been a singularly high and pure doctrine; in others less so; while in others it has been strangely rudimentary and imperfect. There have also been among the higher races periods of retrogression, when earlier and better views have been dissipated and degraded. But the idea of retribution has not been confined to the higher races. It has manifested itself among barbarous peoples, and has not been strange even in savage life. As to the question how far it has extended among the lower races there is great uncertainty. It would be too much, in the present state of our knowledge, to assert its universality, for competent authorities appear to have decided that some few races are destitute of it. On the other hand, however, if we do not apply too high a standard of morality, but judge of the question rather from the point of view of the races themselves, it will be seen that in all, or nearly all, the germs of the idea are present. Sometimes, as our author remarks, it takes the form of a simple reversal of present conditions, the rich here becoming the poor there, and vice versa. Sometimes it is seen in the process of disengaging itself from lower ideas, and assuming the form of distinctions non-moral, indeed, when measured by a higher standard, but from their point of view relatively moral, or containing the promise of morality. Thus when among the Indians a man's place in the future world is held to be affected by his skill and enterprise in hunting, or among the Greenlanders by his courage in the battle with the whale, it may seem as if this hardly amounts to a moral retribution.

'But' (as our author remarks) 'when courage, exertion, and endurance come to be distinguished as praiseworthy, and their opposites—cowardice, effeminacy, idleness, and the like—as unworthy, and when it is believed that a man's condition in the other world will be determined by the part he plays in these things on earth, we are entitled to say that there the idea of a retributive future is present, in however inchoate a form' (p. 23).

Turning now to the second book, in which the author deals with the Old Testament Preparation, we find that it has been done with the same care and accuracy. The first chapter, entitled 'The Negative Aspect,' is devoted to clearing the ground, that is to say, sweeping away certain doctrines which have been held to belong to it, but which are altogether foreign. In this chapter the author first deals with the doctrine of Extinction, showing that certain passages in Job and in the
Psalms, which have been held to imply it, really do not. He shows that the real doctrine pervading the whole Old Testament is the primæval doctrine of the Underworld, which the Hebrews denominated Sheol. To it are consigned all the dead without exception; and there they are gathered into families, tribes, and nations. Having disposed of this, he next shows that there is equally no trace of the Pantheistic doctrine of the future. There is no doctrine of emanation from or of ultimate absorption in the Deity. So, also, he shows that there is no trace in the Old Testament of the doctrine of Transmigration or of the Pre-existence of Souls; or of other subordinate Ethnic doctrines which have been sometimes supposed to be found there.

Having thus cleared the way, the author next proceeds, in his second chapter, entitled 'The Positive Aspect of the Old Testament Preparation,' to signalize the elements of the actual doctrine. He bases his view of these elements on the Old Testament doctrines of God, of Man, of Life, and of Death. God is conceived as the Almighty Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the world, a view of Him which towers above any conception existing in the Ethnic peoples around. But this, which expresses His grandeur, is not the most important view of Him. He is also conceived as a righteous, living, and loving God, a God of grace and of mercy, who enters into a covenant relationship with His people Israel. A similar exalted view was also taken of man. In the Old Testament, although, from one point of view, man is conceived as allied to the beasts that perish, flesh as they are flesh, yet in his origin and his essential nature he is altogether different. He is God's special creation, made in God's own image, and, what is most important, destined to a life of communion with God. Next, in regard to the Old Testament conception of life, we find that as bearing on the doctrine of the last things it is most important. Life is conceived as coming from the Spirit of God. God breathes into man's bodily form the breath of life, and the consequence is that man becomes a living soul. The Nephesh or soul comes into being. It is this union of the Spirit with man that constitutes life; and the continuance of life is dependent on the continuance of the Spirit. But in the Old Testament this dependence of life on the Spirit of life is conceived not simply as a physical dependence. It is that, but it is also a great deal more. In the idea of life is contained the idea of a moral relation to God. God is a God of righteousness, who enters into a covenant with His people, and hence life implies the fulfilment on man's part of
this covenant relationship. It implies a life of righteousness, a life of communion with God, a life in God's favour, and in possession of all the blessings which God abundantly bestows on the righteous.

Next comes the Old Testament idea of Death. Death is just the withdrawal, or perhaps the withdrawal to a certain extent, of the Spirit of life, and in consequence of this the living being sinks into a state of powerlessness. But the crucial point in regard to death is that it is penal. Man was not created for death, but death came in consequence of disobedience. Death is thus a judgment or punishment inflicted on man for his sin; and it has, as its effect, the removal of man from the fellowship of the living on earth, and, what the pious Israelite felt even harder to bear, from communion with God. The dead man disappears from earth; he sinks down powerless into Sheol, the Underworld, the place of the departed. In the remainder of the chapter Dr. Salmond has drawn a most graphic picture of Sheol as the ancient Israelite conceived it. He has collected together and classified almost every utterance contained in the Bible, and the result is that Sheol is depicted as very dark and gloomy. We think perhaps the picture has been drawn too dark. It must be remembered that many of these utterances were drawn from souls in the agony of spiritual conflict and suffering, and may thus have received a colouring. It is thus a question whether they ought to be taken and handled in a dry scientific manner. What idea would a stranger form of the climate of England if all the impatient remarks made by English people on the weather were classified and reduced to a scientific system. More especially, what would he think if, in addition to this, he were told that the shivering natives could never meet, even on the most trivial occasion, without discussing the chances and probabilities of the weather.

We think the view taken by Dr. Salmond of the Old Testament doctrine of immortality is the correct one. It is in truth founded on the saying which our Blessed Lord uttered in proof of the Resurrection, 'God is not the God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto Him.' Dr. Salmond, in accordance with this saying, has shown how the Old Testament doctrine is thrown into the form of a development—a development extending well-nigh over a thousand years. The elements of this development are the Pentateuchal ideas of God, of Man, of Life, and of Death, acting upon the primæval doctrine of Sheol and gradually modifying it; acting also upon the Pentateuchal idea of the theocracy and
God's relation to man, and modifying them. Let us look at the development somewhat closely. At the outset the position is this. In regard to Sheol, the primæval doctrine is that there is no return from it; all who descend into it are there for ever. They live there as shades, powerless, unable to communicate with their fellow-men or to hold communion with God. Then in Sheol there is no distinction of persons. The same thing happens to the righteous as to the wicked. There is no Divine retribution there, but all lie equally under the hand of God. Then as regards the Theocracy and God's relation to man. At the beginning the relation in which God stands to man is conceived as a relation to the theocracy rather than to the individual. God is the God of Israel, the God of the theocracy; and Divine blessings on the one hand, and Divine retribution on the other, are for the covenanted nation rather than for the individual, and are confined to the present world.

Such was the state of things at the beginning. And Dr. Salmond shows clearly how the Pentateuchal ideas of God and of man, of life and of death, gradually modified the position. In the first place, in regard to Sheol. Life in Sheol was penal. It was a penalty inflicted by God upon man for his disobedience, and it was to be for ever and ever. But the inspired Psalmists and poets, grounding on the idea of the righteous, the living, and the loving God, were inspired to feel that it could not be so. Job, in view of Sheol as the punishment of sin, prays that he may be hidden in it till the Divine anger pass away. Surely God's judgment could not last for ever. Surely there must be deliverance. The living and gracious God could not be angry for ever. He could not leave their souls in Sheol, but must lift them up in the end to the joy of His Presence. This strain begun by the Psalmists and poets, was taken up by the prophets; and in the end there arose the hope of a resurrection—not the definite doctrine of the New Testament, but a doctrine in germ, which could, when the fulness of time came, grow into that doctrine.

In like manner the idea of the relation of God to man became profoundly modified. In the beginning it was a relation mainly to Israel as a whole, to the covenanted people; and the Divine blessing and the Divine retribution were for the covenanted people, and confined solely to this world. But gradually the repeated apostasies of Israel conveyed to the prophetic mind the hopelessness of this view. It became clear to Isaiah that Israel would 'revolt more and
more.' In consequence of this, the primitive Pentateuchal view of the theocracy became profoundly modified. It was no longer that of the actual Israel. It became an ideal, a thing of the future; and in this future glorious Kingdom of God all were to be righteous. It is easy to see how this new standpoint would bring in the principle of individualism. The relation of the individual soul to God would henceforth rise into prominence. The future glorious Kingdom was certain; it was established on the top of the mountains; but it was not certain who should have part in it. Individual souls must be tried and tested, and if found wanting must be excluded. We can see how this new view would modify the old doctrine of God's retribution. According to the Pentateuch the retribution of God fell upon the theocracy, and it was confined to this world. In the great future it would fall not upon the theocracy, but upon unworthy individual souls; and necessarily it would come to be thought of not as compared to earth, but as extending to the world to come.

We must not think that in all this there was a clearly defined doctrine. It amounted to nothing more than the forecastings of prophetic souls. There is enough, however, to show that at the close of the Old Testament canon, Israel had advanced far beyond the Pentateuchal system, and that everything was taking such a shape as to lead to the perfect Christian system. The glorious foreseen theocracy was to become the Christian Church, and the retribution of God was to fall upon its unworthy members both in this world and in that which is to come.

The development is, indeed, most remarkable. But the curious thing is that while reading Dr. Salmond's account of it, and reproducing it in the shape in which we ourselves conceive it, our mind has been continually straying to another department of theology. Dr. Salmond has alluded to the dislocation of the Pentateuch by the 'Higher Critics,' and has expressed the opinion that the view of immortality which he has given is not dependent on the dates of the dislocated parts. In this we think he is profoundly mistaken. As we have seen, he has shown that on the question of immortality there was a development of opinion—a development extending over nearly a thousand years. He has also indicated clearly the elements of that development. They were on the one hand the primæval doctrine of Sheol, and on the other, as acting on it, the doctrines of God, of Man, of Life, and of Death. Apparently, however, he has overlooked the fact
that these doctrines are contained in the Pentateuch, and nowhere else. He would doubtless acknowledge that unless we place the doctrines at the commencement of Israel's history the development he sketches would be impossible. But how can we place them there unless we place there also the source from which they are derived? If with the 'Higher Critics' we dislocate the Pentateuch, distributing its contents to different ages, the most important part being relegated to Post-Exilic times, the doctrines vanish into nothingness, and the development sketched could not possibly have taken place. Nor is this all. We also raise another difficulty of appalling magnitude. How could the doctrines of God, of Man, of Life, and of Death, ever have arisen in Israel apart from the Pentateuch? On purely naturalistic grounds, what was there in Israel that could conceivably have led to them? This is a question to which the 'Higher Critics' have never addressed themselves; but surely it is one which, from their point of view, cries for solution.

It is thus clear, so far as the doctrine of immortality is concerned, that it could never have run its course in Israel unless the Pentateuch substantially as we have it had been left by Moses as a legacy to his people. Nor in this respect does the doctrine of immortality stand alone. There are other developments in the history of Israel having their roots in the Pentateuch which on the Critical theory would be equally impossible. In the doctrine of immortality we have, in truth, only one out of many incongruities and absurdities inherent in that theory which time will disclose.

The author's third book is devoted to the teaching of Christ. The Saviour's teaching thus forms the central part of the treatise, and on it he lays, we think rightly, the greatest stress. Indeed, it is in the teaching of Christ that the whole Old Testament development culminates; it is in it that it finds its explanation, and in it that it attains its completion. In like manner, as the author points out, the whole Apostolic teaching is based upon it, and indeed differs from it only in so far as certain points are more fully treated and further explained. The author considers the teaching of Christ under certain heads—viz. the doctrine of the Return, the doctrine of Judgment, the doctrine of the Resurrection, the Intermediate State, and the doctrine of Final Destinies. The great feature of his treatment of this part of his subject is the fulness of illustration he supplies from the Jewish teaching of the period. This is very valuable, and to the student will be most helpful. We are not sure, however, whether in the
result the illustration has not overshadowed the teaching of the Master. At all events, we could have wished that as set over against it our Lord’s teaching had been given in a fuller and more pointed manner.

The only point on which we would differ from the author is his treatment of the intermediate state. He holds that on this subject Christ is entirely silent, and that the intermediate state forms no part of His teaching. We think in view of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, presently to be considered, this statement could hardly be maintained. But, apart from it, we would point out that an intermediate state is clearly implied in Christ’s teaching. In teaching the doctrine of His Return, the doctrine of the Resurrection, and the doctrine of the Judgment, all lying in the future, the fact of an intermediate state for those who leave this world before these dread events take place is clearly implied. It is to be remembered that day by day, as Christ was teaching, souls were departing out of this life. What became of them on their departure? Whither did they go? It could not be to Heaven or to Hell; for these, the final issues of this life, were only to be determined on His return. In the picture He has drawn of the last Judgment (Matt. xxv. 31) it is expressly said of the righteous that then, and then only, are they to inherit the Eternal Kingdom. ‘Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.’ It is also expressly said of the wicked that then, and then only, are they to be consigned to their final place. Indeed, if we may take His words recorded by St. John in this connexion, it would appear that Heaven, the final abode of the blessed, was not as yet prepared. He says, ‘I go to prepare a place for you’; and at the same time He promises to return again and to take them thither, that where He is there they may be also.

There must, therefore, be some abode for the departed where they may await the Second Coming. What was that abode? Presumably it was Sheol, the unseen world in which the Fathers of the Old Covenant believed. But, as we have seen, the primitive doctrine of Sheol had before the close of the Old Testament canon been completely revolutionised. The doctrine of the Resurrection—that is, the doctrine of deliverance from Sheol—had changed it from being, as at first, a final abode into a terminable one; that is, in other words, into an intermediate state. In like manner, the extension of the doctrine of Divine retribution into the future life, and its application to individuals, had given to Sheol a
colour and a character which it had not before. It had created separate abodes in it for the righteous and the wicked. It is clear that in the time of Christ everyone who believed in the Resurrection must look upon Sheol as a temporary or intermediate state. And that this was the general idea of the Jews in the time of Christ our author has shown. He tells us that the common conception of Sheol in the Apocalyptic literature of the period was that of an intermediate state; and he instances the book of Enoch, where Sheol is regarded as a temporary abode in which both the righteous and unrighteous have a foretaste of their final condition, and await the great decision.

What, then, was the attitude which Christ took up in reference to this teaching? We think that attitude is to be found in the parable of Dives and Lazarus. We cannot agree with the author in thinking that the imagery of that parable must be regarded as wholly without doctrinal meaning. We may allow to him that the main drift of the parable is to teach the penalty of a selfish life. But we would ask, how could that penalty be shown except by a reference to the state after death? The drift of the parable is, in fact, to teach the doctrine of retribution in the future state. And the only question in regard to it is whether the future state depicted is the final one of Heaven and Hell, or an intermediate state in anticipation of the Resurrection and final Judgment. Of course, this is not the place to argue the point in full. We must content ourselves with simply mentioning our own conclusion that it is the latter. And in proof of this we would point to two things which seem to be decisive. In the first place, the word that Christ is represented in the Gospel to have used to designate the place of the departed is Hades. This is clearly the Greek equivalent to Sheol; and, indeed, it is not impossible that Sheol may have been the actual word He used. Then, in the second place, the imagery of the parable points to, and indeed depicts, the popular doctrine of Sheol as it had become when modified by the two doctrines of the Resurrection and Divine Retribution in the future life.

Are we then to suppose that Christ gives His sanction to these doctrines? It is important to observe how much of the popular doctrine is excluded from the parable. All the excrescences which a too vivid imagination had made to grow out of it are completely ignored. If we are to draw from the parable teaching regarding the intermediate state, we do not really get beyond the great landmarks of the question. We
may gather from it for certain that there is an intermediate state. We may also gather that in that state there is a place for the righteous—a place of rest and peace and sweet refreshment. It is designated here Abraham's bosom; elsewhere it is called Eden and Paradise. We can also gather that there is a place for the wicked—a place of suffering. But what is the nature of that suffering, whether remedial or otherwise, we are not told. Neither are we told the nature of the flame, nor whether the torment is for a time or for ever. But from the great gulf fixed we may indeed gather the solemn lesson that a man's final destiny is practically determined by his conduct in the present life.

We conclude, therefore, that Christ did teach the doctrine of the Intermediate State. And it is of great importance to remember that this doctrine is not merely a curious theological inquiry. On the contrary, the affirmation or denial of an intermediate state draws after it consequences both theological and practical of a far-reaching character. This we now proceed to show; and it may be well first of all to give a glance at the question in its most general bearings.

Dr. Salmond in his introductory chapter gives a general view of the trend of Christian opinion in regard to the last things. In the sub-Apostolic times, and down to the end of the second century, the interest centred around the Second Coming of Christ, and the associated doctrine of Millenarianism. In the early Patristic times Millenarian views faded away, and in their place attention was concentrated on the intermediate state in which souls wait for the Second Advent. Then came the Mediaeval period, with its over-dogmatism on this state, its manifold divisions for different orders of the dead, its purgatorial fires, and the great practical abuses associated therewith. The next stage was the Reformation, which is thus described by Dr. Salmond: 'Then came the theology of the Reformation, sweeping away with the blast of its vigorous breath the accumulations of enslaving dogma and vain definition which had long held the human mind with terror. It shifted the interest from the middle condition and fixed it on the final states of Heaven and Hell' (p. 5).

The description is accurate as far as it goes; but it does not quite bring out all the significance of the Reformation change. We want to know more precisely what, in view of the intermediate state, had been accomplished in the middle ages, and what exactly was done at the Reformation.

In the middle ages, as a result of the deplorable over-
dogmatism, belief in the intermediate state had been practically destroyed. It was taught generally and popularly that the perfectly righteous on their departure are received at once into Heaven, and that the wicked are consigned to Hell. All that remained of the intermediate state was the doctrine of Purgatory. By this doctrine it was taught that the souls of the imperfectly righteous are detained in Purgatory for a longer or shorter time till they are purged from their sins, and that then they are admitted into Heaven. If we consider this teaching, we see how completely the Patristic doctrine of the Intermediate State had been subverted. Purgatory was no substitute for it; Purgatory had become a mere make-shift, not necessary for all. It was not a place where all wait for the Second Advent. It might, therefore, from a general theological point of view, be disregarded. And in point of fact, what is a matter of crucial importance, it was disregarded, and theology had shaped itself to the general view that Heaven and Hell are the immediate issues of the present life.

What now, in view of this state of things, did the Protestant Reformers do? They had before them the doctrine of Purgatory with its terrible practical abuses, and they felt that at all costs an end must be put to these. It would have been well if, when recoiling from these abuses, they had gone back to the Patristic doctrine, and from that standpoint have combated the abuses of Purgatory. This, however, it would have been difficult for them to do. As we have seen, the general tradition of Christian doctrine had been shaped in a contrary direction, and they could not easily free themselves from that tradition. What they actually did do was this. They swept away the doctrine of Purgatory, and left in its place the naked doctrine that Heaven and Hell are the immediate issues of the present life.

The consequences of this procedure were in every way most serious. It is easy to see that it introduced into Protestant teaching a view of things which is at variance with human nature. It is very clear that the vast majority of souls which pass out of this life are fit neither for Heaven nor for Hell. How are we to deal with them? Are we to promise them all a passage to Heaven, or, what is almost impossible, to dismiss them with dread forebodings? The practical difficulty is enormous. It leaves, in truth, to the Protestant teacher only two alternatives, both of which are to be deprecated. He has the choice between over-strictness and over-laxity. If he adopts the former he encounters the recoil of the common understanding, and gives occasion for much unbelief; if he adopts the latter
the power of the Gospel to elevate is seriously injured. It is clear that the only remedy for this state of things is the doctrine of the Intermediate State in which the powers, both of good and of evil, in man are carried fully out. St. Paul seems to contemplate a progress of good in those who die in the grace of God, going on till the Lord's return, when they will be presented 'perfect and blameless.' He says to the Philippians, 'Being confident of this very thing, that he, which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ' (Phil. i. 6).

But what are the theological consequences of the denial of the intermediate state? That is the point we wish particularly to signalize; nor is it at all doubtful. It is not too much to say that this denial destroys the whole proportion of the faith. In the teaching of Christ there stand forth with awful prominence three great events with their final consequences, which close the present dispensation. These are His Second Coming, the Resurrection, and the great Judgment. It is only at the conclusion of the Judgment that the final awards of Heaven and Hell are given. Now what will be the effect on these great dogmas of the denial of the intermediate state? Let us take first the Judgment.

From the point of view of that denial we must suppose that the righteous are brought from Heaven and the wicked from Hell, in order that they may appear before the judgment seat of Christ. Surely such a proceeding is strange—indeed, so strange as to be well-nigh incredible. But if we can get over this, another incongruity meets us. Clearly the whole process to be present at which they are brought is evacuated of meaning. For the awards which should be the outcome of the great trial have long before been given, and, in point of fact, executed. The Judgment is thus reduced to an empty pageant. No wonder, therefore, that this great crisis in man's destiny has, in circles where the intermediate state is denied, receded more and more into the background. That it has done so is very evident; and the chief cause of it has no doubt been this want of reality ascribed to the Judgment, though alongside of this there may have been another cause: we mean a one-sided view of the Gospel of Christ, which would make the Judgment unnecessary.

It is easy to see the evil consequences of such a view, and how wide it is from the mind of Christ. Clearly it conflicts with all we are told of the Judgment, both in the graphic pictures of our Lord and in the teaching of St. Paul. The Judgment is described by them as a searching and awful
reality. In the first place, great stress is laid upon the fact that all must be subjected to that judgment. Our Lord says 'All nations'; St. Paul, 'We must all appear'; and St. John, 'Every eye shall see Him.' Then we are told that it will be minute and searching, embracing all the thoughts, words, and deeds of our whole lives. For it is not only said generally that we shall be judged according to our works, but this is emphasized in sayings such as that of our Lord: 'But I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment';¹ and in that of St. Paul, 'We must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.'² From this latter saying it would follow that not only the long catalogue of our sins and misdeeds will be brought to light, but also our good deeds, our acts of faith, of hope, and of love, our prayers, our communions, our tears of sorrow, our repentances, our reachings forth after God, and every good deed we have done for Christ's sake—all these extending over our whole lives will be brought to light, and, being set against our sins and misdeeds, a just award will be given 'according to our works.' The great crying want of the present day is that this should be brought home to the minds of all. Many live the greater part of their lives in irreligion and wickedness, thinking it will be all the same if only they are converted in the end. But in view of what St. Paul says, it will not be the same. A whole life of irreligion and wickedness will weigh heavily in the day of Judgment against a few months or years of even ardent piety.

We have seen how painfully and perseveringly the human race struggled up to the conviction of a moral retribution in the life to come. Surely it is of the highest moment that this conviction should be maintained in its integrity in the Gospel of Christ. But it cannot be so maintained; it must inevitably be compromised unless we hold fast the doctrine of an intermediate state.

Let us next look at the bearing of the question on the doctrine of the Resurrection.

We can easily see that it affects that doctrine in a vital manner. It is true we are not able to say distinctly in what manner it does so, for the reason that much remains undecided in Holy Scripture regarding the Resurrection. We do not, for instance, know whether the departed are in a

¹ St. Matt. xii. 36.
² 2 Cor. v. 10.
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completely disembodied state, or whether, as seems more probable, they carry with them behind the veil some kind of corporeity which may be inseparable from the soul. Then, further, we do not know exactly what the connexion is between the risen body and the natural body laid in the grave. That there is a connexion St. Paul intimates when he compares the buried body to a seed sown, and the risen body to the plant growing out of it. The same connexion is also intimated by the common statement of the doctrine of the Resurrection, that it is the buried body which rises. But we are clearly taught that the risen body will be marvellously changed from what it is now. Whereas it is now a natural body, it will then be a spiritual body. But even so it will not be a different body, but the same body changed to a new state. This is made manifest by St. Paul's saying regarding those who are alive at the Second Coming. He tells us that when the trumpet is sounded they shall be changed. Again, another point uncertain is whether the risen bodies of the wicked will be like the risen bodies of the righteous. It would appear that they will be so far alike that the bodies of both classes will be incorruptible. Apparently St. Paul says of all the dead that they 'shall be raised incorruptible.' It is probable, however, that the glories of the spiritual body which he depicts are limited to the righteous. And if we suppose so, the saying of St. Paul would then be parallel to that of our Lord, 'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father.'

The points, however, which we have especially to notice in the present connexion are that the Resurrection itself, and the glorified body which is its consequence, are both relegated to a fixed time, viz. the Second Coming of our Lord. St. Paul says expressly that then 'the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible.' If we bear this in mind we shall see at once how the denial of the intermediate state conflicts with the doctrine of the Resurrection. If the righteous are in Heaven, and have been there ever since their departure, they must be there in an imperfect state, at least so far as regards their bodies. For it is only at the Second Coming that their bodies will be raised and developed into the glorious spiritual body. It is only then that the righteous shall shine forth as the sun 'perfect and blameless in soul' and perfect in body. But it is difficult to believe that they could be in Heaven in an imperfect state. And in point of fact, those who deny the intermediate state are led to overlook the Resurrection. If they do not deny it in so
many words, they throw it into the background. The

tendency in their mind is to the heathen doctrine of the
immortality of the soul. And this reacts disastrously on the
doctrine of the Incarnation. They lose sight of the great
truth that the Captain of our Salvation identified Himself
with us in all things, sin only excepted, in order that He
might free us not only from sin and Hell, but from all the
woes and imperfections attaching to our nature—lead us on,
in fact, step by step to the brightness of eternal glory.

Let us now look at the Intermediate State from a more
general point of view. The chief objection urged against it
is that it takes away from the import of the present life in
deciding our final destiny. It is supposed, in fact, that it
teaches a second probation, a second chance, to those who
have failed in this life. But this is a complete mistake. The
doctrine of an Intermediate State has really no necessary
connexion with the views indicated. So far as the doctrine
itself is concerned, it is compatible with the most varied views
as to what takes place after death. The state succeeding
death might be a state of sleep, or of dim consciousness and
powerlessness such as was believed of old in regard to Sheol,
or it might be a state of simple waiting, or a state of renewed
and even intensified activity, or a state of progress. Our own
view is that it is a state of progress in continuation of our
present life. But what we want to point out at present is,
that any one of these views is compatible with belief in an
Intermediate State, and that whatever view we adopt must
rest, not on the doctrine of the Intermediate State, but upon
its own basis. As for the doctrine of a Second Probation, it
is not our business at present to argue either for it or against
it. We would simply remark that, so far as we can see, it is
not a characteristic of God's Providence to give a second
chance to those who have let their opportunity slip. And,
besides this, the idea of a second probation seems grounded
on a false and superficial estimate of our present life. Our
life in this world is not a mere series of acts, good, bad, and
indifferent. Its main feature is the impression of a character.
Each of these acts has not only its moral attribute, but one
and all they mould our character, so that our character at the
moment of death is the result of all. We are, in a word, at
death, what by our conduct in life we have made ourselves;
and this stamp and character we carry with us behind the
veil. If this dread truth is borne in mind, it will be seen that
we cannot begin anew, as the doctrine of a Second Probation
seems to imply. Rather, whatever help or discipline may
await us in the future must take into account what we have been and what we are. We think a deep meditation on this state of things must lead us to discard the idea of a second chance, and indeed lead us to the conclusion that our final destiny is practically determined by our conduct in this life. In the case of those who have formed a bad character, but who have turned to Christ in repentance before the end, we believe that the good work thus begun will, in the Intermediate State, be brought to completion, possibly through much tribulation. But their place in the Kingdom will be different from what otherwise it might have been; so that practically their final destiny has also been determined by their present life.¹

But our point at present is that, whatever view we may adopt as to what takes place in the Intermediate State must rest on its own foundation. And the only further remark we would make is to indicate the danger of over-dogmatism on questions so dark and mysterious. A cautious theology will not go one step beyond the clear indications of Divine Revelation, and it will be especially cautious in regard to inferences. Inferences drawn from any point which may be considered to be established must be drawn in accordance with the conditions of our present state, and for that reason they will probably be wrong. The life behind the veil, whatever be its nature, is, we are assured, a different life in all its conditions; we cannot, therefore, without error apply the conditions of earthly life to its interpretation.

The author's fourth and fifth books are devoted to the teaching of the Apostles, one whole book being given to St. Paul. In the course of his discussion many interesting questions arise which we should have been glad to notice; but our space is well-nigh exhausted. For that reason we must pass them over, as also the chapters in his concluding book which deal with the doctrines of Conditional Immortality and Restorationism. In his criticism of these systems we are quite at one with the author, and we commend to those of our readers who are interested in the subject the weighty arguments by which he repels them. A few remarks we must make on his concluding chapter, entitled 'The Alternative Doctrine'—i.e. the doctrine of Heaven or Hell as the immediate issues of the present life.

As the reader is aware, we are at issue with the author on this point; for we have already pleaded strongly for the doctrine of an Intermediate State. We would now point out

¹ Compare Phil. i. 6 with the parable of the Talents.
to the author one consequence of his refusal to admit this doctrine; we mean the necessary subversion of the doctrine of the great Judgment on which Christ laid such emphasis. No trace of the Judgment Day is to be found in the author's statement of the Alternative Doctrine—in fact, it could not be found there. It could not be placed at the moment of death, nor, in accordance with his system, at any future time. It is only from the point of view of the Intermediate State that it finds its proper place and emphasis. From this latter point of view alone does it become the great event which Christ represented it to be—the crisis of the human race, to which all things in this life and in the life to come are leading up. Surely this necessary omission of an event so fundamental ought to give cause for reflection. We see, in fact, that the consequence of denying the Intermediate State is the subversion of the Judgment. But not only does this momentous consequence follow. It will be found that the absence of belief in the Intermediate State hampers the author all through the chapter in dealing with the final issues; though otherwise his reasoning is admirable.

He first deals with what forms the great stumbling-block of the present day: we mean the severity of the punishment of the wicked. With regard to this point, it is worth while to note the obliquity of the recoil from it. It is the severity which is the rock of offence; but the recoil as seen, for instance, in Restorationism, is not so much against the severity as against the fact of final rejection. But how can the fact of final rejection be eliminated on any rational principle, human nature being what it is. If we reflect on the matter, we shall see that man, being what he is, a free moral agent, and having thereby the power of shaping his character, the final rejection of the wicked ought not to be a difficulty. It is remarkable in this connexion, that in the teaching of our Lord the necessity of rejecting the wicked holds the chief part, and their punishment is viewed as a subordinate matter. In the parable of the Draw Net the Day of Judgment is represented under the figure of landing the fishes, when the good are gathered into vessels and the bad are cast away. The idea underlying this is clearly the uselessness of the wicked for the purpose of the Kingdom. And again, in the parable of the Tares the same crisis is represented by the separation of the wheat from the tares. Here again the uselessness of the tares is part of the conception. But there is in it more than this: there is the idea of incompatibility and hurt which would accrue to the Kingdom by the presence of the wicked.
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‘The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his Kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity’ (St. Matt. xiii. 41).

With regard to the punishment itself, the author points out, and we ourselves would also indicate, though in a slightly different way, that the many realistic and crude conceptions of Hell form no necessary part of the punishment. The punishment itself lies essentially in the sentence of rejection pronounced by the Supreme Judge. If we consider all that that sentence implies, it will be seen that it is weighty enough in itself without any addition of material suffering. It is final: it is irrevocable. It is the judgment of One who cannot err pronouncing that life, so far as His glorious Kingdom is concerned, has been a failure. With regard to the harrowing pictures of Hell, though repulsive from one point of view, yet from another they are not without a deep interest. They were first drawn in remote times, when the human mind could, as a rule, see nothing but the one idea before it at the time. In this case the one idea before it which caused these pictures to be drawn was the rising feeling of fear, horror, and hatred of sin. The pictures thus possess this living interest, that they are the measure of the growth of the moral feeling. But they are unsuitable for an age of reflection like the present. In an age like the present our idea of the final abode of the wicked ‘has to get,’ as the author remarks, ‘the benefit of that finer moral sense, those higher and purer ideas of judgment and punishment, those humaner feelings, that deeper insight into the intrinsic nature of things, which are the results of the gradual informing of men’s minds with the spirit of Christianity’ (p. 662).

We have already remarked that the author in dealing with questions bearing on the final issues is hampered by his denial of the Intermediate State. This especially comes out when dealing with the great difficulty of the heathen who have never known Christ. On this point we have, on the one hand, the doctrine of salvation only through Christ—a doctrine which must be held in its integrity at all costs; on the other hand, we have the inference from the justice and goodness of God, that none shall miss salvation without an opportunity of receiving Christ. The difficulty lies in this, that the heathen have had no opportunity in this life of receiving Christ, from whence it would follow that they are without the pale of salvation. We do not think the difficulty can be solved apart from belief in the Intermediate State. The author tries to solve it by pointing out, as we think
rightly, that the judgment is to be according to works, and that it is also a judgment according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not; and he appeals to St. Paul's saying, that those who have law shall be judged by law, and those who are without law shall be judged without law. But then, if the final sentence is to be executed immediately on death, it would follow that those among the heathen who are deemed worthy receive salvation apart from Christ. The subject is too large to be treated here, but we may make this one remark. Since salvation is only to be had through Christ, it is possible that there may be in the Intermediate State to those who have never known Christ here some opportunity of receiving Him there. The saying of St. Peter about the Gospel being preached to the dead is much controverted; but at least this much we may gather from it, that there is nothing incongruous in the supposition that such a preaching may take place.

There are two concluding sayings of the author to which we gladly draw attention. The first has reference to degrees of reward and punishment. He says:

'The idea of reward proportioned to the measure of service, and penalty proportioned to the measure of failure, occupies a much larger place in the New Testament generally than is usually recognised. If anything deserves to be described as a lost theological principle, which it concerns us to recover, it is this. It is often alleged against the doctrine of Eternal Judgment that while sins differ through all possible grades of difference, it seems in the end at least to represent them as all punished alike. But it is the very burden of a large part of Christ's teaching, and that of the Apostles, that this final retribution will not be the same to all: that each shall receive according to that he hath done; that it shall be more tolerable for some than for others in the day of judgment; that the servant shall be beaten with many stripes or with few, according to the measure of unfaithfulness; that the issue to each will be in equitable accordance with profession, talent, opportunity, knowledge' (p. 670).

We are at one with this teaching, and could only have wished that the author had developed it on the side of reward and service to the same extent as he has done on the side of penalty and failure. For the latter side of the truth it would not be difficult to find acceptance; and yet at the present moment the former is perhaps the most important. People need to be taught that time spent in irreligion and wickedness not only brings upon the soul a weight of guilt, but is an irreparable loss—a loss of that treasure that during the said time might have been laid up in Heaven. In seeking to
avoid self-righteousness we have gone clean over into the opposite error.

The other remark of the author has reference to progress in the world to come, and which also he regards as a lost theological principle crying out for recall. He says:

'The finality of life does not mean that the future existence is a stereotyped or merely passive condition. The fact that death marks the transition from the probation to the judgment and seals the spiritual decisions on which the future turns, does not mean that we are to be simply what we have been. Life must live, and men must act and grow, and character must deepen. The future will be an existence in which we go on and grow either in knowledge, love, and power of service, or in their opposites. But if so, the decisive matter is the trend of life with which we enter that future. The mercy of God extends to the last hour of life. The grace of God may be efficacious with many as it was with the robber on the cross. Death itself may be their purgatory. In multitudes of human beings, where we see only ignorance, sin, or defiance, there may be in the crisis of death, or in the valley of the shadow, the faint workings of a change in the principle of their life, and what may thus begin shall grow. If there be at the decisive point of life, however late it may come, the tremulous inclination of the soul to God, the feeblest presence of that which makes for righteousness and faith, in heathen or in Christian, it will be recognised of the Judge, and under the conditions of the new life it will grow to more in the power and the blessedness of good' (p 672).

With these remarks also we are at one, if they are applied to the Intermediate State. They form, in truth, a remarkable statement of the conditions and possibilities of the Intermediate State. But there seems something incongruous in applying the statement, as the author does, to Heaven. The state of the righteous admitted into Heaven is described by St. Paul as 'perfect and blameless'; and his words agree with the words of our Lord, 'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father.' The description, in fact, seems to exclude the idea of progress in the heavenly life. Nor can it be objected that in withholding the idea of progress we make the heavenly life one of stagnation. May it not be that the heavenly life will be so high above the present, so high also above the Intermediate State, that the alternative ideas of progress or stagnation have no application to it whatever? Everything we are told of it in Holy Scripture seems to indicate that it will be so high, so transcendent, in the glory of its beauty, as to be quite above our comprehension. 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God
hath prepared for them that love Him.' 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.'

ART. IV.—MR. JEVONS'S 'INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.'


When the history of early religion is investigated on the principles and methods of anthropology, and in the belief that the interests of truth and religion are fundamentally identical, the result may be, and in this case is, a valuable work for students who require an introduction to the study of religion, or for the students of folk-lore and anthropology, or for a wider circle of general readers. Mr. Jevons—who, since the publication of his book, has become the first lay Principal of Hatfield Hall at Durham—has had all of these in view, and he presents them with the preliminary matter necessary for a summary of the results of recent anthropology, an estimate of the bearing of these results upon religious problems, and a connected history of early religion. Although there is nothing in the work itself to inform us of the fact, we learn from the bookseller's advertisements that Mr. Jevons's book is the third number of the series of theological handbooks edited by Dr. Robertson in which Dr. Gibson's Thirty-nine Articles and Mr. Ottley's Incarnation have already appeared.

Such an undertaking requires special gifts, and the student who attempts it is exposed to peculiar dangers. It would be quite possible for a mere collector to publish a very large book, or rather a series of books, of materials upon folk-lore. There are, indeed, so many sources of information that a collection which was nothing more would almost inevitably be unwieldy and difficult to manage. A capacity for industrious accumulation of facts is not, therefore, sufficient for the production of a useful work in the field of Mr. Jevons's labours. The student who is to produce a serviceable and readable book must be endowed with gifts for arranging his facts, and seeing clearly what deductions may be fairly drawn.
from them, while at the same time he requires a delicate perception which shall prevent him from overstatement his case and falling into the danger of dogmatizing. Mr. Jevons has shown great industry in gathering his materials. He has derived them largely, though not wholly, from the writings of others; and in particular he acknowledges his obligations to the late Professor Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*. Where the originality of Mr. Jevons's work is displayed is in the use to which the materials are put. It is when he brings his fine powers of philosophical reflection and his gifts of trained classical scholarship to bear upon the facts before him that he casts a bright light upon many obscurities, and exhibits apparently disconnected fragments in their true relation to the whole subject, and convinces us that he has something fresh to say, and means to say it in a spirit of honest independence and at the same time with the caution of the genuine scholar.

If Mr. Jevons had been writing a history of religion, and not only an introduction to that subject, he would have been compelled to include religions such as Christianity, Mohammedanism, and Buddhism within his scope—the positive religions, as they are called from the analogy of positive law, that is, law enacted by a sovereign. But Mr. Jevons is rather concerned with the elementary ideas and common topics of 'customary religions' not enacted by the authority of any single founder, but traditionally practised. These religions have their institutions, and these institutions may be studied from their social side, and have been largely so studied in recent years. In the present work Mr. Jevons has made an attempt, with what we consider to be no small degree of success, to focus the results of this study so as to show what their total bearing on the history of religion is. He wisely deals at the outset with some not unnatural and certainly not unreasonable objections which may be urged against the comparative method of investigation. If it be said that this method seems to commit us to the assumption that all religions are alike, we should also observe that it implies that religions have their points of difference, or it would not be necessary to compare them; and, in fact, it is for the purpose of ascertaining these differences that the method is brought into use. Nor is it so serious an objection as it seems to be at first sight that the comparative method, by applying the general principles of evolution to religious institutions, requires us to believe that monotheism, the highest form of religion, must have been reached from such lower stages as
polytheism, fetishism, and ancestor-worship. For, as Mr. Jevons truly observes, 'in point of fact evolution is universal, but progress is very rare,' and the evolution of heathen religions 'may well have been, from the religious point of view, one long process of degeneration' (pp. 5, 88, 139, 394). To say that religion is evolved is not at all to reject the possibility that monotheism may have been the original religion. The student of anthropology takes the religious customs and institutions of the various peoples of the world as he finds them. His science does not take him so far back as to the time of our first parents in the book of Genesis, but only to the period just before the civilized races appear to our view. This is the period to which the hypothesis of 'primitive man,' reconstructed by the anthropologists from the traces which he has left, belongs. Between 'primitive man' in this sense and our first parents in the sense of Genesis there is a wide gap. The honest anthropologist cannot pretend to see or say with any certainty what did or did not happen on our first parents' side of this gap. He cannot tell us whether man's origin was monogenetic or polygenetic, and when he is baffled we have no other source of information, unless we go to the book of Genesis. The very ignorance of the anthropologist, however, makes it probable that the Father of man, if He exist, will at this point tell His child what He cannot find out for himself; and whatever value we are disposed to assign to the book of Genesis, we cannot very well set aside Mr. Jevons's contention that the account in Genesis could never have been written except by one who believed that monotheism was the original religion, that there never was a time in the history of man when he was without religion, that the revelation of God to man's consciousness was immediate, direct, and carried conviction with it (p. 7). Whether the movement of the religions of the world be upward or downward is not primarily of importance to the anthropologist. He takes note of what he sees, and tabulates the results of his observations. The area of his investigation is limited. He may, if he chooses, leave the question of the origin of monotheism untouched. It is possible that his labours may carry him to the borderland of light, but the full sunshine of the knowledge of God is not a matter of intellectual research. It is a revelation.

We cannot help admiring the modesty of this position, and its fair recognition of the facts of the case. It establishes a friendly feeling between us and Mr. Jevons, and ensures a patient hearing for the anthropological statements
which he has to put before us. The sensation of interest which we experience as the facts are placed in such an orderly manner before us recalls our feelings when we explored for the first time the fine collection of specimens of anthropology and folk-lore in the Pitt-Rivers Museum at Oxford; and on the present occasion, in place of the courteous guidance of the officials of the museum, we have Mr. Jevons’s cautious deductions before us to teach us the true significance of the evidence.

From the beginning of history, as far back as scientific inquiry is able to be pursued, man believed in a supernatural spirit or spirits, having affinity with his own spirit, and having power over him. This is the starting-point of Mr. Jevons’s work (p. 15). He holds that every anthropologist now knows that it is no longer a matter of controversy that ‘there are no races, however rude, which are destitute of all idea of religion’ (p. 7). This early belief, so far as it is what we should call supernatural, is to be distinguished from the theory of animism—the tendency of man to invest moving and even motionless things with life and will, or with a spirit. There is nothing necessarily supernatural about animism, either in the facts explained or in the explanation given, for the savage may consider that the spirit of the river or the wind is exactly like his own, with nothing unusual, mysterious, or supernatural about it (p. 22). But the belief of primitive man is more than this. He recognizes, by acting upon, the uniformity of nature, and his own helplessness in its presence; and when man realizes his own helplessness, he is convinced of the existence of the supernatural. He casts about for some means of entering into satisfactory relations with the power which is greater than his own, in the belief that by the establishment of such a covenant he can face with courage the mysterious forces around him. The evidence shows, moreover, in primitive religion that there is a spirit of thankfulness and gratitude as well as a sense of fear and dread. It was in the natural tendency to locate this supernatural power that man was led to identify it with the spirits which his animism imagined in the rivers and the wind. If this view of the natural power of the spirits of mere animism appears to anyone to be contrary to the experience that rain and wind are

1 We may refer to the excellent statement upon ‘the general consent of mankind’ in Bishop Ellicott’s The Being of God, p. 30; and to the references there given can be added Hooker, Ecc. Polity, v. 2, 1, and 18, 2; Liddon, Some Elements of Religion, Lecture II. § 2; Schouppe, Elementa Theol. Dogm. i. 64-5.
beyond his control, Mr. Jevons would direct his attention to copious evidence to show that savage man for long believed that he was able to make the rain to fall and the wind to blow (p. 24). This introduces us to the subject of sympathetic magic (p. 28), which Mr. Jevons does not believe to have been in the beginning supernatural in character, nor does he consider that the supernatural was evolved out of or differentiated from it. He is inclined to trace it to the juxtaposition of two races, or of two sections in the same community. One, being the more civilized, has learned 'that certain natural phenomena are due to Divine agency, and are beyond the power of man to influence or control.' The other, being the less civilized, 'has not yet learned to distinguish between what it is and what it is not possible for man to effect, but still employs for the production of both classes of effects indiscriminately those principles of induction which are common both to savage and scientific logic. Hence the more civilized race find themselves face to face with this extraordinary fact, namely, that things which they know to be supernatural are commonly and deliberately brought about by members of the other race. But this is what is meant by magic' (p. 37).

Compare p. 33 for the curious fact that the savage would probably be able to give his assent to all the principles of Mill's logic. Whether Mr. Jevons's explanation be accepted or not, the facts do not necessarily exclude the view that religion and magic had different origins, nor compel us to look at religion as the mere 'sport' of sorcery.

If the question be asked, Why should it occur to a savage that it was possible to establish friendly relations with supernatural powers at all? the answer is, that he was already in the habit of communicating with spirit beings, to wit, the souls of the departed. It need not be said at this point that he regarded the spirits of the departed as supernatural, or that he worshipped them. But he did regard them, not only in some cases with fear, which is natural, but also in other cases with love and affection, which is natural also, as Mr. Jevons, with the authority of Bishop Butler, maintains (p. 46; cf. p. 152). Whether the family feast held after a death was an act of worship of the deceased or not depends upon the similarity of ritual in such a feast and the admitted offerings made to supernatural beings (p. 56), and at this stage of the argument that question is left open. When, however, Mr. Jevons asserts, and justifies his assertion by the production of ample evidence, that the ghosts were in some cases at least regarded as friendly to the living and loved by them, he will be
challenged by an inquiry about the dread of uncleanness which is very generally, if not universally, considered to attach to a corpse and to all who come in contact with it. This leads to a discussion of the world-wide institution of taboo. Taboo is a Polynesian word meaning apparently ‘strongly marked,’ and the only way to understand the vast range of subjects which are taboo, or invested with peculiar, and, if you will, sacred properties, and on that account to be avoided, or approached and touched with due precaution, is to study such instances of the application of taboo as Mr. Jevons gives. Some idea of the treatment of a thing that is taboo may be derived from reflecting that it is treated to some extent as a thing to be boycotted, in the modern phrase; but yet without a great amount of qualification this analogy would be misleading. When a thing is taboo it is to be avoided because it is dangerous; yet it may not be dreaded only, for it is frequently an object viewed with respect, honour and affection. The peculiar characteristic of the institution, which gives to it its widest range and greatest power, is the transmissibility, the infection or contagion of taboo (p. 61). It is perhaps easier for us to understand the transmission of the pollution of uncleanness than the infection of holiness. But if we are inclined to think lightly of the details which invest the subject with such grave consequences in the mind of the savage, we shall do well to reflect upon the obvious benefits of a system of taboo in relation to sanitary matters, and to remember what is implied in the clause on the Communion of Saints in the Catholic Creed when it is interpreted by such a passage as Psalm xviii. 25, 26. Mr. Jevons shows that taboo infects not only things, but actions, and even time itself (p. 65). There are, therefore, things which are taboo, which in themselves must be avoided, and then there are things tabooed, which have derived their character of taboo from contact with some thing taboo or tabooed, and this derived quality may doubtless be explained, as Mr. Jevons suggests, in a large measure by the laws of the association of ideas. From a careful examination of things inherently taboo (p. 69), Mr. Jevons concludes, first, negatively, that the

1 Mr. Jevons does not forget to point out that the savage’s conception of his own spirit, and of the possibility of its extra-corporal consciousness is greatly assisted by the mysterious subject of his dreams. We can hardly say that we are much nearer than the savages to an explanation of our dreams. See, however, Butler’s Analogy, i. 1; Bishop Bull, English Theological Works, p. 219; Newman’s Parochial Sermons, iii. 168, iv. 288; and Pater’s Marius the Epicurean, i. 20. Cf. Dr. Goldwin Smith’s Guesses at the Riddle of Existence, p. 231.
fear of evil spirits is not the source of this universal institution (p. 81). Nor is he satisfied with the now generally abandoned view that it was a mere piece of statecraft, cunningly devised by interested classes, nor with the explanation of it as religious observance, for that does not account for all the facts. He is able also to give good reasons for rejecting the latest theory of taboo, put forward by Mr. Crawley (p. 83). In his own broad and comprehensive view the institution of taboo contained priceless possibilities of moral, social and religious good, because it depended upon the truth that there were some things which inherently involved the obligation of 'Thou shalt not' (pp. 85–8).¹

The necessity and the possibility of establishing permanent relations with some of the supernatural powers around him led primitive man to make an alliance between himself and some animal. In human alliances he observed that blood was a strong bond between men, and his efforts to apply this to the animal world resulted in the system of totemism, which was primarily a series of attempts to effect a blood covenant between man and certain animals of his choice (p. 96). Strange as this practice may seem, we have to notice how totemism 'was the prime motor of all material progress' (p. 113). Without being aware of what he was doing, the savage, in trying to effect alliances with the animals, was finding out what animals were capable of being domesticated. We will not pursue the subject in several other interesting directions, such as the animal or semi-animal form of many gods, or the sacred and unclean character of certain classes of animals. But we will allude to Mr. Jevons's excellent representation of totemism as a triangle, of which the three sides are a clan, a species of animals, and a god, while the angles are the relations in which they stand to each other (p. 127). He notices that among the Semites the complete triangle of totemism is never found. The practice of totemism really lies behind the establishment of animal sacrifices and the sacrificial meals connected with them. As the blood is the life, the shedding of the blood of a totem animal was considered necessary to secure the presence of the supernatural class of beings which were connected with that animal. This leads not only to an altar for slaying

¹ Mr. A. Lang criticizes Mr. Jevons's theory in a letter to the Spectator of January 23, 1897, pp. 122–3, and also refers in illustration of taboo to 'The Book of Rights and Prohibitions' of the old Irish kings.
the victim, but also to a pillar \(^1\) of some kind to which the blood can be applied, and where the god at the moment of application can make his presence known (p. 130). In many cases this monolithic pillar gradually assumed the form of an idol (p. 139), and the god was no longer localized in the animal, but the animal is offered to the god (p. 141). At all stages, however, there seems to have been an effort made to enter into communion with the supernatural power by feeding upon the sacrifice; and Mr. Jevons supplies many illustrations of this point, both from the Semite people and other races (p. 144). There arose of course the grave question, What was to be done when the god of the community failed to render efficient protection, or if individual wants called for special aid? If an appeal was made to one of the supernatural powers which had no friendly relations with the worshipper's own tribe, or with any other, the proceeding would fall under the head of fetishism, in the restricted sense in which Mr. Jevons is disposed to use that term (p. 168). We quite agree with him in being dissatisfied with a use of the term fetish which loosely includes almost everything connected with religion. It is better to say that a fetish is an object chosen by a private individual, as associated with a supernatural spirit who has hitherto had no dealings with the community of which that individual is a member. Fetishism is dangerously near to disloyalty to the tribal god, and from its employment of magic degrades the idea of religion. He, therefore, who makes use of a fetish may be punished by his clan if in the event his appeal leads to disaster. Charms, it may be said in passing, are not fetishes, for charms are not supposed to contain any spirit, but are simply objects associated with things taboo (p. 178). \(^2\) Instead of casting about for some new extra-tribal god, the better course to be commended to the savage on the grounds of loyalty, patriotism and piety, is that he should take some step for placing himself under the more immediate protection of one of the gods of his own community. This practice requires us to examine the details about family gods and guardian spirits (p. 180). Here, as in the case of fetishism, Mr. Jevons is considerably indebted to the evidence collected by Colonel Ellis in West Africa; but he adds examples of his own, and is careful to see that his generalizations do not depend too

---

\(^1\) Gen. xxxi. 45; cf. the two pillars at Mottestone, in the Isle of Wight, described in Venables's *Guide to the Isle of Wight*, p. 289.

\(^2\) For an interesting account of African charms see *Central Africa* for February 1897, pp. 22-4.
much upon local circumstances, for he compares the West African facts with those from the Red Indian tribes of North America, the races of Central and South America and Polynesia, and does not forget the *teraphim* of the Semites, the *lares* of the Romans, and the *θεοὶ πατρῴων* of the Greeks (pp. 182-7). The rise of ancestor worship (p. 189) is traced by Mr. Jevons to the similarity between funeral rites and the offerings made to the gods. It is easy to see that the feeling of piety links together the worship of a family god and the worship of ancestors; and, further, that a man will the more anxiously long for children and descendants when he believes that after his death the worship of his family will in some way do him good. Mr. Jevons argues (p. 199) for the origin of ancestor-worship in the filial piety of the patriarchal family of a comparatively late—to wit, the agricultural—period. Two kindred subjects, which it is unpleasant but necessary to consider, are human sacrifice and cannibalism. These are not to be understood unless we bear in mind the habitual disregard for human life among savage nations (p. 202), which exists along with devoted attachment to particular persons (p. 200). The various motives which Mr. Jevons has found in existence for the practice of cannibalism (p. 201) will probably surprise many readers.

The reference just above to the agricultural period, when the tribe settled down after its period of nomad life, reminds us that species of trees and plants were taken for totems, as well as species of animals, and invested with supernatural powers (p. 206). Such tree- and plant-worship has existed in all parts of the world, and its details are analogous to the worship of animals. Both the clan and the individual engaged in it, and Mr. Jevons tells us that 'it was through plant-worship that cereals and food-plants came to be cultivated' (p. 210); and he traces to it the development of the use of bread or maize and wine in sacramental meals (p. 214). We need not multiply illustrations of the religious associations of trees and plants, but we may refer to the repeated use of the imagery of the tree in Holy Scripture, and perhaps to the Ashera, though Mr. Jevons deals with this in connexion with the monolithic pillar (pp. 134-5). If Mr. Jevons be correct in supposing that totemism led both to the domestication of animals and the cultivation of plants and cereals, it is clear that religion gave an initial and very powerful impulse to material progress. It is also true that material progress reacted on religion, for as man was brought into more extensive contact with the forces of the agricultural period.
of nature he desired to cultivate friendly relations with them, and proceeded to do so in the same manner as had previously distinguished his attitude towards his animal and plant totems. This is nature-worship (p. 226), and it provides us with instances of the way in which the worshipper placed himself in communication with objects which he could not reach—for example, the sun and moon (pp. 231–2). This is plainly a point of importance in the history of religion. When the tribes began to settle down, and to unite in a larger political whole, the question arose what should be the relation of the cults of the various affiliated tribes of the one new State to each other. Thus political progress and religion act mutually upon each other. If, as was often the case, two cults so resembled each other as to promote the alliance between two tribes rather than to hinder it, the two gods might come to be regarded as one and the same. This fusion, or syncretism as it is called, was facilitated by the fact that many of the early gods had no names (pp. 234–8). When that kind of fusion was not possible, the inevitable result was polytheism (p. 239). Under this head we not only have the simple fact that two united tribes worshipped the gods of both, but also the less obvious explanation why totems and mysteries originally connected with one sex are at length worshipped and entered into by the other. Thus the agricultural craft was originally a female pursuit, and the deity of agriculture is therefore regarded as a goddess. But when men also engaged in the work, they too worshipped the goddess of the women (p. 240). If we follow out this conception of polytheism, we may apply the truth which underlies it to the Catholic Faith as alone satisfying the wants of all men. The Catholic Faith must be that which includes all those scattered fragments of truth which men at any time and in any place have been able to perceive. The bearing of this upon the dreams of the reunion of Christendom is also obvious. If the rags and tatters of countless sects are ever on earth again to become the Lord's seamless robe, such a result must be achieved by the readiness of men to find all their own individual beliefs contained in the whole counsel of God, once for all delivered unto the saints, and not by abandoning their own convictions because someone else does not share them, in the utterly vain hope that a remnant will be left which is accepted by all. The lovers of undenominationalism may learn a very fruitful lesson from Mr. Jevons's account of the polytheistic process, if they are willing to learn anything from anybody. Here, too, Mr. Jevons finds certain
issues of belief which have benefited civilized races. For he tells us that the last development of polytheism is anthropomorphism, which 'produced and perfected the two forms of art which the nineteenth century has been able to appreciate but little and to produce not at all—sculpture and architecture' (p. 247). As soon as polytheism was brought into something like a system by the modifications of tribal worship, the need arose for an explanation of the relation of the gods to each other, and for this purpose primitive man resorted to myths, which to us appear untrue and irrational; but to those who first heard them they were regarded as self-evident. These first outcomes of the speculative tendency in man were attempts to explain the phenomena of nature, the constitution of the universe, the descent of man, and those matters which in later times occupy the students of science and philosophy. Mythology formed, too, the romance and history of primitive man (p. 263), but Mr. Jevons would say that mythology is not religion. It is rather 'one of the spheres of human activity in which religion may manifest itself, one of the departments of human reason which religion may penetrate, suffuse and inspire' (p. 264). The passage which points out the difference between the Hebrew and all other early narratives is one to which our readers will be glad to be referred (p. 265). It is plain from the very brief remarks which we have made upon Mr. Jevons's account of mythology that he does not regard myths as the work of priests. On the contrary, he goes further, and says that such a supposition is but a form of the fallacy that the priest made religion, whereas he holds that religion made the priest (p. 270). In all early religions and in all parts of the world priests are marked off from other worshippers. Some of the characteristics of the priesthood are uniform, and in others there is a want of uniformity, for example, in the tenure of the office. There are also irrational elements in the conditions of priesthood, as in myths, pointing to transmission from early stages of culture. In all cases, however, there were some things which the priest could do, and some which he could not do. The principle of uniformity is that the priest had charge of the ritual of the sanctuary which he served. He and he alone could kill, actually or formally, the victim. How this brings out the significance of the fact that the voices of the chief priests prevailed in bringing about the death of the central Victim of the world's sacrifices! It is to this solemn striking of the first blow that Mr. Jevons traces the origin of priesthood. He gives no credence to the theory, which the evidence
prevents him from accepting, that it is by being a magician that a man becomes a priest, or king, or king-priest\(^1\) (p. 289). It is the clansman whose religious conviction of the clan's need of communion with the god was deepest who would take upon himself the task, not with savage joy, but with awful sorrow, of smiting the victim for his fellow-men, and drinking the first draught of blood, and in this way becoming the human image or vicegerent of the god (pp. 291-3). The process of stoning the victim, so as to divide the responsibility for his death, and the frequent provision for the forfeiture of the life of the priest-king, show what ideas of bloodguiltiness and sanctity attached themselves to this initial priestly act. That the first draught of blood was considered to contain more of the sacred life than the rest may be illustrated by the universal reluctance to partake of the firstfruits of the field.

The struggle between the two views of sacrifice, mystically regarded as a communion, or commercially regarded as a way of getting something, affected man's view of the future state. Mr. Jevons's chapter on the next life (p. 297) contains many details upon the 'retribution' and 'continuance' conceptions of the life beyond and the topography of the next world. He is, as all writers upon this branch of the subject must be, especially indebted to Professor E. B. Tylor, who has shown, as we should expect, that the retribution theory appears generally at a later stage of culture than the continuance theory. For the view of the next life in the Old Testament Mr. Jevons is content to quote from the Dictionary of the Bible, with a short reflection that it is the 'continuance' theory which is involved in it. Mr. Jevons will pardon us if we remark that this Old Testament doctrine deserves far more study and attention than he has appeared to devote to it.\(^2\) He will find that there is in the Old Testament a belief in the region of light and full communion on the other side of the Sheol (if we may use such a local prepositional phrase), of which he seems to have taken no account, but which it is fatal to ignore if we are to form a correct estimate of Hebrew eschatology.\(^3\)

\(^1\) The intimate association of the sacerdotal and royal offices in many savage tribes is of course to be compared with the inspired record of Melchisedek, with Zech. vi. 13, and with the Messianic office of our Lord; cf. Pusey, Minor Prophets, p. 537; Kay on Ps. cx. 4, and Wordsworth on Heb. vii.


\(^3\) Ps. xvi. 11, xvii. 15.
We must go to Egypt and to India for the development of the view that after death man rejoined his totem, and assumed the shape of the plant or animal that he worshipped, the view which is commonly known as the transmigration of souls (p. 314). These two countries stand by themselves in having possessed the peculiar combination of circumstances which made the development of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls possible. If people were not progressive, naturally their views did not develop, and if they were progressive they soon passed on to higher forms of belief. But when a more advanced religion, with views of retribution, existed by the side of a less advanced religion, which believes that man rejoins his totem after death, and when the higher religion desires to find room for the beliefs of all sections of the community, then development results from contact. The belief in question was too much a speculation of primitive philosophy to satisfy the religious consciousness. It did not really provide that communion with God after death which man in his capacity for religion desires. This was provided for by the hitherto unheard-of innovation in religion which arose in the Semitic area of the ancient civilized world in the sixth century before Christ. The gift theory of sacrifice was discarded, a closer communion with God was sought, a more hopeful view of life after death was taken when the Mysteries (p. 327) arose, with their open and voluntary membership. Mr. Jevons shows how the new worship was grafted on to the old religion, and in the chapter on the Eleusinian Mysteries (p. 358) he explains the difference between private and public mysteries. Both alike were open to all; but the State mysteries admitted the worshipper to the State sanctuary and to a share in State worship. In this chapter Mr. Jevons treads on much new ground, and it will be news to many that the chief characteristic of the mysteries was not their secrecy (p. 360). A short appendix to this chapter supplies a welcome analysis of the hymn to Demeter (p. 377).

We are nearing the end of the material which Mr. Jevons has placed before us in such a luminous and orderly fashion. But in the two chapters which remain it is not too much to say that we have the most important question which Mr. Jevons has brought before us, and which justifies the careful study of all the means which he offers to us for its correct answer. What are we to suppose to have been the origin of monotheism in the area which can be traversed by scientific inquiry? (p. 382). In the chapter which deals with this question we have one of the fairest statements of various
aspects of the case which we have ever read. Indeed, when we listen first to one hypothesis, and then to another, as Mr. Jevons puts them in turn before us, we are reminded of the way in which Browning reviews his great problem in *The Ring and the Book* from the point of view of those who created the situation, or were called to pronounce upon it. First of all, Mr. Jevons examines the hypothesis that monotheism was evolved out of polytheism. If we suppose that religion is an organism, then the general process of evolution, and the course of religious development in particular, would make it quite possible that monotheism was developed out of polytheism. There are, indeed, some recorded instances in which polytheistic nations have been brought to the verge of monotheism. It is also said that among the Jews traces of a previous polytheism are to be found. But we are not disposed to acknowledge that there is much strength in the chief arguments which Mr. Jevons quotes under this head. The tendency of the Sacred People to relapse into idolatry can be better explained on historical grounds in connexion with the sad influences of the time of bondage in Egypt, than by saying that it indicates a slow upward movement from polytheism. The fact that many sorts of animals, and various offerings from the fruits of the earth, formed part of the sacrifices appointed for Jehovah is not so much an indication that at the one Jewish altar a plurality of deities was worshipped, as that Jehovah was not a local god, but the God of all the earth. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof formed as much a part of the Jewish as of the Christian creed. The plural name Elohim may have come into use when many polytheistic nations employed such forms for the names of their gods, and yet at the same time it may have been providentially selected to rank among those Old Testament adumbrations of the full truth of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity which was declared by the Incarnate Word.\(^1\) To argue that the Jewish religion is as other religions is, however, to begin with a postulate the truth of which may be refuted by a very respectable collection of evidence, which Mr. Jevons by no means ignores.\(^2\) It may be insisted that religion is not an organism, which must obey the same laws as an animal or a plant; that as a matter of fact no nation is known to have reached monotheism by way of polytheism; that the monotheism of the Jews is a unique and solitary

\(^1\) Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 48, 511 (ed. 8).

\(^2\) For example, he insists on the unique fact that the God of the Jews was a 'jealous' God (p. 315).
phenomenon in the history of religion (p. 388). Mr. Jevons is not able to give any certain answer to the inquiry whether totemism, as the lowest form of monotheism, was the earliest form of religion (p. 393). What he does say is, that ‘religious progress moves wholly on one line—that of personality, and is the unveiling, revealing disclosure of what is implied therein. But the Divine personality impresses itself unequally on different minds, and it is to those most impressed by it that religious progress is due: to them monotheism was disclosed, the Divine personality was in their own belief revealed; and we cannot maintain it to be impossible, or even improbable, that such revelation may have been made to primitive man’ (p. 397).

Mr. Jevons devotes his last chapter to the consideration of the evolution of belief (p. 398). The nature of religious belief in the pre-totemistic stage is a matter of conjecture. But as soon as man connected his inner consciousness of a supernatural being with the visible forms around him, he began to desire to enter into communion with him by sacrifice and a sacramental meal. These institutions have been universal, ‘but, of all the great religions of the world, it is the Christian Church alone which is so far heir of all the ages as to fulfil the dumb, dim expectation of mankind; in it alone the sacramental meal commemorates by ordinance of its Founder the Divine sacrifice which is a propitiation for the sins of all mankind’ (pp. 414–15).

We may place here, before our final word, a few small criticisms which we desire to make. Mr. Jevons is often obscure because he tries to get too much into one sentence—too many qualifying epithets, too many cumbrous alternative phrases. He finds a difficulty, apparently, in dealing with collective nouns, and puts a plural verb after ‘race’ on p. 37, and after ‘plurality’ on p. 385; while, on the other hand, ‘swine’ is followed by a singular verb on p. 118. We find also, though very rarely, a slipshod sentence, as on p. 197, where ‘which is simplicity itself’ is allowed to stand alone as a complete sentence between two full-stops. We regret to see the quotation of the etymology which is given for Shotover on p. 250; and we suspect, from a sentence on p. 188, a want of knowledge of the difference between ritual and ceremonial. There is apparently a misprint in the mode of reference on p. 195, note 1, and on p. 86, line 26, ‘a’ should be included between inverted commas. On the other hand, we have a few small points on which we wish to express our satisfaction. Mr. Jevons gives honour to whom honour is due, and speaks of the labour which missionaries have bestowed.
on the study of native religions, and which provides most of the material for the history of early forms of religion (p. 6). He fills his pages (passim) with many very fine samples of classical illustrations, specially, perhaps, let us say, in the case of the quotation from Virgil on p. 274, describing the ‘possession’ of the Sibyl. He looks at things in their general bearings, and never presses a detail apart from the family of facts to which it is related. He never mistakes the apex of his pyramids for their base. And he lets fall many pregnant phrases here and there as he proceeds, such as the saying that ‘belief in the wisdom and goodness of God’ is the fundamental principle of religion (p. 178), or ‘the core of worship is communion’ (p. 225), or ‘man’s dependence on a superior being . . . is a real element in religion’ (p. 233). A good index is provided, though a short glossary, in which the exact meaning of a few terms, such as taboo, fetish, totem, and the like, could be given, would have increased the usefulness of the book very much.

In conclusion, we tender our hearty thanks to Mr. Jevons for a book which must have cost him great labour and diligent thought, and which the Times justly called, in its summary of literature in 1897, one of the principal books of its kind of the year. He has given us what we might fairly call, if it were not so interesting, a stiff and solid book. He has put an enormous number of practices with which we supposed ourselves to be fairly familiar—such as the tonsure (p. 171), tattooing (p. 172), and the wearing of ear-rings (ibid.)—in an entirely new light before us, and has enabled us to see how marvellously embedded in the very heart of man’s nature are those Jewish and Christian means of making covenant and entering into communion with God which have been selected and authorized in the Old and New Testaments. We do not regard these revelations as any the less divine because we find among all nations that similar ways were pursued by men, if haply they might find God.1 Rather are we moved to exclaim in St. Augustine’s favourite Pauline quotation: ‘O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out.’2 As all roads led to Imperial Rome, and as the Emperor Augustus erected a golden milestone in the Forum to mark the centre of the world,3 so, we believe, do all the religious practices of mankind find their centre in the

1 Acts xvii. 27. 2 Rom. xi. 33; cf. Hooker, iii. 11. 21.
3 Uhlhorn’s The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, p. 15.
The History of Religion.'

The cross, and in the sacrifice which the Lord of Glory 1 offered thereon. We take the whole drift of Mr. Jevons's remarkable book to be that the atoning sacrifice of Calvary, as now presented in heaven and shown forth in the Eucharistic oblation on earth, 2 is the centre of the worship of man.

Art. V.—The Church in South Africa.

1. The History of the English Church and People in South Africa. By A. Theodore Wirgman, B.D., D.C.L., Late scholar of St. Mary Magdalene College, Cambridge. Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. (London, 1895.)


Amidst the startling transformations witnessed by the nineteenth century, of which we speak so perpetually, and which we for the most part realize so imperfectly, perhaps none have been wider in area and more far-reaching in their future consequences than the changes which have been effected over the huge continent of Africa. A century ago its map, save along its northern shore, presented a vast blank fringed with a narrow border of fever-stricken territory that broadened at its southernmost point, and even here but little was explored beyond the tableland of the Cape. To-day the entire continent is parcelled out amongst the nations of Europe, except in the remotest regions of the interior and along the shore of the Mediterranean, where the nominal independence of Abyssinia and Morocco stands in dangerous proximity to European protectorates over Egypt and Tunis which leave but the sem-

1 1 Cor. ii. 8. 2 1 Cor. xi. 26.
blance of authority to their native princes. Immense territories unexplored when Queen Victoria ascended the throne are forming fresh empires under the flags of Great Britain and Germany, of France and Italy and Belgium; and the old saying of Herodotus, ἀπὸ τῷ καὶ νόν, is verified with startling iteration as one district after another with very different characteristics has been discovered and summarily annexed.

It requires no slight effort of thought and study to realise our responsibility as English Churchmen under this rapid accession of enormous territory. Despite the many and serious mistakes of our colonial policy, and the dark passages of unfair and cruel dealing with native races which cast a deep shadow on some pages of our history, no other nation has developed such a capacity for colonization as our own; and no Christian believer can question that this capacity, combined with a remarkable aptitude for administration and government, with our wide world commerce, and with the adventurous propensities of our fellow countrymen, is designed in the Counsel of God for a higher purpose than the increase of our national wealth and aggrandisement. All earthly gifts, national as well as individual, are for Christ and His Church, and if England possesses unique privileges they are to be consecrated by their exercise in world-wide Missionary service. Yet such lofty considerations were altogether absent from the purposes of the earlier English colonists of South Africa, and when they began to be partially realised (to our shame as Churchmen, by some of our Nonconformist fellow-countrymen before the Church took an active interest in the work) some of the Missionary bodies succeeded in alienating the sympathies of the European colonists to a degree that seriously injured the progress of Christianity amongst the native races. Yet, despite all the humiliation involved in any record of Christian errors and imperfection, the story of the planting of the Church in so wide a province as South Africa is deeply interesting, as it brings us face to face in turn with all the problems which the propagation of the Gospel involves. The definition and establishment of due relations between the spiritual and secular powers; the maintenance of the faith once for all delivered to the saints against heretical opinions from without and within; the rightful recognition of other denominations, English and foreign, which, in many instances, were before us on the ground, and have worked with a zeal worthy of all praise; the thousand questions which arise out of the contact of civilized with savage peoples, and from the introduction of
Christianity amongst tribes only too liable to shake off the partially effective, although imperfect, restraints of their traditional training without acquiring any higher motives in their place; the perplexing and almost insuperable difficulties which spring from the relation of the sexes and the prevalence of polygamy amongst the Amazulu, as well as from their use of a language so rich in the finest shading of expression as to lay pitfalls for any save those who have acquired a complete mastery of its resources—all these come in turn before the reader in abundant interest and variety. How often are we reminded of the troubles which distracted the Church in the Apostolic age as history repeats itself and enforces its lessons of patience and faith and submission of will! How often are we brought back to fundamental principles and warned that our only safety will be found in faithful adherence to Catholic doctrine and discipline! How often, too, do we find the Church tried by unprecedented hindrances of which the earliest ages knew nothing, but which we may well believe are designed to teach us that nothing can avail her but the living presence and power of her Lord.

The works named at the head of this article may serve as typical examples of the several aspects under which Church Missions may be regarded. Dr. Wirgman's History of the English Church and People in South Africa professes, as its title implies, to cover the whole ground, and describes the introduction and growth of the Church in South Africa, as well as its extension by Missions amongst the neighbouring heathen peoples. Miss Benham's deeply interesting biography deals with one of the ablest of English Missionary pioneers; and the record of his combined intellectual power, wide acquirements, large-hearted self-sacrifice and life-long devotion should suffice of itself to silence the ignorant and scornful contempt of Missions which is still too common. Dr. Cust deals with the principles which should underlie and regulate all Missionary effort, and criticizes with outspoken fidelity the mistakes by which, as he conceives, some part of our Mission work is marred. If much that he writes is keen and pungent, and the standard of self-sacrifice he demands is lofty and uncompromising, no thoughtful reader can fail to recognize the wide knowledge and clear grasp of his subject, as well as the ardent zeal and love for Missions, displayed in The Gospel Message, as in so many other volumes, by this veteran and life-long labourer on behalf of Mission work. Bishop Knight Bruce, in the too brief account of his two
journeys on foot across Mashonaland, shows how not only an English Christian gentleman, but English ladies also, are ready for Christ's sake to endure such hardness as Dr. Cust deems indispensable, not merely in the suffering of bodily pain but in the yet more severe trial of prolonged and helpless association with dirt and disease, and danger and degradation, so that the reader understands the full meaning of the lines inscribed on the title page of *Mashonaland*:

> 'The hut and the dirt, the rags and the skin,  
> The grovelling want and the darkened mind—  
> I looked on this; but the Lord within:  
> I would what He saw was in me to find.'

A few additional words of criticism on some of the books before us may not be out of place. Dr. Wirgman's succinct history includes a useful résumé of the trying conflicts, civil as well as ecclesiastic, through which the province of South Africa has passed, and explains the just grounds which the Dutch have for complaint in some past transactions with the British Government. His very first sentence acknowledges the grave responsibility laid upon the annalist of the Church in South Africa, but the impression conveyed by his book is that it is rather the work of a partisan than of an impartial historian. With his cordial admiration for Bishop Gray and his no less cordial condemnation of Dr. Colenso we heartily concur, but we regret that his advocacy of self-government for the Colonial branches of the Anglican Church should be disfigured by flippant and erroneous reference to the Church of England as bound in fetters that are gilded by endowments. Ignorance upon so simple and thoroughly thrashed-out a fact as that the Church did not accept establishment in return for her endowments does not inspire confidence in the writer's judgment on other questions, nor is this distrust modified by the unqualified language applied to those with whom Dr. Wirgman disagrees. It is a further, though not so serious, a blemish that Dr. Wirgman's style bears evidence of hasty and careless writing. We find it hard, for example, to understand how a Church Committee in Natal, however mischievous, could arrogate to itself an outcrop of usurped privilege and powers (p. 174, note), or to believe that the enemies of the Church would reproach her with being the caprice of Henry VIII., although they may have said she was the subject of it: whilst the assertion that in some minds a bishopric 'is almost identified with a spiritual [does not Dr. Wirgman mean a temporal?] peerage' comes perilously
near the examinee's statement that St. Bartholomew was very largely, if not altogether, identical with Nathanael. Miss Benham's biography of Dr. Callaway conveys, with a condensed brevity well worthy of imitation, the story of a life which deserves and will repay careful study. Eager in his search for truth, and ready to make any sacrifice to find it, Bishop Callaway felt and obeyed the call to give himself to Mission work, and with deep but unconscious and unaffected humility devoted his scientific powers, which were of no mean order, to research into Kaffir life and thought. At what cost of labour these studies were prosecuted in combination with his unwearied toil as priest and bishop is set vividly before us in Miss Benham's pages. Dr. Cust's Gospel Message sparkles with the vigour, originality and mastery of his subject which mark all his books on the great Missionary question. His independence of thought and his ardour in the cause are only equalled by the industry with which he gathers from a thousand sources whatever can illustrate his subject. Sometimes we wish that he would give us fuller reference to the authorities he quotes, sometimes we think him a little hard on matters of Missionary finance, sometimes we hardly follow his appreciation of non-Christian religions. We entirely sympathize with his disgust at ignorant and sweeping condemnation of the religious conceptions of mighty nations, but we at the same time recall what high authority declares—'the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God.'

The early history of the Church in South Africa does not present an attractive record. In the struggles between England and Holland for the sovereignty of the Cape, the spiritual welfare of the British colonists was completely disregarded, and as the Dutch were far more numerous than their English fellow-citizens, it was stipulated that the Dutch Reformed Church should be the established religion of the colony. The Dutch ecclesiastical system was essentially Erastian, and with the ignorance of Church principles then, and even long afterwards, prevalent at home, it was not astonishing that the British governor should claim the same powers, as Ordinary, over the Anglican clergy as his Dutch predecessor had exercised over the Dutch Reformed ministers. The confusion thus engendered was aggravated by serious political complications. It is impossible for us to discuss Lord Glenelg's colonial administration, but Dr. Wirgman attributes to this well-intentioned Minister the blame of troubles under which the colony is still suffering, and affirms
that fifty-six years after the event the mischief still remains unremedied. Vacillating counsels, religious dissensions, race antipathies, repeated Kaffir wars, seriously hindered the progress of the colony, and checked that union of its European inhabitants which was of the highest importance to its welfare. The hostility of the Dutch to English rule, resulting in the formation by the more energetic of the Boers of the Transvaal and Orange Free Republics, the strained relations which long existed between our own colonists and the home Government, and the distrust formerly entertained by the European settlers of all efforts for the conversion of the native races may be traced, in Dr. Wirgman's mature judgment, to the misleading and disastrous influence of the agents of the London Missionary Society in Downing Street. If his contention be just, England is at this moment paying dearly for her apathy about Church extension in her colonies sixty years ago. 'Had Bishop Gray been at Cape Town in 1835, with his statesmanlike breadth of view, lofty aims, and thorough manliness of character, one would have deemed it hardly possible that the Colonial Office should have erred so gravely.'

A few statistics may serve to bring vividly before the reader's mind the spiritual destitution of the Church in South Africa up to the year 1847, when Bishop Gray was consecrated to the see of Cape Town. It was represented to the Committee of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund that there were ten thousand Church people in the colony, dispersed over an area as large as England, Scotland, and Ireland. They were ministered to by eleven clergymen and two catechists, and had eleven churches. In past years their only opportunity for receiving the rite of Confirmation was on the occasion of a passing visit from some Indian or Australian bishop, and then they had frequently to borrow the use of one of the Dutch churches, as their own buildings were quite inadequate, Church discipline and doctrines were altogether wanting. Of the scanty supply of clergy some had long been absent on sick leave, others lived away from their churches. 'One had not for some time had a single adult at service.' No wonder that a modified Plymouth Brethrenism prevailed amongst the laity, that the advocacy of fasting was held in suspicion as tending to Popery, or that in the schools part of the Church Catechism was omitted for fear of giving offence. 'The state of the Church in the colony was one dead level of inefficiency, incompetency, and neglect.' The charge of

1 Wirgman, p. 93.  
2 Ibid. p. 127.
so large an area was in itself sufficiently excessive, but the
limits of the new diocese were made to include the Orange
River Territory, Kaffraria, and Natal—the latter a thousand
miles from Cape Town in one direction—as well as the island
of St. Helena, which lay a thousand miles off in another.

The arrival of the Bishop in February 1848 inaugurated
a new era. He was accompanied by seven fellow-labourers,
three of whom were already in Holy Orders, and was pre-
ceded or followed by thirteen more, some of whom had
learned a handicraft to help in furthering their work, even the
Archdeacon (Merriman) wearing boots made by himself. A
month later the Bishop, already hard at work, wrote as
follows:

'I have never a quiet moment, and have upon my shoulders all
the accumulated neglect and faults of half a century. Church build-
ing, however, is being talked of and meetings ad nauseam. The
liquidation of debts on Churches—£7,000 on the Cathedral,
£1,700 on Trinity—the formation of parishes and vestries, and the
correction of disorderly proceedings, are my chief occupations just
now. This parish (Wynberg) has a chaplain quite useless, an infant
school where morality is taught as a substitute for the Christian
faith, a Government school from which the Catechism is excluded,
a Church girls' school where it is mutilated to suit the Methodists,
a Sunday school held in church from which it is excluded. Into
this last I walked up last Sunday week to hear the children, but
instead of this I heard a long extempore prayer from an Indian
layman who had turned the church into a conventicle. . . . The
cathedral is a joint stock affair, some of the proprietors Jews or
Atheists, and the offerings of the Holy Communion have before now
gone to pay interest on shares. Still, I think things look very
promising, and I am in good heart. People quite appreciate the
restoration of things upon the principles of the Church of England.'

This hopeful estimate was confirmed, notwithstanding the
more detailed knowledge acquired of deficiencies, by Bishop
Gray's first visitation tour. On September 23 he wrote:

'I have now travelled nearly 900 miles since I left Cape Town,
and have not yet met with a single English church, or more than
one English clergyman previous to my arrival at Uitenhage. This
simple fact is the best evidence and illustration I can give of our
past unfaithfulness and our sad neglect of this most interesting
colony. Yet intense gratitude has been the feeling uppermost in my
mind during the whole month that I have been passing through
successive scenes of spiritual destitution. Far from being dejected
or cast down, I am full of hope; for I believe that God is with us
of a truth, and that His Blessed Spirit is influencing for good many
a soul within this great diocese. If we only prove faithful to our
The first four years of Bishop Gray’s episcopate were spent in unwearied labours to master the needs of his enormous diocese, and in devising plans effectually to supply them. No more vivid picture could well be drawn of the spiritual condition of the colony than that which is condensed into a few pages in the admirable Digest of S.P.G. Records. The peril of the Church in South Africa was grave and imminent. Some of her members had not seen the face of a clergyman for forty years; others were being absorbed, naturally enough, into other communions. One farmer brought his daughters twenty-five miles to beg for confirmation; another travelled 180 miles to be confirmed, but it was necessary that a coloured woman with whom he had cohabited for fifteen years should first be prepared for baptism and that she should be married. Dutch ministers lent their churches. Jews were moved by the Bishop’s words to subscribe towards new buildings. Interest and deep feeling were everywhere aroused, and at Grahamstown, where 112 candidates were assembled, whole rows of them were in tears. Missionary work amongst the coloured population went hand in hand with efforts for the English colonists, and the baptism of seventy adults at St. George’s, Cape Town—all heathen, save three Mohammedans—within fifteen months crowned the labours of Mr. Douglas. Within two years a special Mission to the Kaffirs was inaugurated, and in reply to the Bishop’s inquiry of Archdeacon Merriman if he knew of a fit man to head the Mission, the Archdeacon wrote:

‘I really do not; but I know a willing one, and, what is of more consequence, a man willing with his whole house. Myself, my wife, Miss Short, Jetters White and Kaffir Wilhelm would all think ourselves honoured if we were sent on this mission together. We should go and live a hard self-denying life in a Kaffir kraal, eating, like Kaffirs, sour milk and mealies, and working with and for Kaffirs.’

It was additional cause of serious anxiety for the future that although a kindly spirit prevailed amongst the Christians labouring in South Africa amidst heathen darkness they represented twenty different religions, and were working without much mutual intercourse or any unity of design.

The increase in the number of the clergy from sixteen to fifty in three years, with the expectation of further additions,

2 Ibid. p. 280.
awakened new apprehensions about the future maintenance of a work that had been so rapidly extended. Every parish was divided into three distinct races, who held persistently aloof from one another. In some districts Church workers were regarded as intruders, in others they were weakened by party divisions, in most they were the last in the field. At best effectual supervision over so vast an area as the original diocese of Cape Town was a physical impossibility, and when, after four years’ experience, varied by adventurous journeys which rivalled in incidents the better-known travels of Bishop Selwyn, Dr. Gray visited England he had marked out the districts of Grahamstown and Natal as the seats of new bishoprics, which were finally established before his return to the Cape early in 1854.

The troubles which speedily arose out of Dr. Colenso’s appointment to the see of Natal form a mournful episode in the Church history of South Africa over which we cannot linger here. The purpose of God overrules heresies to the testing and eventual edification of the Church, and in Dr. Gray South Africa was provided with a Metropolitan of statesmanlike discernment and undaunted courage. The more pressing wants of his scattered flock were now in some measure supplied; the union of the two European races, Dutch and English, as testified by the admission of two Dutch ministers and their congregations into the Church, was apparently begun; Church efforts for the evangelization of the heathen were carefully and successfully elaborated, and the Bishop was now called upon to organize, first the diocese of Cape Town, and eventually the province of South Africa, upon the firm basis of certain Constitutions and Acts accepted by the united body of bishops, clergy and laity assembled in representativesynod. Under what a storm of obloquy and opposition the Church Constitution was inaugurated, through what perils of ineffectual appeal to the colonial and home tribunals it was gradually shaped, and how public opinion became eventually all but unanimous in its favour—the history of these events contains lessons full of interest and encouragement for those who are called to act on Catholic principles. Of course, under circumstances so unprecedented some mistakes were inevitable, and Bishop Gray was denounced, as Bishop Selwyn was in New Zealand under similar conditions, as dictatorial and domineering. But he laid the foundations of the Church of South Africa deep and true. He studied carefully first principles, and discerned how to apply them so as to secure needful freedom for his province whilst it continued to be an
integral part of the Anglican Communion. He ensured the maintenance of discipline as regards faith and morals on the basis of mutual agreement, and he elaborated a system of diocesan and provincial synods which formally disclaimed the right to alter the formularies or the standards of faith and doctrine of the Mother Church of England.

A hasty glance at the Kaffir College of Zonnenbloem, designed for the sons of native chiefs, and destined to train up a native ministry, must conclude our imperfect notice of Bishop Gray's episcopate. No conviction has been more strongly borne in upon the minds of our most thoughtful missionaries than the persuasion that a native Church can only be permanently built up by the agency of a native priesthood, and consequently that educational work, though slower in its operation, is absolutely indispensable. The institution at Zonnenbloem has been superseded as a college for Kaffirs through the growth of a similar and more convenient college at Grahamstown, but it still attracts the sons and younger brothers of the Basuto chiefs, and its union of industrial training with a high standard of intellectual teaching enrolled over 300 students between 1876 and 1889. In the year 1892 it contained seventy-six native and European scholars. It has before it a field of usefulness, and an opening for Christian truth, greater (in the opinion of the present Bishop of Cape Town) than any other Diocesan institution.

We have no space for further details of the remarkable change wrought in the position of the Church in South Africa by Bishop Gray during the twenty-five years of his unwearied ministry. He died as he had lived—in harness—and the whole colony gathered in affectionate and respectful sorrow round his grave. We will let Dr. Wirgman express in words—characteristic alike of his mode of thought and expression—the estimate his admirers had formed of the man whom the S.P.G. Committee pronounced to be the foremost prelate in the British Colonies:

'It was given to him to stand foremost amongst those who have redeemed the coldness of the nineteenth century [we should hardly have thought that coldness was one of its distinguishing characteristics] from the reproach that her sons were utterly alien from the robust and sturdy religion which nervèd the heroes of the Church Primitive to do and dare all for the Catholic Faith. It was given to him to stand firm as St. Athanasius of old, and maintain his position as the victorious champion of the Faith, whole and undefiled, in the bitterest conflict and most arduous struggle against heresy and Erastianism that our Church has ever passed through. It was given to him, through the unwearied energy, patient perseverance, unwavering
courage, and gentle humility of a life devoted to God, to weld into a Province of Christ's Church the feeble beginnings of English Church life in South Africa. His was no mere prominence as a theologian, a scholar, a sacred orator or an ecclesiastical statesman. Dowered as he was with a measure (and that no sparing one) of all these gifts, others may have equalled or surpassed him in each or any of them, without touching his special claim to the loving reverence of Churchmen of this and all future generations. He restored to us the primitive ideal of the Christian Bishop and Father in God, the unwavering champion of the Catholic Faith against the world. He restored to us this ideal when its very existence was imperilled amongst us fifty years ago, when the office of a bishop in England was almost identified with a spiritual peerage; of itself not necessarily an evil, but which had become so by the Erastianism and politico-religionism with which, in too many instances, it was involved. He taught men by his life and actions that the Anglican Church throughout the world was an integral part of the Christendom founded and organised by Christ and His Apostles, and able to point backward over eighteen centuries of unbroken historical continuity to the Day of Pentecost. He disentangled the Erastian traditions which clung around the connexion of Church and State in England, which fettered her energies, crippled her powers, blighted her life, and gave her enemies cause to blaspheme. He freed his own province, and by implication such of the sister provinces as were not free, from the reproach that our Church was the creature of the State, the caprice of Henry VIII., the plaything of Edward VI. and his venal advisers, and the political tool of Elizabeth. He showed the world by his independent courageous initiative, and his assertion of his inherent right as a Metropolitan and Bishop of the Church Catholic, that the blemishes and defects caused by the establishment of the Mother Church are the accidents and not the essence of her being. He helped the tried hearts of loyal Churchmen in England to take courage and wait in patience the day of their deliverance, neither anticipating nor deprecating the methods whereby, in God's Providence, the severance between Church and State will in His own time and way be surely wrought out. All this and even more we may reckon as the conscious and unconscious influence of the life of the man who has been fitly named "the Athanasius of the South," apart from the personal holiness, loving tenderness and Christian humility which were the leading graces of his character. 1

The history of Church work and progress in Kaffraria is not inferior in interest to that of the mother diocese of Cape Town. It had early attracted Bishop Gray's attention, who mourned that over its wide area of nearly 18,000 square miles, with a people willing to attend Christian assemblies and schools, there were in 1848 no Church labourers in a field already white with the harvest. Various

1 History of the English Church and People in South Africa, pp. 131-3.
sections of the great Bantu race comprise the vast majority of the population, the chief of whom are the Kaffirs, the finest of the South African tribes.

Many of their customs, such as circumcision and purification, resemble those of which we read in the Old Testament; and their reverence for their chiefs, their vast possessions of cattle and their pastoral life all recall the ancient story of the patriarchs. Eloquent in speech, logical in reasoning, patient in argument, they are much given to metaphysical speculations, and are capable of long silent self-communing reflections on Nature, and the powers above Nature, their own being and the Source of all being. They believe in spirits, good and evil, and regard the former as ministers of Providence whose favour they seek to obtain by sacrifice.'¹

Still they are but as 'children crying for the light,' the slaves of debasing and immoral superstitions, practising the diabolical rites of witchcraft with all its unspeakable horrors of 'smelling out' and executing its victims with indescribable tortures. A visit to England by Bishop Gray to raise the necessary funds, and the selection of a suitable man in the person of Rev. H. T. Waters, who cheerfully gave up his country parish to enter upon the work, absorbed so much time that it was not until 1855 that the first Church Mission was planted in the territory of Kreli, the Chief of all the Kaffirs.

Hardly had the Mission been established at St. Mark's—so the new station was named—when a wave of fanaticism swept over Kreli's people, bringing ruin and desolation in its train. In obedience to the visions of a young native girl, to whom, as she asserted, the dead chiefs of their tribe had appeared, the Kaffirs readily slew their own oxen and ravaged their own crops under the persuasion that as soon as this was done the buried warriors would return to life, bringing with them tenfold all that had been sacrificed, and would sweep all the English into the sea. A terrible famine was the natural and inevitable consequence, and most European settlers left the country; but Mr. Waters stood his ground and was enabled to save 6,000 souls who, but for the relief which he dispensed, must have perished. No wonder that his heroism and devotion won him 'extraordinary moral influence.' A few years later, in 1862, 1,300 natives were living on the station, all of whom had in some degree renounced their former evil life and had consented to follow the rules laid down by the founder of the Mission. By 1869 over 800 natives had been bap-
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tized at St. Mark's, and branch stations had been established which grew so rapidly as to rival or surpass the mother settlement. At the new centre of All Saints', on Inyanga or Moon river, after nine years of unremitting labour, Mr. J. Gordon reported that his daily services at sunrise and sunset were attended by ninety persons, and the Sunday congregations averaged 900. Nor were these merely converts in name. When, in 1865, their Mission chapel was nearly in ruins, and no help from outside was obtainable, everyone—men and women alike—set eagerly to work on a new building which they completed at a cost of labour and materials voluntarily given worth 80l., a sum that should be multiplied a hundredfold to represent its equivalent in England. So once again, 'in much proof of affliction, the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality.'

Church missions in Kaffraria were under the episcopal supervision of the Bishops of Grahamstown until the year 1873, when, through the help of the Scottish Church, an endowment for a new diocese of Kaffraria was provided, and Dr. Callaway, who had been labouring amongst the Kaffirs for nearly twenty years, was selected as its first bishop. We have already referred to the high character and attainments of the new prelate. With the ardour and self-consecration of a Missionary evangelist Dr. Callaway combined singular sagacity in discerning the weaker points in current Missionary methods and a clear understanding of the best means to be adopted for the effectual spread of Christianity amongst the Kaffirs. Yet his penetration and calmness of judgment in no degree chilled the fervour of his zeal or weakened his faith in the power of the Gospel message and of its eventual success in South Africa. In his Charge to the Diocesan Synod in 1879 Dr. Callaway dealt so ably with the causes of native disaffection and displayed so wide an acquaintance with the native cast of thought that Sir Bartle Frere (the Colonial Governor) had it printed at the public expense and commended it to the 'special attention' of the home Government. We can only note here two points on which the Bishop with his long experience emphatically insisted. The first was his conviction that the success of Missions amongst the natives of South Africa has been greater than is supposed, and that it is as great as any reasonable calculation of probabilities would lead us to expect. The
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second was his undoubting persuasion that God would not only give the native races grace to become Christians, but also to be able ministers of His Gospel amongst their brethren. 'And in this faith,' he added, 'I wish to dedicate to God all my remaining power and bind it to the purpose of raising a native ministry.'

We have been the more anxious to insist upon Dr. Callaway's breadth of view, because too many persons regard Missionaries as unreasoning enthusiasts and disparage, if they do not absolutely discredit, the value of their work. The laying of the foundation stone of the Theological College at Umtata for Kaffir training was the occasion of a picturesque scene. 'Whilst Europeans were making their offerings Gangalizwe, the Tembu Chief, rode up with a regiment of his cavalry and presented 10l Chief after chief followed his example, and many natives gave cattle and sheep.' Yet Dr. Callaway's chief reliance was placed on Christian association and example.

'My firm persuasion,' he wrote, 'is that colonization by Christian people will do more for the natives than the isolated efforts of solitary missionaries dotted here and there about the country—men, many of them of narrow notions, who say truly enough the Gospel is the remedy for all evils, social and moral, but who miserably mistake the means of bringing the Gospel to have a bearing on the people and to get an entrance into their hearts. It is perfectly clear that we cannot with any wisdom or justice address untutored savages as we should address educated and well-informed Christians who have lived all their lives in the atmosphere of Christianity. Here, more than anywhere, example is more than words; and I attribute the widespread and increasing influence I have over the heathen around me simply to the general cheerfulness and good temper of my daily life, and to the attempt to act towards them as an elder brother or a father. This system is infinitely more telling than any number of Sunday sermons. My best sermons are preached when I am engaged with them in labour; and ... it is clear that a work of this kind not only may be carried on by laymen, but ought to be by every layman in his character of a priest unto God. ... I feel sure that unless [the natives] are taught good habits as well as good doctrines, the latter alone will not save them from temporal ruin; and the Kaffirs, like other coloured races, will gradually disappear before the white men. ... The progress of things must be natural; and we must not adopt any hotbed, high-pressure system.'

Bishop Callaway's practice in the performance of Mission work thoroughly accorded with his theory. He devoted himself with intense assiduity to mastering not merely an

---
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acquaintance with the Kaffir language, but such an insight into their mind and spirit as should enable him to follow the Kaffir order of thought. He followed their highly developed forms of speech through its varied idioms and minutest shades of meaning, and by constant comparison of word with word acquired the exact turns of expression required to teach religious truth to the native races. No pains were deemed too great by which he might gradually amass a full record of aboriginal beliefs and superstitions, until he became an acknowledged authority in Amazulu ethnology and primateval civilization. It would be difficult to encounter in the annals of Church history a more striking example of Christian devotion than that afforded by this highly educated scientist, consecrating all his powers with the energy of an apostle to an accurate rendering of Christian ideas in Zulu. Of the need for such caution Miss Benham gives the following illustration:

"The clear insight and searching investigation which Dr. Callaway brought to bear on matters of importance appear in his examination of the problem of what Zulu words are fitted to translate prayer into the vernacular. He enters into the native mode of asking from all conditions of men; into familiar and disrespectful forms; into the forms used in addressing the ancestral spirits; and into the mode of addressing chiefs or great men, and the childlike feeling which underlies their seemingly vague petitions—"it is only necessary to tell my chief that I am suffering. He will know what to do to relieve me . . . to ask in any other way is 'snatching' from the chief.""

It may be questioned whether any branch of the Anglican Communion has been more rapidly and more firmly consolidated than the ecclesiastical Province of South Africa. Within the space of half a century—a brief period, indeed, in the life of a Church—no fewer than ten dioceses have been organized. The older regions of the colony in Cape Town, Grahamstown and Maritzburg, the distant island of St. Helena, the Dutch republics represented by Bloemfontein and Pretoria, the border territories of Zululand, St. John's (Kaffraria), Mashonaland and Lebombo, have each their separate and complete diocesan administration, and are all united under the ecclesiastical government of one Provincial Synod on the pattern of primitive discipline and Apostolic order. Taught by dearly bought experience the Church has learned at last the priceless value of episcopal supervision over its colonial branches, and under the Divine blessing has reaped results which the most sanguine hopes could never
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have anticipated. From the most backward position of any Christian community in South Africa, the Church has reached the front rank in influence and importance; a rank largely due to the exertions of one devoted man—the apostolic Robert Gray.

We have hitherto made no reference to the share which women have taken in the work of the South African Church. In no field of human enterprise has the tenderness of womanhood more wonderfully displayed the heroism which Divine grace can impart than in the calm courage with which delicate English ladies have gone forth to face every form of trial and of danger to carry the Gospel to the heathen. What the blessings of Christianity are to the whole female race is only fully learned through a wide acquaintance with the unspeakable sorrows which darken their lot, not only in savage but in Mahommedan and Hindu lands. Already the names of women shine in the list of English martyr missionaries. Their work in the hospitals of China and the zenanas of India is well known. Perhaps some of our readers may not be so well informed of an episode in South Africa—rivalling Bishop Knight Bruce's famous walk across Mashonaland—a part of which the following extract describes. We will let Miss Blennerhasset describe in her own words a day or two of the walk of 160 miles on which she set forth, with two other ladies:

'Wednesday, July 1st.—We are away from 'Mpanda's at last! We planned to encamp last night about four miles from 'Mpanda's and begin our walk in earnest to-day. Our departure was delayed in many ways, the natives being very tiresome, rushing back to the canteen to drink, refusing to start, &c., so that it was getting dark as we filed after the long line of carriers down to a point where we were to cross the Pungwe. One little canoe, dug out of a tree, was there to meet us, and a strange little shrivelled old man paddled us over. We sat on the edges of the canoe, there being no seats or sticks across, and the boat was too narrow to admit of our sitting at the bottom of it. We were in mortal terror, afraid to breathe, for a sudden movement would easily upset such a canoe, and the river, as we knew, swarmed with crocodiles. It was a great relief to be on terra firma again and to watch the natives and the loads coming over. We had now arrived at the kraal where we were to spend the night. It was already dark, and we proceeded to hunt up the bundle containing candles, lanterns, &c., but it was not to be found. To our horror we discovered that the boy who carried this special load had not come on; he had got tipsy and remained "somewhere." There was hardly any wood to be had, but we made as good a fire as we could, and took the contretemps gaily. It was hopeless to try and pitch a tent in such darkness and confusion, so we rolled ourselves
in our blankets and slept by the camp fire. We could hear lions roaring in the distance and the weird cry of the hyena. Towards morning we were roused from troubled sleep by frightful screams and lamentations, a sort of dismal chant, broken by long sobbing screams; it was really a blood-curdling sound, and for some moments we were afraid to speak or move. At last, seeing that our natives were paying little or no attention to it, we made inquiries and found that one of the inhabitants of the kraal had just died, and his people were keening over him, much as mourners do in Ireland.

Friday, July 3rd.—We arrived here, Sarmento, to-day a little after 1 P.M. We are now forty-five miles from 'Mpanda's. Yesterday's walk was very trying: there was no water for nearly twelve miles; the soil was loose, sandy, and for every step forward we seemed to slide two back. . . . During the night the lions came down to drink at the swampy pool in front of the shelter, and they made a terrific noise. It seemed very strange to be so near all these wild creatures, with not even the slenderest door or mat to shut them out of our hut. In the morning the spoor of an elephant was seen. I wish we could have seen him and the lions—from a distance. Sarmento is beautifully situated . . . but the village is dirty beyond belief.

July 7th.—In the woods, rain pouring and great trouble with our carriers. At the first halt, a few hours from Sarmento, they refused to go any further. The Inkoos, or chief, a very picturesque person, with his wool plaited into at least a hundred little tails, went off and hid in the woods. Towards evening he returned and asked for blankets for all his men, pointing to ours as if inclined to take them. . . .

July 13th.—Massi Kessi. Here we are after quite an adventure. All our boys, except four Portuguese natives, fled in the night at Shemoios.

July 14th.—At last. Umtali! Yesterday was a day of misfortune, for on leaving Massi Kessi we found that the boys had lost their way and were not even sure of the direction of Umtali. . . . We climbed bare slippery hillsides; the heat was intense, and we could find no water till late in the afternoon. We had nothing to eat, the provisions having come to an end the day before. However, we had a small quantity of bovril, which we drank when we found a stream. . . . (At Umtali) the Bishop gave us up his hut, and made us as comfortable as possible. I feel very ill, and fear I have got the fever.'

It has been our aim, with so much of detail as the limits of an article will allow, to present our readers with a coup d'œil of the Church as it is actually at work in one of our English colonies at the present hour. Are we mistaken in asserting that it comprises a microcosm of Church history in all ages, from its rudimentary acceptance by the dim conception of
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wild tribes who are only so far civilized as they have been brought in greater or less degree under its influence, to its most perfect development in the finished organization and completeness of a Church equipped not only with the three-fold order of the ministry, and with adequate powers for self-government, but with equal fulness of Catholic truth to that enjoyed by any branch of the Church throughout the world? What variety of spiritual gifts is crowded into its brief existence of fifty years! What gifts of Church statesmanship and unyielding fidelity to the faith once for all delivered; of scientific powers consecrated to the service of Christ; gifts of healing and of tongues, painfully acquired by long years of study, and devoted to Christ's service amongst 'the least of these,' the very lowest and most degraded; gifts of martyrdom, none the less real because not wrought by the quick flash of spear or sabre, but by the long-drawn endurance which has drained away life's vital energy; gifts of burning love which has nerved gentle women to sustain amidst scenes of filth and nameless horrors all that is most revolting to a refined nature, and so to fill up that which is lacking of Christ's sufferings for the sake of His body the Church. Nor is the record less impressive to the eye that reads it rightly because most of its heroes laid down their lives on obscure fields of action, far from the observation and the applause of their contemporaries, who rarely noticed them except with wonder at their unaccountable enthusiasm, or with assertions of their failure in the unequal struggle, which they would not so much as touch with one of their fingers. Yet overpowering though the task, and utterly inadequate the means available for its accomplishment, enough of visible success has been granted to the Church’s imperfect sacrifices for South Africa to stimulate Churchmen to further exertion; and amidst the impenetrable darkness which shrouds the future of that deeply interesting land we may confidently trust that no scanty share of honourable toil and of resultant blessing will be the portion of the Church in South Africa.
ART. VI.—LORD BLACHFORD'S LETTERS.


We imagine that most readers of these charming Letters will sympathise with our regret that their highly gifted author forbade the publication of the autobiography he had written for the use of his own family. The insight this volume affords into an exceptionally interesting career and personality makes us eagerly crave for more. A brilliant double first at Oxford; the intimate friendship through life of men like Cardinal Newman and Dean Church, who have moulded the cultured thought and life of their countrymen in a higher degree than most of their contemporaries; a practical experience of administrative government on a wide and varied scale, and its resultant contact with leading statesmen of every party in turn, with its abundant opportunities (so admirably utilized) for insight into the characters of those who sway the destinies of our huge Empire; a mind quick to discern existing requirements and fertile in expedients to supply them, as illustrated by his share in founding the Guardian newspaper and his rapid grasp of the only working solution of the right basis for the Colonial episcopate on the ground of voluntary mutual contract; and added to all these so sincere and intelligent an attachment to the Anglican Communion, as made him one of her most steadfast sons in the days when many were sorely shaken and were abandoning their allegiance. Such are the prominent elements in a life which touched, as few modest lives have done, all the outstanding points of our complex modern civilization. Lord Blackford was at once a man of thought and a man of action; whose career was worthy of the highest traditions of English statesmanship, and whose personal character added lustre to every position which he was in turn called to fill.

Frederic Rogers, afterwards Lord Blachford, born in 1811, was the grandson of Sir John Rogers, Baronet, of Blachford, South Devon, and eldest son of Mr. Frederic Leman Rogers, who held a post in the Audit Office. After a distinguished career at Eton, where he was the contemporary and friend of Mr. Gladstone and Bishop Selwyn, of Arthur Hallam and Sir Francis Doyle, Frederic Rogers, at the early age of sixteen, passed to Oxford. His reputation for scholarship had pre-
ceded his entrance at Oriel, and he had the good fortune to be allotted as a pupil to Newman, the man of all others to make the most of any brilliant scholar placed under his care. A special intimacy, which gradually ripened to affection, sprang up between tutor and pupil, and was naturally intensified when circumstances led Newman to give up all his pupils except Frederic Rogers. The latter was now in his fourth year, the long vacation of which he spent at Iffley, near Newman’s house, and a short extract from a letter to his sister will illustrate the characteristic generosity of the large-hearted tutor.

‘The other morning as I was leaving Newman’s room, he informed me, in a very embarrassed kind of way, that he hoped I understood that I was reading with him as a college pupil and friend, an intimation which certainly to me was as unexpected as anything could be. I said what occurred to me on the subject, and the matter is now settled, only, as that is the case, I must take care not to pester him. However, I really think I shall get as much good from him by being merely under his superintendence as from any regular drudging, for he is a person who does me more good, I think, in his remarks on my essays and such like, than in regular cram, and really he seems disposed to give a very great deal of his time to me if I could with a good conscience exact it’ (p. 7).

The following year a failure of his eyes, which troubled Frederic Rogers through life, obliged him to relax his reading, and to reduce the number of books he took up for his degree, but despite this drawback he gained a double first, the only one conferred that year (1832). To Cambridge men it seems strange that he should have been allowed to go in for honours after five years’ residence, and that his first in classics, however richly deserved, should have been won by a Greek oration which did not fulfil the conditions required by the examiners.

In 1833 Rogers was elected to a fellowship at Oriel, and the next nine years were spent at Oxford in taking pupils and in such study as his enfeebled eyes allowed. The interests of the Letters during this period centres around the personality and work of Newman. By early training, as well as by native temperament, Frederic Rogers was in such entire sympathy with his friend as to quicken his own remarkable insight into character and his ability to describe it. The following portrait of the man who so largely originated the Oxford Movement, and the conception formed of his aims and of the secret of his influence by so able and devoted a disciple, is of too special interest and accuracy to be passed over.
'Newman seemed to have an intuitive perception of all that you thought and felt, so that he caught at once all that you meant or were driving at in a sentiment, a philosophical reflection or a joke—within a certain circle, no doubt, but within a circle which comprehended all your common sympathies. And so there was in talking with him that combination of liveliness and repose which constitutes ease; you seemed to be speaking with a better kind of self which was drawing you upwards. Newman's general characteristics—his genius, depth of purpose; his hatred of pomp and affectation; his piercing insight into the workings of the human mind—at least that part of it which is best worth knowing—his strong and tenacious, if somewhat fastidious, affection (not, it must be confessed, without a certain tenacity of aversion also)—are all matters of history. I should add that he always seemed to me to have a kind of repugnance to the highly finished manners of the man of the world. Nothing covers what is behind it so completely as moral or physical polish. It reveals nothing but what it reflects. And this Newman did not like. It baffled him and kept him at a distance. He did not know what matter of interest he could touch with confidence, and this to a man who is keenly alive to sympathy or the want of it, means an atmosphere of artificial constraint. As the [Oxford] Movement gathered power in his hands he became somewhat more disinclined to men who affected an independent position, and was quick in detecting a growing divergence, though sometimes curiously over confident in his power of counteracting an adverse prepossession. In Newman's sermons and Hurrell Froude's conversation I found an uncompromising devotion to religion with a discouragement of anything like gushing profession, which I had been brought up to dislike and distrust; also a religion which was fervent and reforming in essentials with a due reverence for existing authorities, and habits, and traditions, all of which I had been brought up to respect; also a religion which did not reject, but aspired to embody in itself any form of art and literature, poetry, philosophy, and even science, which could be pressed into the service of Christianity. And this met my own desires and tastes, not to say my own conception of what man was made for. And lastly, I was greatly captivated by the idea that it was possible for a Church not only to teach the truth, but by its discipline to clear itself from impurities and enforce to a certain extent holiness of life among those who belonged to it. Like the rest of our small circle, I fully believed that Newman was to do something infinitely great in the direction of Christian Church revival—revival in holiness, discipline, and authority' (pp. 14, 15).

We make no apology for the length of a quotation which reveals the guiding principles of the writer's entire and consistent life. From Mr. Newman, as Dean Church wrote after Lord Blachford's death, his pupil caught that earnest devotion to the cause of the Church which was supreme with him through life. And when the crisis of separation came, which tried both men so keenly, in his fidelity to the Anglican
Communion, Rogers never entertained an unworthy or bitter thought of his friend, but recognised and openly maintained that Newman's mistake was that of a lofty and unselfish soul.

Meanwhile their intimacy grew ever closer, and all Newman's plans for furthering the Church movement were poured into the willing ears of Frederic Rogers. Literary projects scattered over a widely diversified field; articles for the British Critic, translators for the English Library of the Fathers, poems for insertion in the Lyra Apostolica, are eagerly discussed. At one time Rogers is sounding Keble and adroitly luring him to contributions of poetry or prose. At another he is beating up recruits of competent scholarship for translation work, and volunteers himself to undertake St. Ambrose, and to act as a treasurer of the translation fund. At a third he offers in the same breath to combine the incongruous tasks of reviewing Bentham and the Lyra, although he adds modestly respecting the latter, 'I know I am not up to half your meanings in different places, but still I might save you trouble, and you might talk to me about a general arrangement when you come here, and polish up afterwards. If you have any one in your eye (Mozley, e.g.) who will answer the purpose better, and will do it, so much the better' (p. 31). When we remember that Rogers was at this time studying for the bar, and that the weakness of his eyes prevented his reading more than two hours a day, we can appreciate the strength and generosity of his attachment to Newman. It is always idle to speculate on what might have been had events taken a different turn from their actual development, but it is hard to repress such speculation as we come upon the discussion of what place in the Anglican Church would be most suitable to the future Cardinal. Sir William Heathcote questions whether a bishopric is exactly the right sphere for him, and Rogers would like to see him Provost of Oriel, or promoting, as Canon of Rochester, the usefulness of Cathedral services, then so sterile and now so happily utilised. The suggestion of a Brotherhood of Charity elicits a sentence of characteristic causticity. 'It is a kind of thought that causes even me sometimes a certain unsubstantial fidgety aspiration, such as people have after those acts of self-denial from which circumstances seem most effectually to protect them' (p. 56).

Some of the obiter dicta in the letters of this period are very amusing. Froude has told him of a good lady who wonders that Newman and Arnold should have any difference between them, their sentiment and general tone so perfectly agreeing, as their respective sermons show them to do. 'Keble
is the most impracticable of men. I have bullied him with questions till I am afraid of affronting him about the *British Critic*, and all I can get out of him is that he will look up Collier: and an injunction not to give you any hopes of his writing, because he has disappointed you often enough already' (p. 34). This to Newman. To his sister he writes that despite Keble's retention of his boyish spirits he is very much afraid of him, as in talking of serious subjects he has a disconcerting way of keeping silence sometimes, which may mean either that he thinks you have been overforward and are talking sillily, or what you say is new to him and he has no answer to make (p. 36). Rogers meets Southey at dinner, but the poet hardly said anything except that he abused Arnold for imputing to people (old friends of his own) what he must have known to be false motives (p. 41). Mrs. Sargent is scandalised at R. Wilberforce for speaking disparagingly of the Reformation, which considered, she seems to have managed ill in marrying three (at least) out of her four daughters to people who would hold the same objectionable language (p. 33). We should add that Rogers saw reason to modify his own earlier opinions about the leading reformers. The Bishop of London objected to Wilson as Principal of Battersea Training College because he was Keble's curate, but was won over by Sir H. Oakeley, which elicits the remark that it seems amusing that Oakeley's good opinion should compensate for the guilt of a connexion with Keble (p. 57).

In the light of subsequent developments it is interesting to note how gradual was the spread of Church principles, and what a medley of hopes and fears was stirred by the first timid and tentative efforts towards a fuller recognition of Catholic practice. Writing in 1837 he says: 'Our clergyman here (Legge of All Souls) seems edging forwards towards daily service; last year he had it on Saints-days, now on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Dodsworth is to have his church (in Albany Street) always open, really for the benefit of poor people who live two or three families in one room' (p. 43). In 1839, 'One cannot go anywhere without hearing of the "Oxford Tract party," men are discussing Newman in the clubs, and people are overheard using the words "Newmanite" and "Puseyite" (a new and sonorous compound) in the public streets' (p. 52). Next year a popular way of speaking is that 'without agreeing with the Oxford people, it must be allowed they have done good hitherto.' The interest in the movement is becoming general, and the hope of its advocates lies in the rising generation rather than in their elders. Even
foreign priests inquire whether there are not professors at Oxford who *se rapprochent à la religion catholique*, and receive with impatient disdain the immediate reply, 'Ils la tiennent, Monsieur.'

The winter of 1840 was spent in Rome with Mr. James Hope (afterwards Hope Scott of Abbotsford), and although his companion subsequently joined the Latin Church, the effect on Frederic Rogers was to strengthen his anti-Roman convictions. The two friends enjoyed the *entée* to the best circles in the Imperial city, and spared no pains to become acquainted with the organization and working of the Roman Church, as well as with the unique treasures of the Vatican, which they visited with Mr. George Richmond, R.A., and 'a Christ Church man, by name Ruskin.' *En route* they had spent some days in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, collating a MS. treatise of Tertullian for Pusey. The religious ceremonies did not attract them. They were 'excessively disgusted' with the rite of introducing two new Cardinals, 'petrified' by the list of relics at the basilica of St. John Lateran, dissatisfied with the music in the Sistine Chapel, which, though very beautiful, was decidedly by way of being a sight, and grieved at the miserable account given by Roger's Italian master, a member of the Pope's Swiss Guard, of the drunkenness of the parish clergy, even more in the country than in the city. 'Certainly,' he writes to his sister, 'Rome strikes me as the least devotional of any Roman Catholic city I have been in. I do think that if I wanted to stop my own self from turning Romanist, Rome is the place I would fix myself in' (p. 78).

Such criticisms as these had, however, jarred so painfully upon Newman's mind, that Rogers felt bound to defend himself against the severity of the strictures passed upon them.

'My dear Newman,' he writes under date January 16, 1841, 'I don't remember what I said against Rome which you think wrong. I hope it was nothing insolent or flippant, or self-congratulatory. I must own, however, to a strong aversion from her present form, which has been growing on me ever since I have been here. It is a wretched thing to be travelling among foreign Churches with the feeling that we must see faults in them in order to justify our own (Anglican) position; and I know I have had that feeling about me very strongly, and I dare say it has made me say things more bitterly than I ought to have done, particularly, I am afraid, in letters I have written since yours. All I can say is I have tried not to allow it to make me believe lies' (p. 83).

A fortnight later he returns to the same subject, with
the same transparent fairness in acknowledging a certain bias, whilst he maintains the essential justice and sincerity of his conclusions.

'I quite own,' he writes, 'that I am disposed to fix on the faults of Rome. I know I have long felt so, ever since I began to feel that the controversy between ourselves and Rome was really pressing, and since I have “fancied” that high estimate of her advantages was leading to a scorn of our own Church. And I cannot complain of being distrusted on that account; I distrust myself, I know I am very likely not to observe their merits, or to give them proper weight. But I do think you a little hard on my honesty when you set me aside as simply disqualified to be a witness of facts against her.' And again, 'I think you are mistaken in thinking that it is “their demureness,” or “their minute ceremonial” merely that is setting me against them. However, I will not inflict justifications on you, particularly as I have just plucked a letter which I had nearly finished to you, containing near two pages of them' (p. 87).

The two men were evidently drifting more and more widely apart, and events had occurred during Rogers's absence from Oxford which culminated in the great secession. At Innsbruck, on his way homewards, he met with an account of Tract 90, copied from the Univers, and on his return the storm raised by its publication was still raging. Rogers, however, was now divided by decided differences of opinion, not only from the more advanced men, such as Ward and Oakeley, as well as from Newman himself, but he did not entirely agree with the line advocated by Keble and Pusey and Sir G. Prevost. Those of whose action he now most approved were Church, who from this time to his death was his closest and most intimate friend, and James Mozley. But the charm of the old Oxford life was gone, and after two terms farther residence at the University, Rogers moved to London to read law and write for the Times. A farewell letter, of singular delicacy of thought and expression, although not written until a twelvemonth later, furnishes a suitable conclusion to this chapter in Frederic Rogers's career.

'My dear Newman,—I do not like to meet you again without having said once for all what I hope you will not think hollow or false. I cannot disguise from myself how very improbable—perhaps impossible—a recurrence to our former terms is. But I wish before the time has passed for such an acknowledgment, to have said how deeply and painfully I feel—and, I may say, have more or less deeply felt for years—the greatness of what I am losing, and to thank you for all you have done and been to me. I know that it is in a great measure by my own act that I am losing this, and I can-
not persuade myself that I am substantially wrong, or that I could long have avoided what has happened. But I do believe, if I may dare to say so, that God would have found a way to preserve to me so great a blessing as your friendship if I had been less unworthy of it. I do feel most earnestly how much of anything which I may venture to be thankful for in what I am is of your forming—how more than kind, how tender you have always been to me, and how unlikely it is that I can ever again meet with anything approaching in value to the intimacy which you gave me. . . . I should have been pained at leaving all this unsaid. But I do not write it with any idea of forcing an answer from you—nor does it require one; and I shall not attach any meaning to your leaving it unanswered' (p. 111).

The editor of the Letters gives us an interesting picture of the journalism of the day from Rogers's own pen, as follows:

'I dined with Mr. Walter and his son in Printing House Square at 5 o'clock, and found that I was expected to write an article then and there on one of the subjects of the day. I protested my inability, not supposing myself capable of doing such a thing in less than a week. This was pooh-poohed. I tried, found it possible, and found also that I was expected to repeat the process next day; same hour, same dinner, short conversation after dinner, then the subject was announced, and I was left alone till tea-time, when Mr. Walter appeared, read aloud what I had down, with criticisms, and, after correction, carried off the copy to the printer. When the article was finished, the same process was repeated, and when I was disburdened of the whole articles I went home to bed. Gradually it appeared that I was expected to do this (exceptis exceptii excepiones) every evening. And being, though an Oxford Don, not skilful at saying No, or in evading saying Yes, while Walter was an adept in the art of making you believe that you had pledged yourself to do what he wanted you to do, I found myself soon engaged to write a daily article, usually in the manner aforesaid, with a very liberal salary. I neither wanted nor expected one or the other; but there I was—engaged, with a month's vacation and occasional holidays, pledged to write six articles a week, and to eat five dinners in Printing House Square. Several rules or objects I laid down for myself: (1) Not to write on Sunday, except in case of real urgency. (2) To strike a blow when I could in favour of the "good cause." (3) To substitute as far as I could satire for "thunder." . . . It was a harassing work, partly from its continuous pressure, partly from a constant apprehension that my independence was being undermined. At the same time it was very interesting and amusing' (pp. 112-3).

It was no small compliment to the anonymous writer's ability in handling abstruse questions that he drew a respectful reply from Sir Robert Peel to his articles on the Currency. Rogers makes light of his own newly acquired knowledge on the subject, but we may credit the great financial minister
with sufficient penetration to have rightly appreciated the strength of arguments, or he would not have cared to notice them. With rapid discrimination he could select the best method of handling a topic or lay bare the weak place in a position, and he knew what weapons were most effective in each case to accomplish his purpose, as when he killed duelling with unsparing ridicule.

'I could be virtuous,' he writes, 'not to the extent of airing any chivalrous or transcendental principle, but in a sober, reasonable, decent, utilitarian way. And be it observed that under cover of this cool reasonableness it is possible to give support now and then to a tolerably high standard of moral judgment' (p. 114).

So successful, indeed, was he as a writer of leaders that Crabb Robinson wrote to Walter that the Times was better than it had been ever since he had known it—that is, for thirty-six years.

Yet, despite such marked success, Rogers welcomed the offer of a post in the Civil Service as a release from the drudgery of writing for the Times. His connexion with it had lasted only two years, but his relations with the Press were shortly renewed under circumstances of vital importance to the Church. In 1845 Newman went over to Rome, leaving those who had trusted to his guidance 'headless, unorganised, suspected by others and suspecting each other; for nobody yet knew who would follow where he led' (p. 118). A small band of determined men decided to uphold to the utmost the principles of the Oxford Movement as they were understood before the defection of Newman and his imitators.

'Whether I,' writes Frederic Rogers, 'was the first to start the idea of a newspaper I do not know. Anyhow, the idea was taken up by the knot to which I belonged, embracing James Mozley and Thomas Haddan, who, like myself, had written not unsuccessfully in the Times, and Church and Bernard, who had signalised themselves in reviews. We, I think, comprised the substantial staff of the undertaking. We expected to succeed in doing good, for it was something even to shake out a standard and seem not discouraged; and, in the event, to succeed financially. But we were totally inexperienced in the handling of a newspaper and in the conduct of business. We took the somewhat bold resolution of starting the paper ourselves, dealing directly with the printer and with Haddan's clerk as ostensible publisher and sub-editor. We made an agreement with some printers in Little Pulteney Street, and hired a room opposite the printing establishment, over the shop of a baker, where we could attend or meet to see what was going on, and where some of us spent the greater part of every Tuesday night correcting proofs, rejecting or inserting matter, writing articles on the
last subject which had turned up, giving last touches, and generally editing. Bernard, Haddan, and I, being in London, must, I suppose, have done most of this work, but Church and Mozley used to take their share, making use of a bedroom at my lodgings in Queen Street, Mayfair, whither I had migrated from the Temple. To these lodgings we used sometimes to return at four or five o'clock in the morning, sometimes perhaps later; for I connect some of these returns home with the smell of bread hot from the oven, on which, I think, we sometimes made our breakfast' (pp. 118-9).

It was on January 21, 1846, that the first number of the Guardian appeared, and it speedily became a power. The secret of the success which it at once achieved and has since so worthily maintained may be traced to the exceptional ability of its original promoters, to the high tone which it adopted in handling subjects that kindled no little bitterness of feeling, to its studied avoidance of the odium theologicum, and to its opportune supply of a widely felt want. It would be difficult to exaggerate the value of the support thus afforded and consistently continued throughout half a century to the Catholic movement in the Church of England.

Frederic Rogers’s first appointment in the Civil Service was to be Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under Mr. Gladstone, but he had only held the post for a year and a half when, in the spring of 1846, he became Assistant Under-Secretary to the Colonial Office, with which his official life was thenceforward identified. We pass over his earlier official life and his work as Emigration Commissioner. In the fourteen years during which he held this responsible position events of vast political moment occurred, and changes of far-reaching importance were effected, in the manipulation of which Rogers had a considerable share. Glimpses of Oxford University gossip, of dissensions, more or less real, in the Cabinet, of the diplomatic misunderstandings which preceded and the blunders which sullied the Crimean War, of the Hampden scandal and the defection of Manning to Rome, of the Papal aggression and Lord John’s ‘no Popery’ letter, occur in the letters of this period, and provoke quotation on a larger scale than we can allow ourselves to indulge in. We rest content with three brief sentences out of seventy pages.

‘Mozley is setting to work with a book on Baptism. He declares there has been no thinking for the last twenty years, not even by Newman, so he is going to give the world his thoughts, which I am afraid will not wholly give satisfaction. As if we had not enough to torment us, he is bitten by St. Augustine’s Predestinarianism’ (p. 141).
Sir George Grey, of New Zealand fame, had said that in England we all live for the present, whereas in the Colonies people plan for what will or ought to be twenty or a hundred years hence, which elicits this thoughtful observation:

‘I have never been able to see how a really representative Government could be far-sighted except in the way of removing obstacles to the natural action of the society. People have not in the mass patience enough or faith enough in any of their representatives, to endure anything that is only to have prospective advantages, involving, of course, large present sacrifice’ (p. 157).

From the same letter we culled the following vivid breezy notice of the great Primate of New Zealand:

‘Have shaken hands and exchanged words with Selwyn. Just what he was in the fifth form at Eton. I was much struck with his way of walking up and down talking to his old and some new friends; there was a kind of lofty frank independence and παρουσία about it, rather like a savage yet very like a bishop, a combination of humour and dignity and unaffectedness and elasticity that recalled one’s feeling of having got hold of a great man, long lost.’

The years 1858, 1859, were much engrossed by negotiations with France on the Coolie Question, and at M. Persigny’s urgent request Rogers went on a special mission to Paris to arrange the terms of the treaty. It was the period of the entente cordiale, and the Emperor was anxious to satisfy the requirements of the British Government, despite the many obstacles interposed by the planters and officials of the French-African colonies. The letters of this period afford some vivid sketches of the entourage of the French Colonial Office, which was then presided over by the notorious Plon Plon. He appears, however, at his best in these pages, and as being sincerely desirous to effect an arrangement on the conditions we insisted upon for the protection of our Indian subjects. The following extract describes a Christmas dinner at which Rogers was amongst his guests:

‘His hotel is an extremely handsome villa, rather Pompeian in style, consistently classical, with the necessary modifications to make it Parisian. The dinner was very choice, rooms and lighting splendid, and the party made up, half of grand official-looking gentlemen, and half of Algerian officers (one being General McMahon, the man who stormed the Malakoff, and is now military commandant of Algeria); of the rest I found out nothing, except my old friend Benedetti, and a young prince of Schleswig-Holstein, who is on the wide world here. . . . It was pleasant to see the style of such a dinner (to say nothing of eating a variety of remarkably good things): the rising from dinner instantly on finishing, and proceeding to the very hand-
some drawing-room, where the whole party instantly set to work on their cigars, the Algerians walking up and down the room in twos, as if it was a guardhouse or the deck of a steamer, was a new style of thing. But otherwise, except when the Prince or Benedetti took me in hand on our business, there was nobody to talk to except my little Prince, who introduced himself. To say the truth, I think the Frenchmen might have been a little more civil. I had entirely to start the conversation, almost to force it, even to my neighbours at dinner. There was no species I will not say of effort to make the foreigner at home, not even of inclination to meet him half way. If it had happened in England, I should just have called it English mauvaise honte, and I really think some of it may have been so; at least there was about one or two of the soldiers a great want of that ready prompt look which one associates with a Frenchman, almost the manner of men who were not quite sure that they were in their place; perhaps they only felt that they were not quite the men to do the honours of the Prince's drawing-room; anyhow, I wish they had been a little more agreeable (pp. 195, 196).

Prince Napoleon was, however, pointedly polite, and impressed the English official with his evident desire to do effectively the work of his own department. His own radical opinions were sufficiently notorious, and he was inquisitive about the prospect of England's being radicalised by Mr. Bright. When Rogers remarked that everyone was ready to effect reforms in any department except his own, the Prince eagerly replied, 'Mais je les fais dans le mien.' 'The only touch of character that I remember was explaining (as he likes to do) the difficulty he has in forcing this treaty down the throats of the old sailors and the Colonial party. ‘Je vous dis, il fallait le faire enfin par ma volonté. Il fallait dire absolument : Je le veux.” And I dare say he did’ (p. 198). The course of the negotiations was interrupted by the French war in Italy, and Rogers was harassed by much running backwards and forwards from Paris, by having to deal with the officials of several departments at home and in France, and by wearisome delays which postponed its final settlement until after he had become Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies and the ratification was committed to other hands. ‘The convention, he writes, ‘was concluded as I had settled it; I imagine, with scarcely an alteration.’ The dry details of this administrative work are enlivened in the correspondence by such abundant reference to other topics as testify the wide culture of the writer, his keen enjoyment of every opportunity for a peep behind the scenes, his swift insight into character. Statesmen, French and English, flit before us. ‘Persigny, more insignificant as I look closely at him, but very friendly
and amusing; Lord John Russell, so small in stature that it seems absurd to receive directions from him, but dignified and able; Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, writing perfect volumes of minutes and saying he had learned as a great maxim in life to write as little as possible; Lord Carnarvon, not the least afraid of the Commons, but a little too self-conscious, though with a generous desire to effect worthy objects; Cardwell, just and kind, clear-headed and hard-headed, industrious, and enormously safe; Lord Granville, the pleasantest and most satisfactory chief of those under whom I served, knowing how to distinguish Ministerial from departmental policy, and in a diplomatic kind of way thoroughly enjoying the characteristic and amusing side of business.' These are but examples selected off-hand from a whole gallery of rapid silhouettes. An anecdote related by Sir H. Taylor hits off the salient features of two eminent statesmen like instantaneous photography. Lord Grey, at a Cabinet Council, was objecting after his manner to everybody's draft of a proposed despatch, till Lord Melbourne exclaimed, 'Well, then, in God's name try your own hand on it!' Lord Grey wrote a sentence, altered it, expunged it, then crushed up the paper and threw it down, then da capo with another sheet, when Lord M. struck in with, 'Ah, I thought so; you see now when you have nobody to contradict but yourself, you are done!' (p. 233).

The rapid expansion of Greater Britain during the period in which Frederic Rogers filled the office of Assistant Secretary for the Colonies brought him an amount and variety of work which tested the strength and versatility of his powers to the very utmost. The Colonial Office is the ultimate court of appeal in all the controversies which arise either in Crown Colonies or in those which possess representative institutions, between private persons and officials, or among officials themselves, and it is of the utmost importance that it should maintain a reputation for scrupulous integrity and impartial justice. Beside the infinite variety of questions which arise in the settlement of new territories, and which demand great delicacy of treatment by the distant Home Government, as well as accurate knowledge respecting an enormous mass of particulars, there were special problems calling for solution in the proposed federation of the North American and Australian groups of our Colonial dependencies, and in the readjustment of the relations of Church and State consequent upon the disestablishment and disendowment of the Colonial Churches. It was not until his retire-
ment from the Civil Service, and his acceptance at Mr. Gladstone's invitation of a peerage, that Lord Blachford carried through Parliament the measure which secured at once the liberty of the Colonial Churches and their permanent connexion with the Anglican Communion. Our readers will be interested in his own account of an achievement the importance of whose far-reaching issues will be evident to all thoughtful Churchmen.

'As endowments were one after another cut away, I succeeded in persuading successive Secretaries of State that Churches might be allowed to organise themselves, a matter on which there was much traditional jealousy; that the appointment to bishoprics to which the State contributed no endowment should be left to these Churches; and finally that the form of creating bishops and of appointing bishops by letters patent should be abandoned. In the Colonial Churches, as in the Colonial civil government, the changes which have taken place (almost entirely within the period during which I was connected with Colonial matters) are worth noticing. Formerly there were Colonial bishops appointed during pleasure by the Crown under letters patent, asserting very unambiguously the extreme form of royal supremacy. . . . About the year 1843, Selwyn refused to accept the Bishopric of New Zealand unless the appointment was made for life, and the rampant Erastianism exalted. This was done, but the Crown still retained the creation and appointment of bishops, even after Miss Burdett Coutts had set the example of instituting bishoprics without State aid. The independence of Colonial Churches suffered from two jealousies—one, the apprehension that if the Church organised itself, it would prove a troublesome and exacting power; the other, lest ignorant or heterodox men ordained by Colonial bishops should, through our system of patronage, find their way to English preferment. Thus there was a strong official and ecclesiastical feeling against any organisation in the nature of a synod, and against taking the Colonial episcopate from under the direct control of the Crown' (pp. 303, 304).

Only those who are acquainted with the inner history of Church administration at this period can realise how strong were the prejudices and how tenacious the opposition to be surmounted before the Colonial Churches were fully emancipated; and it was an inestimable advantage that their legal position was shaped by such wise and sympathetic counsels as those of Frederic Rogers. It was no small triumph of statesmanship to secure a happy solution of the knotty problems involved in determining the future constitution of the Colonial Churches and the status in England of the Colonially-ordained clergy.

'When I became Under Secretary for the Colonies, I found
the Duke of Newcastle quite prepared to go with me, and Fulford, the Primate of Canada, fully realised the advantages of a free hand. The initial processes were going on everywhere. But he with my help, and I with his, first clenched the matter in Canada, when, Palmer being happily the leading law officer, and Phillimore, I think, Queen's Advocate, I got the Colonial Office to announce that colonial Churches would be left to elect their own bishops, subject to the necessity of obtaining what the Prayer Book calls a mandate if they were consecrated in this country by an English bishop... The old letters patent were swept away. But the existing law of England... provided that no colonial clergyman should be eligible for employment in England unless ordained by a bishop who had been appointed by letters patent... and indiscriminate admission of (Colonial) ordinations as qualifications for English preferment might have poured on us a multitude of clergymen unfitted for English parishes, and the question arose (shortly after I became a member of the House of Lords) what security should be taken against this danger. The question was complicated by a confused state of the law, and embarrassed by a variety of prejudices and jealousies—so much so that nobody would take it up. And it was admitted on all hands that I (who had brought this confusion to a climax) was the proper person, if not the only person to bring in a Bill for its settlement. Having the good will of all parties, I succeeded in passing an Act, of which the principle is this, that any person who has received episcopal orders, and is willing to accept all the tests required from an English clergyman on receiving an ecclesiastical appointment, may be admitted to employment in the English Church by any diocesan bishop. But the bishop's power of rejection is absolute' (pp. 304, 305).

After thirty years of official life Frederic Rogers retired to his ancestral inheritance of Blachford, in Devon, to which as well as to the family baronetcy he had succeeded on his father's death. He resigned his post in May 1871, and it was in the autumn of the same year that Mr. Gladstone made him the offer of a peerage. His reply, well worthy of quotation, but too long for our concluding pages, is a model of dignified independence and right feeling; but when he had once accepted a seat in the Lords he held himself bound to attend to Parliamentary business, and for thirteen years longer he did much hard and useful work. Besides the members of his own family, Sir H. Taylor and Dean Church were his most regular correspondents during his later years, and his letters to them show all the brightness and mental alertness of his earlier years. They are evidently the utterance of a mind which retains its interest in all manner of subjects, sacred and secular, political and scientific, and which combines with the high culture of one whose life has been
passed in the centre of London life the conscientious anxiety of an English country gentleman for the welfare of his neighbours and dependents, their schools, cottages, and farms. Rural life, he complains, certainly tends to comatoseness, but when business calls him to the House of Lords his right hand has lost nought of its cunning, as witness the following description of the debate on the Afghan war, written in December 1878:

'The debates were not generally brilliant, but interesting and characteristic. Cranbrook spirited and loud, but the bunkum rather overdone; Lord Halifax (to me) inaudible, and I should think to the last degree prosy. Lord Lawrence I thought interesting and instructive, but his very bad hesitating manner, his (not unnecessary) egotism, and his aged look (he is not as old as I am) gave an appearance of weakness, and the matter itself was sometimes weighty, sometimes not. Lord Derby cold and balancing, but often hitting the nail on the head. The Duke of Somerset very amusing. The next day Lord Grey (I should say) statesmanlike (them's my sentiments). Lord Northbrook, able, full of matter, but too detailed in self-justification... Dizzy was to me for the first time thoroughly amusing. I have hitherto found him dull. But this time he did some light chaff in a manner which was as good as a stage play. It gave me the idea of a man who had a thorough contempt for human nature in general, and his audience in particular, but still thought that some of them might be worthy of the strain of amused and amusing irony with which he addressed them. It was impossible to appreciate it without hearing it. On paper it appears (in parts, at least) dry and unmeaning, particularly perhaps his solemn enumeration of the various Treaties of Rectification of Frontier which have been contracted of late, but when you heard his tone of mock solemnity which seemed to say, “I really believe the lot of you are fools enough to take all this in earnest,” with a kind of stony twinkle in his marble face, one could hardly believe that one was not at a comedy. I was next to Lord Sydney, and almost at the same moment we ejaculated: I, What a fellow it is; he, What a buffoon. But there was a kind of divine impudence about it, particularly his treatment of an interruption by Lord Grey, “You are impetuous,” and a sustained ironical chaff of Lord Derby, which almost inclined me to vote for him colère que colère. But at the end of the speech he thought it necessary to go off in bunkum, and that cured me completely' (pp. 392, 393).

We must, however, bring our somewhat desultory notice of these Letters to a close. The last five years of Lord Blachford's life were chiefly spent in retirement, but we may mention in passing that they were marked by a renewal of his acquaintance with Cardinal Newman, and we have a few touching glimpses of that, to our thinking, most mournful,
yet most fascinating figure. The Oxford pupil died November 21, 1889, about a year before the Cardinal, with whose estimate of Lord Blachford, spoken a few days before his own death, we may suitably conclude. He said how constant was his regret that his friend had not joined the same Church with himself; that of all his friends Lord Blachford was the most gifted, the most talented, and of the most wonderful grasp of mind, and that of all the intimacies which he had formed in his Oxford life, close though some of them were, none had approached his intimacy with Lord Blachford.

ART. VII.—THE TRUE HISTORY OF THE EDWARDINE ORDINAL.

1. Die anglicanische Weißen und ihre neueste Apologie. Von Dr. Theol. HACKELBERG LANDAU. (Grätz, 1897.)
3. Buceri Scripta Anglicana. (Basel, 1577.)

We shall be frank with our readers and confess that the Austrian pamphlet appears at the head of this article more to prove the interest taken in the question of our Ordinal in remote parts than because it had any information to give about it. It is the well-marshalled argument of an intelligent person far from genuine sources of information. He has pursued his researches so deeply as to be able to recommend the first volume of Lord Macaulay's history as an authority on the intentions of the reformers. The brochure seems to have been finished before the Bull Apostolicae curae appeared, but the author had not the heart to suppress quite a number of plausible arguments which the Bull ignored—for instance, the summary determination that, as the Church and the Faith of the Church finds its expression in its liturgy, the national bishops are not infallible judges by themselves but only in union with the Pope, and their rights of liturgical legislation are subject to Papal control. If that were so there need never
have been any inquiry into the question at all. But the perusal of works like this brings home to our minds that there can be but a futile pretence of argument on the part of those who have subjected their minds to authority. What is the use of reasons if the authority be supreme? They resemble the clever and plausible accounts of Nature and her laws which philosophers spun before Bacon taught them in such questions to ignore authority and investigate facts. And we fear that among all persons whose search into facts is likely to be spoiled by belief in authority the first and most impressive will be the supreme authority himself.

A very large amount of valuable writing upon the principles of ordination and their application to the Anglican case has accumulated round the Bull Apostolicae curae: chief among which we place the answer of our two archbishops, and next to it the admirable Publications of the Church Historical Society (S.P.C.K.). Of the articles which have appeared in our own pages we say nothing. Upon the general question little can remain to be said. But there is one branch of the discussion which has been, so far as we know, passed over, though it is quite important enough to require notice. We mean the information which can be gathered from the history of the composition of the Anglican Ordinal as to the intention of its authors in propounding it.

The Bull itself declares the value of such an inquiry, for it says that 'For the full and accurate understanding of the Anglican Ordinal, besides what we have noted as to some of its parts, there is nothing more pertinent than to consider carefully the circumstances under which it was composed and publicly authorised' (p. 18). These words, if they had occurred in a judicial sentence or in a disquisition upon some question of scholarship, would have led us to expect a minute and detailed examination of the historical circumstances in question to follow on this declaration of their importance. Who could possibly suppose that the next sentence of the Bull would run thus: 'It would be tedious to enter into details, nor is it necessary to do so, as the history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church, as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects, and as to the end they had in view' (p. 19). One may well be led to suspect that when the first of these sentences was indited an inquiry into the history of the Ordinal was intended which another influence pronounced to be imprudent and set aside upon very insufficient reasons. For, when we consider the variety of
opinions which worked upon the compilers of the English formularies in 1549, we must pronounce that there are few periods or transactions as to which a careful historian would be less inclined to lay down *a priori* the motives which influenced responsible persons in their public acts. And if ever there was a leader in whose case such presumption of intention would be unsafe it was Cranmer.

Before entering on the question of the intention of the Edwardine Ordinal we must protest against the ambiguous use of the word 'intention' in the Bull. That term is commonly taken to mean the purpose and desire with which a minister of the Church uses the forms which are appointed for him. But the same word in the Bull means for the most part the purpose and desire with which the Reformers framed the Ordinal as it is. The latter of these meanings is the intention of the rite and its framers; the former is the intention of the person who uses the rite. They ought to be kept entirely distinct; but in the following sentence they are confounded: 'If the rite be changed, with the manifest intention (*ea manifesto consilio*) of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention (*intentionem*) wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament' (p. 21). It is evident that in these words the intention of introducing another rite is the intention of those who framed the Ordinal; but when it is said that the necessary intention is wanting to the Sacrament, there the intention pointed to is that of those who use the rite. For the Sacrament is celebrated by them and not by those who compiled the form they use. Can it be said with any sort of reason that the intention of those who made the form remains imposed for ever after upon those who use the form and determines the purpose and desire with which they do so? This might be unimportant if the wording of the Ordinal were alleged incapable of Catholic explanation. But it is impossible for the Roman Church to take this position so long as the decision upon the Abyssinian Orders is recognised. And we cannot understand the words 'si qua quidem verba in Ordinali Anglicano ut nunc est porrigant se in ambiguum, ea tamen sumere sensum eundem nequeunt quem habent in ritu catholico' (p. 43), otherwise than as allowing that if the intention had been good the form is sufficient.

1 In the above extract it will be seen that the Latin *consilium* and *intentio* are both rendered by 'intention' in the authorized translation.
If this be the case a question arises which has not been at all considered in the Bull: that, namely, of a sufficient form which has been established with an imperfect intention by its first framers under special circumstances which soon passed away yet left it impossible to change. Would such a form be bad even in the hands of those who used it with a good intention? This is, as we shall show, a purely hypothetical case as regards the Anglican Ordinal. It is certain that those who framed that form did so, not with the intention of changing the nature and powers of the ministry, but with that of making priests possessing (to use the words of the Bull) 'rem quam instituit Christus.' But had their intention been different it would still remain to be proved, for the purpose of a complete judgment, that the form was incapable of being used effectively by others in their time or after them who might honestly and devoutly regard the form as expressing the whole intention of Christ and of Christ's Catholic Church, and desire to make themselves the instruments of carrying it out. It would be a hazardous principle for the Roman Church to lay down that the intention of the original framers of a rite binds the intention of all who afterwards use it. For then the beliefs on the Real Presence of those who first said of the consecrated elements 'haec omnia bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis,' would bind those who hold transubstantiation.

The Prayer Book of 1549, which preceded the Ordinal by a few months, was so framed as to secure, not indeed the cordial approval, but the public consent and signature of all the English bishops except one; and the bench at that time included more than ten prelates attached to the old learning. Dom Gasquet shows indeed that the conservative bishops reserved to themselves, and freely used, liberty to criticise in the House of Lords the book which they had subscribed. We may well be glad that they did so, for we thus learn the nature of their objections to it. They declaimed against the withdrawal of the directions to use Eucharistic adoration in the service. But they made no complaint as to its teaching upon the Eucharistic sacrifice or the priesthood. We have the formal consent, so far as silent acceptance gives it, of the conservative prelates of Edward VI. to the fact that both sacrifice and priesthood remained in the Prayer Book of 1549. Let thoughtful inquirers decide whether it is likely that Cranmer, having in the early part of the year put forth a book which made a sacrifice and required a priest, would in the later part of it impose an Ordinal intended to make, not a priest,

1 Gasquet, pp. 172-80.
but a Gospel minister. In fact, it is plain that a Communion office, which in its title professed to contain what is 'commonly called the Mass,' and in which the celebrant is throughout designated as priest, was not intended to depart essentially from the established ideas upon Orders. That 'priest' in this book means 'sacerdos' is proved to demonstration by the fact that it is so rendered in the Latin version made immediately afterwards by Ales for the use of Martin Bucer. Much emphasis is given to the consent of the old-learning prelates to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, by the reply which Gardiner, their ablest man, published to the work of Cranmer on the Sacrament. For in it Gardiner contrasts the sentiments of the Archbishop's work with the doctrine of the book of 1549. That book placed the Church of England and Cranmer as representing it in an attitude seriously different from that extravagant Protestantism which the Bull imputes to it, and it was while the influences still prevailed under which this attitude was taken that the Ordinal came to be drawn up and published.

Father Breen, in an article 1 charitably entitled Quare fremuerunt gentes, and directed against the Anglican arguments in favour of our Orders, declares that 'if Cranmer had wished to retain the Catholic priesthood he would have retained the Catholic rite of ordination.' We should have an easy reply to this assertion if we could really adopt the account of the composition of the Ordinal given in the able Treatise on the Bull which has been published by the Church Historical Society. 2 'Their [the English Reformers'] four principles of liturgical reform were, larger reading of the Bible, a return to antiquity, use of the English tongue, and greater simplicity. In dealing with the Ordinal they had little scope for acting upon the first two principles. But the Ordinal was translated into English, and, above all, it was simplified.' We shall see hereafter that desire to use the Bible and return to antiquity had a great deal more to do with the making of the Ordinal than the writer supposes. But it is certainly not the case that it was translated, if, as the context implies, the meaning be that it was translated from the Roman Pontifical or from the slightly varied form of that use which constituted the Sarum Pontifical. We cannot therefore reply to Father Breen that Cranmer did retain the mediaeval Ordinal translated and simplified. But we can show very plainly that his determination, consented to by the bishops of all parties, to

1 The Tablet, Oct. 17, 1896. 2 No. xix. p. 27, S.P.C.K.
have a new one did not in the least imply any intention to disuse the Catholic priesthood.

The Ordinal was to be in English, like the rest of the Prayer Book. The Pope himself makes no objection to the validity of the Edwardine Ordinal on the ground of its being in English. And not only was it to be in English, but to be like the rest of the book, in the very best English, both as to form and style, fit to take its place by the side of the English Bible as one of the national treasures of literature, as well as of devotion. At present every tyro thinks himself entitled to despise Cranmer. But we need only compare the devotional forms which have been produced during the last three centuries, either in the Anglican or the Roman Communion, with those of which Cranmer was the chief author, to be assured that he possessed veritable liturgical genius. Considering the ordeals which the English Prayer Book has had to face, and the triumph with which it has come through them, there would be no exaggeration in pronouncing it the most successful piece of liturgical work that the Church has seen. We can well understand that Archbishop Magee on the day of his consecration should say: 'I have been thinking how impossible it would be in the present day for anyone to compose such a service. The men who drew up that service had a conception of what was suitable for such an occasion which seems wanting now.' There is no doubt that Cranmer was chief of these men; and we are to conceive such a critic considering whether the Roman Pontifical furnished him with a form of Ordinations fit to take its place with his Prayer Book.

No one will imagine for a moment that Cranmer would have felt any objection to the Roman Ordinal because it was old. He had sufficiently shown in the Prayer Book not merely a willingness to incorporate old forms but an unequalled appreciation of the merits of primitive prayers, and a power to perform the difficult tasks of rendering them into English and composing new prayers to match them. But neither in its structure nor in its matter was the Roman Ordinal, fitted with whatever modifications, to make a part of the English Prayer Book. It passes muster in Latin under the patronage of the Church and with the aid of its ancient associations. In English it would reveal its defects. It has no such antiquity as the twelve or fourteen hundred years which, as Dom Gasquet justly remarks, add so venerable a charm to many of the Roman services. And its piecemeal composition, evident upon the most cursory perusal, made a

difficulty which was perfectly well known to the Reformers, in finding out what part of the service makes the priest. It is not easy to say how much of the history of the Roman Ordinal, which later research has brought out, may have been known to them. But under the light of modern knowledge the whole service falls to pieces. It is known that no part of it is primitive. It is known that the first part of the present Ordinal of Priests, including the silent laying on of hands and the prayer 'Vere dignum,' suffices to make the priest according to primitive rule; but the rubrics of the rite do not recognize this fact, for they call the candidates ordinandi, until that much later point, at which the so-called 'porrectio instrumentorum' occurs. At this point the rubrics recognize them as ordinati, following therein the erroneous decision of Pope Eugenius IV. With the delivery of the instruments is conferred the power of offering 'sacrifice.' But when we remember that this commission was added to the service two or three hundred years before transubstantiation was defined, and observe in the work of Morinus the various forms which it assumes in various Ordinals, we must acknowledge that its terms are very unfit to express with any distinctness the tremendous sacrifice which the Roman Church believes it to designate. An emphasis is now added to the 'porrectio instrumentorum' which does not belong to the delivery of the ecclesiastical garments, which occurs just before, since the 'Veni Creator' is sung immediately before the giving of the vessels. But this was not the case when this portion of the Ordinal was composed, and if the 'Veni Creator' were absent it would be impossible to deny that the conveyance of power to offer 'sacrifice' might be applied to much lower meanings of that common word than the 'renewal' (as a recent Roman writer dares to express it) of the sacrifice of Calvary.

1 See Morinus, De Sac. Ord., Antw. 1665, pp. 262-271, and part ii. passim.
2 See Maskell, Monumenta Ritualia, iii. 211, ed. 1847.
3 This awful expression seems to us inconsistent with the completeness and even with the Divine character of the sacrifice on Calvary. For how can that one sacrifice for sin for ever wax old or require renewal? The expression occurred in an article in The Month by the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J., but we supposed it to be a lapsus calami, as milder terms were used on the subject in a later article by him in the Contemporary Review. But we notice that it reappears in his pamphlet which stands at the head of this article (p. 19), and we therefore call attention to it as an example of the lengths to which men may be permitted to go in the Roman Church when writing in favour of a dominant idea. The expression is wholly unauthorised by the Council of Trent. See also the notes in the Douay Bible on Hebr. x. 12.
But of all the objections to placing the Roman Ordinal in the English Prayer Book the most important is still to be named, and it was certainly known to the Reformers. It is the position held in that service by our Lord's commission in St. John xx. 22. This is the original charter of the Christian ministry. The Council of Trent, though it does not assert (as the Bull wrongly represents) the commission of sacrifice to be the chief element in the Christian priesthood, yet places that commission and the power to forgive sins side by side as co-ordinate elements of the office. And in defence of its assertion that such an office was instituted by the Lord the Council refers to five texts from Scripture. The only one of these five which could possibly be used as the sentence of ordination is this passage from St. John. Yet it is placed in the Roman Ordinal at a point long subsequent to that at which the priest has been made and recognized as such by being permitted to join in consecrating the Holy Eucharist. The Lord's words by which He sent forth His apostles as true priests are therefore in the Roman Ordinal reduced to the position of conveying one particular power of the priesthood, an unnecessary ceremony if the whole priesthood has been conferred before; for how can the priesthood be really such and yet want any of its powers? 'Back to Scripture' was the watchword of the English Reformers, and it is vain to suppose that they would use for making the priest a sentence of human composition with no special merit of solemnity or distinctness of meaning, while the greatest, worthiest words that could be imagined, the words of the Lord Himself, which are recognized by the Council of Trent as conveying the power and meaning of the priesthood, were relegated to an inferior position. It was plainly required, then, that a new Ordinal should be prepared embodying any part of the mediæval form which could be considered essential, but wholly reconstructed, and with much new matter. Whence was this matter procured?

It was just at the time when the Ordinal was being prepared that Martin Bucer arrived in England, and became the guest of Cranmer, by whom he had been invited to take refuge in England from the troubles connected with the Interim. The disposition of Cranmer to lean upon other minds is well known, but such a disposition was hardly needed to make it certain that Bucer would be consulted in England. Germany was at the time as much ahead of England in literary experience of the ecclesiastical kind as

1 See Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. i. p. 335.
she has often been since in matters of secular scholarship. And Bucer represented very worthily the best German thought. It is a mistake to suppose that he was eager for change or blind to the defects of the Reformation. His last work excites the admiration of Dom Gasquet himself as a ‘remarkable treatise, full of practical knowledge and wisdom.’ It is doubtful, as the same writer shows, whether he approved of the substitution of the revised Prayer Book of 1552 for its predecessor; and there is a curious piece of literary history which shows his appreciation of the fatal effects of suppressing the doctrine of the Real Presence and abolishing ecclesiastical discipline. He wrote from Cambridge describing the conduct of ‘those who hold our doctrine’ that ‘not a few, casting aside all care for true penitence, faith, good works, ecclesiastical communion and discipline, work and strive, and that often in the most irreligious spirit for this alone, how they may withdraw Christ our Saviour from our sacraments and sacred assemblies, and may shut Him up in His own place in Heaven.’ This letter appears in the correspondence of Calvin. But Beza, who edited it, fearing that the pungent expressions last quoted might give offence to the Zwinglians, altered them into the vapid words, ‘They deliver upon the participation of Christ through the sacraments such things as are not sufficiently imbued with the sense of true piety.’ When such a person was in England at that time it was certain that he would be asked to supply suggestions for the Ordinal, to be rigorously checked and revised by the English committee. And this was what did happen.

In Bucer’s Scripta Anglicana (Basel, 1577), p. 255, we find a Latin ‘Ratio Ordinandi,’ large portions of which bear to parts of the Anglican office a resemblance too close for any supposition but that one is the translation of the other. Courayer supposes Bucer’s Latin to have been an Ordinal for Germany. This cannot be the case, for it is shown never to have existed in German by its want of the asterisk in the table of contents which is affixed to the portions of the volume which did exist in that tongue. And if it was an Ordinal suggested or adopted in German, it would have no place in the Scripta Anglicana at all, unless Bucer also used it in England. Another conjecture is possible, that it was proposed by Bucer in substitution for the Anglican

1 *Ed. VI. and the Prayer Book*, p. 301 n. 2 *Ed. VI.* p. 299.

Ordinal along with his other proposed alterations of the Prayer Book of 1549. Had it been so it would have been placed in connexion with those suggestions in the volume. But nothing seems admissible except the supposition that it was a draft submitted for the first English Ordinal.

From a literary point of view it is interesting to note the admirable skill with which the English editor, doubtless Cranmer, manipulated the cumbersome composition of Bucer and brought it to the noble form which we know so well. Hallam describes Bucer as a man of much acuteness, but prone to metaphysical subtlety, and finds some of his expressions 'more than usually confused,' and Collier expresses a similar opinion of him. Dom Gasquet, however, is well acquainted with his writings, and does justice to their considerable merit. He had the defects in style and in clearness of thought which so many Germans have since displayed, but along with them the learning and copiousness which have made their works stores of suggestion for men of better literary powers. Besides, there is with Bucer's sincerity and earnestness a tinge of sentimentalism of which nothing remains in Cranmer's work. Extracts from each placed side by side will serve to exemplify, by their likeness in some places and their contrast in others, the process by which the English Ordinal was framed.

**Bucer's Latin.**

*Inde psalluntur Psalmi* xl. cxxxii. cxxv.

Audistis frater in canonicâ vestrá examinatione et nunc in concione atque in recitatis sacris lectionibus apostolicis et evangelicis quanta sit dignitatis et molis munus hoc ad quod estis accessiti et nunc in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi solemniter instituendi. Hortamur ergo in Domino vos et obtestamur per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, memores sitis in quantam vos ipse Filius Dei dignitatem eyehat, ut illud ipsum munus administratis ad quod ipse in hunc mundum venit et mortem acerbissimam obit cuique regni

**English Ordinal of 1549. Special Psalms at the ordering of Bishops and Priests, 40, 132, 135.**

You have heard, brethren, as well in your private examination as in the exhortation and in the holy lessons taken out of the Gospel, and of the writings of the Apostles, of what dignity and of how great importance that office is, whereunto ye be called, and now we exhort you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to have in remembrance into how high a dignity and to how chargeable an office ye be called: that is to say to be the Messengers, the Watchmen, Pastors, and Stewards of the Lord: to teach, to premonish, to feed and

1 Quoted by Dom Gasquet, *Ed. VI.* p. 127.
Cum itaque sit munus vestrum tanta simul et excellentiae et dignitatis et molis atque difficul-tatis, videtis quantâ oporteat vos et curâ et solicitudine in illud incumbere ut et gratos vos ei Domino prestetis qui tanto vos honore afficit tantamque vobis confert dignitatem et nullum vobis ipsis et ecclesiae ejus dam-

provide for the Lord's family: to seek for Christ's sheep that be dispersed abroad, and for His children which be in the midst of this naughty world, to be saved through Christ for ever. Have always therefore printed in your remembrance how great a treasure is committed to your charge. For they be the sheep of Christ which He bought with His death, and for whom He shed His blood. The Church and congregation whom you must serve is His spouse and His body, and if it shall chance the same Church or any member thereof to take any hurt or hinderance by reason of your negligence, ye know the greatness of the fault, and also of the horrible punishment that will ensue. Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your ministry towards the children of God, towards the spouse and Body of Christ: and see that ye never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you according to your bounden duty to bring all such as are, or shall be, committed to your charge unto that agreement in faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among them, either for error in religion or for viciousness in life.

Then forasmuch as your office is of so great excellency and of so great difficulty ye see with how great care and study ye ought to apply yourselves as well that ye may show yourselves kind to that Lord who hath placed you in so high a Dignity; as also to beware that neither yourselves offend, neither be occasion that
num detis. Jam autem nihil potestis hujus ex vobis cogitare, omnis hæc facultas a solo Deo datur; quantopere ergo pro bono Spiritu ejus orare vos sit necesse cernitís. Cumque nullà allà re tantum humanæ salutis opus quod vobis imponitur possitis perficere quam doctrinâ et exhortatione ex divinis Scripturis depromptâ et vitâ huic doctrinâe respondente, agnoscitis quanto etiam studio incumbere vos opor
teat legendâ et perdiscendâ D. Scripturis meditandâ quoque et formandis moribus cum vestris tum vestrorum ad earundem Scripturarum regulam. Et hâc ipsà de causâ quam procul etiam a vobis omnia mundi negotia et studia submovenda perspicitís.

Hæc vero omnia confidimus vos diu multumque et religiosé ante cogitasse considerasse pro
beque ponderasse, atque ita vocatíoni Domini ad hoc munus ob
sequi, ejus confisos ope, sic decre
visse ut velitis hoc unum totis viribus agere cunctasque huc curas et cogitations vestras con
ferre ut et Spiritum Sanctum facultatem caelestem munus vestrum sancte et salubrite obeundi a Patre Domini nostri Jesu Christi per hunc unum mediatorem et propitiatorem nostrum indelexeriter oretis et jugi vos ac religiosa D. Scriptura
rum lectione et excussione ad hoc ipsum ministerium vestríum indies amplius instruatis et corrobore
tis: et vitam quoque vestràm atque vestrorum sic laboraret quotidie sanctificare et ad Christi doctrinâm conformare ut salutaria gregis Christi exemplaria vos et others offend. Howbeit ye cannot have a mind and will thereto of yourselves: for that power and ability is given of God alone. Therefore ye see how ye ought and have need to pray earnestly for His Holy Spirit. And seeing that ye cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work pertaining to the salvation of man but with doc
trine and exhortation taken out of Holy Scripture and with a life agreeable to the same: ye per
ceive how studious ye ought to be in reading and learning the Holy Scriptures and in framing the manners both of yourselves and of them that specially per
tain unto you according to the rule of the same Scriptures, and for this selfsame cause ye see how ye ought to forsake and set aside (as much as you may) all worldly cares and studies.

We have a good hope that you have well weighed and pondered these things with yourselves long before this time: and that you have clearly determined, by God’s grace, to give yourselves wholly to this vocation whereunto it hath pleased God to call you, so that (as much as lieth in you) you apply yourselves wholly to this one thing and draw all your cares and studies this way and to this end: and that you will con
tinually pray for the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost from God the Father by the mediation of our only Mediator and Saviour Jesus Christ: that by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures ye may wax riper and stronger in your ministry. And that ye may so endeavour yourselves from time to time to sanctify the lives of you and yours and to fashion them after the
vestros præstetis: et quo in ista omnia possitis et liberioribus animis atque felicius etiam incumbere omnes hujus sæculi curas et negotia longe a vobis rejiciatis sic ut hæc omnia in examinatione vestrâ peti Dei auxilio promisistis. Ut vero et præsens Christi ecclesia de his mentem et voluntatem vestrâm quoque intelligat et vos hæc vestra promissio etiam ecclesiæ facta magis ad officium solicitet, respondebitis clarâ voce ad quae de his ipsis officiis vestrâ promissio etiam ecclesiæ nomine interrogabimus.

The interrogatories in Bucer's form undoubtedly are the basis of those which are proposed to the candidates of each order in the Edwardine Ordinal. The following is given as a specimen of the method of adaptation:

Confiditis vos a Domino nostro Jesu Christo præcentre pastor gregis sui et summo animarum episcopo ad Ecclesiæ suæ ministerrium esse vocatos?

Post hæc jubetur etiam ecclesia eadem orare [pro] ordinandis in silentio hisque precibus datur justum spaciurn, quo finito subjicit primarius ordinarius. Dominus vobiscum. Oremus. Deus omnipotens Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, gratias agimus tæ divinæ majestati et immensæ in nos charitati et benignitati per hunc ipsum filium tuum Dominum et Redemptorem nostrum Rule and Doctrine of Christ; and that ye may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the rest of the congregation to follow. And that this present congregation of Christ here assembled may also understand your minds and wills in these things and that this your promise shall more move you to do your duties ye shall answer plainly to these things which we in the name of the congregation shall demand of you touching the same.

The Bishop. Do you think that you truly be called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the due order of this Realm to the ministry of the Church? (Deacons.)

Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the order of this Church of England to the ministry of Priesthood? (Priests.)

Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this ministration according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the order of this Realm? (Bishops.)

After this the congregation shall be desired secretly in their prayers to make humble supplication to God for the foresaid things, for the which purpose there shall be a certain space kept in silence. That done, the Bishop shall pray in this wise. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Let us pray. Almighty God and Heavenly Father, which of Thy infinite love and goodness...
Towards us hast given us Thy only and most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our Redeemer and the Author of everlasting life: who after He had made perfect our redemption by His death and was ascended into heaven, sent abroad into the world His Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors: by whose labour and ministry He gathered together a great flock in all parts of the world to set forth the eternal praise of Thy holy name. For these so great benefits of Thy eternal goodness, and for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call these Thy servants here present to the same office and ministry of the salvation of mankind, we render unto Thee most hearty thanks, we worship and praise Thee; and we humbly beseech Thee by the same Thy Son to grant unto us which either here or elsewhere call upon Thy Name that we shew ourselves thankful to Thee for these and all other Thy benefits; and that we may daily increase and go forwards in the knowledge and faith of Thee and Thy Son by the Holy Spirit. So that as well by these Thy ministers as by them to whom they shall be appointed ministers, Thy holy Name may be always glorified and Thy blessed kingdom enlarged: through the same thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ which liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

Priests.

Almighty God and most merciful Father, which of Thy infinite goodness hast given to us Thy only and most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our Redeemer and Author of
et ubique nomen tuum invocantis
bus gratos nos tibi semper praे
stare pro his et omnibus aliis
beneficiis ejus [?tuis] : sicque
quotidie in cognitione et fide tui
et Filii tui proficere per Spiritum
Sanctum tuum ut per hos ministros
tuos et eos quibus nos dare
ministros voluisti, nosque omnes,
nomen sanctum tuum semper
amplius glorificetur et beatum
regnum filii tui latius propagetur
potentiusque quocumque perve
nerit obtineat. Per eundem Filium
tuum Dominum nostrum Jesum
Christum qui tecum vivit et re
gnat in unitate ejusdem Spiritus
Sancti per omnia sæcula sæcu
lorum. Amen.

Post hanc precem primarius
ordinator cum presbyteris pre
sentibus imponit iis qui ordinan
tur in genua sua procumbentibus
manus et dicit Manus Dei omni
potentis Patris Filii et Spiritus
Sancti sit super vos, protegat et
gubernet vos, ut eatis et fructum
everlasting life: who after that
he had made perfect our redeemp
tion by His death and was as
cended into heaven, poured down
his gifts abundantly upon men,
making some Apostles, some
Prophets, some Evangelists, some
Pastors and Doctors, to the edif
ying and making perfect of His
congregation; grant, we beseech
Thee, to this Thy servant such
grace that he may evermore be
ready to spread abroad Thy
Gospel, the glad tidings of re
conciliation to God: and to use
the authority given unto him, not
to destroy but to save; not to
hurt but to help; so that he as a
faithful and wise servant, giving
to thy family meat in due season,
may at the last day be received
into joy; through Jesus Christ
our Lord, who with Thee and
the Holy Ghost liveth and reign-
eth one God, world without end.
Amen. [Bishops.]

Then the Bishop, laying his
hands severally upon the head of
eyery one of them, shall say:
Take thou authority to execute
the office of a Deacon in the
Church of God committed unto
thee: in the Name of the Father,
and of the Son, and of the Holy
Ghost. Amen. [Deacons.]

When this prayer is done the
Bishop with the Priests present
shall lay their hands severally
upon the head of every one that
receiveth Orders. The receivers
humbly kneeling upon their knees
and the Bishop saying:

Receive the Holy Ghost; whose
sins thou dost forgive they are
forgiven: and whose sins thou
dost retain they are retained;
and be thou a faithful dispenser
of the Word of God and of His
holy Sacraments: in the name
of the Father, and of the Son,
vestro ministerio quamplurimum afferatis, isque maneat in viam æternam. Amen.

His finitis canit Ecclesia symbolum fidei et proceditur ad communionem quam ordinati una sumant: qui etiam dum communionem sumperint in eo loco manent ubi impositæ eis manus sunt.

Cum autem tres ordines sint presbyterorum et curatorum ecclesiae: ordo Episcoporum: deinde presbyterorum quos veteres cardinales vocabant, qui primam ecclesiae gubernationem administrant in locis ubi non sunt Episcopi; et eorum presbyterorum qui his adjutorio sunt, et vocantur apud nos Diaconi vel adjutores. Ita ordinatio quoque attemperatur: ut cum ordinetur aliquis superintendens, id est episcopus, omnia aliquanto plenius et gravius gerantur et perficiantur quam cum ordinatur presbyter secundi ordinis, vel tertii. Ita etiam fit nonnullum discrimen inter ordinationem presbyterorum secundi et tertii ordinis.

It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there hath been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. [Preface to the Ordinal, 1549.]

It thus appears that the Committee which drew up the first English Ordinal had before them a Lutheran form suggested for their acceptance by a writer whom some of them regarded with deference and of whose work they made great use. The memory of Bucer must be honoured for the
suggestion of a part of the Ordinal which our Archbishops in their noble reply to the Bull can designate as a 'præclara adlocutio' and an 'examen dignissimum, quod nisi quis legerit et per perderit et cum Sacris Scripturis comparaverit, Ordinalis nostri virtutem plane non novit.' Yet no portion of Bucer's work belongs to the part of the Ordinal on which its validity depends. *His suggestions in that department were all rejected.* He professed indeed to recognize three Orders of the ministry. Doubtless he had been warned that this was necessary in England. And the Lutheran body in Germany to which he belonged was not Presbyterian by theory and system like the Calvinist, but recognized after a sort distinctions in the ministry.¹ And Bucer might defend his use of one form with variations for each Order by the example (had he known it) of the ancient form from the Canons of Hippolytus, which is the same for Bishops and Priests except for one word. But no such cloudy utterance met any favour from the English Bishops, who for Bucer's halting distinctions substituted the plain declaration of the Preface to the Ordinal and sent forth three distinct services for the three Orders. Moreover, they supplied from the ancient Catholic forms ample provision to answer the canonical necessity of an express intention of claiming from God the gift of each special Order, and carried out the faith expressed in these prayers by conferring each Order distinctly and sacramentally. There is nothing in Bucer corresponding to the declaration of intention on the part of the Bishop at the beginning of the English form for priests, 'Good people, these are they whom we propose, God willing, to receive this day into the holy Order of the Priesthood;' or to his prayer taken from the Sarum use, 'Mercifully behold these Thy servants now called to the office of the Priesthood;' nor to the words in the consecration of Bishops, 'We present you this godly and well learned man to be ordained and consecrated Bishop;' nor to the prayer, 'Mercifully behold this Thy servant now called to the work and ministry of a Bishop.'

The framing of the Edwardine Ordinal becomes in this way known to us with a minuteness not usual in the history of liturgical forms. And we perceive at once that more than one influence was at work upon it. Those who are led by prejudices and presumptions would have anticipated a ready acceptance on Cranmer's part of the draft which a foreign reformer whom he regarded with all the deference of his sub-

massive nature offered for his acceptance. There was nothing in it likely to surprise or shock him; we might even have supposed him ready to adopt something much more extreme. For in the resolutions of bishops and divines of the questions concerning the sacraments set forth in the year 1539, we find Cranmer’s answer to the question ‘whether Bishops or Priests were first,’ to be: ‘The Bishops and Priests were at one time and were no two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ’s religion.’ Still worse is his reply to the question ‘whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a Bishop and Priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient;’ for it runs, ‘In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Bishop or a Priest needeth not consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient.’ It has, however, been well pointed out that Cranmer signed the King’s Book, in which the doctrine upon the ministry is orthodox, four years after his reply to these questions.

It is not necessary that we should reconcile the utterances of that accomplished but dependent mind. Though we feel assured that the literary composition of the Ordinal can be due to no one but Cranmer, yet with regard to its Catholic structure deliberately adopted in the face of Bucer’s suggestion, we can choose between various solutions. Either Cranmer had surrendered his wild views on the ministry (which indeed were never more than tentative), and when the responsibility of preparing a new Ordinal was laid upon him returned to saner counsels; or other members of the Ordinal committee overruled him by their votes or brought him over by discussion; or, finally, Cranmer and those who sat with him on the committee felt themselves obliged to frame their work so as to satisfy the Bishops of the old learning; an object in which they completely succeeded, for no Bishop in the Church of England, with one exception, refused to subscribe the Ordinal, and all without any exception accepted it for use. And it seems a monstrous thing that the forms which responsible and perfectly competent contemporaries accepted, even though unwillingly, and were never censured either by the Pope or Queen Mary for accepting, should be brought up for judgment and condemned by their doctrinal representatives three centuries later. Dom Gasquet makes some slight but very lame attempt to refute this argument; but the Bull, none. It is indeed the opinion of some that there existed at the time a

1 Burnet’s Hist. of the Reformation. Records, Book iii. xxi.
2 P. 280.
purpose on the part of the reforming Bishops to alter their work in a Protestant direction when circumstances should permit. This is a question of no practical importance, since circumstances ruled by the manifest providence of God never did permit any further change than the unessential alterations of the second Ordinal of Edward. But we do not find it easy to believe that work so systematic and complete was put out with any other view and design than that of permanence.

The Bull makes it a great reproach to the Edwardine Ordinal that in the sentences of ordination for Bishops and Priests no mention should have been made of the particular office intended to be conferred. It has been truly replied that the previous prayer in which the grace of the office is besought is really the place in which distinct mention of the nature of the grace is required. And when such special mention is also demanded in the sentence of ordination, the scholastic theory of a sacrament and its necessary form is permitted to overbear the primitive testimony about the requisites for Orders, confirmed as it is by the silent laying on of hands in the ancient part of the Roman Pontifical itself. It cannot be rightly maintained that mention of the office is indispensable in the sentence of ordination, nor can the Roman Church assert such a principle so long as it does not recall the fore-mentioned response in the Abyssinian case, that 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum' was enough to make a Priest. Still, it may be fairly argued that such distinctness in the act of ordaining, though not indispensable is very appropriate and brings out well in the actual gift of Order the meaning and result of the prayers previously offered. And the question may well be asked why in the Edwardine form the sentence for making Deacons should specify the Order in words, 'Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in the Church of God,' while no corresponding words should appear in the Ordinals of Bishops and of Priests? Our reply is this, that in the belief of the time the words which ordained the Priest were those which our Lord used to ordain Priests and those which consecrated the Bishop were, 'Take the Holy Ghost' with the words added in which St. Paul describes the particular purpose and meaning with which the Holy Ghost is conferred on a bishop.

Morinus classifies the various lawful opinions concerning the relation of the presbyterate and the episcopate under four heads. First, the theory that they are different

1 De Sac. Ord. Pars iii. Exercitatio iii.
orders, secondly, that they are but the same order. Thirdly, that the grace of the episcopate is that of the priesthood increased and intensified, and fourthly, that the grace is the same with the power of ordination added for the bishop; the latter being the opinion to which the learned author himself inclines. These different views of the nature of the two offices and the grace which belongs to each correspond to various views of the history of their origin as recorded in Scripture.

In the prayer 'Vere dignum,' which is found in the ancient part of the Roman Ordinal of Priests, the record of Old Testament ordinations is recounted as the precedent of the New—‘ut cum Pontifices summos regendis populis præfecisses ad eorum societatis et operis adjumentum sequentis ordinis viros et secundæ dignitatis eligeres . . . . Hæc providentiam Domine Apostolis filii tui Doctores fidei comites addidisti quibus illi orbem totum secundis prædicationibus impleverunt. Quapropter infirmitati quoque nostriæ Domine quæsumus hæc adjumenta largire . . . . Da quæsumus omnipotens Pater in hos famulos tuos Presbyterii dignitatem: innova in viscera eorum spiritum sanctitatis: ut acceptum a te Deus secundi meriti munus obtineant . . . sint providi co-operatores ordinis nostri.’ It is plain that the history of Christian ordination is here supposed to correspond to that of the Jewish. The apostolate or episcopate came first, and the presbyterate was created as a second order to assist it; just as Aaron was first appointed, and the inferior priests and Levites were given him as helpers.

But the subsequent additions to the more ancient rite in the Pontifical did not follow out the same idea. The gradual elevation of the priesthood and its functions made it an anomaly to represent it as an inferior Order. There is not in any of the additions which were successively made to the earlier form of the Roman Ordinal for Priests any repetition of the above-mentioned view of the relations of the episcopate and the priesthood or any further reference to Old Testament example. And the seal was put upon this progress of doctrine when the words in which the Lord ordained the apostles were placed in the Pontifical for the ordination of Priests. That alteration implied the adoption of a corresponding view of the sacred history of Orders, and expressed the belief that the words of St. John xx. 21 made the apostles presbyters, and imparted a gift which they passed on to others when they ordained elders in every city. The special powers of the apostolate were something over
and above the presbyterate, and were used to make a further development of the ministry, exemplified in the cases of SS. Timothy and Titus, when the time of the apostles' departure was at hand. The well-known essay of Bishop Lightfoot has brought this question before the English Church in recent times. But it is raised and it is answered in the Roman Pontifical. And, however conciliatory to Presbyterians the application to presbyters, in the Edwardine form, of the Lord's sacred words may have been, there can be little doubt under the circumstances of the time that the first and chief persons whom it was calculated to conciliate were the adherents of the old learning who found the familiar sentence applied as the mediaeval Church had been used to apply it. The discussion of the question of Orders in the Council of Trent followed so soon upon the issue of the English Ordinal that the opinions on the point which prevailed at Trent are likely to have been those of the English bishops of the old learning. They were embodied in Sessio xxiii. Canon iv.: ‘Si quis dixerit per sacram Ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum, ac proinde frustra episcopos dicere Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, anathema sit.' The Council probably did not know how to deal more clearly with the awkward position in which the sacred words stand in the Pontifical. But bishops who thought in this way could not refuse to accept the words as a sufficient form.

The sentence of consecration for Bishops in the Ordinal of 1549 was adopted on the same principle as that for ordering Priests: the principle, namely, of using Scripture words originally applied to the corresponding Order in New Testament times. 2 Tim. i. 6, 7, was commonly applied when the Ordinal was composed to the consecration of Timothy as a Bishop, and the authority which, with little hesitation, we may assert to have been immediately present to the framers' minds is that of the Paraphrase of Erasmus. That work had been just placed in every church in England as an authoritative exposition of the New Testament. And we find the verse in question there expounded thus: ‘Donum Dei quod per impositionem manuum meorum episcopus ordinatus accepi, suscites.'

Thus it appears that the reason why the words Bishop and Priest were not placed in the Edwardine sentences of ordination was that the sentences themselves were considered to mark the respective Orders because they had been spoken to the primitive holders of those Orders. It is the very same principle on which the words of Institution in
Holy Communion have been used by the Church of Rome itself as the words of consecration. No fitter words could be used to declare an intention of doing what Christ did, than those which He used to His apostles and His apostles to their bishops. And when combined with the declaration of intention in the Preface and the distinct petitions for the making of Priests and Bishops in the prayers, they establish a case for true form and intention in the Edwardine Ordinal which the argument of the Bull cannot be said to touch.

The Bull intimates the opinion that the alterations in the sentences of ordination made at the Savoy Conference prove a consciousness on the part of the Anglican Bishops of that time that the Edwardine forms were defective. It has been pointed out from a good many quarters that this is a mistake, and that the Savoy alterations were directed against the Puritans. But we have not seen it noticed that the changes which were at that time made in the Epistles and Gospels of the Ordinal entirely support this view. For the passages from Acts xx. and St. Matthew xxviii. 18 sq. are transferred from the Ordinal of Priests to that of Bishops; I Tim. iii., which had been common to both, was confined to the Ordinal of Bishops; and St. John x. 1 sq. which had been also common, was confined to Priests; while St. John xx. 19 sq., from which the Priests' sentence of ordination was taken in 1549, was in 1662 given as an alternative Gospel for Bishops. It would seem that the revisers of Charles II. inclined to a different view of the manner in which the two Orders appear in Scripture from that which was taken by the Reformers of 1549. And in fact it is known that all through the 17th century beginning from the celebrated sermon of Dr. Bancroft in 1588, a reaction towards strong statements of the Divine right of Episcopacy over the Presbytery had been going on. It found expression in the changes of the Ordinal. It thus appears that not only is the Pope mistaken in the account he gives of the alterations of 1662, but the Edwardine form was founded on a view which is taught in his own Pontifical, while the alterations which, according to him, made our Ordinal valid embodied a conception of the relations of Bishop and Priest which is certainly not that which the Pontifical suggests.

We should be well content to leave the question whether the Ordinal was, or was not, intended for the continuance of the existing ministry to the verdict of a jury or the decision of a court of Judges. It is a question of fact. The Pope, although he himself, and still more his adherents, may easily assume the claim of power to make our Orders good or bad.
by his command, yet really possesses no power in the matter except that of giving a decision upon historical evidence as to a point which is true or false independently of any human judgment or opinion. As matter of fact, we conceive it to be plain and clear that the intention of the English Ordinal of 1549 was exactly that which its Preface declared, that the Orders which had been in the Church since the time of the Apostles might be continued and reverently esteemed.

It is true that the Reformers thought, and with good reason, that the sacrificial character of the Priest had been exaggerated; and the Ordinal shows signs of this belief. They thought, as Cardinal Manning did, that 'Priests have a danger of becoming Mass Priests or Sacrament-mongers.' But they did not allow this opinion to lead them to omit a sacramental charge and commission from the sentence of ordination. Even if it had led them to this, the omission could not have been more absolute than the omission of the authority to remit sins is from the sentence which accompanies the 'porrectio instrumentorum' which, according to the rubric of the Pontifical, makes the Priest. Yet the Council of Trent pronounces the power to remit sins a constituent of the priesthood side by side with the power of sacrifice. And it may be justly argued that the power of absolution implies the power of making the memorial of the great sacrifice through which alone absolution can be given, just as the Lord Himself remitted sins by the power of His sacrifice, without making mention of the sacrifice; while it is by no means so clear that the power to make the memorial implies necessarily the authority to apply it. The claim of the Lord's commission to be a sufficient form is overwhelming, and it is difficult to characterise in respectful language the utterance of a Christian Bishop who says that the authors

2 We doubt, therefore, whether careful Roman Catholic theologians will adopt the words of the Rev. S. F. Smith (The Bull, &c., p. 20): 'It is vain to say that these words [i.e. St. John xx. 21] suffice because our Lord used them, for it must first be shown that our Lord intended to confer then and there (not having conferred it previously in the Last Supper) the entire power of the priesthood: that is, the power of sacrifice as well as the supplementary power of forgiving sins. And if words are to account for anything, He must be held to have had no such intention, for certainly the words "Whose soever sins ye remit," &c., do not in any way express the notion of sacrifice.' The words at the Last Supper are certainly not so clear in conferring the priesthood that it can safely be left dependent on them. We do not remember any allusion to them in the Ordinals. And where has the author learnt to call the power of absolution 'supplementary'?
of an Ordinal in which those words are incorporated have 'deliberately removed whatever set forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite' (p. 17). To say that this sentence was adopted with the view of excluding from the Priests' commission the power of sacrifice comes very near to blaming the Lord Himself for not naming that power in His commission to the Apostles.

We have laid before the reader the information about the composition of the Ordinal which we have to give. It seems to us important, but the Bull takes no notice of it. We feel sure that it was quite unknown to the authors of that document, or to the Pope who adopted and published it. For if any historian were to say, 'We know what abettors the Reformers associated with themselves from the heterodox sects,' while at the same time he was aware, but did not tell, that a draft by one of these abettors was altered in its most important particulars, he would never be trusted again. But we are by no means so sure that the information was not in the hands of the English Roman Catholics. Dom Gasquet repeatedly quotes Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*, and that learned person is not one to pass over a treatise 'De ordinatione legitimâ ministrorum ecclesiae revocandâ,' without looking at what it contained. He prudently says nothing about it. But Father Breen is not so wise. He must undoubtedly have seen or heard of Bucer's proposed form, for in a communication to the *Tablet*, which we have before quoted, he says that Cranmer 'sent for Bucer, a Lutheran, to come over to England and draw up a rite for making Gospel ministers, such as he had drawn up for the German Lutherans, which was practically adopted.' In what terms admissible to the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review* can we describe the assertion that a draft treated as we have shown Bucer's to have been, was 'practically adopted'?

The Bull *Apostolicae curae* must needs have a great effect upon Englishmen's judgment of the Papal claims. We know what effect it has upon ourselves. We have not two minds, one to consider the Bull and another to deal with the Pope's infallibility. We have but one for both processes, and what it tells us upon the one question we must perforce apply to the other. However plausible any arguments for Papal infallibility that may be adduced to us may be, we shall never consider them strong enough to overcome the fact that in this question, which concerns both faith and morals, the Pope, expressing a firm purpose of deciding infallibly and irrevocably, has decided wrongly: so wrongly that to accept his
decision would be to deny the grace of the Holy Ghost, in Whose name, after faithful appeal to Him, the work which this human authority disallows is done.

ART. VIII.—LEA'S 'HISTORY OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.'


DR. H. C. LEA of Philadelphia is already known as the writer of several learned works on subjects connected with ecclesiastical history. The book now before us is likely to add to the reputation which he possesses as an industrious collector of historical details. It bears marks of very wide and careful research. The author has apparently attempted to exhaust the literature of the matters with which he deals, so far as original sources are concerned. He has thus compiled a vast mass of facts and opinions. Many times in our perusal of his three bulky volumes, containing in all no less than sixteen hundred and sixty-six pages, we have noted down a point of importance which we thought he had omitted, only to find it mentioned further on in the work. The industry and pains which must have been necessary for the accumulation and arrangement of so much material deserve high praise.

We desire further to give Dr. Lea credit for the full intention to deal fairly with his subject. He has not been afraid to refer to many passages in the Fathers and the Schoolmen which are very far from supporting positions to which he has committed himself. A painstaking student who should work carefully through the authorities referred to in any part of the book would have the matter for forming a very good opinion about the period to which they should belong.

Yet the claims of learning and industry and of the intention to be fair, which we cordially recognize, do not lead us to express approval of the work. The faults by which, in our judgment, it is marred prevent it from being in itself a helpful or trustworthy guide on the momentous theological and practical matters of which its historical details are the setting. The writer seems to have little sense of proportion,
and the lack of this quality has injured both the substance and the method of his work. Regard to it might have saved him from attaching undue importance to the idiosyncrasies of individual teachers, and have enabled him to avoid overloading the text of his book with a multiplicity of details and an excess of quotations. It might have given him the power of selecting luminous and representative instances of teaching, and of showing by means of them the true currents of thought, instead of, as is too often the case, allowing these to be out of sight because of the prominence granted to mere eddies. Moreover, while the materials are to a certain extent arranged by the division of the book into chapters on different subjects, within the chapters the arrangement is by no means such as to promote ease in grasping the various features of the matter being discussed.

We have expressed our belief in Dr. Lea's desire to be fair. But we cannot say we think him free from unconscious bias. Of this there are many indications. Not the least, perhaps, may be seen in the scoffing tone which he frequently adopts. There is no gain to an historical inquiry by sneering at Pope Leo XIII. for 'shaking hands with Democracy' and affecting 'an external liberalism' while making a 'persistent and determined effort to bind' 'the minds of the younger generation of ecclesiastics' 'in the chains of the thirteenth century, and to hold them rigorously to mediævalism' by promoting the study of St. Thomas Aquinas (i. 137-8). An altogether false idea would be given to any ignorant of the facts by the statement that the office of Penitentiary was abolished by Nectarius, the Bishop of Constantinople, 'in consequence of a fair penitent being seduced by a deacon' (i. 179). It is, to say the least, unnecessary to speak with contempt of the 'instructions to the priest to share the penance' of the penitent which are found in some Penitentials (i. 192). To suggest that the 'deprecatory form has been preserved' 'in the sacrament of extreme unction' because since it is 'part of the function of this sacrament' 'to restore the sick

1 The idea which Dr. Lea's statement would naturally give is that the sin happened because of the existence of the office of Penitentiary. As a matter of fact, according to one account (Socrates, Hist. Eccl. v. 19), the sin was committed altogether independently of the penitential discipline, and had no closer connexion with the Penitentiary than that it became known through the deacon being degraded as a result of the confession; and, according to the other account (Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vii. 16), the only way in which it was a result of the use of the penitential discipline was that it was an outrage committed by the deacon in question while the lady was waiting in the church after having made her confession to the Penitentiary.
to health,' and since 'in this case the result is known, it is manifestly wiser to leave the whole responsibility with God,' is as useless, from the point of view of historical research, as it is lacking in reverence (i. 461). And, to give but one other instance out of many, it would have been as well if Dr. Lea had restrained himself from saying that the detention of a soul 'in purgatory until the penance is completed,' when the 'penance' is being performed by a living friend, 'is only a reasonable precaution to insure performance' (ii. 227-8).

The same unconscious bias leads the author to misunderstand the patristic and mediæval use of the spiritual interpretation of Holy Scripture. When St. Ambrose,¹ and St. Augustine,² and St. Gregory the Great,³ and Alcuin,⁴ and Peter Lombard,⁵ and Aquinas,⁶ and other writers derive inferences about the forgiveness of sins from our Lord's methods in the raising of Lazarus, he fails to see that they had in their minds, though they did not on every occasion express them, a number of concurring arguments among which their view of the mystical significance of what Christ said and did was only one (i. 138-40).⁷

We ascribe to the same cause, rather than to any intentional unfairness, many misinterpretations of the Fathers and the Schoolmen. Here, again, we can only give a limited number of examples of a frequently recurring characteristic. The space at our command, even if we should devote the whole of this article to one point, would be insufficient to treat adequately all the instances of it which we have noticed. The statement of St. Chrysostom ⁸ that 'God pardons those only who come to Him freely and willingly' (i. 15), certainly does not mean that the reconciliation entrusted to the control of the bishops is unconnected with the forgiveness of sins.⁹

¹ St. Ambrose, De Pan. ii. 7.
⁴ Alcuin, Ep. cxii.
⁷ Both the Fathers and the Schoolmen habitually cite a passage of Scripture or another writer as if the quotation proved the point referred to where the actual grounds of belief are numerous.
⁸ St. Chrys. De Sac. ii. 2-4.
⁹ This, on any reasonable method of interpreting an author, is clear from other passages in St. Chrysostom (e.g. De Sac. iii. 5-6), even if it were not shown by the context of the passage referred to above. It is a continually recurring mistake of Dr. Lea to suppose that if it is said God pardons, it is meant that the priest does not; and if it is said there must be certain dispositions in the penitent, it is meant that the absolution is in itself of no value. In all Sacramental action God is really the worker
The assertion of St. Pacian\(^1\) (i.114) that he who confesses his sins to his brethren, being assisted by the tears of the Church, is absolved by the prayers of Christ is entirely consistent with a belief in the reality of priestly absolution.\(^2\) When St. Jerome\(^3\) and St. Gregory the Great\(^4\) declare that a wrong decision by priest or bishop will not be ratified by the judgment of God (i.116, 119, 120), they say nothing that is out of harmony with a firm belief in the powers of forgiveness committed by Christ to His Church.\(^5\) To speak of the recital of the seven penitential psalms as winning the mercy of God (i.125-6) does not make it inconsistent for Alcuin\(^6\) to believe the doctrine of Absolution.\(^7\) That St. Bernard\(^8\) should say that confession washes away sins (i.134) is no reason that he should not ascribe to priests the power to absolve.\(^9\) Peter Lombard is not without a coherent theory (i.157) because he speaks of priestly binding and loosing as 'the manifestation of those bound or loosed by God,' and also admits that a priest may sometimes exhibit 'as bound or loosed those who are not bound or loosed with God.'\(^10\) The assertion of St. Thomas Aquinas\(^11\) that 'the use of the keys' is 'only efficient when in accordance with the will of God' (i.147) does not prevent the greatest of the Schoolmen from logically holding that a real gift of absolving power was bestowed on the priest only His instrument; and the reality of the gift is not affected by the possibility of its being useless in a particular case. Cf. St. Matt. x.12-13.

---

1 St. Pacian, Par. ad Pan. 15.
2 This is shown by the very full and emphatic statement in Ad Semp. Ep. iii. 11. And Dr. Lea makes the same mistake as in the case of St. Chrysostom.
4 St. Greg. Mag. Hom. in Evang. i. 17, § 18, ii. 26, §§ 5-6.
5 See e.g. St. Jer. Ep. xiv. 8-9 and the context of the above passages.
6 Alcuin, De Psalm. Usu, ad init.
7 See e.g. De Div. Off. 36, Ep. xii. cxii. Here, again, there is a complete misunderstanding through not realizing that strong statements may be quite consistently made about the effects both of the acts or inward dispositions of the penitent and the absolution of the priest. To use the highest of illustrations, it might truly be said of some of the miracles of our Lord that the cure was effected by His touch, or that it was the result of the faith of the person healed: see e.g. St. Luke viii. 44, 48.
8 St. Bern. e.g. Serm. de Divers. xl. 2, xci. 1.
9 See e.g. Serm. in Festo SS. Pet. et Paul. i. 2, compared with Serm. de Divers. xl. 6; Exhort. ad mil. temp. 12 (§ 30). See note on Alcuin, supra.
Apostles and their successors by Christ Himself. The decrees of the Second Council of Orange were not self-contradictory (i.95), and the decisions of the Council of Trent were in no sense a triumph of Pelagianism (i.104).

When we add that, besides the want of historical sense and the existence of unconscious bias leading to continual misunderstanding of writers and facts, we have observed a lack of the technical knowledge necessary for the proper treatment of the subject of this book, and a frame of mind which is altogether unappreciative of considerations which any priest who is used to hearing confessions knows to demand serious thought, our readers will understand there are good reasons for doubting whether the fundamental principles and main contention of the work are likely to bear investigation.

Dr. Lea has set himself to prove that there is no foundation in Holy Scripture or the teaching and practice of the early Church for belief in the existence of the power of Absolution. He supposes that in the first few Christian centuries

1 See e.g. the whole of S.T. Suppl. xviii., and cf. the note on St. Chrysostom, supra. One of the extraordinary features of these continual misrepresentations by Dr. Lea is that he is himself perfectly aware of the passages the comparison of which shows clearly what the right meaning is. Most of the references we have ourselves given in the above notes are also in one place or another of his book.

2 A more skilful theologian than Dr. Lea has written of 'the illustrious Council of Orange' (Bright, Lessons from the Lives of three great Fathers, p. 177), and the characteristic feature of the work of this Council is the balanced harmony of its decrees.

3 The Council of Trent was certainly not Pelagian. See e.g. Sess. vi. De Justificatione, canons 1-4.

4 E.g. he appears to imagine that the Agape was the same as the Eucharist (i.5), and that no power can be conferred in ordination which is not expressly mentioned in the form (i.121-3). He fails to see that the question of the use of auricular confession during life is quite independent of the practice of making general confessions on special occasions and of Chapter confessions (i.196-200, 237), and that the fact of confessions being under some circumstances made to lay people does not affect the possession of special powers by priests (i.217-26): cf. St. Thom. Aqu. S.T. Suppl. viii. 2, 3, with ibid. 1. He misses the meaning of St. Thom. Aqu. S.T. Suppl. vi. 5 ('Sicut cum teneatur sacerdos ad celebrandum, si non desit copia sacerdotis, confiteri tenetur, aut si desit, saltem conteri tenetur, et habere propositum confitendi, copia sacerdotis oblata') when he writes 'he can evade the difficulty by making a vow to confess' (i.271), and similarly misunderstands other passages, as e.g. Pet. Lomb. Sent. IV. xvii. 1-2 (i.212): see also i.155, 212, 214, 238, 478, 479, ii. 5, 6.

5 Some parts of a very painful discussion in i.425-39 could hardly have been written by anyone acquainted with the practical difficulties of the confessional and regarding them in at all a right light.
the reconciliation of the penitent had no connexion with the forgiveness of sins. He imagines that St. Leo did not regard the action of the priest as being of an absolving character (i. 33, 118, 182-3, 461), that even Gratian was very uncertain about the matter, and that the really sacerdotal theory of Absolution was created by the University of Paris.

'Little as the practical churchman might imagine it, his labours were of small account in comparison with those of the schoolmen, who, in the University of Paris, were destined to modify so greatly the whole structure of Catholic belief—to impose, we may almost say, a new religion on the foundations of the old faith. The two great development periods of ecclesiastical power were in the ninth and the twelfth centuries. In the former the dissolution of the empire of Charlemagne gave rise to an era of social reconstruction, during which feudalism and ecclesiasticism clutched at the fragments of shattered sovereignty. It was then that the Church emancipated itself from the State, and, by skilful use of the doctrines promulgated in the False Decretals, formulated the principles which eventually enabled Gregory VII. and his successors to triumph over monarchs. No less important was the silent revolution of the twelfth century which gave to the Church unquestioned domination over the souls and consciences of men. As the human mind began to awaken after the dreary slumber of the Dark Ages, and thinkers once more commenced to debate the eternal questions of man's relations with God, and the Divine government of the universe, all culture and intelligence were at the service of the Church, and the answers to these questions could not fail to be given in favour of sacerdotalism. The race of schoolmen arose, whose insatiable curiosity penetrated into every corner of the known and of the unknowable, framing a system of dialectics through which their crudest and wildest speculations assumed the form of incontrovertible logical demonstration. With keen subtilty and untiring industry, through successive generations, they advanced from one postulate to another, building up the vast and complex fabric of Catholic theology. Fashioned by their hands the Christian faith emerged from the schools a very different thing from what it had been on entering, and the modifications which it underwent were all directed to the exaltation of ecclesiasticism. The whole was moulded into symmetry by the master hand of St. Thomas Aquinas, the most perfect product of scholasticism, who grasped all the labours of his predecessors and reduced them to a system which, despite the opposition of the Scotists, has held its place to the present day' (i. 136-7).

Part of this work of the schoolmen, according to Dr. Lea, was to impose on the Western Church the belief in the possession of exclusive power of Absolution by Christian priests. We are prepared to go some distance in recognizing weak points as well as many great merits in the theology of the schoolmen. It was their tendency to attach far too much
importance to logical arguments and _a priori_ considerations. They were without some of the requisites for the true interpretation and right use of Holy Scripture. They do not appear to have sufficiently possessed the power of estimating the value of particular decisions and individual writers. The texts of the Fathers which were at their command were far from trustworthy, and it was impossible for them to detect the spurious character of some documents they used. If we dissent most emphatically from the central position taken up by Dr. Lea, it is upon far wider and stronger reasons than could be afforded by any love of scholastic theology.

Dr. Lea's treatment of Holy Scripture is altogether inadequate. He bases on a small number of passages a view that our Lord 'assumed as a postulate that in the dealings of God with man repentance suffices to procure pardon for sin,' 'assumed in all His acts that change of heart was the only thing needful,' showed that 'externals were of no importance, that man dealt directly with God, and that repentance, love, humility, pardon of offences or charity, sufficed to win forgiveness.' He states that, while 'Hebrew tradition' had 'prescribed certain outward manifestations of the internal change of heart,' our Lord in this teaching was none the less 'giving expression to traditional Hebrew thought' (i. 3-4). He indicates his opinion that the teaching of St. James and St. John on 'the redeeming character of mutual confession of sins' and 'the power of intercessory prayer,' and the value of the act of 'the presbyters' in anointing and praying for a sick man, and the ascription by St. Paul of forgiving force to the blood of Christ, and expiatory power to 'temporal suffering,' were early instances of departure from what our Lord taught (i. 4). On 'the celebrated texts in the Gospels of Matthew and John' he thinks it sufficient to say:

'Whatever sense may be attributed to this grant of power, the primitive Church evidently regarded it as personal to the holy men whom Christ had selected as His immediate representatives... In fact, how slowly the idea was developed that even the Apostles had this power is seen in Philip's referring Simon Magus to God for forgiveness after repentance and in the legend related above from Eusebius of St. John and the robber. Had the belief existed the apostle would not have been represented as offering his own soul in exchange and as interceding long and earnestly with God: as soon as assured of the sinner's repentance he would have been recorded as absolving him' (i. 107-8).

1 There is a very valuable statement on the scholastic theology in Pearson, _Lectiones de Deo et attributis_, Lectio i. (Minor Works, ed. Churton, i. 1-9).
Learned as he appears to be in some departments, we cannot give Dr. Lea credit for knowledge of the Bible. If the use of the name Philip instead of Peter in the above quotation may be due to an accident, we can hardly imagine that by any kind of slip a writer with a competent acquaintance with the New Testament could have supposed that the words of the unjust steward, 'I cannot dig,' were spoken by the prodigal son (i. 260).

A more thorough study of the Bible would surely have shown how much there is in it which bears on the subject. Both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament confession of sin is referred to as being of value in the sight of God. In the account of the first sin of man confession is elicited from those who have sinned by God Himself. After the second sin recorded in Holy Scripture He makes a similar appeal. And when it is remembered that these two histories are most profoundly significant as to the dealings of God with man, it will be seen that this fact is of very high importance. So also in the transgression of Achan and the great sin of David, occurring in both cases in histories that again are full of deepest meaning, the confession of the offender is obtained from him by the minister of God.

Similarly the Mosaic Law made provision for a solemn confession before God of 'all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins,' and for the confession of particular offences in connexion both with restitution and with sacrifice. Further, still keeping to the Old Testament, the Proverbs declare that 'whoso confesseth and forsaketh his sins shall have mercy;' the Psalms testify that confession of transgression is a means to the forgiveness of iniquity; and when the prophet Daniel 'set his face unto the Lord God' he 'made confession of the sins of his people.'

Passing on to the New Testament, we find that those who were helped by the ministry of St. John the Baptist confessed their sins, that the Jews and Greeks who were converted by the preaching of St. Paul at Ephesus 'confessed and shewed their deeds,' that St. John associates confession with forgiveness, and St. James regards it as a means to being healed.

1 Acts viii. 20-23. 2 St. Luke xvi. 3.
3 Gen. iii. 11-13. 4 Gen. iv. 9-14.
5 Josh. vii. 19-21; 2 Sam. xii. 13. 6 Num. v. 7.
7 Lev. xvi. 21. 8 Lev. v. 5. 9 Prov. xxviii. 13.
10 Ps. xxxii. 5. 11 Dan. ix. 3-4.
12 St. Matt. iii. 6; St. Mark i. 5. 13 Acts xix. 17-18.
14 St. John i. 9. 15 St. James v. 16.
A second point which it is necessary to notice here is the use made of external means in the histories which the Bible records. In the typical history of the deliverance from Egypt and the journey towards the Promised Land, the rod of Moses is given prominence. Uplifted hands are the means of securing victory for Israel over the Amalekites. The serpent of brass is used to make the recovery of those who were bitten possible. Naaman has to dip himself in the waters of Jordan if his leprosy is to be cured. Even when the promise of God has been given that Hezekiah will recover, the prophet Isaiah commands that a lump of figs be laid upon the boil. And in the New Testament, our Lord Himself puts forth His hand to heal, or touches the eyes of blind men, or makes clay of His own spittle and commands washing in the pool of Siloam to restore sight, while in the ministry of St. Paul ‘handkerchiefs or aprons’ ‘were brought’ ‘from his body’ ‘unto the sick,’ ‘and the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them.’ Holy Scripture makes it abundantly plain that it is the will of God to help men by means of persons and things.

So far we have observed two general principles pervading the Old Testament and the New Testament. With these in mind, we turn to the teaching of our Lord on the forgiveness of sins. He described belief in Himself as a way to eternal life, and to those who know anything of the general characteristics of His teaching it is clear that there cannot be eternal life without forgiveness. On the same occasion he linked the new birth of water and the Spirit with the sight of and the entrance into the kingdom of God. He claimed that, as the Son of Man, He had authority to forgive. On the night before His death He declared that His Blood was shed unto remission of sins. At a solemn point in His ministry He promised to St. Peter that his acts of binding and loosing would be ratified in heaven. A little later He made the same promise to His Apostles as a body. On the evening after His Resurrection He sent them as the Father had sent Him, and asserted that they had the powers both of forgiving and retaining sins.

1 E.g. Ex. iv. 17, vii. 19, xiv. 16, xvii. 5, 9.
2 Ex. xvii. 11-12.
3 Num. xxi. 8-9.
4 2 Kings v. 10-14.
5 2 Kings xx. 4-7.
6 E.g. St. Matt. viii. 3.
7 E.g. St. Matt. ix. 29.
8 St. John ix. 6-7.
9 Acts xix. 11-12.
10 St. John iii. 15.
11 St. John iii. 3, 5.
12 St. Matt. ix. 6.
13 St. Matt. xxvi. 28.
14 St. Matt. xvi. 19.
15 St. Matt. xviii. 18.
16 St. John xx. 21-23. The force of this commission is not destroyed
The rest of the New Testament contains little on the subject. St. Paul claimed to be able to judge matters of sin in the Name of the Lord Jesus.\(^1\) The Christian Church at Corinth, acting in concert with him, could deliver a sinner unto Satan with a view to his ultimate salvation.\(^2\) In forgiveness there is a special relation between the acts of the Corinthians and those of St. Paul, and when St. Paul forgives he does so in the person of Christ.\(^3\) And the forgiveness of sins is associated by St. James with the ministry of the second order in the Church.\(^4\)

Now, it would be untrue to say that Holy Scripture gives us a fully expressed and clearly defined system of the forgiveness of sins. As the central truths of the Faith are left to be gathered from the Bible and given dogmatic expression by the Church, and as it is part of the Church's office to explain and regulate the full meaning and detailed method of administration of Baptism and the Eucharist, so it is in harmony with the general principles of Christianity that the New Testament should supply with regard to forgiveness only the materials from which it is for the Church to formulate the doctrine which is true and establish the practices which are right. Yet, while this is the case, a real examination of Holy Scripture yields the three highly significant points which we have mentioned — the value attached by God to confession of faults, the use made by God of human and material instrumentalities, and the possession and exercise of a specific power of forgiveness by the Apostles and the Church of the first days.

Our next step is to inquire what is the light which is thrown on Holy Scripture by the teaching and practice of the Church. And here there are two facts which have to be considered in relation to one another and to the evidence afforded by the New Testament. The first fact is the belief that the Christian Ministry possessed powers such as those described by our Lord in His promise and gift to the Apostles; the second fact is the existence of a system like the excommunication and reconciliation exercised at Corinth.

if, as has been contended by e.g. Bishop Westcott \(\textit{in loco}\), it was addressed to the disciples generally. From one point of view all the powers of the Church belong to the whole body, but the various powers can only be exercised by means of the particular order appointed for that purpose, in the same way that, e.g. sight, which from one point of view is the act of the man, is only possible by means of the eye. How and by whom any power bestowed by our Lord can be exercised is only to be known from the decisions and practice of the Church.

\(^1\) 1 Cor. v. 3-5.  
\(^2\) Ibid.  
\(^3\) 2 Cor. ii. 10.  
Belief in the powers of the Ministry in connexion with the forgiveness of sins is found among Christians from very early times. There is an indication of it in a letter of St. Ignatius in which he speaks of the Lord forgiving all penitent persons if they have recourse to the unity of God and the council of the Bishop. It is worth while to notice a passage in which Tertullian, writing before he became a Montanist, makes it part of the work of repentance for the penitent to ‘throw himself on the ground before the presbyters.’ If these statements are somewhat indistinct, they fairly receive interpretation from later writers. St. Cyprian says that ‘the remission which is accomplished by means of the priests is pleasing in the sight of God.’ Many statements in Origen imply that, whatever idiosyncrasies in this matter as in others there may have been in his teaching, he believed that the Christian priest can forgive sins. St. Ambrose in express terms declares that repentance and confession can restore to grace the baptized who have sinned, and that the forgiveness of sins is exercised in the Church by the power of the Holy Ghost, while he repeatedly connects the pardon of God with the acts of the priest. St. Pacian emphatically asserts that bishops convey remission in accord-

1 St. Ignat. Ad Philad. 8, πάσιν ὑμῖν μετανοήσασθαι ἄφιε ὁ Κύριος, καὶ μετανοήσασθαι ἐς ἑαυτὰ ἡμῶν καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

2 Tertullian, De Pcen. 9, ‘presbyteris advolvi.’ This passage would not by itself show any association of special power with the clergy because mention is also made of seeking the ‘legationes’ of all the brethren, and in chapter x. the words ‘cum te ad fratrum genua pro-

3 St. Cyp. De Lapsis, 29. ‘Confiteantur singuli quaeso vos, fratres dilectissimi, delictum suum, dum adhuc quidem in seculo est, dum admitti confessio ejus potest, dum satisfactio et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est.’

4 Origen, e.g. In Lev. Hom. v. 12, De Orat. 28. The opinions of Origen on this point are discussed in Bigg, Christian Platonists of Alexandria, pp. 214-8.

5 St. Ambrose, De Pan. ii. 3 (§19).

6 Id. De Spir. sanct. iii. 18 (§137), ‘Nunc videamus utrum peccata donet Spiritus. Sed hic dubitari non potest, cum ipse Dominus dixerit “Accipite Spiritum sanctum: quorum remiseritis peccata, remissa erunt.” Ecce quia per Spiritum sanctum peccata donantur. Homines autem in remissionem peccatorum ministerium suum exhibent, non jus aliquid potestatis exercerunt. Neque enim in suo, sed in Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti nomine peccata dimittunt. Isti rogant : divinitas donat ; humanum enim obsequium, sed munificentia supernæ est potestatis.’

7 See e.g. In Ps. xxxviii. Enarr. 37, where he interprets St. Matt. xvi. 19 of the forgiveness of sins and then says, ‘Quod Petro dicitur, apostolis dicitur;’ and In Ps. cxviii. Expos. x. 17, ‘Accepimus Spiritum sanctum, qui non solum nostra peccata dimittit, sed etiam nos facit sacerdotes suos aliis peccata dimittere.’
ance with the promise of our Lord.\(^1\) St. Chrysostom describes the powers of the clergy as exceeding those of kings, since a royal pardon avails only upon earth, and the forgiveness bestowed by a priest extends also to heaven.\(^2\) St. Augustine,\(^3\) and St. Jerome,\(^4\) and St. Leo,\(^5\) and the later writers generally unhesitatingly regard forgiveness as to be found in the ministrations of the Church.

Side by side with this teaching we find the existence of the penitential system. There is a brief reference to excommunication in the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome,\(^6\) and mention is made of the work of obtaining reconciliation in the later treatise\(^7\) wrongly ascribed to the same writer, which is assigned by Bishop Lightfoot\(^8\) to a time not later than the middle of the second century. The practice of excommunication is definitely referred to in the *Shepherd* of Hermas.\(^9\) In the middle of the second century the penitential discipline of the Church is closely connected with the history of Montanus.\(^10\) Irenaeus mentions the case of an individual seeking reconciliation.\(^11\) Tertullian,\(^12\) Origen,\(^13\) St. Cyprian,\(^14\) the Apostolical Constitutions,\(^15\) the Councils of the fourth century,\(^16\) are among the many witnesses to a fact which it is impossible to doubt.

If the evidence went no further than the establishment of

---

\(^3\) St. Aug. e.g. *Serm. ad Catech.* 14-15, *Enchir.* 65. When Dr. Lea asserts that a ‘positive claim for’ ‘ministers of the power of remitting sin’ ‘was a heresy of the Donatists, fittingly rebuked by St. Augustine’ (i. 460; cf. i. 117-8), he ignores the fact that what St. Augustine condemned was an idea that the priest himself, as distinct from God through the priest, forgave sin. He speaks in the same way about Baptism as being the act of God, not of the minister who outwardly bestows it (see e.g. *De Bapt. c. Don.* iii. 15; *C. litt. Pet.* ii. 57, iii. 59).
\(^4\) St. Jer. e.g. *Ep.* xiv. 8, *C. Pelag.* ii. 7.
\(^6\) St. Clem. Ro. *Ad Cor.* i. 57.
\(^7\) Ps.-Clem. Ro. *Ad Cor.* ii. 8.
\(^8\) Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers,* i. i. 406, ii. 201-4.
\(^9\) Hermas, *Pastor,* i. iii. 5, III. vii.
\(^11\) Iren. C. *Har.* i. xiii. 5.
\(^12\) Tert. e.g. *De Pan.*
\(^13\) Orig. e.g. *Hom.* i. in *Ps.* xxxvi. § 5, *Hom.* ii. in *Ps.* xxxvii. § 6.
\(^14\) St. Cyp. e.g. *De Lapsis.*
\(^16\) *E.g.* Council of Elvira, A.D. 305.
these two facts, there would be a high probability that the administration of the penitential system was carried on by the exercise of the powers relating to forgiveness lodged in the Ministry. But the evidence does go further. St. Leo was contemporary with and was largely instrumental in the beginning of the change from public penance to private confession. There could hardly be any better witness as to what the change involved. And it is clear that he regarded the powers exercised in the new method as being those which had been exercised in the old method; for he is at pains to argue that those who confess their sins under the new system will receive forgiveness no less surely than those who confessed them under the old system. To his mind there is a change in the details of administration; there is no change in anything essential.

Now it is the failure to grasp this one point which vitiates Dr. Lea's whole treatment of the subject. It is a matter of very small theological importance to what extent the methods in which the Church has exercised the powers which were committed to her by our Lord have varied in different times. What is important is, whether principles have been retained. Our Lord gave to His Church the power to bind and the power to loose. He declared that the sins retained were retained, and that the sins forgiven were forgiven. To use such a power, since it is of retaining as well as of forgiving, it is necessary that the minister should know the sins which have been committed, and that he should pass judgment upon them. This act of judging was in the older public method of reconciliation; it existed in the private system which eventually superseded it. The older reconciliation opened the door to Communion; the newer Absolution similarly frees the way. A theory that the two processes are essentially different can only be maintained by ignoring the teaching of

---

1 See his clear statement in Ep. clxviii. 2: 'De poenitentia scilicet, quae a fidelibus postulatur, ne de singulorum peccatorum genere, libello scripta professo publice recitetur, cum reatus conscientiarum sufficit solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta. Quamvis enim plenitudi fidei videatur esse laudabilis, quae propter Dei timorem apud homines erubescere non veretur, tamen quia non omnium hujusmodi sunt peccata, ut ea qui poenitentiam poscent non timeant publicare, removere tam improbadis consuetudo, ne multi a poenitentiae remedii arceantur, dum aut erubescunt aut metuunt inimiciis suas sua facta rererii, quibus possunt legum constitutione percelli. Sufficit enim illa confessio, quae primum Deo offeritur, tum etiam sacerdoti qui pro delictis poenitentium praecursor accedit. Tum enim demum plures ad poenitentiam poterunt provocari, si populi auribus non publicetur conscientia confitentis.'
our Lord on the one hand and of the fifth century on the other, and by dissociating the two things it is natural to unite, the teaching of the intermediate centuries that the Church has powers of forgiveness and the existence in the same period of penitential discipline.

Dr. Lea fails to understand the drift of Christian history partly because he has no true conception of the Church. He shows no sign of knowledge of the fact that the Church received from our Lord and His Apostles a deposit of truth. He shows no sign, again, of grasping the relation of the work of Christ to that of His Church. Without such knowledge and grasp it is impossible to see the proper significance of events in the early centuries of Christian history.

Nor do we think that he realizes the needs of souls and the requirements of human nature. There are passages in his book, not few in number, which could hardly have been written by one to whose mind such things were vividly present. And as it is true that the great Christian doctrines must seem to be folly to 'all who merely reason in an abstract intellectual plane of thought,' so there are other qualifications for studying God's methods of forgiveness than industry and learning.

The Catholic doctrine of the powers of the priesthood to absolve penitent sinners is founded on the revelation of God in Holy Scripture, and rests on sure testimony from the history of the Church. It has the corroborative proof that it answers to the deepest necessities of human life and satisfies the instincts of natures which desire to rest in God. And while thus supported, it affords in turn an additional indication of the truth of the Christian religion, which is in this way able to promote the good of man.

In its principles and main lines of thought, then, this History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church is, in our judgment, altogether perverse and useless. As we said at the outset, the materials so abundantly collected may be of great service to many students if they

1 See e.g. Acts xviii. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 St. Tim. i. 13, 14, iv. 7; St. Clem. Ro. Ad Cor. i. 42; St. Ignat. Ad Eph. 3, 4; Ad Magn. 13, Ad Trall. 6, 7; Ad Philad. 1-3; St. Polyc. 7; Iren. C. Har. i. ix. 4, 5, x. 1.

2 See e.g. St. John xiv. 26, xvi. 13; 1 St. Tim. iii. 15.

3 This sentence is quoted from a valuable article on the Emperor Julian by the present Bishop of Salisbury, in Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography, iii. 484-525. The words quoted above are on p. 517.
will view them in their proper relation and proportion. There are also practical purposes which the book may well serve.

One of the features of English Church life of the present day is the great growth in the practice of Confession. Such a fact imposes on all who have anything to do with the administration of it a deep responsibility not always sufficiently remembered. The future of English religion depends to a larger extent than may at first be supposed on a right attitude in many questions which concern this matter. Absolutions carelessly or unwisely given, Confessions carelessly or lightly made, may do untold harm not only to single souls but to the whole religious life of a Church and nation.

We desire not to be misunderstood. We write with the most profound conviction of the value of Confession. We make our own the glowing words in which, forty-seven years ago, Dr. Pusey for a moment allowed the devotion of the priest to overcome the restraint of the theologian:

‘If there is one part of our Ministry which God has blessed; if there be one part of our office, as to the fruits of which we look with hopefulness and joy to the day of judgment, it is to the visible cleansing of souls, the deepened penitence, “the repentance unto salvation not to be repented of,” the hope in Christ, the freshness of grace, the joy of forgiven souls, the evident growth in holiness, the Angel-joy “over each sinner that repenteth,” which this ministry has disclosed to us... When we see the dry and parched ground clad with verdure which gladdens the eye, we doubt not that God hath “sent a gracious rain upon His inheritance, and refreshed it when it was weary.” When we see the fever abate, the wasted form recover strength, the sunken eye look full and thankful to Heaven, we doubt not of His hand who “bringeth down to the ground and bringeth up.” When we hear how one bowed down lifted up herself, how the blind saw, the lepers were cleansed, the deaf heard, we know from Whom virtue went forth to heal them. When we see spiritual cures, the spiritual sight restored, the taste in heavenly things given back, the senses deadened to the things of sense, the conscience once dulled, now tender; the proud heart, like a little child; the hardened heart flow in tears of penitence; the soul more alive to its remaining infirmities than it once was to whole heaps of deadly sins; or that great triumph of Divine Power, where one becomes eminent for the grace most opposed to his deepest besetting fault, we must adore the miracles of Divine Grace. Satan does not cast out Satan. It was His Name, through faith in His Name, which gave them their spiritual life and power and victory in Him.’

But because of the very strength of our conviction of the value of Confession, we dread anything which may tend to
rob it of its rightful power. These volumes by Dr. Lea may serve to illustrate the tremendous emphasis in the Fathers and in many of the Schoolmen on the need of deep penitence. The ways in which penitential sorrow found expression in the early Church might be as unreal in our day as the methods of reconciliation which were once appropriate were unfitted for different times. But the same spirit which prompted the austerities of the primitive penance is needed wherever spiritual life is be strong and true. It will be a bad thing for the English Church if, amid all that is happy and hopeful of late years, there comes to be less of the unflinching penitence which was one mark of the Tractarian leaders.

It is possible also to learn useful lessons from some of the misunderstandings of Fathers and Schoolmen to which we referred at an early point in this article. The doctrine of priestly Absolution ought always to be taught in such a way as to protect and emphasize the truth which Dr. Lea imagines to be inconsistent with it. As in Baptism it is the Holy Spirit who unites the soul to the Sacred Humanity of Christ, and in the Eucharist it is our Lord Himself who is the true Priest, and the Holy Spirit who makes the bread and the wine to become the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Son; so in Absolution Christ is the true Absolver, and the Holy Spirit applies His precious Blood to the souls of the penitent. This truth in no way lessens the reality of the instrumentality of the priest: it demands care to show that in all which is thus done God is the true worker.1

There is a lesson, too, in the variations of opinions and complexities of views which Dr. Lea has collected. On these, indeed, he lays altogether undue stress. But they serve to show how unprimitive and lacking in universal sanction are some of those narrower ways of regarding the office of the priest in relation to Confession which, if we are rightly informed, are becoming more common in the Church of England. There can be no doubt as to the irregularity of the exercise of spiritual powers by a priest who is not licensed by a bishop, or of a priest who has a licence intruding without permission into the sphere of another. In many cases, too, it is undoubtedly the right course for a penitent to seek Absolution from his parish priest. But when it is asserted that Absolutions irregularly given are wholly invalid, or that obligations which had their origin in mediæval times are necessarily to be observed among ourselves, or that pieces of discipline purely Western cannot be laid aside without for-

feiting grace, or that the powers conveyed in ordination are simply dormant until they are awakened by a further act of episcopal authority, there is need for vehement protest. It was to refute such views that Dr. Pusey wrote the work from which we have already quoted, in which he showed not only that the Church of England has regarded the matter in a wider aspect, but also that, on Catholic grounds, she was justified in doing so. It was to present in a summarized form the principles he then advocated that his biographer penned the clear sentences:

'Jurisdiction means no more than lawful authority, which even Roman theologians of high name believed to be given to presbyters at their ordination. Jurisdiction, as exhibited in the canons of the Primitive Church, is not so much delegation of a new faculty as a rule of order, intended to prevent that confusion which must ensue if the exercise of all ministerial duties were entirely left to the discretion of individual bishops and presbyters."

And, lastly, Dr. Lea's volumes may illustrate the injury which has been done to Christian truth by distortions of it. To take but one instance suggested by the facts he has compiled about Indulgences, what could in itself be more Christian, or more in accordance with the best instincts of our nature, than that the earnest prayers and holy lives of high saints have special value in the sight of Almighty God Himself, and that their merits have a sanctifying and ennobling power throughout the whole mystical Body of Christ? Yet this truth was so encumbered and degraded by accretions and misconceptions that it was made to be an excuse for sin to some and a stumbling-block to others. There can be little sadder reading than the long series of facts which Dr. Lea's third volume records. Every student of the Reformation knows of the iniquities into which the system of Indulgences

1 Liddon, *Life of E. B. Pusey*, iii. 268-9. A clear account is here given of the standpoint of Dr. Pusey's work, *The Church of England leaves her Children free to whom to open their Griefs*. The book itself will repay close study. It is no part of our present task to write about the attitude of the Church of England on the subject of Confession; but we may refer to a small work which deserves to be widely known, the late Canon Cooke's *The Power of the Priesthood in Absolution and a few Remarks on Confession* (Parker and Co., second edition, 1874). It contains a clear statement of the Scriptural teaching, some references to the Fathers, and a most valuable catena of Anglican doctrine, with a list of instances of the known use of Confession in the English Church since the Reformation. There may be differences of opinion as to a particular point treated in chapter iv.; but the writer leaves no room for doubt that he establishes his contention of the lawfulness of Confession in the Church of England.
led the Papal Court. The evil is not yet dead in the Church of Rome. The reaction from it has to no small extent impoverished English thought about the Saints.

There is thus much incidental use to which the History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church may be put. But it is much to be regretted that the author is without the key which would enable him to put his learning to good account. Except in the form of chronicle, history cannot be rightly written except by those who have grasped its principles. To start with but little idea of the teaching of Scripture, to have no true conception of the nature and doctrines of the Church, to be unobservant of some of the real needs of human life, is to fail to see the significance of the history of Christian practice and thought.

ART. IX.—REFORMED JUDAISM.


2. Judaism at the World's Parliament of Religions. Comprising the papers on Judaism read at the Parliament, at the Jewish Denominational Congress, and at the Jewish Presentation. (Cincinnati, 1894.)


Among the adherents of various religious beliefs who were assembled at Chicago, none were more prominent than the Jews in the endeavour to prove that their creed could be adapted to the spirit of the age, and that its professors were fully in harmony with their political and social surroundings. The papers contributed were a powerful apology for the Jewish community, repelling the accusations commonly made against it, and exposing the prevailing misconceptions of their views and principles. Progressive Judaism had a twofold object: first, to emancipate the Jewish mind from the narrow groove of Talmudic tradition; and secondly, to place their faith upon a rational basis, and thus to check the progress of irreligion and atheism. The Jews in the United
States are a very large community, and their wealth and culture probably give them an influence beyond that which their mere numerical strength would command. Before the great immigration of Russian Jews in 1891 and 1892 they were said to be nearly half a million. To this 100,000 were added in one year by the colonization scheme of Baron Hirsch; and in 1893 the Rabbi Louis Grossman, of Detroit, said at Chicago, 'We have to-day in this country about a million of Jews, but no head for their ecclesiastical government.' The influx of Russian Jews was bitterly resented by the great body of American artisans. They were thrown upon the cities and congested districts, and were of no use for developing the resources of the country. The Government therefore required that pauper immigrants should be returned to the lands whence they came, at the expense of the steamship companies. A letter from Baron Hirsch, dated Paris, October 15, 1894, to the superintendent at New York, explained that the Jewish Colonization Association had decided to make the Argentine Republic their destination, and a warning in Hebrew was addressed to the Jews that they could only be admitted to the United States under special conditions and circumstances.

It is supposed that the number of Jews in the world reaches eight or nine millions. In the Middle Ages Poland was the centre of Israel; and the three Powers that partitioned Poland—Russia, Germany, and Austria—have the largest number of Jewish subjects. The numbers in Russia are variously reckoned from three to five millions. There are more than three millions in Austria, and 600,000 in the German Empire. There are about 100,000 in England, and the same in Holland, and 80,000 in France. In the other European countries the numbers are smaller.

One of the first questions which Reformed Judaism raises is, whether the Jews thus dispersed are a nation or tribe, or only a religious persuasion, with no common bond of union other than that of their faith. The reformed Jew, whilst professing the strongest attachment to his religion, casts aside all race distinctions, and maintains the universal brotherhood of mankind. Thus the Rabbi Moses, of Louisville, Kentucky, concluded his paper at Chicago:

'Moses and the prophets, the psalmists and sages, worked and prayed, lived and died, not to glorify a race, but to glorify the God of humanity. If I knew that there is not a drop of Semitic, not a drop of Jewish blood in my veins, I would yet cling with every fibre of my being, as long as there was breath in me, to the religious com-
Reformed Judaism. April

munity of Israel, to the Church of Yahvism, to the monotheistic faith of pure humanity. Abraham is not our father, Isaac did not beget us, Jacob we know not; but Yahve, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Father of all men, the Father of justice and mercy, He is our Father and our God, He is the Redeemer and Guide of spiritual and universal Israel from generation to generation.1

For a long period the circumstances of the Jews, especially in Europe, have been such as to maintain the social and religious barrier which has kept them distinct from their neighbours. But the records of history prove that this was not always the case. The Reformed Jews, therefore, point to periods when there were large accessions of proselytes, and amalgamation with foreign tribes and families. In the earlier times in Palestine there were remnants of the old inhabitants who conformed to the religion of Israel. Solomon at the dedication of the Temple, and the prophets afterwards, spoke of the coming in of strangers. Even before the establishment of the Samaritans on Mount Gerizim there were many foreign admixtures with the stock of Israel; in the time of Esther and Mordecai many of the people of the land became Jews, for the fear of the Jews fell upon them (Esth. viii. 17). There can be no doubt that one of the effects of the dispersion of the Jews, especially in Egypt and Babylonia, was a large influx of proselytes. Thus Bishop Westcott says:

'From being the centre of a kingdom Jerusalem became the centre of a creed. The growth of a Church succeeded to the growth of a people, and the sympathies by which its members were united grew wider as the source from which they rose became more truly spiritual.'2

And again:

'The persecution of Antiochus quickened sympathy throughout the whole body, and directed it to one centre. The dispersion was reconciled with a real unity when the Law was felt to supply the want of a fatherland. The lesson which was first taught at the return was completed; and the Church finally assumed the place of the nation.'3

The fact that at the time of the Christian era the Jewish community consisted in a large measure of proselytes of foreign descent is proved by the records of Jewish and pagan antiquity.4 According to Josephus,5 the Jewish community of Alexandria contained a large proportion of Greeks. Many

1 Judaism at the Parliament of Religions, p. 284.
2 Introduction to the Gospels, p. 51.
3 Ibid. p. 61.
4 Israel among the Nations, p. 104.
5 Bell. Jud. vii. 3, 3.
of the Jews of Cyrene, Antioch, and Palmyra were Greeks by
descent, and the Jews who had become Greeks were mingled
with the Greeks who had become Jews. Horace and Juvenal
testify to the zeal of the Jews of Rome in making proselytes,
some of whom underwent circumcision. In the time of the
Asmoneans and Herods multitudes were brought in from
Idumea, Iturea, and Syria. Tribes of Arabs were won over
in a body to the Mosaic law; Mohammed himself has been
described as a disciple of the Jews. Even after the doors of
the Synagogue had been closed by the rabbis, to prevent the
absorption of Israel by other nations, a number of proselytes
contrived to slip into it. A remarkable instance of this in
the eighth century is repeatedly mentioned by the advocates
of Reformed Judaism—the conversion of the Chasars, with
their prince Bulam, a people of the Finno-Turkish stock
north of the Black Sea.

Proselytism led to amalgamation with foreign nations,
and the adoption by the latter of Hebrew ideas and cha-
acteristics. To this is to be traced the strange theories of
the Hebrew origin of certain nations of Europe or Asia, one
of the latest being that of Anglo-Israelism. The great extent
and importance of the Babylonian Jewish settlement is fully
described by Dr. Edersheim. When the exclusive laws of
the rabbis were enacted, a distinction was made between those
who had preserved their purity of descent and those who
had intermarried with their heathen neighbours. The Jews
of the Babylonian district between the Euphrates and Tigris
were characterised as healthy; Media was said to be sickly;
Elymais in the last gasps; and Mesene to be dead. This
exclusiveness probably increased in rigour after the flight of
the rabbis from Palestine, which was the immediate result of
Hadrian’s war of extermination. Before this time there was
a considerable period during which proselytes were eagerly
sought after and welcomed. In Damascus almost the whole
female population embraced Judaism. The Acts of the
Apostles speaks of multitudes of proselytes and worshippers
of Jehovah in the cities of Asia Minor. The father of
Timothy, and Titus, and other fellow-labourers of St. Paul, were
probably of the number; and many were no doubt included
in those ‘Jews of Asia’ who were the Apostle’s implacable
enemies, and the Judaising party in the Church of Galatia
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was recruited from the same class. The original Roman Church consisted mainly of Jews and proselytes; and in the reign of Domitian there were many Jewish proselytes, who shared with the Christian converts the special enmity of the Emperor. Wherever proselytes were made in large numbers there was an amalgamation of the descendants of Israel with other nations; other Israelites have been absorbed by real or compulsory conversion to Christianity; and hence it is asserted that not a single European or American people is free from all admixture with the Semitic Jew.

The causes of the sufferings of the Jews have often been discussed, and form an historical problem of no small difficulty. Indeed, cause and effect are so often mingled that it is probable that no adequate explanation can be found. Hammond, commenting on the 109th Psalm, says:

'By this is very lively described the condition of the Jewish posterity, ever since their ancestors fell under that signal vengeance for the crucifying of Christ. First, their desolations and vastations in their own country; secondly, their continual wanderings from place to place, scattered over the face of the earth; and thirdly, their remarkable covetousness, keeping them always poor and beggarly, be they never so rich, and continually labouring and moiling for gain as the poorest are wont to do; this is the constant curse attending this people wheresoever they are scattered.'

Bishop Horne, in his Discourse on ‘The Case of the Jews,’ regards their continuance as ‘the accomplishment of prophecy as a standing miracle: the bush of Moses surrounded by flames, ever burning, yet never consumed! This people, strangely secure, without a friend or protector, have survived the wreck of empires; oppressed, persecuted, harassed always, by edicts and executioners, by murders and massacres, they have outlived the ruins of them all.’ Thomas Jackson observed that their sufferings were unaccountable, except as an exact correspondence with the prediction in Deuteronomy. They were expelled by one nation after another, and their money could not purchase their peace and security from calamities; and ‘nothing could allay that hateful and loathsome conceit which most men have entertained of them.’ Israel is not only cut off from the land which God had given him, but is made a proverb and a byword among all people.

Meanness and avarice, sourness and misanthropy, were
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no doubt commonly ascribed to the Jews; yet similar vices were to be found outside their community, and the enmity with which they were regarded may be traced to other causes. Dr. Edersheim says that in the time of Agrippa the Jews of Egypt were the most wealthy and industrious inhabitants of the land, and their number and privileges were a continual source of annoyance to the Egyptians. About the same time they were exposed to hatred and persecution in Rome, which may have been caused by their religious observances, and large contributions to the Temple. Strange fables were invented about them. This scorn and hatred was returned by the Jews, who would not point out the road to a stranger or conduct the thirsty to a well.\textsuperscript{1} The Jews in Asia Minor were mostly engaged in trade. Their accumulation of wealth excited the cupidity of the populace, whose indignation was further aroused by their refusal to engage in military service on the plea of religious scruples.\textsuperscript{2} The Jewish hatred of Christians must be placed among the causes, and not merely among the results, of their persecutions. Dr. Edersheim says: ‘By degrees all friendly relations between the two parties ceased. Religious discussions were interdicted, as tending to weaken the faith. Jewish Christians were anathematized as worse than heathens or Samaritans, and Christian books were placed in the same category with works on magic.’\textsuperscript{3} This fanaticism was prior to the persecutions undergone by the Jews in the Middle Ages, so that the observation of Beaulieu is hardly applicable: ‘How can we take offence at the fact that the Jews of the Middle Ages, held in bondage, and despised by the people, should have applied to their Christian persecutors the imprecations of the Talmud against the heathen oppressors of Israel? From whom should they have learned how to treat them as brethren? In passing judgment upon the conduct of the Jews with regard to the Goim, it were scant justice to forget the action of the Christians towards the Jews.’\textsuperscript{4}

Yet it is impossible to disconnect the sufferings of the Jews from their hatred of Christians and their rejection of Jesus of Nazareth. The Paschal Feast, at which the mixed multitude clamoured for His death, was the forerunner of another Passover in which the nation was, as it were, hemmed in as sheep for the slaughter. Their Paschal Table became the snare to take themselves withal; in the same net which they laid for others was their foot taken. Their cry against
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the Christians was that they did contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there was another king, Jesus; but this only hastened their ruin at the hands of the Power to which they appealed. Besides this, the sufferings of the Jews have been by no means confined to Christian countries. Yemen, in Arabia, has its tale of suffering as well as Spain and Italy. There has been a continual repetition of Haman's accusation: 'Their laws are diverse from all people; neither keep they the king's laws; therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them.'

The hatred to which the Jews have been exposed has been mainly caused by their degeneracy, and this degeneracy is in a great measure due to the treatment which they have experienced from Christian nations. Thus, Beaulieu observes that the side which the Jew generally turns to us is that of the trader or money-getter. But this is not in accordance with the true traditions of Israel, but is rather owing to conditions which have been forced upon the Jews. Israel was a nation of students before she became a nation of money-makers. The honour was of old given to the rabbi, the Scribe, the Hakkam, and not to the publican or financier. It is through external influence that Israel has fallen away from her traditions. The Law, the Prophets, and the best traditions of Israel alike condemned the mercenary spirit and the pursuit of gain. Hosea said of Ephraim, 'He is a merchant or Canaanite; the balances of deceit are in his hand; he loveth to oppress.' Zechariah's conclusion of his prophecy was contained in the words: There shall be no more the merchant or Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts; and yet, when the Messenger of the Covenant visited them, he found the courts of His Father's House converted into a place of merchandise, and the worshippers from all nations crowded out by the tables of the bankers, to whom the concourse at the feasts yielded a profitable business. In the teaching of the Law the original tradition was against the mercenary spirit, and answered to the saying of the Gospel, *Gratis accepistis, gratis date*; and, according to Dr. Edersheim, Simon Ben Jochai, after the time of Hadrian, was the first among the sages to claim support, not from manual labour, but from his profession as a theologian. The Rabbi Joseph Silverman, of New York, in replying to the popular charges of exclusiveness and clannishness, appealed to Mr. Zangwill's tales. People who have lived in a Ghetto for a couple of
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centuries cannot at once step outside when the gates are thrown down. Their insulation has become the law of their being. The social ostracism has not proceeded from the Jews, but has been practised against the Jews. It was commonly believed that the Jew amassed wealth, not because he was industrious or frugal, but because he was mean, tricky, and deceitful. The Jews were said to be parasites on society, consumers, and not producers. This was a slander. The Jew by birthright was a tiller of the soil, but he was deprived of this right by centuries of persecution; he has been a wanderer, with no land of his own, and has thus been compelled to gain a subsistence by traffic in money and gems. At the present day the Jews are found in all trades and professions, and they contribute to the intellectual wealth of mankind in poetry, art and science.¹

On the other hand, the Jewish rabbins must be admitted to have given colour to the charges made against the Jews by their contempt of the illiterate and their disparagement of field labour. Even the Son of Sirach denounced mechanical employments, as if they were inconsistent with the pursuit of wisdom. The Scribes who rejected Jesus of Nazareth said, 'This people, that knoweth not the law, are accursed.' A generation later the country-people were not only despised as illiterate, but charged with dishonesty, disregard of the law, except where it suited their convenience, and want of self-respect. They were excluded from office in the synagogue, and not admitted to bear witness, and even treated as Samaritans.² In the honour due to honest toil the older and purer tradition was continued in the Christian Church by the fishermen on the Lake of Gennesareth, the tent-maker, the humble descendants of Judas, the Lord's brother, with their hands hardened by daily toil. Thus Judaism was corrupted long before the miserable conditions of Jewish life in the cities of Europe aggravated that physical and moral degradation which Renan and other popular writers unfairly represent as the inseparable adjunct of the hated race. The hunch back, the stooping gait, and tendency to certain diseases which are found in Poland and Russia and in the squalid dens of Whitechapel,³ are due to the sedentary habits of the majority and to centuries of privation. Their recognized laws of diet and purification are in themselves healthful, and have tended to their preservation through all these untoward circumstances, and to a persistence of intel-
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lectual vigour in the midst of their physical infirmities. But, after all that has been said on the results of 'imprisonment within the bars of the Ghetto,' and their exclusion from civil privileges and social rights, the question still remains, What was the cause of their constant ill-usage in so many diverse countries and positions? How came such a character as Shylock to be depicted, or to be accepted as a picture of Jewish life? How has the strange fable of the kidnapping and murdering of Christian children obtained so wide a credence in the East? It is indeed a strange chapter of history, over which a cloud of mystery hangs. The Reformed Jews have at least proved that one of the chief causes of their tragical past has been the departure of both Jews and Christians from their earlier faith and purer traditions. The aim of Reformed Judaism being to accommodate the Jewish religion to modern needs and ideas, it naturally assumes an eclectic and rationalistic character. Freethinking, toleration, respect for other religious beliefs, emancipation from arbitrary restrictions, the material and intellectual progress of human society, find a conspicuous place in it. Jewish ideas of a tribal, national, or separative kind will be thrown into the background. Dr. Edersheim's description of Judaism indicates that it is capable of such a development:

'In its general aspect Judaism was a vast system of rationalism, which, according to the bent of different minds, took the direction of traditionalism, of scepticism, or of mysticism. While its foundation was immovably fixed in the Bible, its general cast was rationalistic, inasmuch as it only provided for the intellect, and elaborated Judaism entirely in accordance with rationalistic principles. With certain exceptions the doctrines were left unsettled, and to the free choice of every individual.'

The Reformed Jews therefore speak of the Law as an august legislation, and not a dogmatic creed. They say that the dissensions between the Talmudists and the followers of Maimonides were on minor points only; and at the present time the discussions between the Orthodox and Reformed Jews are on matters of Temple practice more than on articles of belief. Again they say: 'The orthodox Jew repudiates all ideas of change; but in reality he is no more like his forefather of a century ago than Maimonides was like Hillel.' 'Maimonides, though liberated in his philosophical thought, was fettered in his religious practice.' But though the Re-
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formed Jews look back to Maimonides (twelfth century), the progress of the movement dates rather from the eighteenth century, when the wave of sceptical thought swept over Germany and other European countries, affecting Judaism and Christianity simultaneously. It was then that Baruch or Benedict Spinoza was excommunicated by the Synagogue, and the Jews of Poland and Hungary stopped up all the chinks in their traditions, and hurled the terrible Cherem at all who attempted innovations. But the leader to whom the movement owed most was Moses Mendelssohn, the friend of Lessing, and the grandfather of the composer. His intellectual vigour was the more remarkable from his physical inferiority. According to Beaulieu he was ugly, deformed, and humpbacked. He was born in September 1729, at Dessau, in Germany. His father was a Sopher, or transcriber of the Pentateuch, who kept a Hebrew day-school. Here he was taught as a child to repeat the Mishna and Gemara mechanically, and thus a spirit of inquiry was stirred in him. He wrote Hebrew verses and composed a metrical paraphrase of the Psalms. The Rabbi David Frankel, of Dessau, was his instructor in the Talmud. Then he studied the philosophical works of Maimonides. He maintained himself by hawking and peddling, the usual resource of indigent Jewish lads. When Frankel removed to Berlin, he followed him thither, and was housed by Bernard, a benevolent Jew, by whose aid he acquired the elements of Latin. He earned a few groschen by copying, and with these he purchased a dictionary. He studied a Latin translation of Locke on the Human Mind. Then he fell in with a liberal Jew from Poland, Israel Moses, driven thence by the persecution of some fanatics, who became his brother in distress and taught him Euclid. After this he was made tutor in Bernard’s family, and this enabled him to purchase books and acquire a knowledge of Greek and mathematics. Bernard afterwards promoted him to be manager of his silk manufactory. He found the Jews of Berlin narrow-minded and ignorant; the best part of the ancient teaching was forgotten. They resorted to quibbling and far-fetched and distorted quotations, and those who deprecated these abuses were despised as illiterate. Mendelssohn therefore commenced a Hebrew periodical, The Coheleth Mussar, or Moral Preacher, giving extracts from the best of the Rabbinical precepts. This excited an outcry; and his appeals to their better feelings were drowned in clamour and vituperation, and he was compelled to abandon it. His translations of the Pentateuch and
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Psalsms into German were, however, welcomed by the majority. In 1744 he became acquainted with Lessing, whose writings contributed much to a more favourable estimate of the Jews in Germany. He learned from him to be a temperate advocate of his people, while he protested against the harsh and degrading manner in which they were treated. Mendelssohn's literary works included a German translation of the Phaedon of Plato, with additional evidences of the soul's immortality. This treatise was reproduced in other European languages. Beaulieu argues that this re-writing of the Phaedon was a courageous breaking loose from traditional ideas, of which few Christians of that time would have been capable. The Zurich Protestant minister Lavater challenged Mendelssohn to refute Bonnet's Inquiry into the Evidences of Christianity. In his reply he denied that the work of converting aliens was in accordance with the Jewish religion. The rabbins say our laws and traditions are obligatory on our own nation only. The laws of Nature and the religion of the Patriarchs may suffice for others. Our rabbins abhor proselytomania; they tell us to dissuade those who come to be converted. The Talmud says, "A proselyte is annoying to Israel as a scab. So let them be content with the observance of the precepts of Noah; tell them of our nation's misery and obloquy to deter them." The biographer of Mendelssohn tells us that,

'like his prototype and namesake, Moses, he delivered his people from the bondage of their benighted taskmasters; like him, he led them forty years through the desert of ignorance and superstition, during which he sustained them with the manna of his wisdom, bore meekly and patiently with their stubbornness and perversity, and defeated their adversaries; and like him, too, he now stood on the summit of Nebo, with the noble prospect before him of the promised land of knowledge and general information, religious and moral improvement, and progressive civil and political restoration.'

He died January 4, 1786, aged fifty-seven years. Among his works there was a German translation of the Apology for the Jews by Manasseh Ben Israel, his predecessor in the succession of teachers of liberal Judaism, who flourished in the seventeenth century. The so-called Jewish Reformation is, however, regarded by several Jewish writers as dating from Mendelssohn. The following comparison of Mendelssohn with Spinoza was made by Dr. Deutsch at Chicago: 'Spinoza believed in effects only: Mendelssohn's philosophy was based
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on design. According to the former, God has no personal relation to man; in the latter's system Providence occupies the foremost place. While Spinoza, although not formally abjuring his faith, remained indifferent to Jews and Judaism, Mendelssohn's lifework was devoted to the elevation and promotion of his co-religionists. He abhorred Spinoza's philosophy, and regarded his Pantheism as no better than Atheism. Dr. Deutsch praises especially Mendelssohn's Introduction to Manasseh Ben Israel's *Salvation of the Jews*, as helping to spread the idea of mutual toleration.

The able work of Beaulieu on *Israel among the Nations* is a vigorous protest against the Anti-Semitic agitation in Germany and Russia, which may be shown to be based upon false assumptions which have been made about the Jewish community. It also shows that the consequent large migration of Jews to America is tending to the growth of Reformed Judaism, which abandons many of the traditions which have exposed the Jews to dislike and suspicion, and reverts to the ancient Law, which is more favourable to the modern ideas of equality and fraternity and the removal of the barriers of race and class distinctions than Talmudic Judaism. But if the Anti-Semites accuse the 'Orthodox Jews' of Nihilism and Anarchy, they have even less reason for the charge:

'There is, in all the world, perhaps nothing more stubbornly conservative than the Talmudic Jew. So far from being the natural enemy of tradition, he is sedulously occupied in conforming to tradition. Wherever the Jew has remained Jew, neither the Government nor Christian society has had anything to fear from Israel. In order to become a revolutionist, the Jew must become de-Judaized. If in Germany or Russia there are Jews who may be accused of promoting the spirit of negation and destruction, they are generally such as have freed themselves from the beliefs and traditions of Israel.'

The enfranchisement of the Jews began in France in the decree of September 27, 1791; other European countries followed this example between 1849 and 1879, while they are still treated as aliens in Russia, Spain, and Portugal.

'Under the influence of our civilization and of Western liberty the Synagogue has spontaneously undertaken a purification of its ritual and its mode of worship. Modern Jews are undertaking to adjust the traditions of Israel to our modern civilization, as the Greek Jews in ancient times adapted their ways to Greek civilization. Thus Judaism is becoming less Jewish, less Semitic.'

Reformed Judaism, while thus divesting the religion of its
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foreign and Semitic character, adopts a general monotheistic basis, and announces its adhesion to the popular doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, confirming this by testimonies from the Hebrew Scriptures and the moral maxims of the Talmud. Dr. Isaac Wise, of Cincinnati, in a learned and thoughtful paper, expounded the 'Theology of Judaism' at the Parliament of Religions. The religion commonly known as Judaism should rather be named 'the Fear of Jehovah.' It is the veneration or worship of Jehovah as expressed in Psalm xix. 10: 'The fear of the Lord is clean, and endureth for ever.' It takes for its basis four dogmas or postulates: 1. The existence of God. 2. Revelation and worship. 3. Conscience and ethics. 4. Rewards and punishments in a future state. The monotheistic religious knowledge was preserved in the human family by patriarchal tradition, and reached Abraham in its fulness. With Abraham began the definite God of revelation. God and His attributes are revealed in the Thorah by the seven holy names. This is asserted both in the Talmud and by Maimonides. The names include El Shaddai, God Almighty as announced to Abraham, and those which were proclaimed to Moses at the burning bush and in the cleft of the rock in Horeb, to the people at Sinai, and the Holy One in Lev. xix. 2: 'Ye shall be holy: for I, the Lord your God, am holy.' Dr. Wise observes that in these names revealed to the Fathers there is nothing tribal, national, or local; they are the names of the God of all the earth. The prophets of Israel added nothing to this revelation. They only knew of God and His attributes what they had learned from the Thorah.

In thus reverting to the doctrines of natural religion, the aim was to arrest the downward progress of unbelief; creation, Providence, revelation, and the future state were retained, with the consequent duties of prayer and worship. But revelation was gradually explained away, and became little more than intellectual progress and enlightenment, poets and sages and teachers of science obtaining a recognition by the side of the Hebrew prophets. Thus, the Rabbi G. Gottheil, of New York, in his historical sketch, observed that at the early stage of the controversy the reformers, as well as the conservative Jews, appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures and the Talmud, to the written and oral law. In the course of time these principles were modified. First the oral law was disparaged, then the obligation of the written law was disputed, and Spinoza's distinction between the political and moral precepts
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was insisted upon, the latter alone being the abiding doctrine of Judaism. In later times the Jews were influenced by the critical school of Bible students, with its theory of a gradual evolution of Hebrew literature. Thus Judaism came to be regarded as the product of the Jewish mind of the day, each generation possessing its prophets, sages, and revelations. The Divine economy in the unique guidance of Israel has been continued through the ages. The Jews are a chosen people because they are chosen to do a certain work for mankind, and not in any exclusive sense. On this principle they are free to seek fellowship with others, and to promote a general brotherhood among men. We hold that God is no respecter of persons, for He is the Creator and Father of all. They have no desire for the planting of a Hebrew kingdom or republic in Palestine. 'Palestine,' they say, 'is not our country.' We have no wish for a return. We are cosmopolitans, citizens of the world. We have no desire for a temple or a restoration of the ancient sacrificial worship. Our synagogues are now our temples. The ruin of Jerusalem is no longer bewailed. It is rather a splendid funeral pile, and illustrious from its memories of heroism. Out of that death the Synagogue emerged with a new vitality.

The Reformed Jews at Chicago spoke with reverence of the great Teacher of Nazareth, the saintly sufferer of Golgotha with the golden aureole round His brow. Dr. Kohler gave his idea of the true character of Jesus, speaking of Him as a 'man of the people,' elevating the Essene ideal of love and fellowship to a new and grander form, not disdaining to eat with shepherds, publicans, and sinners, whom the Essenes despised; as a prophet, a bold reformer. He commends His merciful treatment of the adulteress and of Mary Magdalene, who was described in the Talmud as a network of evil spirits entangling men in sin. In His rebukes of the Pharisees on the Sabbath His sayings were in agreement with the Essenes and the Talmud. He is commended as 'a master-mind,' a religious genius, the paragon and acme of the order of Chasidim. In His righteous indignation at the profanation of the Temple courts by the priestly house of Hanan He was in agreement with the Essene principle expressed in the Talmud. For this principle He died as a martyr. In His discourse on the Last Judgment, the words with which He enforced the duty of almsgiving are echoed in the Talmud: He who receives a stranger with Abraham-
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like hospitality receives the Majesty of God, the Shechina. Miss Josephine Lazarus, in her paper on the 'Outlook of Judaism,' said: 'John, Paul, Jesus Himself: we can claim them all for our own. The Jew must change his attitude before the world, and come into spiritual fellowship with those around him.' The Rabbi Silverman, of New York, argued that Christian schools and congregations were misled by the popular teaching, for it was not the Jews, but the Romans, who crucified the great Nazarene teacher.

The expectation of a personal Messiah seems to be permanently shelved by the Reformed Jews. As in ancient times there were Hellenizing Jews in Alexandria, in whose minds the hope was vaguely blended with the heathen poet's conception of a coming of a golden age and a reign of universal peace, which they expressed in adaptations of old Sibylline oracles, so the coming of a national deliverer fades away in the abstract idea of human progress and improvement in the minds of developed Jews. So Dr. Gottheil expressed it:

'The tragic question of the Messiah has ceased to be a question for us. It has been answered once for all, and in such wise that we have no controversy on that point with any creed or Church. "Has come," "is come"—or "is to come again"; all difference in time is meaningless to us by the adoption of the present tense: "Messiah is coming now, as He has been coming in all past ages." So one of the Talmudists distinctly taught: "Messiah's days are from Adam until now." That form of the idea about which the dispute has hitherto been waged between Synagogue and Church is clearly the creation of the needs of a certain period of Jewish history, fashioned in the likeness of the mind which testified of it. We leave to history what was temporal in the conception. We keep only that which is spiritual, and therefore above time. That part consists in the belief that mankind will outgrow and overcome all causes of evil in its midst; that peace and not war, love and not hatred, knowledge and not ignorance, trust and not fear, hope and not despair, are the ends towards which the Ruler of the world is guiding mankind; and that Israel was chosen to make this proclamation to the world, and to labour and to suffer in the fulfilment of that mission.'

'Messiah means progress, means betterment all round, means peace, means redeeming of the fallen, means equality of rights and goodwill toward all men.' Dr. Schwab, in an historical paper on the Messianic idea, concluded by comparing the desperate effort of Judas of Galilee to shake off the Roman yoke with the American War of Independence, which brought
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in its train the reign of the Messiah: that is, the triumph of liberty and equality in the American Republic.

In the other subjects which were handled by the Reformed Jews at Chicago—religious, ethical, social, and political—there was a similar tendency to fall in with the spirit of the age, and to adapt Jewish ideas to the notions current in the popular literature of the day. The subjects thus treated included the doctrine of immortality, the science of comparative religions, the function of prayer, the ethics of the Talmud, the greatness of Moses, the position of women among the Jews, the voice of the Mother of religions on the social question. No religious persuasion seems to have had so large a proportionate representation, or to have entered so warmly into the views of the promoters of the 'Parliament of Religions,' as that of Reformed Judaism. The point especially insisted upon was, that it was a popular error to suppose that all Jews hold the same form of faith and practice, or that all believe in the coming of a personal Messiah, in a bodily resurrection, or in the establishment of a Palestinian kingdom. Modern Judaism is divided into Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Radical. Orthodox Judaism believes in carrying out the letter of the ancient Mosaic code as expounded by the Talmud. Reformed Judaism seeks to retain the spirit only of the ancient Law, discarding the absolute authority of both Bible and Talmud, making reason and modern demands paramount. Conservative Judaism is merely a moderate reform. Radical Judaism declares itself independent of established forms, clinging mainly to the ethical basis of the religion.1 (It may be observed that some of the most extreme radical views were advanced by women.) It is added, that 'the object of reform is not to break up Judaism, but to retain in the fold those who would have gone over, not to Christianity, but to atheism.'2 Thus they reply to the statement of Dr. Graetz, the German historian of the Jews, who says Judaism cannot survive the uprooting of all the tendrils with which it clings to Palestine, for it is from them that it derives its sap. The reformed synagogues, that eliminate from their worship all that is peculiarly Hebrew, are in great danger of becoming nothing more than way-stations on the road to Christianity, or on the well-trodden slope that leads to freethinking.3

Conservative Judaism was well represented at Chicago by Dr. H. Pereira Mendes. The Orthodox Jew, he said, can only
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admit religious changes on the authority of a representative conference of Jewish rabbis sufficiently versed in Hebrew law and Scripture. He believes with his heart and soul in the restoration to Palestine—a Hebrew State from the Nile to the Euphrates. Under the shadow of a temple, erected for the worship of the one Father, to be a house of prayer for all people, there should be a court of arbitration for the settlement of the nations' disputes and promotion of universal peace.\(^1\) Beaulieu concludes that though multitudes, especially in the West, are gradually falling away from the practices of their creed, yet Judaizing Jews still abound. In Europe they are, perhaps, even in the majority.\(^2\) As the Jews of Russia and Germany emigrate westward it is evident that their links with traditional Judaism will be relaxed; but whether they will be attracted to reformed Judaism there is reason to doubt. The 'slope' is one that leads more to indifference and unbelief than to freethinking speculation. The philosophy of the reformed Jew is not adapted for the illiterate multitude. The leakage from traditional Judaism is likely to be much greater than the accession to the Reformed synagogue. Yet a growth and progress may be anticipated for the latter. The Rev. J. H. Lord, of Umarkhadi, Bombay, has found that the Beni-Israel of Western India, after a long period of insulation from the other communities of Hebrew origin, are now acquiring a knowledge of both the old and new Judaism. The majority are seeking for the re-establishment of the traditional Judaism; another, smaller body is tending in the direction of the new school of Jews known in Europe generally as the 'Reformed Jews.'\(^3\)

Reformed Judaism, like Reformed Hinduism, whether of the Brahmo Somaj, or the so-called 'New Dispensation,' or the Arya Somaj, is not adapted to the illiterate multitude. It will draw its adherents from the educated and cultured classes, not from the poverty-stricken, the oppressed, the poor of the flock. It has in it a remnant of the old Pharisaic pride. This people that knoweth not the Law are accursed. It was by its condescension to those of low estate that the Christianity of the early ages provoked the contempt of the heathen philosophers, as we learn from Origen's great work against Celsus. The remnant of true Israelites who believed in Christ were drawn from the despised Galileans. To the chief rulers He had no form nor comeliness; there was no beauty that they should desire Him. He was despised, and

\(^1\) *Judaism at the Parliament of Religions*, p. 238.  
\(^2\) Beaulieu, p. 15.  
\(^3\) *Bombay Diocesan Record*, April, 1893; Supplement, p. 39.
they esteemed Him not. The prophet Zechariah, when his staff was broken, adds that the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the Word of the Lord. To those who listened to God's Word every darkening cloud around the devoted city was an earnest that the storm which should destroy it was gathering upon it. The little flock which waited upon the Good Shepherd obeyed the warning, and, fleeing to Pella, escaped the horrible judgment which fell on those who remained. So it was by its influence over the poor of the flock, rather than by its successful contests with the wise and learned, that Christianity should prove its superiority to all other religions. We may be too anxious for the intellectual qualifications of our missionaries, and thus be unmindful of the paramount importance of the Message itself and the needs of the human soul, which nothing but our Message can supply—the Message which is to be proclaimed, not with wisdom of words, lest the Cross of Christ should be made of none effect. We are debtors both to the Greeks and the barbarians, both to the wise and the unwise.

Mr. Lord, in a letter of August 1894, made the following remarks:

'Modern Judaism up to the beginning of the present century is one thing; that of the nineteenth century is apt to be anything, and is hydra-headed in its diversity. Its developments present almost annual novelties. It seems to be characteristic of all non-Christian religions nowadays to have a school of teachers which is trying to adapt the old faith to the times. I remember attending a meeting in the Bombay Town Hall some years ago, in the presence of the Governor. A leading Parsee priest declared that Parseeism consisted in only three main principles—good words, good thoughts, and good actions—passing over altogether what Parseeism is shown to be in its old books. So Brahmo-Prantha-Somajism is a similar accommodation of Hinduism. Even conservative Islam has its modern prophets; while modern Judaism, at least in civilized countries, presents teachers who declare that the sole mission of Judaism is, and has always been, to maintain the doctrine of the unity of God in the world, and but little more. It is a serious count against modern Judaism that, as Miss Josephine Lazarus would put it, "it coils up in its shell," and has had no aggressive effect religiously upon the world. As far as Judaism is concerned, the world at large remains as far from God as ever it was. It is the fashion now for Jews to claim for Judaism all that Jesus of Nazareth has done. In a lecture at Harvard Union the Rabbi M. Elkin asserted that St. Paul, and not our Lord, was the author of Christianity; that our Lord, St. Peter, and others kept the Jewish law loyally, but that St. Paul had reversed it all. This was quoted in the

1 Pusey on Zech. xi. 11.
Beni-Israel paper in Bombay. This answers to the statement of Dr. Pereira Mendes, that "the Christianity of Paul became supreme." The Judaism of eighteen centuries was venerable for its antiquity, and also for its general unity of teaching and opinion, and for its profound learning (albeit mixed up with the wildest puerilities), and also for the devotedness, constancy, and self-denial of its adherents. The modern Judaism of the present century, whatever it can claim on the score of enlightenment, the ingenuity of its adroit adaptations, or its general research, certainly is not venerable. It has no inter-cohesion, no antiquity. It is a congeries of all sorts of divergent views, each votary's Judaism being pretty much what he chooses to declare it to be, an entirely subjective religious system; and yet all such Judaists, like many other "reformers" of other religions, as mentioned before, profess to read antiquity into it, and to declare (as Miss Josephine Lazarus would put it) that their present Judaism is "Judaism reverted to its original type," with the outer shell laid aside. And yet Talmudism in its unwritten form obtained acceptance as truly in the days of the Gospel as it did 650 years later, when written. Judaism in the hands of its present exponents may be declared to be in a state of demoralization, and a fair question to put to most modern Jews in countries where the older Judaism does not now prevail, is, "By what Judaism do you hope to be saved?" The Jewish novelist, Zangwill, describes the process of change of faith in his Children of the Ghetto and Grandchildren of the Ghetto. The first part of his tale represents the state of the orthodox Jew just arrived in East London from Poland and plunged into the Judaism of England. In the Children of the Ghetto one sees the process of disintegration of the older Judaism in the rising generation. In the Grandchildren of the Ghetto the same have passed to the West End, with fortunes made, and discuss the various ultra-developments of Judaism, even to Rationalism on the part of some. American Judaism comes into it slightly."

These remarks of Mr. Lord's confirm the view which we have expressed, that Reformed Judaism offers attractions to the prosperous and cultured Jew, but will not meet the needs of the poverty-stricken and illiterate. It is to the poor of the flock that the Word of the Lord is made known. The sign of the advent of the true Messiah is that to the poor the Gospel is preached.

ART. X.—RICH AND POOR.

(London, 1896.)

If the genteeler half of the world does not know how the other half lives, it is not for want of books and printed information. There is no such place as 'Outcast London,'
though there are many 'bitter cries' of poverty and wretchedness. A searching light of sympathetic inquiry has for many years past been directed towards the conditions of life of the urban poor. It is not everyone, however, who has leisure to master reports of Poor Law Commissions, or the eight volumes of Mr. Charles Booth's monumental work on the *Life and Labour of the London People*—an expression which of course includes all classes of the people and not one only. For those who are distracted by the manifold aspects and problems presented by the condition of the labouring class in a great city, and, in fear of being lost in so vast a labyrinth, are inclined to turn away from it altogether, Mrs. Bosanquet has written a brief and modest, but clear and practical book, the aim of which is to present the 'underlying unities and principles' which can bring order into apparent chaos. Economic controversy is avoided, except so far as the conviction of the authoress that character must be reckoned among economic forces has been considered disputable.

Instead of on the one hand bewildering the mind with too large a field of vision and endeavouring to take in the endless details of East and South London life, or on the other hand of confining the attention to some one special evil or some few selected streets, those who are in earnest in desiring to serve their fellow-men are invited to study a single typical parish, seeing that a parish is, at least on the secular side, an organized unit, equipped with complete machinery for Poor Law administration, and that nothing can be effectively done to cope with want, dirt, disease, improvidence, and vice except by working in touch with, and in subordination to, the institutions, often very ancient, of local government, and, let us add, the religious organization of that Church which thinks of none as strangers and 'nihil humani alienum.' Parliament has now severed almost the last link of parochial connexion between Church and State. Churchwardens are no longer overseers of the poor, and the charities entrusted to the Church of Christ to administer now come to Christ's poor, not as 'God's gift,' but from a secular source. But the needy can only be properly cared for if ecclesiastical and civil authorities work in harmony with each other, and if outside philanthropy works as ancillary to both. Mrs. Bosanquet's method is to take one of the seven great East-end parishes, straggling from almost the heart of the City at one end into almost the country at the other, with its 380 streets (some composed of business premises and only inhabited by day), its 14,000 houses and cottages, and 127,000 residents. Long as
the parish is, it covers but 648 acres, the only open spaces in which are a few sooty but often well-cared-for graveyards. Rising above the endless roofs are here and there the massive buildings of the Board schools and the steeple
ts of twenty-one churches—the old mother church and its twenty modern daughters. There are but few places of worship not belonging to the Church of England, for Dissent spreads its wings to leave a neighbourhood which has been deserted by the comfortable class to which it chiefly looks for support. The last relic in the district of anything approaching to a natural feature is the muddy canal. Dead dogs float on it, and barges laden with trees, 'hewn on Norwegian hills,' for the great timber yards, an occasional conflagration in which throws hundreds of wood-choppers out of work. Boys bathe here in summer, and it is the scene now and then of some dark tragedy. A very modern-looking drinking fountain in one of the chief thoroughfares, once a Roman road, preserves the memory of the well called St. Agnes le Clere, much resorted to at one time by fashionable invalids, and St. John's Court is the site of a priory founded for black nuns, to whom the possession was confirmed by Cœur de Lion in 1195.

In Pugin's satirical *Contrasts* one of the most depressing plates is a picture of a city in mediæval times contrasted with a picture of the same city as it was half a century ago—the one concealing amid its rich and lovely architecture plenty, doubtless, of plague, want, ignorance, darkness and human passion, but yet, with all its towers and spires, its bulwarks and palaces, girdled by fair meadows, such a place as the old painters dreamed, and we haply might dream, the *Civitas Dei* to be; the other hideous, monotonous, featureless. Since Pugin's time a few pretentious buildings have been added to our cities, but their ugly and base outskirts have spread themselves over the wholesome country and overflowed many a pretty suburban village. Mrs. Bosanquet says:

'To suggest that a "gentleman" should go to live in the parish now would be regarded as a joke or an impertinence; but at the beginning of the century it was a fashionable, if not indeed an aristocratic, quarter. Many of the streets bear the names of the distinguished knights and worthies who dwelt there on their estates, or in comfortable residences; and now and again the explorer may still come across a dilapidated old house, let out room by room and swarming with unkempt children, but bearing witness in carved staircase and handsome mouldings to times of past prosperity. And even within the memory of man the neighbourhood had kept much of its rural appearance; one aged woman remembers going to church.
through fields and stiles, while another talks of seeing deer in a gentleman's garden on a spot now covered by one of our worst slums' (p. 16).

One of the last (though in another quarter) of these beautiful suburban mansions, surrounded by historic elms and cedars, was Fairfax House, not long ago destroyed. But the nobleman and the rich burgher lived once actually among the common people. The palaces along the Strand—most of us can remember Northumberland House—represented then the West End of London; so did High Holborn and Bloomsbury. But the City itself is covered with the sites of great residences, whether of prelate, peer, or merchant prince. The alderman, the citizen of credit and renown, such as John Gilpin, then lived over his shop and not at Surbiton or Sydenham. The Lord Mayor was not left a lonely civic inhabitant. Even the city rectors resided. Such a blending of gentility and even sometimes of magnificence with the lives of the labouring poor was good for all classes. It is often said that the spectacle of the extremes of wealth and of poverty side by side excites anarchic jealousies. Better surely that we should have rich and poor side by side, and wealth and poverty juxtaposed cheek by jowl, than *tota divisos urbe*, West-Endians and East-Endians. It must often, for instance, have struck the visitor to Cardiff with pleased surprise to find in the middle of that overgrown hive of modern industry a vast castle inhabited by a great feudal lord. No adventitious ‘Settlements’ of casual philanthropists from the universities or elsewhere, however excellent, can make up for the disappearance from a society of its natural leaders and refining influences. Contrast in this respect the severance of classes in London or New York with their co-habitation in a city which has not yet learnt the lessons of modern progress and civilization. ‘There is no West End in Moscow,' the Bishop of London said lately.¹ 'Palaces and cottages are scattered about side by side throughout the length and breadth of the city.'

Yet it would be a crude mistake to think of the poor quarter, or quarters, of London as permeated with ideas of equality. The social scale is minutely and even microscopically graded, and class distinctions are marked by punctilious etiquette. Mrs. Bosanquet remarks:

¹ Address at Northampton on *Russia*, October 23, 1896.

'I have known an engine-driver’s daughter cut off from all intercourse with her family because she had demeaned herself by
marrying a skilled mechanic, and a shoemaker's daughter refuse a steady young fellow to whom she was much attached solely because, being a soldier, he was below her in social standing' (p. 4).

Differentiation of calling and rank could not have been more sharply marked in days when each occupation was denoted by some outward token, from the furred robe of the physician to the implements of the handicraftsman:

Flavius. Is this a holiday? What! know you not, Being mechanical, you ought not walk Upon a labouring day without the sign Of your profession? Speak, what trade art thou?

First Commoner. Why, sir, a carpenter.

Marullus. Where is thy leather apron, and thy rule? 1

The Trades-unions have also created an aristocracy of labour—not helpful to the weak and slow (to be which is the raison d'être of aristocracy), but competitive and exclusive. According to the census of 1891, the 'industrial class' of the United Kingdom numbered 9,025,902 out of a total population of 37,732,922. About two and a quarter millions should be added from other branches of industry not enumerated. But of these eleven and a quarter millions of industrial workers, Trades-unionism had at the end of 1893 a membership of only 1,270,789, and the numbers tend to decrease. It was pointed out in a recent article in the Guardian 2 that the success of the Trades-unions in forcing on employers a uniform wage has compelled the latter to part with many an elderly or less skillful workman who otherwise would have been kept on at a lower rate of pay, the result being an increase of pauperism among mechanics in London during the last two years, in spite of better trade. A revival of close corporations and guilds, were it possible to ignore the effect on prices and the competition of the less highly paid labour of the Continent, might have much to say for itself. But the enforcement of a good and uniform wage should imply as a corollary the enforcement of a high standard of good work. Otherwise it is suicidal, and the workman is sawing off the branch on which he sits. Probably the lesson which needs most enforcing on the entire consuming class, rich and poor, and that wherein there would lie most hope of the elevation of the labouring population, is the economic and moral undesirability of mere cheapness. We are for ever complaining of the inferiority of modern workman-

1 Julius Caesar, Act I. scene i. 2–7.
2 'The Trade Unions and Old Age Pauperism,' February 17, 1897, p. 258.
ship, in point of materials, artistic taste, skill and patience, compared with that of even seventy or eighty years ago. There has been no work, we say, put into it, and no love. The substitution of machinery for the human hand and human heart is largely responsible for this decadence. Bezaleel and Aholiab were filled with 'the spirit of the Lord' to work in gold, in silver and in brass (Exod. xxxv. 31); but our churches are now furnished with lecterns, candlesticks, altars and stalls, turned out, all on the same poor patterns, by the hundred. Certainly in things that are not for God it cannot be expected that any but the rich should consent to forego the advantage to the purse which the rapid multiplication of useful and pretty objects through mechanical invention has rendered possible. But the willingness to buy cheap articles is due also to a certain moral change in people, shown in the craving for change and variety in the things about us, the democratic instinct for quantity rather than quality, the desire to emulate wealthier persons by having things that look as good for a time, the lessened fastidiousness of taste, the preference of what is showy for what is substantial, simple and good. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the well-to-do ladies who waste hours in driving from shop to shop comparing prices and cheapening goods are as responsible as anyone for the existence of the sweater's den. The eagerness not to be behind the ever-shifting fashions, the want of pride and self-respect which makes imitation of the caprices of 'smart' society the ideal of myriads of otherwise good women, are constantly throwing trades out of work, and are fatal to any high standard of artistic and workmanlike tradition in the mechanic class. Goods are 'turned out' to sell, not constructed to last. If consumers would be content with fewer things and better things, if they were severely critical of slovenly and hasty work, if in furnishing a house, giving presents or the like, they bought only such articles as no alteration of vogue or style could make them ashamed of, the economic and moral consequences to the community would gratify every philanthropist. Division of labour does not require that the less qualified workers should produce bad work, but that the easier parts of good work should be assigned to them.

The industrial problem, in truth, is far more a moral than a merely economic one. Carlyle asks:

'How is the labourer related to his employer? By bonds of friendliness and mutual help; or by hostility, opposition, and chains of mutual necessity alone?' With hunger preying on him, his con-
tentment is likely to be small! But even with abundance, his discontent, his real misery, may be great. The labourer's feelings, his notions of being justly dealt with, or unjustly; his wholesome composure, frugality, prosperity in the one case, his acrid unrest, recklessness, gin-drinking, and gradual ruin in the other—how shall figures of arithmetic represent all this?\(^1\)

And the fault is not all on one side. Carlyle says elsewhere:

'Shirts by the thirty-thousand are made at two-pence half-penny each—and in the meanwhile no needlewoman, distressed or other, can be procured in London by any housewife to give, for fair wages, fair help in sewing. . . . Imaginary needlewomen, who demand considerable wages and have a deepish appetite for beer and viands, I hear of everywhere; but their sewing proves often a distracted puckering and botching.'\(^2\)

Indeed, it may be doubted whether the employers of the flotsam and jetsam of industry make abnormal profits, or even the landlords of their dismal abodes to anything like the extent usually supposed; for Mrs. Bosanquet points out (pp. 89, 96) that in bad times rent is the first thing to get into arrears, and that the high rents, imposed as insurance against loss, are far from representing what the owner actually receives. Of course this acts hardly on those who pay punctually and in full. It is difficult again to see how combination and organization can help a widow who gets a precarious subsistence by mangling or making artificial flowers or the like. After all, in what employment have wages risen more than among domestic servants, without any combination whatever? As regards the ordinary mechanic or able-bodied workman, existing wages of from twenty-four shillings paid to an unskilled labourer to thirty-five or forty shillings earned by the cabinet-maker or printer ought to be enough, supposing employment to be regular, to support a family respectably in a place where almost everything except house-room\(^3\) is so cheap as East or South London. Long experience of life in Wessex villages enables us to affirm that the agricultural labourer of Wiltshire or Dorset, with eleven shillings a week and a cottage, and a few pounds at harvest, and twenty or thirty perch of potato ground either free or rented for a few shillings a year, does usually manage to keep

---

1 Chartism, 1840, p. 9. 2 Latter Day Pamphlets, 1850, p. 235. 3 The old story of the five families in the cellar, however, whose domiciles were separated by chalk lines, and who got on very well together until the family in the centre began to take in lodgers, must be a grim pleasantry.
a tidy home, and pay also into a benefit club.¹ His children are sufficiently clothed and nourished, and will put by their pennies for the school savings bank or the Lent self-denial box, and he himself, without being a teetotaller, can find a few shillings to amuse himself with at Whitsuntide or at the local fair. The Free Education Act has not put into his pocket more than twopence or threepence a week, for the school fee was seldom more than a penny for each child. He gets eggs and fresh butter cheaper than the dweller in towns, but very little else. For example, he pays usually a shilling a gallon for oil at the village shop, and sixpence for a quarter of a pound of tea. The twopennyworths of relishing 'bits' for dinner which are purchased at nightfall under the kerosene lamp of the cheap butcher or tripe-vendor or fried-fish seller in the Borough or Poplar, are almost unknown to him. Yet the living of the agricultural labourer is something more than ἄναγκαια τροφή. The 'Beati pauperes' does not seem such a trial to faith in his case as it does when we contemplate the conditions of life of those who exist in the slums and rookeries of a great modern city. It is true that the young countryman seldom stops in his native village; but what draws him to the town, apart from the difficulty of finding employment in the country, is not so much that he will be better paid in the town as that he will be better amused. There he will get a weekly half-holiday, whereas the farmers are ceasing to allow even Good Friday as a day off. Rural life is duller than it used to be, and at the same time a new craving for excitement has caught hold of all classes. Nor will those who have gone away return. After the music-hall and the theatre which so enliven the Londoner's life, the penny reading and the efforts of the rector's daughters are insipid, and the harvest home uninteresting. Vestigia nulla retrorum. Those who have known the gas-lamps, the shop-fronts, the multitudinous noise of hurrying streets, and have drunk in the daily stimulant of life in a town, will not come back to skylarks and parish meetings. It is pretty certain, to tell the truth, that a family rescued from destitution and disease in the worst and most overcrowded alley, and transplanted to a honey-suckle-covered cottage in a garden of roses somewhere in Boeotia, would in a fortnight borrow their fare back to London and be off.

Such tendencies it is hopeless to go counter to. We have

¹ A day-labourer in 1755 earned not more than 8d. or 10d. per diem, but even so was better off than farmers in other countries¹ (Chamberlayne's Britannia Notitia, quoted in Traill's Social England, v. 132).
to make the best of things as they are. But modern civilization has an appalling problem to grapple with in these vast and shapeless cities which it has given birth to. Adam Smith and the philosophers of the Industrial Movement did not foresee that chiefly through the success of their doctrines the urban population of this island would in less than a century increase from three to twenty millions. Their gospel was the abrogation of restrictions, the abolition of *status*, and entire liberty to every man (and woman and child?) to make the utmost use of his capacities in competition with every other unit. We have learnt how one-sided, how productive of unexpected cruelties and demoralization that gospel was. Instead of a society bound together by a *nexus* of cash payment, we would fain revive wholesome human relations; we would guide chaotic forces by prudent regulation into beneficent channels; we would allow once again to the influences of religion, to the better affections of redeemed men and women, their sway in the workshop and mart. Mrs. Bosanquet says (p. 144):

'It is not always realized how far effective work starts originally from some quite natural point of contact between rich and poor; grows, that is, out of relations entering into our everyday life and capable of being developed into fruitful sources of mutual helpfulness. The duties arising out of the relations between employer and employed, or between different members of a family, are striking instances of this. No one, for instance, can do for the wage-earners in any place of business what could be done for them by the man who employs them, and with whom it rests so largely to determine the conditions under which they shall work; and no one can do for the children of a family what the parents can do.'

Besides those supplementary agencies, then, of organized charity for the guidance of which Mrs. Bosanquet offers many wise suggestions based on experience and careful thought, our permanent aim must be to multiply the points of personal relationship between man and man, producer and consumer, employer and employed, and to elevate the standard of self-respect and of responsibility towards others, especially towards parent, child and spouse, in the operative class. The real employer of labour is the consumer, who cannot escape

---

1 At an early period a great advance in English commercial activity had led to a surprising enlargement of our towns, and a reversal of the supremacy of the southern over the northern counties, thus shifting the balance of national character. In the Midlands, Birmingham between 1665 and 1725 increased sevenfold. The total population of England and Wales in 1742 was a little over six millions. See Traill's *Social England*, v. 131, 132.
from his responsibilities. He is bound to consider what he consumes, and to take some trouble to trace the history of its production. And yet modern conditions have separated the employed from the ultimate employer by an increasing distance. Even the immediate employer is often an impersonal company, or, at any rate, the ancient relation between master and servant has come to be represented by that between a foreman and an army of ‘hands.’ What the workshop is capable of becoming may be illustrated by an account in the *Fortnightly Review*\(^1\) of a wool-spinning factory at Wareméville in the Val-des-Bois. The owner, Monsieur Harmel, employs twelve hundred workmen, and, in the character of a Christian father, provides them with education and recreations as well as work. He claims a very large authority, regulates many minute details of life, avails himself of the assistance of monks and nuns, and has succeeded in diffusing a highly religious spirit among those who work for him. The girls especially are described as healthy and good. They elect their own monitors or supervisors, who superintend them, and keep up a strict moral discipline. The writer of the article admits, however, that English workpeople would not endure the loss of personal freedom. The same dread of interfering with liberty would probably stand in the way of the truly Christian system adopted in Vienna for dealing with pauperism, the two main ideas of which are the acceptance by the well-to-do of a personal individual relationship towards the destitute, as ‘fathers of the poor’ and ‘mothers of the poor,’ and a determined discrimination between different kinds of paupers, who are classified according to their deserts, the rogue and vagabond class, those who in old-fashioned England would have sat in the stocks or been sent to the House of Correction, being dealt with without any mawkish sentimentality, while in dealing with the merely unfortunate, from ‘brethren of noble poverty’ (to use Cardinal Beaufort’s phrase at Winchester) downwards, ‘Christ Jesus is anointed in His poor members.’ But all this implies asking a great many questions, unpleasant to the interrogator and to the interrogated.

But, after all, men and women are not, as it is the fashion now to represent them, mere soft clay in the hands of circumstance, the resultant of the forces which compose their environment. Good as it is that their surroundings should be wholesome and elevating, it is far more important that

\(^1\) *Object Lessons in Christian Democracy*, by Mrs. Crawford, January 1896.
the conscience and the will of the men and women themselves should be touched and purified. There may be good husbands and wives, dutiful children, careful parents, kind neighbours, there may be thrift and cleanliness and honesty and purity and self-denial, even where in the outward conditions of existence sweetness and light are strangers. And, contrariwise, the most thorough reform and improvement of the conditions of existence—healthy dwellings, good and sufficient food, picture galleries and people's parks, high wages and adequate leisure—will not raise a population out of sordid wretchedness unless a moral change is also effected. There are men who make fifty shillings by four days' work, and spend the other three in the public-house and in bed. There are young unmarried men earning thirty shillings a week, who spend it all on self-gratification, without saving a penny. There are men in receipt of good wages who keep back a third or a half for pocket money, and are content to see wife and children slatternly, hungry, and out of health. A woman will spend a month's earnings on some occasion of finery, or a girl will cough away in some unhealthy employment rather than surrender her 'independence' by entering domestic service. Nor would the realization of the dreams of the municipal Socialist cure some of the darker features of city life, such as the child-prostitute, the child-criminal, and the child-drunkard.

The Warden of Toynbee Hall, in *Twenty Years' Retrospect*, published in 1894, looks back on the results of the efforts made to improve the lot of the poor with mingled feelings. He says:

'There is much in a retrospect of twenty years to rouse satisfaction and much to rouse disappointment. On the whole, it may be said that the standard of comfort in the East End has risen. . . . [On the other hand] under the influence of teaching, some good and some bad, stealing and lying no longer rank among the chief vices. The "robust conscience," which damns as wrong any departure from simple honesty and truth, often is wanting. Mothers are no longer so stern about truth-speaking in their children. . . . A workman's word can hardly be counted as his bond. . . . It is this want of honesty which makes suspicion so common in many working-class organizations, and makes it hard for leaders to lead. . . . Old-fashioned puritanical morality has in fact been replaced by the sentiment which makes suffering the one evil, and counts that action good which, even by lying and thieving, reduces suffering. . . . In the same way there seems to be an increase of what, for want of a better word, may be called "impertinence," of that sort of independence which refuses to confess any ignorance, or allow any
superiority, which never goes softly, or hesitates to rush in where angels fear to tread. . . . There are many signs of this self-trust—children choose their own schools; boys and girls take their lives in their hands and leave their homes to dwell in lodgings; the greatest admiration is expressed in the clubs for "smartness"; and the acknowledgment that any reverence is due to man—even to God—is growing rare. Obedience is not counted among the virtues, because there seems to be no one greater than self. But perhaps even more noticeable than decrease of honesty and increase of imparity is the growth of the habit of gambling. Of this there is no question. The result of a race is of more general interest than a vote in Parliament.'

We have in such words a glimpse of the seamy side of the nineteenth-century preaching of the blessedness of emancipation from control. The training of character seems to belong to an antiquated discipline. Yet secular education, or education not based on religious creed, is not having the moralizing effect predicted for it. The boy-matricide of Plaistow was well up in his school standards; but such a story of precocious depravity has rarely been unfolded. Is this a time to discredit the inculcation of definite religious faith in the young? Yet Mr. Sydney Buxton, M.P., protested not long ago (November 5, 1894), in the London School Board that too much time was given to dogma and not enough to drains. If there is any hope of regenerating society, it has surely been proved by this time that we must fall back on historic Christianity. Museums, days in the country, 'information for the people,' teetotalism, tracts, have all been tried, in vain. On the other hand it is disheartening, nay, it is appalling, to recall how few among the working classes come within the range of the influence of Christianity. Mrs. Bosanquet, describing the same parish, says (pp. 39-41):

'To the vast majority the Church as a religious influence is an unknown power. Some few years ago a census was taken of all those who went to church on a given Sunday, with the result that, out of a population numbering about 127,000, only 4,167 attended in the morning and 5,495 in the evening . . . . This failure of the Church to reach the people cannot be attributed to any success on the part of Dissent, for Dissent is still weaker. The same census showed only another two or three thousand within the walls of chapels, while even special mission services collected but 2,357. Any sect, however peculiar and fanatical its tenets, may be sure in such a multitude of some following; none succeeds in really reaching the hearts of the people. The Salvation Army itself counts for less than nothing in the district. It has no foothold there in the shape of meeting-hall or refuge; its stray preachers in the main thorough-
fares only attract small children, and within our slums no emissary is ever seen.

'The attitude of the people towards the Church, then, is not one of hostility or dissent; it is simple indifference. They are not interested in matters of religion... such things are wholly outside of, and disconnected with, their normal everyday life, and therefore do not appeal to them... This almost universal indifference to religion is partly due, it is to be feared, to a deep-seated defect of character... The same indifference extends to almost anything which reaches beyond the momentary interests of everyday life. Surely the people of London are like none other in England in their intense devotion to the present moment and their blind forgetfulness of past and future. Sometimes they are carried beyond the present by discontent, but it is not often that more than grumbling is achieved by this. It is to the discontented that the would-be innovator of every description addresses himself—the Socialist, the anarchist, the vegetarian, the atheist, and all the multitude who have their favourite social remedy to push. But discontent is only another form of living in the present, and can never rise to the force of an enthusiasm. The one interest which at present has power to carry them out of themselves is politics; and even in politics principles have to figure as expediences, and be supported by promises, if they are to appeal to a majority of the electors.

'The "one thing needful" for our parish to-day is to lift the people in some way out of themselves, to give them wider interests and a more steadfast hold upon realities. With the mass of the people the Church has failed utterly and entirely to do this. The strength of its position, the completeness of its organization, the patient devotion and enthusiasm of many of its ministers, stand helpless before the stolid indifference of the thousands whom it regards as its flock.'

It was sadly confessed lately by the Head of the Oxford House that not five per cent. of the London operative class ever enter any place of worship. Is it not certain that, if our holy religion is to regain its hold on the people, it can only do so by being presented in a boldly supernatural form, and without any of that haziness or indefiniteness which is supposed to be most in accord with the spirit of the present age? Where the Gospel is clearly preached, where the claim to the allegiance of His subjects of a personal and Divine Redeemer is urged week by week, where the whole system of sacramental grace and the ministry of reconciliation is faithfully propounded to sinful men and women, where reverence and dignity mark the services, where Christian discipline is tenderly but firmly enforced, where a self-denying clergy visit the people in their homes not as mere almoners or friends but as the ambassadors of God, the call to repentance will not always go unheeded. What does not impress the
non-Church-goer with the supernatural claims of the Holy Catholic Church is such an announcement as that which appeared not long ago in a London newspaper 1: that the following Sunday evening, at a certain church—in addition, it is fair to say, to the usual evensong—the topic of the incumbent would be ‘The Valkyrie,’ illustrated by limelight views. ‘Miss —— will be the soloist, and a cornet solo will be played by Mr. ——. The collections throughout the day will be for the starving and destitute’!

Mrs. Bosanquet asks, Why has not religion given the poor a more steadfast hold upon realities outside and beyond themselves? She answers her own question:

‘I believe it to be largely because the ministers of religion (and here I refer to all creeds alike) have allowed the spirituality of their work to be swamped by the material needs around them’ (p. 41).

‘If Church-workers would really keep foremost in their minds the primary importance of their influence upon character, they, more than any others, should be able to build up broken lives and strengthen the feeble. As it is, they, like others, have come to regard hunger as the worst of all evils, to be satisfied at the cost of any other consideration, moral or spiritual. “Feed a man first, and then convert him” is practically the maxim among many of them; but experience shows that unless the conversion precedes or accompanies the feeding, they have only made a caddger of him. I have heard it said that the Church fails in relief work because it does not believe in God, i.e. it has not sufficient faith in the power which makes for righteousness, and puts its trust too much in almsgiving’ (p. 183).

The italics in these quotations are ours. We agree most cordially with Mrs. Bosanquet. Is this one of the fruits of so-called Christian Socialism? By the ‘Church’ we presume she means the clergy, which is not quite the same thing. But when the authoress blames the clergy for bribing the people to come to services and classes, she should remember that, where there is not a deep enough chest to succour everyone, the ‘household of faith’ must come first. Mrs. Bosanquet herself points out that the parish church was formerly the natural centre of all parochial works of mercy, and that the relief of distress has always been accepted by the Christian Church as a duty peculiarly her own. However excellent may be the methods of the Charity Organization Society, it is hardly to be expected that the Church should resign into its hands her own time-honoured work. Still, there must be organization and method. Quaint bequests of new sixpences to be picked up by so many widows, 1 women

1 Daily Chronicle, September 20, 1895.
or men,' from the pious testator's tombstone, loaves to be
distributed to decayed communicants in church, the largesses
and flannel 'petty-coats' distributed by Lady Bountiful
among the deserving—these did no harm in simpler days.
There was a spirit of religion and a human bond in such
givings and receivings that one misses in the more scientific
methods of dealing with poverty necessitated by our complex
state of society. How delightful is Charles Lamb's _Lament
on the Decay of Beggars in the Metropolis_! Must we always
' rake in the bowels of unwelcome truth'? Mrs. Bosanquet,
again, is rather too severe in denouncing as 'patronage' and
'subservience' the charity which stoops and the gratitude
which looks upward. 'Dependence,' after all, is a reflexion
of our gracious relation to 'our fair Father Christ,' who also
is our Brother, and helpful sympathy need not imply equality.
Nor do doles always demoralize. But she is right in showing
how ineffectual haphazard charity must be in the present
day to improve the condition of the poor. To scatter half-crowns
and soup-tickets is like sprinkling a dried land with an
asperge or watering-can, when what is needed is the irrigating
of it with canals, in whose ducts and channels can flow the mani-
fold force of that Love which, like Niagara, has power to turn a
million wheels and ' make the world go round.' One of the me-
diæval names for a purse was 'eleemosinaria mea；' but 'doing
an alms' without harm requires now much care and thought.
The worst is that this lesson has been so dinned into people
that the selfish make it an excuse for spending their money
entirely on themselves. Wastefulness is another mistaken
way of supplying the want of the poor. The population of
a University town was once described as consisting of 'them

1 Lamb whimsically resented the reforming efforts of his day. 'The
mendicants of this great city were so many of her sights, her lions. I
can no more spare them than I could the cries of London. No corner
of a street is complete without them. They are as indispensable as
the ballad singer, and in their picturesque attire as ornamental as the
signs of old London. They were the standing morals, emblems, me-
mentos, dial-mottos, the spital sermons, the books for children, the
salutary checks and pauses to the high and rushing tide of greasy
citzenry. Above all, those old blind Tobits that used to line the wall of
Lincoln's Inn Garden, before modern fastidiousness had expelled them,
casting up their ruined orbs to catch a ray of pity and (if possible) of
light, with their faithful Dog Guide at their feet—whither are they
led? Or into what corners blind as themselves have they been driven,
out of the wholesome air and sun-warmth? Immersed between four
walls, in what withering poorhouse do they endure the penalty of double
darkness, where the chink of the dropt halfpenny no more consoles their
forlorn bereavement, far from the sound of the cheerful and hope-
stirring tread of the passenger?"
as lives on the gents, and them as lives on them as lives on the gents.' The enormous outlay of hosts and guests at a certain famous Fifth Avenue ball which was the talk of two hemispheres early in this year, and to which the heirs of republican and puritan simplicity were carried in sedan chairs dressed in superb costumes and robes of the time of Louis the Magnificent, was defended on the ground that the expense was 'good for trade,' and overflowed upon the poor. If, however, such 'unproductive expenditure' is to be defended, it must be not by an economic fallacy, but on the moral ground that princeliness and grandeur have—in their proper place—an elevating and refining influence on the community.

Besides personal voluntary agencies, there are, of course, many objects on which the wealthy can bestow money without demoralizing anyone, such as the endowment of hospitals, convalescent homes, surgical instrument charities, denominational schools, and (if properly planned and placed) model dwellings for the poor, like those connected with the names of George Peabody and Lord Guinness. It is necessary to make this proviso, for of the gloomy blocks of buildings—looking on the outside like barracks or factories and on the inside resembling rabbit-warrens, and excluding light and air—which are being multiplied in London and the provincial towns, more for economy of space than from any philanthropic motive, Mrs. Bosanquet says: 'In bad or indifferent hands, it is beyond question that all the physical and moral evils of East London are intensified by life in "the models."' And why should the stranger not come upon some cathedral-like building, and, asking what it is, be answered 'The Workhouse Chapel,' erected to the Redeemer's glory by some rich man or woman? Our forefathers thought it not amiss—as at St. Cross, near Winchester—to build such for their bedesmen. Albrecht Dürer's 'Adoration of the Crucified,' one of his masterpieces, was painted for the chapel of a small almshouse in Nuremberg. Would such a building be demoralizing? Would it be inconsistent with the strictest discipline and refusal to pamper thriftlessness and idleness? The doctrine, indeed, of Mrs. Bosanquet and other charity organizers that what a man sows that he must also reap, and that if a man will not work neither shall he eat, is a most wholesome one, and very necessary for these times of hysterical and undiscriminating passion of pity. Not only so, but the law that a man's selfishness involves in its consequences those whose lot Providence has bound up with his is not always to be set
aside by human intervention. Mrs. Bosanquet has the courage
to say:

'The most common form of encouraging bad habits is by “re-
lieving” the wife or children of an idler or drunkard; in other words,
by relieving the man of responsibilities which he has voluntarily
assumed, and setting him free to spend his time or his earnings in
his own particular form of self-indulgence. “But,” it is often urged,
“we cannot let the family suffer for the father’s faults.” It is not
quite clear to me that we cannot, if that is the nearest way to re-
demption for all alike’ (pp. 187, 188).

At the same time a much larger question is here glanced
at. It might be argued by a non-believer that by leading
sinners to hope for pardon and restoration, on perhaps an
imperfect repentance, until seventy times seven, Christianity
encourages transgression; and that if men were given clearly
to understand that each offence would be inevitably followed
by its consequences, they would be far more cautious about
offending. We believe that God does vindicate His eternal
laws, and that sternness is an essential element in His provi-
dence. Yet His compassions fail not, but are new every
morning, and Righteousness and Peace do kiss one another
without compromise or loss. Mrs. Bosanquet gives some
instances of tact and wisdom in succouring distress without
encouraging wrongdoing.

The divorce of philanthropy from religious agency would
be truly short-sighted. The ‘laicization’ of the French hos-
pitals, and dismissal of the Sisters who used to tend the sick,
has been far from successful in its results. In England a
similar disposition has lately shown itself to reduce religious
ministrations to a minimum in hospitals and workhouses, and
to leave the sick, the dying, the aged and afflicted to shift for
their own spiritual needs. There are few Englishmen who
would echo the terrible line inscribed by Shelley in the visitors’
book at the Chartreuse Convent at Montauvert:

Εἰμὶ ἀνθρώπως δημοκράτικος τ’ ἄθικος τε.

But there is a growing desire in different quarters at one
and the same time to secularize humanitarian effort and
confine the Church to purely spiritual functions. It is true
that Christianity is concerned with ζωή rather than βίος, with
life rather than livelihood. It is also true that charity
organization cannot in these days, in great cities, follow

1 Shelley’s Poetical Works, with a memoir by W. M. Rossetti, vol. i.
p. lxxxix. London, 1870. We give the line as Shelley wrote it in the
Visitors’ Book.

2 St. Augustine: ‘Temporalia transigamus, quam vitam Græci non
ζωήν sed βίον vocant.’ De Trin. xii. 11.
purely ecclesiastical lines. But the Church will not resign any work of compassion, corporal or spiritual, or stand aloof from any reform which may make it easier for her children to live lives of godliness, sobriety, and honesty. Our Lord did not inveigh against the sanitary state of the valley of Hinnom, and when young children were brought to Him He did not say, 'Have them washed,' or 'Have them vaccinated,' but He laid His hands on them and blessed them. Nevertheless, the Incarnation touches life at every point, and restores to man the healthy mind in the healthy body. And on the other hand can the philanthropic effort to improve the lot of the unhappy, can the endeavour to build up character in the poor, and excite and guide the consciousness of responsibility in the well-to-do, dispense with the motive-power supplied by revealed religion or with the agencies of the Divine society? The same love of Christ which has left in these very East-End parishes many an ancient refuge of peace for worn-out toilers in almshouse and Domus Dei is still alive, waiting to be directed into the channels which a wise compassion points out as most beneficial under the difficult circumstances of the present day, and in view of its complicated and almost insoluble problems. The reopening, in renewed beauty for renewed usefulness, of St. Saviour's, Southwark, as a collegiate church is one of many proofs that this is so.

Art. XI.—GIBSON'S 'THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES': Volume II.


In a former number of this Review we were able, with some qualifications as to one point of great importance and as to certain details, to express our very cordial approval of the first volume of Dr. Gibson's book on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. The second volume has now been published, and has afforded us the opportunity of again thanking the Vicar of Leeds for much valuable work.

The general features of this volume are not different from those of the first volume. As before, documents are quoted

1 See Church Quarterly Review, July 1896.
and skilfully used. The explanations of doctrine and history are clear and compressed. There are marks of most careful accuracy and of a strong and well-balanced mind. The learning of the author is held in restraint, so that he never departs from his immediate purpose, or makes his work heavy or unsuitable for those for whom it is intended.

Dr. Gibson notices in his preface a 'possible criticism,' which he wishes to 'meet beforehand.'

'It may, perhaps, be said that there is a lack of proportion in the treatment of the Articles, since far more space has been devoted to the first eight than to the remaining thirty-one. My reply must be that the fault, if it be a fault, has been deliberately committed, and for this reason. The first eight Articles practically restate, in an enlarged form, the rule of faith as contained in the Church's Creed, and therefore stand on a different footing from the others. In some works on the Articles this seems to be regarded as a reason for devoting but little space to them, it being presumably taken for granted that the student will have previously mastered Pearson's great work, or some other treatise on the Creed. It has seemed to me wiser to adopt the opposite course, and to make the commentary on them fuller than that on the remaining Articles, in order to emphasize their importance, and to give them their proper position. I trust, however, that the lack of proportion is not really so great as might at first sight appear. Many of the later Articles admit of very slight treatment, and I hope that it will be found that adequate attention has been paid to the really important ones among them, especially to those on the Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry' (Preface, pp. vi-vii).

The disproportion in the actual space given to the two divisions of the Articles is not so great as might be thought from merely looking at the outside of the volumes, or even from the author's apologetic statement. When the introductory matter which refers to the whole of the Articles is allowed for, we observe that 266 pages are devoted to the eight Articles contained in the first volume, while 435 pages are allotted to the thirty-one Articles of the second volume. When the consideration which Dr. Gibson points out, that 'many of the later Articles admit of very slight treatment,' is remembered, and when the supreme importance of the subjects of the earlier Articles is kept in view, it will hardly be thought that there is real disproportion in the book.

In counting the number of the pages, we have observed a small point which leads us to make a suggestion, and to repeat a hope which we expressed in our former review. The pages of the two volumes are numbered consecutively. But the paging of the second volume begins with the number
of the first page of the index of the first volume. Coupling
this with the fact that the index at the end of the second
volume is to the complete work, it appears not unlikely that
it is intended in the future to publish the book in one volume.
If this should be so, we venture to suggest that there may
be classes of readers among the laity who may wish for
either the first or the second volume without the other suffi-
ciently numerous for it to be well that the two parts of the
book should be separately sold. On the other hand, the
lightness of the paper and binding would do away with
some of the objection which would ordinarily attach to a work
of this size being in one volume.

We have referred to Dr. Gibson's practice of quoting
original documents. We may point out one or two instances
of the importance of students of the Articles being familiar
with the history of their text. The significance of the
omission from the published form of Article XXI. of a clause
which was in the original draft is not small. And after
commenting upon this, Dr. Gibson goes on to say:

'Perhaps no article gains more than this from being read in the
light of the history of the time when it was drawn up, and from
being illustrated by contemporary documents. Had we nothing but
the bare letter of the Article itself to consider, it might be plausibly
maintained that by saying that "General Councils have erred," it
condemns those Councils which the whole Church has ever rever-
enced as truly general and expressing her mind, such as Nicea
(325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451).
Nothing, however, is more certain than the fact that no such sweep-
ing condemnation is intended, for, contemporary with the Forty-two
Articles, and drawn up to a great extent by the very same men who
are responsible for them, is the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum;
and in this there is a remarkable section which runs parallel with the
Article, amplifying its statements, and affording a practical exposition
of it, and commentary upon its meaning.... The Article must
beyond question be interpreted by this longer statement. It is
certain, therefore, that it does not intend to cast any slur upon those
Councils which are received "magna cum reverentia," but that it uses
the term "General Councils" in a loose and popular way, of Councils
which claimed to be "general," as well as of those which are truly
representative of the mind of the whole Church. The necessity for
such an Article is seen in the circumstances of the time. From the
early days of Luther, the Reformers, both on the Continent and in
England, had persistently appealed to a free General Council, and
finally the Pope (Paul III.) had been driven in 1545, to summon a

The omitted clause was, 'Possunt reges et pii magistratus, non
expectata conciliorum generalium sententia aut convocatione, in re-
publica sua juxta Dei verbum de rebus religionis constituere.'
"General Council." But (1) it was called by the Pope alone, who claimed the right to cite to it, in person or by proxy, the king of England among other Christian princes; and (2) it consisted only of bishops of the Roman obedience. It was therefore not such a Council as the Reformers could regard as truly "general," or feel themselves compelled to accept. But in view of the fact that it was actually being held when the Articles were drawn up, and that its decrees were certain to be appealed to as authoritative by the opponents of the Reformation, it was important that in the Anglican formulary a statement should be found, asserting, in terms such as would justify a refusal to be bound by the decisions of Trent, the abstract position maintained with regard to "the authority of General Councils" (pp. 529-32).

Similarly, Dr. Gibson shows how an alteration in the original draft of Article XXII. indicates that those who were responsible for it 'deliberately abstained from seeming to express any condemnation of the practice of praying for the departed, and that it is impossible to strain the words of this Article on Purgatory to indicate such a condemnation' (pp. 537-8). So, too, the differences between the present form of Article XXV. and the form in which it stood in 1553 are shown to be of some importance, and a comparison of the Article of 1538 on the same subject 'with the corresponding passage in the Confession of Augsburg shows the stronger position on the reality of sacramental grace which the Anglican divines maintained' (pp. 586-87). And, again, the joint consideration of the history of Article XXVIII. and of 'the course of thought on the subject of the Eucharist in the Church of England during the sixteenth century' leads to the conclusion that 'the positive character impressed upon the Articles in regard to Eucharistic doctrine' does not belong to 'the Edwardian Reformers, such as Cranmer and Ridley,' and that their 'opinions' on the subject of the Holy Communion have nothing more than an historical interest for us' (pp. 641-7).

Now, we fully adhere to the way of regarding 'Articles of Religion' and the meaning of subscription to them which, following, among other divines, Archbishop Bramhall and Bishop Bull and Archbishop Ussher, and with an important letter by Dr. Pusey in mind, we laid down in our review of the first volume of Dr. Gibson's book. It would, we believe, be disastrous for the Church of England if an attempt should be successfully made to impose a narrower view either of the Articles themselves or of subscription to them upon the clergy. But, while this is the case, it is a matter of great interest and importance in tracing the history of doctrine in

1 *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1896, pp. 403-4.
England to have accurate knowledge of the standpoints of the earlier forms of the Articles and of the final revision of them. It has been too readily assumed in some quarters that their teaching was meant to tend in a Calvinistic and Zwinglian direction. If Dr. Gibson's work had no other merit, it would be of use as showing some of the very grave historical difficulties which are involved in such a view.¹

It would be easy for us to use all the space at our command in quoting instances of the excellence of the expositions here given of the doctrines contained in the Articles. On the subject of grace, we must be content to call attention to the useful statements with reference to the words 'justify'² and 'faith' in Holy Scripture (pp. 390–2, 399–400), the clear teaching on the relation between justification and sanctification (pp. 393–7), the explanation of the term 'supererogation' (pp. 425–6), the summary of the history of indulgences (pp. 427–33), and the excellent treatment of the difference between 'precepts' and 'counsels' in view of the reality of vocation (pp. 437–8), and to quote a brief passage on the connexion between the Fall and the need of grace:

'Admit in any true sense the Fall, and Divine grace becomes a necessity. Deny the Fall, and grace may perhaps be dispensed with and human nature without supernatural assistance be found equal to the conflict with sin' (p. 361).

If we are to offer criticisms on this subject, they must be in the expression of doubts whether sufficient allowance is made for the high spiritual condition of man before the Fall (pp. 365–6), or the distinction between the absolute character of predestination to grace and the conditional character of predestination to glory (pp. 465–81), and whether the sermon of Dr. Waterland on the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is as 'convincing' as Dr. Gibson holds it to be (pp. 448–9).

An important section of the Articles is that which deals with the subject of the Church. Here we may notice the clear, short statement on the teaching of Holy Scripture that

¹ Compare the references to the designedly ambiguous character of part of Article IX. (p. 376), the omission in the present Articles of the Tenth Article of 1553 (pp. 386–7), and the 'wise silence' of Article XI. 'on more than one subject connected with the doctrine of justification by faith, which was keenly disputed between the Romans and Lutherans in the sixteenth century' (pp. 405–6).

² There is an interesting article on 'St. Paul's Use of δικαιον' in the American Journal of Theology for January 1897, pp. 149–58, by Professor E. P. Gould. Perhaps Dr. Gibson's summing-up on pp. 396–7 may show the line of thought on which there may be agreement between those who begin by interpreting δικαιον differently.
the Church is a visible society (pp. 500–2), and the accurate explanations of the legislative powers of a local Church (pp. 514–9), the relation of local Churches to the Church Universal (pp. 520–4),¹ and the test ‘whether a Council is truly “General” and representative of the mind of the whole Church’ (p. 536);² and we may quote the interesting treatment of part of the Nineteenth Article:

'The object of this clause is not to condemn the Roman Church as apostate, but simply to deny her claim to infallibility. Whatever may be said about the infallibility of the Church as a whole, it is clear from history that no one branch of the Church can claim for herself infallibility apart from other branches. So the Article points to the historical fact that in the past the principal Churches of the East have erred, mentioning the three great patriarchates, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, and maintains that similarly the Roman Church has also “erred.” No particular errors are specified in any case; but it is not difficult to point to periods during the great Arian controversy when each of the three Eastern Churches mentioned in the Article fell into serious errors. Thus the Church of Antioch went wrong at the Council of the Dedication in 341, when a defective creed acceptable to the Arians was accepted in lieu of the Nicene faith. The Church of Alexandria certainly “erred” when Athanasius was in banishment, and Gregory or George of Cappadocia ruling the See. The Church of Jerusalem was also infected with Arianism for a considerable time. In the same way the Article states that the Church of Rome has erred in the past. She erred when her Bishop Liberius accepted an Arian creed;³ when Zosimus vindicated Pelagius; and when Honorius accepted the Monothelite heresy. Later examples of error might easily be given, but it is probable that those who compiled the Articles were thinking of these earlier ones, and pointing to well-known and admitted facts of history as establishing the general statement that the Church of Rome was liable to error, and as sufficient to justify them for not accepting as necessarily correct the decisions of the Council of Trent. In view of this Council, and any possible decisions that might emanate from it, it was important that the Church of England should make her own position clear, and state beforehand the grounds which she felt would justify her in declining (if necessary) to submit when Rome had formally spoken. The Council, it will be remembered, was actually being held when the Articles were drawn up' (pp. 506–8).

¹ We think, as we have indicated, Dr. Gibson's statements on these subjects admirable. As a matter of interpretation of Article XX., we have some difficulty in following him in his apparent opinion that the Church in one part of the Article means a local Church, and in another part of the Article means the Universal Church.

² It perhaps prevents confusion if the title Ecumenical is used for Councils which Dr. Gibson describes as ‘truly “General.”’

³ We doubt whether, considering all the circumstances of the acceptance by Liberius of an unsatisfactory creed, that act can rightly be described as the Church of Rome erring.
Amid much that is valuable on this subject we regret that in the discussion of 'the relation of Church authority to private judgment' (pp. 525-6) it is not pointed out that temporary opinions, however apparently universal for the time being, are not the real voice of the Church, and that the answer to the questions 'Who is to decide whether the Church has exceeded the powers thus conceded to her? and what is to be done if it should appear that as a matter of fact she has exceeded them?' (p. 525), is to be found in the consideration that the settled and permanent teaching of the Universal Church affords the test whether the decisions of any local Church or an apparent unanimity of the whole Church at a particular time are really the utterance of the Church herself and therefore secured from error by the promise and power of Christ and the indwelling of God the Holy Ghost. Such a test may leave particular individuals or generations in uncertainty on some questions; it may cause long delay in the assertion of truth. That it works slowly is no reason for doubting that it is the appointed method of Him who, while 'men are impatient and for precipitating things,' 'appears deliberate throughout His operations, accomplishing His natural ends by slow successive steps.'

We have read with great interest the comments on Article XXII. The condemnation by the Council of Trent of certain opinions and practices in connexion with the matters mentioned in the Article is noted as an indication of the grossness of 'the abuses which called forth such language' (pp. 538-42), and this is followed by a useful account of the history of the doctrine of Purgatory in the Church, a good statement about the teaching of Holy Scripture, valuable passages on 'the time of man's probation' being limited to the present life, the need of 'progress' and the probability of 'gradual purification' after death, a clear explanation of the word 'indulgence,' and temperate discussions of images and relics and the Invocation of Saints (pp. 542-72). It would perhaps have been well to quote another passage from St. Augustine in addition to those which Dr. Gibson mentions; we are not altogether satisfied with the treatment of St. Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians iii. 10-15; we do not think the

2 *In Psalm, xxxvii. § 3;* the opinion there indicated is the same as that in *De Civitate*, xxi. 13, one of the passages quoted by Dr. Gibson.
3 Dr. Pusey took this passage to show that 'there will be suffering in the Day of Judgment, probably the particular judgment upon the individual soul upon its departing from the body,' and added, 'the image
author allows sufficiently for the fact that in this life much progress is by means of pain as indicating a probability that the joy and rest of the intermediate state may not be without intermixture of some forms of suffering; and he does not attach enough importance to the universality with which Invocations of Saints came to be practised throughout the Church, both in the East and in the West, and fails to emphasize as clearly as is right the fact that it is the corruptions in 'current teaching and practice' rather than Invocation itself which the Article condemns.

There are two points of importance in which the Sacramental teaching of this work calls for criticism. The first is with regard to the reception by the wicked in the Holy Eucharist. After a definite assertion of the objectivity of the Sacred Presence of Christ, Dr. Gibson goes on to say:

"If, however, it is clearly implied that the Presence is there first, before it is "received," it seems to be no less clearly taught in the last part of the clause that faith is a necessary condition to the reception of it" (p. 661);

and, further on, in the course of a somewhat detailed consideration of this question, he says:

"Since the wicked are certainly not made to "have life" through participation in the sacrament, it would not appear to be safe to assert that they do "eat the Body of Christ in the sacrament." It cannot be maintained that it follows as a necessary inference from the doctrine of the Real Presence; for if the connection of the Presence with the elements be of such a nature that of necessity all those who receive the outward elements must thereby also receive the "inward part," ulterior consequences will follow: such as the reception of the Body of Christ by birds or mice, which might through some deplorable accident eat a portion of the consecrated bread. . . . On the whole, then, even if, as many have thought, the view that the wicked do actually receive the Body and Blood without being thereby being made "partakers of Christ" be capable of reconciliation with the terms of this Article, yet it appears to be more in accordance with Holy Scripture and the mind of the primitive Church, as well as with the most obvious and natural meaning of Articles XXVIII. and XXIX., to hold that the wicked, though brought (so to speak) in contact with the Body and Blood, are through want of faith unable to receive that spiritual food which is offered to them" (pp. 673-4).

seems to represent a more or less prolonged suffering in that day, according to the greater or less grievousness of the things to be destroyed in those who are saved.' See the whole discussion in What is of Faith as to everlasting punishment? (pp. 104-12). If 'the day' means the day of the Universal Judgment, 'the fire' may be analogous to and may sum up what has preceded it in the intermediate state. This is the more likely if it refers to the pain of the sense of having sinned, which, it may be anticipated, will accompany seeing our Lord.
There are very grave objections to the view which is thus laid down. The natural inference from the fact that the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament is connected not with the faith of the communicant but with the Act of Consecration, is that the 'res Sacramenti,' the 'inward part' consisting of the Body and Blood of Christ, is received by all communicants. The teaching of Holy Scripture, making no connexion between the Presence of Christ and the faith of the communicant, and showing that the results of the reception of the Sacrament are very different in different persons, is harmonious with a belief that all communicants receive the Body and Blood of Christ, while only some receive the 'virtus Sacramenti' or 'benefits' intended to be conveyed thereby. The ordinary teaching of the Fathers, to which St. Augustine cannot be reckoned as an exception, tends in the same direction. The painful question relating to the possibility of accident which, to our great regret, Dr. Gibson has suggested, will hardly receive a more reasonable and reverent answer than that given by St. Thomas Aquinas. On the doctrinal matter, we see nothing in what Dr. Gibson has written to lead us to doubt the belief which has commonly been held in the Church. On the subordinate question of the meaning of Articles XXVIII. and XXIX., we can accept their language on the not improbable hypothesis that 'eat' is used in the sense of 'eat beneficially,' and that the phrase 'partakers of Christ' denotes those who spiritually and to profit partake of Him. Dr. Gibson cites the opposition of

---

1 St. Matt. xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. x. 16.
2 St. John vi. 54; 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.
3 It is natural to explain such passages as In Joan. Evang. xxvi. 18, by e.g. De Bapt. c. Don. v. 9; Ad Donat. post collat. 27. There is some discussion of this point in the Church Quarterly Review for January 1896, pp. 326-7.
4 St. Thom. Aq. S.T. III. lxxx. 3, ad 3: 'Etiamsi mus vel canis hostiam consecratam manducet, substantia corporis Christi non desinit esse sub speciebus, quamdiu species illæ maneat, hoc est, quamdiu substantia panis maneret, sicut etiam si projiceretur in lutum. Nec hoc vergit in detrimentum dignitatis corporis Christi, qui voluit a peccatoribus crucifigi absque diminutione suae dignitatis, præsertim cum mus aut canis non tangat ipsum corpus Christi secundum propriam speciem, sed solum secundum species sacramentales. Quidam autem dixerunt quod statim cum sacramentum tangitur a mure vel cane, desinit ibi esse corpus Christi, quod etiam derogat veritati sacramenti, sicut supra dictum est. Nec tamen dicendum est quod animal brutum sacramentaliter corpus Christi manducet, quia non est natum uti eo ut sacramentum; unde non sacramentaliter, sed per accidens corpus Christi manducat, sicut manducaret ille qui sumeret hostiam consecratam, nesciens eam esse consecratam.'
Bishop Guest as an argument against this interpretation (pp. 661-2). There is no doubt that he disliked and opposed Article XXIX.; but, as Dr. Gibson himself with characteristic fairness mentions (p. 674, n. 3), he eventually signed the Article, and, considering what his opinions are known to have been, he can hardly have done so in any other sense than that it denied, not the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the wicked, but only their profitable partaking of the Sacrament.

The second point of importance with regard to the Sacraments is about the doctrine of concomitance. On this subject it is said:

'The doctrine of concomitance is the belief which was definitely laid down at the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent that "as much is contained under either kind as under both, for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and likewise whole Christ is under the species of wine, and under its parts." It must be said, however, that this doctrine, that "whole Christ," both body and blood, is received under either kind, is theologically most uncertain. There is no trace of any belief in it in the early Church. It only makes its appearance in connection with the growth of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and comes into prominence when a theological justification for the practice of communion in one kind is wanted. There is but a single passage of Scripture which can with any show of reason be quoted in its favour: "Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 27). But it is rash in the extreme to infer the doctrine from this text, when the words of the institution are remembered, as well as St. Paul's comment upon them: Jesus took bread . . . and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took a cup . . . and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood" (St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27). "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16). Where the gifts are so carefully distinguished by our Lord and His Apostle, it seems the height of presumption to assert that "whole Christ" is so contained under either species that "they who receive one kind alone are not defrauded of any grace necessary to salvation"' (pp. 683-5).

We agree with Dr. Gibson that the Roman practice of communion in one kind is an unwarrantable interference with the methods ordained by Christ, but we cannot follow him also in his rejection of the doctrine sometimes cited in defence of the practice. If, as we ourselves think, it is 'rash' to quote 1 Corinthians xi. 27 to defend the doctrine, it is hardly less rash to use the two other passages to which Dr. Gibson refers in order to attack it. So far as we know, the
question was not discussed by the Fathers, and there are no means of forming a satisfactory opinion as to what they may have thought. But, in our judgment, the spiritual character of the Eucharistic Presence is the very strongest argument in support of the doctrine. Even in a natural body, if it should be alive, the flesh and the blood could not be completely divided. But in the case of a spiritual body a division seems to be inconceivable. The Presence in the Eucharist is that of the living Christ Himself. He Himself is in the bread; He Himself is in the wine; He cannot be divided. There is no 'exinanition' of the glorious state of His risen and ascended Body and Blood. As we reject a carnal presence, we cling to the doctrine of concomitance.

On some minor matters about the Sacraments, we do not like the word 'maintains' in the sentence at the bottom of page 601; we do not think Dr. Gibson has quite grasped the sense of the word 'partly' ('partim') in Article XXV. (pp. 603-5)¹; and we should have been glad if he had added to his clear statement about Extreme Unction (pp. 605-10) some notice of the Eastern use of this rite as showing its ultimate universality, and had said more about the acceptance of the word μετουσίωσις in the East;² but for the most part we have read his treatment of these important articles with much sympathy and agreement as well as admiration. We may instance the excellent explanation of the history of the word 'Sacrament' (pp. 594-601); the useful treatment of Infant Baptism (pp. 634-9); the admirable description of the technical theory of Transubstantiation in the non-material sense as 'a theory of the schools, a philosophical opinion which is "destitute and incapable of proof," as well as "involved in tremendous metaphysical difficulties" by which we refuse ' to

¹ The right explanation seems to be that given in Maclear and Williams, Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England, p. 305, note 2. ² The words "qua; partim . . . in scripturis quidem probati" are not intended to divide exactly the five Sacraments in question, but simply to suggest in general terms how they came to be what in actual use they were when the Article was written.' Cf. Forbes, Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 448.

² This matter has recently been made one of some controversial interest, though it cannot be regarded as the real point at issue, in connexion with the Roman rejection of the validity of Anglican Orders. There is a valuable letter on the subject by Professor W. E. Collins and Mr. W. J. Birkbeck in the Guardian for March 17, 1897, p. 442, and a short statement and two more letters by the latter writer in the Guardian for March 31, 1897, pp. 507, 514, and April 7, p. 553. It may be noticed that the contention of Professor Collins and Mr. Birkbeck was also accepted by Mr. William Palmer in his Dissertations on Subjects relating to the 'Orthodox' or 'Eastern Catholic' Communion, pp. 207-8.
be bound,' but which is not necessarily 'a bar to communion, provided no assent to it were demanded from us' (p. 659); the statement that the intention of the compilers of Article XXXI. cannot have been to deny the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (p. 691); and we desire to quote a clear and accurate summary of the teaching of the Fathers on the Eucharist, and a helpful passage on Regeneration as distinct from Conversion and Renewal:

'The teaching of the Fathers concerning the Presence is informal and unsystematic. It is, however, quite clear from the language used by them, as well as from the expressions employed in the Liturgies of the Church, (1) that they believed in the Real Presence, and yet (2) that they were not committed to any formal theory of the manner of it such as that which was afterwards elaborated, and (3) that they held the permanence and reality of the elements even after consecration' (pp. 649-50).

'In Regeneration God gives Himself to the soul; in Conversion the soul gives itself to God. It may be illustrated from the Parable of the Prodigal Son. All the time that he was in the "far country" the prodigal was still a son. So the man who has once been regenerated in Baptism is still a "child of God," even though, like the prodigal, he has wandered away from the Father's house, and is spending his substance in riotous living. And that which in the parable is represented as the "coming to himself" of the prodigal, when he realised his condition, and determined to arise and go to his father, and confess his sin, that in the spiritual reality is Conversion. Thus there is no sort of inconsistency in proclaiming both Regeneration and Conversion. It was just because the prodigal was a son that he could venture to arise and go to his father and say, Father. So also just because a person is a child of God in virtue of his Baptism, he can venture to arise and, confessing his sin, yet call God by the name of Father. Renewal, the third term mentioned above, should be distinguished from both Regeneration and Conversion, as that which, owing to man's natural infirmity, is constantly and even daily required in all Christians even after they are "converted." It is that for which we ask in the Collect for Christmas Day' (pp. 633-4).

The treatment of the early history of Episcopacy (pp. 731-46), the validity of Anglican Orders (pp. 746-58), the Royal Supremacy (pp. 762-72), the Papal claims (pp. 772-80), of the question of war (781-2), and of the lawfulness of

1 It is said on p. 733, n. 1, that 'tradition is unanimous as to the identity' of the office of the seven men appointed in Acts vi. with the subsequent Diaconate. The same statement is made in Lightfoot's Philippians, p. 188, and in the article s.v. 'Deacon' in the Dictionary of the Bible, i. 739 (2nd edit.) for which Dr. Gibson is partly responsible. The unanimity is not quite unbroken (see St. Chrys. In Act. Ap. Hom. xiv. 3, and Conc. in Trullo, canon 16, Harduin, Concilia, iii. 1668).
oaths (pp. 788-90), is admirable. And Dr. Gibson's clearness of thought and method prevents him from falling into a confusion very commonly made with regard to the history of married clergy.

'For the existence in early days of a married clergy there is abundant evidence. But, in considering it, two distinct questions present themselves which require separate treatment: (a) Was the use of marriage permitted to those clergy who had married before their ordination? and (b) Was marriage after ordination permissible? The two questions must be examined separately; for it is not fair to quote, as is sometimes done, passages which imply the existence of a married clergy, as if they necessarily involved the fact that marriage was permitted to those who had previously entered into holy orders. (a) There is no room whatever for doubting that during the first three centuries the use of marriage was freely allowed, and many allusions to the existence of a married clergy might be cited... We trace a growing feeling in various quarters against the ministrations of a married clergy. ... In the West the feeling made rapid progress, and before the close of the fourth century began to obtain official sanction from the Church. ... The present custom in the East is for bishops to be always selected from the ranks of the monks and unmarried clergy. But to others, both priests and deacons, marriage before ordination is freely conceded. (b) With regard to the second question raised above, Was marriage after ordination regarded as permissible in the early Church? it must be candidly admitted that there is very little evidence for an answer in the affirmative, and that the prohibition of marriage to the clergy appears in very early days. The fierce attack of Hippolytus upon Callistus (c. 220) shows that early in the third century it was not usual to permit those already ordained to marry; for Hippolytus says that Callistus determined that "if any one of the clergy should marry, he might remain in the clergy as not having sinned," evidently implying that it was the first time that such a thing had been allowed.1 ... The evil results of the stringent rules were so patent that in the sixteenth century Reformers of various schools of thought were all agreed on the necessity of some relaxation of them. ... In 1553, and again in 1563, the decision of the Church as to the freedom of the clergy to marry was embodied in the series of Articles' (pp. 697-703).

As the result of his study of the question, Dr. Gibson states his conclusions as being that 'there is no law of God,' but only a traditional, though primitive, ecclesiastical discipline, prohibiting the marriage of the clergy, and that the Church of England did not go beyond either what was lawful

1 Dr. Gibson's reference to 'Wordsworth's Hippolytus, p. 91' for this statement is less scholarly than most of his work. The passage referred to is in Hippolytus, Refutatio omnium haeresium, ix. 12. It may be seen also in Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, I. ii. 323.
or what was right when she altered this law of 'ecclesiastical discipline' because

'The experience of several centuries had shown to our Reformers the grave evils that flowed from the rigid rule which had been customary; and they were perfectly justified in holding that the national Church was competent to settle the matter for herself, and that she was well within her rights in altering her rule' (pp. 703-4).

We have not hesitated to criticise with candour some parts of this second volume, as of the first volume. But the general impression made upon us is of a most favourable kind. If there are a few passages we could wish altered, there is very much, we think, admirable. And, without forgetting the permanent value of Bishop Forbes's *Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles* as a learned and thoughtful theological treatise on subjects connected with the Articles, or the careful method and sound judgment which make Dr. Maclear's and Mr. Williams's *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England* a most useful manual, or the painstaking collection and arrangement of illustrative documents which mark Mr. Tyrrell Green's *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*—we do not feel any doubt that as a commentary on the Articles Dr. Gibson's work is entitled to the first place among existing books.

In conclusion, we have been struck by the extent to which the author's knowledge of current literature is abreast of the time. His references to the Papal Bull *Apostolicae curae* on Anglican Orders (p. 756), to Father Puller's *The Bull Apostolicae curæ and the Edwardine Ordinal* (p. 758), to Mr. Frere's *The Marian Reaction in its relation to the English Clergy* (ibid.), and to Mr. Wakeman's *Introduction to the History of the Church of England* (pp. 764, 771), are among the signs that he has not allowed the engrossing cares of a great practical work to make continued study impossible. That is a fact which may be worth remembering by some of the clergy and candidates for Ordination who read Dr. Gibson's clear and methodical, accurate and learned book.
ART. XII.—THE EDUCATION BILL.

A Bill to Provide for a Grant out of the Exchequer in Aid of Voluntary Schools, and for the Exemption from Rates of those Schools, and to Repeal part of Section 19 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870.

Under this modest title the Government has succeeded in carrying a most useful little measure through Parliament. After the miscarriage of their somewhat ambitious effort of last year, they determined to proceed more cautiously in the future. They had then had comparatively little experience of the miserable bitterness and littleness of sectarian hostility by which they would be opposed. They had no doubt reckoned to some extent upon the gentlemanly feeling and fair and reasonable opposition which had been characteristics of our English House of Commons; but one trial evidently sufficed to convince them that these were characteristics of the Lower House of the Legislature on which it was no longer safe to reckon. If any doubt on the subject remained in their minds it must have been dissipated by the manner in which their Bill of this year was opposed.

It was evident from the outset that Mr. Balfour had not forgotten the loud vauntings of what they had accomplished in defeating the Government Bill of last session, which formed the staple subject on which Opposition orators eloquently dilated at all party gatherings that were held during the long vacation, and that he was resolved to profit by them. To have given them an opportunity of amending the Bill in any way, would no doubt have been trumpeted forth with equal rejoicings during the next vacation: the Bill was, therefore, drawn in such a brief and concise manner as to present the fewest points of attack to the enemy, and it was so arranged that no concession could be made in response to the frantic demands that were pertinaciously insisted upon without practically defeating the Bill. With a strong majority at his back, Mr. Balfour was resolved this time to make his opponents feel that he could put his foot down in real earnest, and that strong in his own convictions he was determined to carry the Bill through as it was drawn. To prevent any possible disappointment, he this time took the Bill under his own charge, instead of leaving it in the hands of the head of the Department; and we are happy to be able to say that he has completely succeeded in doing what
he had resolved, and the Bill came forth from the Committee without a word having been altered, although endless amendments were proposed upon every line and almost upon every word of the earlier portion of it. The result redounds enormously to the credit of Mr. Balfour's statesmanship, whilst it affords unmixed gratification to his supporters. Beside the two important modifications in the position of Voluntary schools about which their friends have written until people have become weary of hearing of them, there have been two most valuable improvements made in the status of these schools; the two well-discussed modifications to which we have just referred are the exemption of Voluntary schools from local rates, and the repeal of the clauses in previous Acts which limited the Government grant to 17s. 6d. for each child in average attendance, unless the managers of the school provided a sum from voluntary sources equal to the amount claimed as Government grant. The former of these was a specially unjust and irritating charge, as it was administered most unequally in different parishes, and also because it compelled struggling Voluntary schools to pay rates towards the support of their wealthy rivals, whilst the limit placed upon the grant penalised the schools that were the most deserving of help. What the actual pecuniary gain from the alterations made by the Bill under these two heads may be it is not easy to say, but it would probably average something less than a shilling per child if it fell equally upon all schools; but this it did not do; being severe in a few places and not felt in most of the others: the finances of some excellent schools were seriously crippled by what they lost, because they were excellent as well as economical, and some London schools were threatened with extinction in consequence of the heavy rating placed upon them under directions supposed to have been given by the London County Council. It may be interesting to note that the Voluntary schools in Blackburn and Sheffield lost 10d. on each child in average attendance, and those in Birkenhead and Birmingham 9d. under the operation of the 17s. 6d. limit. These are the heaviest recorded injuries inflicted by the two clauses which have been repealed.

The two points just named were accepted by the House of Commons with comparatively little opposition, the whole weight of resistance to the Bill being concentrated on the two improvements designed specially to help the Voluntary schools out of their present difficulties. These were an
additional special grant of 5s. per child in average attendance, to be paid under the advice of a body elected by the representatives of the Voluntary (in our case Church) schools within such area, and to be apportioned by them to each school according to its needs, subject to the approval of the Department. This legalising of the Confederation of schools seemed to arouse as much hostile feeling amongst the opponents of denominational religious teaching as did the proposed additional grant of money to be assigned to them.

The first question that naturally arises in examining what benefit the Act will confer on our schools is this: Are five shillings sufficient to meet the necessities of our struggling schools? This is a question more easily asked than answered, as it is not easy to ascertain what their requirements actually are; they differ so much in different places. In some instances the school staff is less than is desirable and than it ought to be; in others, the teachers are paid at a much lower rate than in adjoining Board schools, and their salaries ought to be increased; in others, the provision of school material is on much too economical a scale; whilst in others the expenditure on the school greatly exceeds the income. It would obviously demand a most extensive knowledge of details, including a careful study of balance-sheets and an intimate acquaintance with all the circumstances connected with the individual schools, to state, with any approach to accuracy, what are the exact pecuniary wants of our Voluntary schools. As this is quite beyond our power of supplying, and is, we believe, very much more than the Education Department can really know, we must content ourselves with giving a few broad facts, that our readers may have as correct a view of the subject as we can set before them.

The first thing to which we would call attention is the table contained in the Report of the Education Department of the cost of educating each child in twenty-three of the largest towns in the kingdom in Voluntary and in Board schools. If we take the average result of the whole twenty-three towns, we find that whilst each child in a Voluntary school is educated for £1. 18s. 11¼d., it would cost 2l. 10s. 1½d. if it were sent to a Board school; and that this difference of 1½s. 2½d. is made up to the extent of 9s. 4½d. by the larger payments given to the teachers in Board schools, or by the additional number of teachers employed in them. If we look a little closer we shall find that the difference of outlay in Board schools varies from £1. 15s. 10½d. per child at Portsmouth
and £16s. 10½d. at Hull to 3l. 8s. 3½d. in London. In the Voluntary schools the variation is, of course, considerably less; the most costly schools are those in London, where 2l. 6s. is expended on each child, and the cheapest are those in Sunderland, where 1l. 12s. 6d. suffices. It is worthy of remark that though each child in a Board school at Hull costs 1l. 11s. 5½d. less than a child educated in a London Board school, its proficiency at school, as measured by the Government grant, is greater, as it earns 1½d. more than its London confrère, beside which there was lost to the Hull school 1s. 6½d. per child under the 17s. 6d. limit. In other words, by an outlay less by forty-six per cent. the Hull Board schools earned about eight per cent. more grant than did the London ones. And if we compare the Government grant earned by the Voluntary schools with that obtained by the Board schools in the twenty-three large towns, we find the difference to have been only 8½d. per child, though the amount expended upon its education was 11s. 2½d. more; whilst in every town the Voluntary schools had their grant lessened by the action of the 17s. 6d. limit, a loss which only fell upon eight of the twenty-three towns for the Board schools. It will be seen that the figures just given add to our difficulty in stating what is the additional sum needed to support our Voluntary schools, as the London Voluntary Schools spend much more on the education of each child than does the Hull School Board; and, we may add, so do the managers of the Voluntary schools in eleven others of the twenty-three towns.

The comparison between the Voluntary and Board schools in some of these large towns, no doubt, shows a considerable deficiency in the resources of the Voluntary schools, from a comparative point of view. But even in the case of these large towns the new grant of five shillings a child, added to the advantage that will be gained by freedom from local rates and exemption from fines under the 17s. 6d. limit, will cover a considerable portion of the difference between the expenditure of the two classes of schools; and though there will remain a sufficiently large gulf between the resources of the two sets of schools to create serious heart-burnings in many places, these will happily be much lessened, if not removed in others.

If we take a wider view and compare the cost of all the Voluntary and Board schools (with the exception of London) we find the difference much less. The average cost for 'maintenance' in the Board schools in England (excluding
London) is given by the Report of the Education Department for 1895-6 as 2l. 5s. 3½d. per child, whilst that in Voluntary schools is stated to be 1l. 18s. 5d., a difference of only 6s. 10½d., and in Wales it is nearly elevenpence less. The new Government assistance will not quite cover this difference, but when we remember how much more economically all pecuniary matters are managed when in the hands of private persons, who have themselves to make good deficits, than they are when under the control of Boards, who have only to make a small addition to the rate in order to obtain what is required, the inequality does not seem very formidable. Still, there can be no doubt that many Voluntary schools will have a grievance, though it will be a much less serious one than that under which they now labour; and, of course, the injustice inflicted on managers and parents who desire definite religious teaching for the children who are compelled to attend Board Schools does not disappear.

In estimating how matters will stand after the new Act comes into operation, there is some information which has been gathered by the Northern Counties Voluntary Schools Protection Association that may be of service. From this it appears that there are 2,140 districts under School Boards, and 7,225 districts in which, happily, there are none. Of the districts under School Boards there are 607 in which there are both Board and Voluntary schools, and it is in these that the pressure upon the friends of Voluntary schools has been most severe, as they have had to pay rates for the support of the rival system as well as to pay subscriptions towards the maintenance of their own schools. In these districts there are 2,349 Board schools, educating 1,084,610 children, and 2,634 Voluntary schools, educating 819,392 children; and the amount raised by rates towards providing for the maintenance and other expenses of these and the other Board schools (excluding capital charges) was 4,059,465/. It follows, therefore, that the rates have to furnish more than 2l. for every child under instruction, when the cost of administration as well as that of the maintenance of the school is taken into account. Beside this the School Boards have borrowed 28,745,781l. for building schools, and had last year to raise 633,519l. by rates, in addition to the sum just named, to pay the annual instalment due on account of these loans, and, in addition, 2,091,297l. for works of a permanent character for which they could not borrow. The mere mention of such sums shows how very much more economically Voluntary schools are managed, and how much further the new Govern-
ment grant may be expected to suffice to meet their expenditure. It also shows what a heavy burden is thrown upon the supporters of Voluntary schools in addition to what they have to supply for the maintenance of their own schools. In the other 1,535 districts where School Boards exist, there are 1,450 in which there are no Voluntary schools, whilst in eighty-five, though there are Boards, they have no schools.

From the figures that have been just given it will be seen that the new Government grant will fall short of supplying the Voluntary schools with funds that will enable them to vie with the more extravagant School Boards in the rate of expenditure in which they may indulge. This is by no means an unmixed evil. The cost of carrying on our elementary schools has in many instances been raised to an extravagant height by School Boards determined to leave no stone unturned that might help to injure the rival system, which they were bent upon destroying. They have consequently raised the salaries of teachers to an extent that might be perfectly justifiable in the case of the few, gifted with exceptional abilities, who would have risen in whatever pursuit they had followed, but is excessive for the many, who are endowed with only moderate average talents, and who would have had small prospect of rising in any other calling. The effect of this has been that many of the ablest teachers, whose principles led them to throw in their lot with Voluntary schools on account of their religious teaching, have received very inadequate incomes, whilst companions, who stood on a lower level than they did at college, have enjoyed the larger incomes paid by some School Boards. This has necessarily produced a sense of irritation in the minds of teachers, who have suffered, and of managers, who have desired to pay higher salaries but had not the money required for the purpose. The additional grant will enable many of these inequalities to be removed, whilst it will be altogether inadequate to adopt the higher scale of payments current amongst the more extravagant School Boards. Managers of Voluntary schools will therefore have to continue to accept some of the inconveniences of the present situation, and if they are wise they will measure the amount of remuneration they offer to their teachers by the amount of ability they possess. They must cease to regard all teachers as equal, and deserving of equal incomes. In no other profession does any such rule as this hold. No doubt one result that would follow from acting upon such a rule as that just suggested would be the rapid increase of female teachers, who are paid at a lower rate than male teachers, and
for our own part we should not grieve over this, as the reverence and religious tone of schools under the care of female teachers is often very remarkable.

So much may be said for the sufficiency or insufficiency of the new grant, supposing it to be equally distributed amongst all the Voluntary schools of the country; but our readers will have seen from what we have written that the amount of aid required must differ materially, especially as there are districts where Board schools also have to be supported, and others which are exempt from that infliction. This difference the Act recognises, and provides that associations shall be formed of schools within areas approved by the Education Department, and that through these associations shall be paid, or be arranged to be paid, to the various schools within the limits with which they have to deal, the sums which it is thought desirable for them to have. That is, supposing there are 1,000 children in average attendance in a given area in the associated schools, there will, at all events in urban districts, be assigned to the association 250l., and it will be for this authority to recommend to the Department what amount from this sum each of the schools shall receive, so that the poor struggling schools without endowments, and in neighbourhoods where few or no voluntary subscriptions can be obtained, may receive more, whilst those in more fortunately circumstanced districts may receive less. The chief difference which may be made is thus provided for in the Act: "If associations of schools are constituted in such manner, in such areas, and with such governing bodies representative of the managers as are approved by the Education Department, there shall be allotted to each association while so approved, a share of the aid grant, to be computed according to the number of scholars in the schools of the association, at the rate of five shillings per scholar, or, if the Department fix different rates for town and country schools respectively (which they are hereby empowered to do), then at those rates." From these words it will be seen that whilst there may be different rates for town and country schools, it by no means follows that there must be: it is intended that each case shall be judged upon its merits, and though schools will no doubt be ranged upon some system, and the grant assigned to each be regulated upon some fixed plan, it will be open to the governing body to propose exceptional treatment when the circumstances of the case require it.

Upon the constitution of the governing bodies, to whose lot it will fall to make recommendations to the Department
as to the amount which each school is to receive, very much will depend. Whatever the area eventually determined upon, we hold that these bodies must be denominational, and it was with the greatest regret we read some words uttered by the Vice-President at a recent distribution of prizes at the National schools in the village of Girton, near Cambridge. He is reported to have said that 'he hoped the associations would be comprehensive and not narrowed down to any single sect, because the work of improving secular education in village schools was not a thing which touched any question of religious difference.' But if the assessment of the amount of grant does not touch such questions, it will have a great deal to do with sustaining or destroying schools. To include various bodies of religionists in the same association would infallibly destroy their usefulness. The members of each religious body would feel it to be their duty to fight for the largest amount of help they could get for the schools of their own denomination, and the feeling that such a desire existed, and that the less scrupulous members of the body were plotting to carry their object, would infallibly destroy that mutual confidence which is essential for the successful action of bodies such as those now proposed to be called into existence. It might have been thought that the Vice-President of the Council would have seen enough of the narrow sectarian spirit of the opponents of the Church in the recent discussions concerning the Education Bill to have prevented his making the suggestion that men of similar views and prejudices should be joined with Churchmen in deciding the special amount of help to be meted out to Church and other schools. We are not enamoured of his other proposal that these governing bodies for federated schools should associate themselves with County Councils; after the experience we have had of some County Councils we should certainly object strongly to any connexion with them where interests affecting the Church had to be determined. These remarks of the Vice-President make us thankful that the carriage of the Bill through the House of Commons was placed in the hands of Mr. Balfour and not in his. If these new confederated bodies are to be a success, they must be denominational. It would be a cruel wrong to place upon them men like Mr. Carvell Williams or Mr. Lloyd George, or some country partisans of theirs, who would glory in making them an ignominious failure. They are confessedly an experiment, and for the Government to saddle the experiment with a condition which must seriously diminish, if it did not destroy, the chance of its
success, would be the height of folly. The first question to be
determined with regard to these confederations of schools is the
area over which they are to extend. Our idea would be that
each religious body that has schools should be allowed to
determine for itself what area would be best adapted to meet
its wants. It is obvious that the Roman Catholics, the
Wesleyans, and the Undenominationalists would require
something very different from the Church, as their schools
are so much fewer. We would therefore leave them to speak
for themselves, and would not venture even to make a sugges-
tion about schools concerning whose social wants and powers
of dealing with them we know little or nothing. But con-
cerning Church schools we have no hesitation in recommend-
ing that the diocese should be the area proposed, as has
been suggested by a scheme for confederation issued by the
National Society. It has many advantages. The existing
Diocesan Boards of Education could easily be moulded so as
to supply organisations that would meet the requirements of
the Department. Then, in the matter of raising a good cen-
tral fund to supplement the new special Government grant,
it would have peculiar advantages, as it would bring the
wealthier and poorer parts of the Diocese into more intimate
relations with each other about this all-important subject of
education, in which all are, or ought to be, equally interested.
Moreover, it would only continue to do what it has been
doing for some time past.

The diocese would need to be divided into a number of
smaller organisations, in order that the complete information
concerning the wants and position of every school may be
accurately ascertained; and here again existing arrangements
would make it easy to obtain what is required. The rural
deaneries would furnish small and suitable bodies with a
recognised centre that could provide the information required,
and that would at the same time supply convenient bodies of
managers to elect members of the central governing Council
by which the affairs of the confederation could be administered.
The business that will occupy the attention of this Council
will be of a very difficult and delicate character, which it
would be well-nigh impossible to be satisfactorily managed
entirely by persons living in the immediate neighbourhood of
each other, where private and personal influences would be
only too apt to have more weight than would be desirable.
But if the central governing body is to be representative of
the whole diocese, county as well as town, town as well as
county, in every case there would be members from the
in immediate neighbourhood of the school whose affairs were under discussion, who could fully set forth all that it would be desirable should be known concerning it, and there would also be persons from a distance, unbiased by personal acquaintance with the managers of the school, or by party and mere local considerations. These might be depended upon to give a fair and just decision in all questions relating to the distribution of grants. Moreover, it will be a great help to all who are jealous for the perfect fairness and equity of the governing body, that its decisions will have to be reviewed under knowledge derived from H.M.'s Inspector, who has visited and examined the school, who knows not merely the dry figures concerning teachers and salaries and the pecuniary affairs of the school, but who has also a certain amount of information concerning the spirit in which the school is administered, the efforts made for its efficiency, and the probable effect that the grant will have; whether it would be likely to be used to add to its excellence and the strengthening of its weak places, or be in danger of being misapplied to the relief of its supporters. There can be no doubt that these governing bodies will be closely watched and severely criticised by persons anxious for their failure, and it will demand that the members should be, as far as possible, able and large-minded men, resolved to do what can be done for strengthening the influence of the Church at large in the field of education, and not tempted to place the interests of a party or a locality in the first position.

Moreover, it is desirable that the members of this governing body shall possess accurate knowledge of the details of school management. A not inconsiderable portion of the difficulties of our schools has arisen from the want of such knowledge on the part of the managers. Economy and efficiency can only be combined when those charged with the direction of the schools thoroughly understand their business, and to this it is not easy for persons to attain without the aid of some one thoroughly acquainted with the details of management. For such knowledge needs to be acquired by experience, and if a few of those possessing it would devote some time to assist those less informed in acquiring it, they would render invaluable service to the cause of education. We have spoken of the difficulties which arise from the great divergence in the sums paid for the salaries of teachers in Board and Voluntary schools. In a less degree there is something of the same difficulty in the very varying rates of payments to teachers in Voluntary schools, and in
the number of teachers that it is considered necessary to employ. It might be possible, at all events after a time, for the schools in the same rural deanery, or possibly in the same diocese, to have scales of salaries for all the teachers employed within their limits, and also to have rules respecting the amount of staff to be employed in the schools of varying size. By this means a certain amount of heartburning might be avoided. Other questions of a somewhat similar kind there are which might be advantageously settled by these central bodies, by which schools in the respective neighbourhoods might be better adapted to the special wants of the people for whose benefit they are designed. For instance, in all towns of a certain size it is most desirable to have some elementary schools where the children pay a small fee; with the confederation now suggested it would be much more possible to make arrangements for certain schools to be free, and for one or more of them to charge a small fee, than it has been hitherto. If we might venture to give advice to those concerned with the management of these confederations, there are two other points which we would recommend them specially to bear in mind.

The first is, that they should not attempt authoritatively to interfere with the details of the management of the schools in their district. By all means let them advise wherever they are invited to do so, or a suitable occasion arises, and so far as is necessary adjust the amount of grant to each school according to the skill, or want of skill, with which it is managed; but by all means let them avoid all appearance of assuming a right to dictate. It not infrequently happens that the more incompetent managers really are, the more keenly they resent all direct efforts to set them right. They must learn to some extent by experience. A few careful hints, and the occasional presence of an expert at their committee meetings, would probably suffice, with a little patience, to place what needs amending on a better footing.

The second point is, not to be unmindful of the possible wants of the more fortunately circumstanced schools in their zeal to help the poorer ones. It is most desirable that every confederated school that in any way needs it should derive some benefit from the special grant, and that their managers should feel that they are not only helping the poor, struggling schools in their deanery or diocese, but also that the schools in which they are personally most deeply interested are being placed in a more advantageous position through their union with others in an endeavour to raise the religious tone and
the secular efficiency of the schools of the diocese. One is only too well aware of the weaknesses of human nature not to feel the immense importance of avoiding everything that might excite the feeling that the wealthier schools were being neglected, or thought little of, in order to promote the aggrandisement of the poorer and least promising schools.

We cannot conclude without pressing upon our readers the important results which may be made to follow upon the system called into being for the confederation of schools, if only that system can be made to work successfully. The weakness of the Church of England has long been the difficulty of getting its members to act together; the clergy have, too often, pulled in different directions according to their personal idiosyncrasies with less regard than they ought to have felt for the general interests of the Church. It will be well if these school confederations impress upon us the importance and advantages of our all working together; and whether they shall or shall not do this will depend to a great extent upon the wisdom and carefulness with which the special business entrusted to these organisations is conducted. And that again depends upon a wise selection of men to constitute the central governing body. Is it too much to hope that at a crisis like the present, school managers will endeavour to cast aside all small personal ambitions and party preferences, and select the best and ablest men to represent them on the central governing body?

SHORT NOTICES.

1. *Responsio Archiepiscoporum Anglia ad litteras apostolicas Leonis Pape XIII. de ordinationibus Anglicanis.* (London: Longmans, 1897.)


Had the revival of the controversy on Anglican Orders had no other effect than to force the Pope to give us his reasons, it would have done good. The world can now take them at their true worth. But it has had the further result of moving the official heads of the English episcopate so to depart from all its traditions of timid reserve as to issue a doctrinal statement, as it were, *ex cathedra.* This is a matter for real thankfulness. And we are no less grateful that, on such high points of doctrine as the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the *sacerdotium* of our priesthood, and the 'character' imprinted in the Sacrament of Order, the Archbishops should have found themselves
so obviously at one as, not only to defend a common position, but to state fearlessly and explicitly what it is and why it should be accepted as sufficient by 'the whole body of Bishops of the Catholic Church.' More than this, they repudiate with energy the Pope's insinuation that what is popularly described by that 'harmless but invidious word' sacerdotalism is merely the opinion of 'a small section of the Anglican body formed in recent times, and tell him that 'he speaks with great ignorance of the facts' (§ 16). Quite apart, then, from any ultimate effect that the Archbishops' 'Answer' may have in furthering reunion with the Church at large, it has committed, united, and strengthened us at home. This service, at any rate, the Pope has done us; and we make no doubt that this new departure in Anglican policy, which, it would seem, owes its impetus to the late Archbishop of Canterbury (§ 1), will commend itself to Churchmen on all sides. They thankfully recognise that a reply so courteous in tone, so Christian in spirit, and yet withal so firm and dignified in argument, will be likely to do far more for the Anglican Communion than ever the Pope's Letter Apostolic can do against it.

The document itself begins with a few words of introduction as to the Papal Bull which closed the last stage of the controversy. The authors address the Pope as 'our venerable brother,' and treat him in their address as, like themselves, amenable to the judgment of the episcopate as a whole (§ 1). They could not have done otherwise. But, if so, that takes the edge of finality off the Pope's pronouncement, and gives us Anglicans good ground for retaining that confidence in our Orders which the Archbishops are careful at the outset to express (§ 2). They evince no little astuteness in the contrast which they immediately proceed to draw between that confidence and the uncertainties both of practice and formularies, out of which somehow or other the Papists have to construct their case against us. 'From these documents'—the Pontifical and others—say the Archbishops, 'so obviously discordant and indefinite'—so Anglican, if one might adopt the term of contempt which Papists, if the Pontifical were our formulary, would certainly apply to it—'no one, however wise, could extract with certainty what was considered by the Roman Pontiffs to be truly essential and necessary to Holy Orders' (§ 3).

The Archbishops then (§ 4) thank the Pope for 'consulting the interests of the Church and of the truth' by abandoning vain opinions. So do we all. When a man of high place and high principle, like the present Pope, intervenes in a controversy, one may expect to find the field cleared of shams. It is, indeed, a grateful concession to be told that we need not trouble to discuss any more points like 'The Tradition of the Instruments' and the private intention of the minister. But now come the real turning-points of the controversy to be dealt with; and, first, the practice of the Roman Court. The Archbishops regard it, and rightly, 'as of less importance' (§ 5). They are well aware that the Letter Apostolic of Leo XIII. was no new decision, nor was it based on any fresh and free inquiry. 'Inasmuch as the case was submitted by him to
the Holy Office, it is clear that it, being bound by its traditions, could hardly have expressed dissent from the judgment, however ill founded, which was passed in the case of Gordon (§8). Exactly; and there the Archbishops not only rate the condemnation of our Orders at its true worth, but lay their finger, gently yet firmly, on the weak point in the system of the Roman Church. It can reopen nothing. It can never admit that it has made a mistake, even in the facts upon which a doctrinal decision is based. Infallibility, claimed apparently for the decision of Clement XI. about Gordon in Leo XIII.'s Bull, dare not allow even its basis of fact to be questioned. It is a right instinct thus to keep the foe at arm's length by Bulls of condemnation and a steady maintenance of the unapproachable non possumus attitude. But the facts cannot so be buried. In Pole's case, for example, the Archbishops succeed in showing that his action did not square with his opinions. Men who, according to Eugenius IV.'s decree, which Pole re-issued as Papal Legate, ought to have been re-ordained, were permitted, as we now know, thanks to the recent examination of the registers by Mr. Frere, to retain their benefices and exercise their ministrations. The practice of the Roman Court, therefore, as illustrated by the conduct of its legate, does not make so certainly for the nullity of our Orders as the Pope would seem to think (§6). Nor can it be said to have been settled in that direction by what is known of the case of Gordon. The Archbishops point out with perfect justice that, so far as the documents hitherto accessible go, the adverse decision was based on Gordon's petition which 'was vitiated by falsehoods concerning our rite' (§7); while, as to the new documents now alleged as of 'incontestable authenticity,' let them be 'made public if the matter is to be put on a fair footing for judgment' (ib.). We may safely say the challenge will never be accepted. Infallibility, once committed to a doctrinal decision, dreads to expose its basis of fact. Its instinct is to take refuge in other expedients, the tightening of organisation, and a liberal use of Roman cement, to shore up and put a new face on the building, so that it will stand whether undermined or not.

When they come to deal with the Pope's treatment of the question on its merits, the Archbishops at once face round at the real dividing line. They agree with him in the general doctrine of matter, form, and intention; though (§§ 9, 10) they point out that, except in the Sacrament of Baptism, no fixity of matter and form can be required. That cuts away a good deal of ground from the Papal argument as to the form of Orders. But the line of division, as they allow, is intention. Well then: 'the intention of the Church must be ascertained from its public formularies and definite pronouncements which directly touch the main point of the question, not from its omissions and reforms, made as opportunity occurs, in accordance with the liberty which belongs to every province and nation' (§8). There the controversy is carried up to first principles. Again, all through the Bull, the Pope charges Anglicans with the deliberate removal of a certain type of expression, now partially but by no
means fully represented in the Roman rites. It is, no doubt, part of the answer to urge, as our Archbishops do, that the expressions in question are not to be found in early Ordinals, including the Roman (§ 12); and that, if judged by his own tests, the Pope's Orders would turn out to be null too (§ 20). But it is not the whole. There is an obvious difference between the position of the English Church which struck out language that she once employed and the position of ancient or Eastern Churches which never employed it at all. If the Papists like to make the most of that difference, we cannot deny the charge. But we are not concerned to. Strong from their point of view, it amounts to nothing from ours. The Archbishops protest—what you would urge or accept on behalf of any honest man—that what the Church says, and not what she omits, is the index of her mind (§§ 8, 16, 17); and they are content to demand that the language of her Ordinal should be judged by the facts of history and the plain requirements of Scripture. Thus they find it easy to show that, on the points of priesthood and sacrifice, it comes up to the standard of the ancient Western Ordinals, (§§ 12, 13), while it faithfully includes every function ascribed to each order in Holy Scripture (§ 19). That is enough. They add many interesting digressions. In one place they go out of their way to state explicitly Anglican doctrines that have been misrepresented or ignored. 'Further we truly teach the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice'; and then follows (§ 11) an admirable statement of it, concluding with the parenthetic but express assertion that 'the sacrifice of the Eternal Priest and the sacrifice of the Church . . . in some way certainly are one.' At other places they carry the attack, bravely but not defiantly, into regions where Rome has thought or pretended that she was quite secure. Thus they call attention to the fact that there is a gap between her lex credendi and her lex supplicandi in the doctrine of Sacrifice; for that which is professed in the formulae of Trent goes beyond and differs from what may be gathered from the Canon of the Mass (§ 11). They institute, with equal effect, a comparison between the Pontifical and the Ordinal, and 'confidently affirm' that in its larger and more comprehensive setting forth of the nature of the priesthood (§ 19), as in the conciser form in which the commission is bestowed (§ 15), the Ordinal is to be preferred. They challenge directly the Papal assumption that there is, or ever has been, a 'Catholic rite' (§ 16) in such sense as there is a Catholic creed. These are not the words of men with a weak case. But the main point in dispute lies in a nutshell. May local Churches recur to first principles? May they go back to Scripture and antiquity or not? To add that the whole 'Answer' is written in beautiful Latin which Leo XIII. himself will be the first to praise, and that it is learned and scholarly as well as firm and well considered, might seem impertinent and superfluous, but that these merits add to its claim for appreciative study. Let any intelligent Churchman study it well; let him make up his mind whether what is distinctively Roman should have any weight as the standard of doctrine by the
side of what is Scriptural, Catholic, and Primitive; and after this
‘Answer’ he will never be inclined to doubt the strength of his
case.

Studies in Dante. First Series: Scripture and Classical Authors in
Dante. By Edward Moore, D.D., Hon. D. Litt. Dublin,
Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1896.)

This book appears to us to be rather an Academical disquisition
upon matters already known, than a contribution of anything fresh to
the study of Dante’s works. That he was ignorant of Greek, and
therefore knew Aristotle only through the two Latin translations
styled by him the Old and the New, and that there was no Latin
translation of Homer in his time, are facts of which he himself in-
forms us in the Convito, and which are therefore well known to the
serious students of his works, to whom Dr. Moore tells us this
volume appeals. But Dr. Moore assumes that they require the
further caution that they should look to the Vulgate and not the
English version of the Scriptures, if they would trace the use which
Dante has made of Scripture; while, to enable them to form a more
complete idea than he says was before possible of the encyclopædic
character of the poet’s learning and studies, and of the full extent and
variety of his literary equipment, he proceeds to tabulate all his
author’s citations or imitations of, and references and allusions to,
both Scripture and classical authors. And he analyses the result of
this investigation as follows:

‘The Vulgate is quoted or referred to more than five hundred times,
Aristotle more than three hundred, Virgil about two hundred, Ovid about
one hundred, Cicero and Lucan about fifty each, Statius and Boethius
between thirty and forty each, Horace, Livy and Orosius between ten
and twenty each; with a few scattered references, probably not exceed-
ting ten in the case of any one author, to Plato, Homer, Juvenal, Seneca,
Ptolemy, Æsop and St. Augustine, if we may be allowed to extend the
term “classical authors” so as to embrace all those mentioned.’

Dr. Moore also suspects Dante’s knowledge of Valerius Maximus,
though nowhere mentioned by him. Peter Lombard, Bonaventura,
Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, and above all, St. Thomas
Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, to say nothing of Alfraganus and
possibly other Arabian astronomers, fall beyond the limits which Dr.
Moore proposes to himself, but, as he says, would, if included,
largely increase his totals of quotations.

Now we venture to doubt whether it would occur to any student
of Dante to trace his aid from Scripture in any other language than
that of the Vulgate; least of all in English, with which he was not
acquainted. And we are inclined to think that Dr. Moore’s impos-
ing array of Dante’s Scriptural and classical references and quotations
will rather weary than gratify his readers. That Dante was an em-
bodyment of all the learning that the Middle Ages could impart, and

1 These Dr. Moore attributes to Michael Scott and St. Thomas
Aquinas, respectively.
has fully set it forth in his various works, is common knowledge to all who have studied them. But it by no means follows that a student will prefer to have Dante, the Scriptures, and the Classics, put as it were before him in a lump, to being left to discover for himself the various passages, in their proper places, as he reads Dante at large. It was well enough for Virgil to combine Dante and himself in one bundle for the grasp of Antæus; but an addition to it of the Scripture and the classic poets would have made it too heavy even for the giant.

The question occurs to us, 'Where is this process of selection, this partial concordance of Dante's learning, to stop?' May we not expect a further volume, grouping together such subjects, for instance, as all similes and metaphors which he has derived from sport, from the habits of birds or animals, especially falcons, or from natural phenomena; all comparisons which he makes of places or scenery in this world to those met with by him in the other; all references to places by mention of the rivers on which they were situated; all allusions to the bashfulness or modest behaviour of brides and honourable women. This list might be largely increased, but will suffice to illustrate our meaning. Speaking for ourselves, we consider Dante's own rule a golden one: 'Di cui suo loco dicero l'ordigno.' Eclectic dislocation is not to our fancy.

Let it not be supposed that we are insensible to the painstaking labour which Dr. Moore has expended upon these studies. They will be valuable to specialists such as the fellow-Aristotelians whose assistance he acknowledges. He has also brought into prominence one or two points connected with Dante's comparative knowledge of different authors: e.g. the fact that the Odes of Horace had fallen into general oblivion and neglect in his time, and that the epithet 'Satiro' given to him in Inf. iv. 89 seems to show that Dante was not acquainted with the Odes. Dr. Moore acknowledges his obligation for this conclusion to the learned monograph by Dr. Manitius, of Göttingen, entitled *Analekten zur Geschichte des Horaz im Mittelalter, bis 1300.* In like manner he lays stress upon all Dante's knowledge of Plato being limited to the *Timeæus,* as it had been, long before, translated into Latin by Chalcidius.

Dr. Moore prides himself on having extended his researches over all Dante's works instead of limiting them to the *Divina Commedia.* This, no doubt, has been done; but we are not in a position to say how far, with reference to the *Opere Minori,* he has entered into other men's labours. He owns himself, however, under obligation, with regard to the *Convito,* to the Appendix of Mazzuchelli to the 'Minerva' Edition, Padua, 1827, and the *Saggio* of Monti, &c. (the 'Edd. Milanesi'), Milan, 1823; and, as to the *De Monarchia,* to Dr. Witte's elaborate classification of the quotations occurring there. We hope, however, that he has been more sparing in his appropriations from these authors than in those which, so far as the *Divina Commedia* is concerned, he has made from Scartazzini. True it is

---

1 *Poi fece si che un'fascio er' egli ed io,* Inf. xxxi. 135.
2 Inf. xviii. 6.
that he says in his Preface, ‘In the Divina Commedia generally I have been constantly indebted to the exhaustive notes of Scartazzini, though not always able to agree with his conclusions. No one could attempt any sort of work upon this part of Dante without being so indebted.’ But is not this a practical admission that Scartazzini has exhausted the subject, as in truth he has? We fail to see how a subsequent commentator is justified in setting forth the eminent Swiss editor’s reasonings, citations and conclusions as if they were wholly new, and prefacing them, passim, with an ‘I think,’ omitting all acknowledgment of the source from which they are derived. The instances in which their real author is referred to, are few indeed in comparison with those in which he is not. And although here and there Dr. Moore adds a citation of his own from some author, these seldom throw any further light on the matter in hand, and, not seldom, seem prompted by a mere desire to cap his predecessor. Let us take one instance. To

‘Ed io ch’avea d’orror la testa cinta,’

Inf. iii. 31,

Scartazzini most appositely cites

‘At me tum primum sævus circumstetit horror.’

Æn. ii. 559.

Dr. Moore, however, thinks that we may more aptly refer to

‘Hinc exaudiri gemitus, et sæva sonare
   Verbera, tum stridor ferri, tractææ catenaæ.
   Constitit Æneas, strepitumque exterritus hausit.’

Æn. vi. 557–59.

We leave our readers to judge how far the one word ‘exterritus,’ which Dr. Moore prints in italics, more aptly recalls Dante’s expression ‘d’orror la testa cinta,’ than does the ‘circumstetit horror’ of the passage from Æn. ii. The circumstance, dwelt upon by Dr. Moore, that in Æn. vi., ‘Æneas, like Dante here, stands at the “vestibulum” of the place of torment,’ cannot in any way enlarge the meaning of ‘exterritus.’

To return, however, to Dr. Moore’s systematic appropriations from Scartazzini. Such a course, if permissible to him, must be equally so to any one of us; and should his example be largely followed, what will become of Scartazzini’s proprietà letteraria in his 3 vol. Leipsic edition of the Divina Commedia? There is yet another aspect of the matter. We have a right to assume that every serious student of Dante possesses that book. These are the readers to whom Dr. Moore specially appeals. Is it fair to them to adduce, as something fresh, so much that they have already on their shelves? A single instance will suffice. At page 38, and again in greater detail at page 218, Dr. Moore sets out, in words which import a fresh discovery, the fact that, in Purg. xxxiii. 49, Dante, misled by the erroneous reading ‘Naiades’ instead of ‘Laïades’ in Ovid, Mel. vii. 759—which was not corrected till after his time—refers to the Naiads instead of to Òidipus as having solved the riddle of the Sphinx. But all this information is contained in Scartazzini’s note
to the passage in the *Purgatorio*, and is, indeed, much older, since, as he there points out, it is to be found in Monti's *Saggio*. The *Saggio* was published in 1823; Scartazzini's *Purgatorio* in 1875; and this mistake of Dante's and the reason of it have been common knowledge for years past. It is a fair matter for explanation to beginners in Dante studies, such as Dr. Moore's class at the Taylor Institution, or at Gower Street; but it is, to say the least, a work of supererogation to put it before readers who know it beforehand.

We think, moreover, that readers, whether beginners or advanced students, will prefer to go direct to Scartazzini's pages, where they will find, not his conclusions only, but also much further matter, together with citations from St. Thomas Aquinas, the Mystics, and other authors whom Dr. Moore excludes from his investigations. We cannot but contrast with Dr. Moore’s practice Scartazzini’s own scrupulous avoidance of any trespass on a contemporary’s labours. Thus, in the Preface to his last (1896) 1 vol. edition of the *Divina Commedia*, when telling us that he has decided to retain his former Index, he adds, ‘Had I wished to act as a copyist, I might have taken Toynbee’s, with its assistance thoroughly replanned my old one, and then have boasted of the great improvements that I had put into it. But I did not wish to ransack Toynbee.’

To proceed, however. Acting upon Dr. Moore’s observation, at page 4, that with respect to Dante’s classical allusions and reminiscences, irairosearlT?pocr6iivaitoiXXeiirov, we propose to jot down a few additional passages from Homer, Virgil, and Horace, which we think deserve to be cited.

I. Dante and Homer.

‘E la notte de’ passi con che sale
Fatti avea due nel loco ov’eravamo,
E il terzo già chinava in giuso l’ale.’

*Purg.* ix. 7–9.

We do not intend to discuss this well-known terzina, or the much-disputed meaning of the passage which it concludes. Scartazzini, and Dr. Moore himself in his *Time References in the 'Divina Commedia'* have done that very fully. But we notice that neither of them has referred to the two passages in Homer, in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* respectively, which we subjoin:

*Il.* x. 252, 253.

And

*Od.* xiv. 483.

These lines, especially those in the first passage, seem so à propos to Dante’s, that we are fain to suppose that he must in some way have known of them; perhaps, as Dr. Moore says with regard to the parallel which Mr. Butler has suggested between *Par.* xxiii. 25–27

1 Mr. Toynbee’s Index to the Oxford Dante.
and II. viii. 555 sqq., at second hand. That parallel, by the way, seems to us far less close than the one which we here point out.

II. DANTE AND VIRGIL.

(1) "Pars tollere vocem Exiguam; inceptus clamor frustratur hiantes."

\[ \textit{En. vi. 492, 493.} \]

Dr. Moore quotes this passage in illustration of Dante’s description of Virgil, on his first appearance, as one

‘Chi per lungo silenzio parea fioco.’

\[ \textit{Inf. i. 63.} \]

We suggest that the quotation is far more appropriate to \textit{Inf. iii. 27}, ‘\textit{Voci alte e fioche.’} Virgil, when first descried, does not utter a word. There can, therefore, be no reference to his voice in ‘fioco,’ as used in \textit{Inf. i. 63}. Rather, he appears to be in the condition of one who is so feeble that he cannot speak. Dr. Moore makes no new discovery in saying that ‘fioco’ means ‘feeble,’ not ‘hoarse.’

(2) ‘Mostrava come in rottas si fuggiro
Gli Assiri, poi che fu morto Oloferne,
Ed anche le reliquie del martiro.’

\[ \textit{Purg. xii. 58-60.} \]

Dr. Moore comments on this as follows:

‘The prominent part played by the headless trunk [of Holofernes] in the graphic narrative [in Judith, cap. xiv.] leaves no doubt, I think, that this is intended by “reliquie del martiro,” rather than the slain Assyrians, or the head of Holofernes hanging upon the walls (Judith, xiv. 1), one or other of which interpretations is found in most of the early commentaries’ (p. 59).

This is merely a transcript of the substance of Scartazzini’s note \textit{ad loc.} We venture to think that neither his conclusion nor the interpretation which identifies ‘le reliquie del martiro’ with the severed head of Holofernes is right. To us there seems something ludicrous in making ‘le reliquie’ yield up, as it were, the uttermost farthing of its possible meaning by referring it to ‘the remains of the remains of Holofernes,’ whether his head or his headless trunk matters not. We therefore follow the majority of the best commentators in thinking that the allusion is to the Assyrians. Their rout and flight is the subject of the sculpture. The death of Holofernes is mentioned merely as the cause of their panic. The word ‘martiro’ is used elsewhere by Dante as well with respect to sufferings inflicted on a number of persons at once as to those undergone by one individual. See, for instance:

‘Più fur di cento che, quando l’udiro,
S’ arrestaron nel foso a riguardarmi,
Per maraviglia obblando il martiro.’

\[ \textit{Inf. xxviii. 52-54.} \]

We doubt, however, whether Dante is referring to the \textit{slain} Assyrians. Is it not more probable that the allusion is to the small remnant which are supposed to be represented as escaping from the slaughter? The exact conformity of the grammatical construction
'le reliquie del martiro' with that of Virgil's twice repeated description of Æneas and his Trojans as 'reliquias Danaûm atque immitis Achilli' 1 seems to us strongly to support this conclusion. The portrayal of some few of the flying host, left uninjured in the haste of the pursuit, would heighten the spectator's sense of the ruin and slaughter of the vast mass of the fugitives. Moreover, if all were slain, how could they be called 'reliquie'? We have not met anywhere with the interpretation which we suggest; but it is strange if our references to Virgil have not occurred to others besides ourselves. Unfortunately we can get no help from Dante himself: this being the only passage in the Divina Commedia where the word 'reliquie' occurs.

III. Dante and Horace.

(1) 'Presso al mattin del ver si sogna.'

Inf. xxvi. 7.

To the passage from Ovid, Heroid. xix. 195, 196, quoted to this by Scartazzini and Dr. Moore, we may add—

'Vetuit tali me voce Quirinus
Post medium noctem visus, quam somnia vera.'

Horace, Sat. i. x. 32, 33.

(2) 'La mente nostra peregrina
... dalla carne.'—Purg. ix. 16, 17.

Compare

'Dum peregre est animus sine corpore velox.'

Horace, Epist. i. xii. 13.

(3) 'L' animo che vince ogni battaglia
Se col suo grave corpo non s'accascia.'

Inf. xxiv. 53, 54.

Compare

'Corpus onustum
Hesternis vitii animum quoque prægravat una.'

Horace, Sat. ii. ii. 77, 78.

Before we leave the subject of Dr. Moore's quotations, we may mention that he is in error in thinking that the parallel in Dante himself to the meaning of 'alzato' in Purg. x. 64, 65 ('Li precedeva al benedetto vaso, Trescando, alzato, l'umile Salmista') which occurs in Par. xxi. 130–132, where he says of the Cardinals of his own day that they 'voglion quinci e quindì... chi diretto gli alzi,' has not been noticed. Mr. Haselfoot adduced it, nine years ago, in his note to the first of these passages. But Dr. Moore, with his opinion

1 Æn. i. 30, iii. 87. Æneas himself enlarges to Dido on the forlorn condition of the Trojan escaped remnant, as follows:

'Nos, reliquias Danaûm, terraeque marisque
Omnibus exhaustos jam casibus, omnium egenos.'

Æn. i. 598, 599.

The use of 'reliquias' in the sense of something saved out of the midst of destruction is found in Æn. vii. 243, 244, where Ilioneus, on behalf of Æneas, gives Latinus

'fortunae parva prioris
Munera, reliquias Troja ex ardente receptas.'
of the futility of translations of Dante,¹ probably never looks at one. Scartazzini, though he did not cite the parallel in his edition of the Divina Commedia, has now rectified the omission in vol. i. of his Encyclopedia Dantesca, sub v. 'Alzare,' and was doing so, we conjecture, about the same time that Dr. Moore was writing the present work.

We will conclude with a word of praise for the three Indices appended to the book. Two of these are lists of quotations, No. i putting first those from the Vulgate and the different classical authors in order, with the passages from Dante's works bearing upon them respectively printed opposite; while No. 2 reverses this arrangement, putting Dante's works first and the quotations connected with them last. Index III. is a general one of the topics discussed. These Indices seem to us to be the most useful portion of the volume. By their aid, singly or combined, the curious in such matters will easily put together Dante, the Vulgate, and the Classics, sous tous les rapports in which they are connected. They constitute an exhaustive concordance of Dr. Moore's subject, and their preparation must have involved much patient labour.

The Epistle of James, and other Discourses. By R. W. Dale, LL.D., Birmingham. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895.)

It will surprise no one who is well acquainted with Dr. Dale's books on the Atonement and on the Epistle to the Ephesians to hear that this present collection of discourses contains some very valuable passages and some striking lines of theological thought. There are, we know, certain districts of divine truth, such as those which bear upon the chartered channels of grace, with which Dr. Dale did not, from his circumstances, become familiar; and there are some topics, such as the doctrine of originale peccatum (see p. 252), on which he never quite seemed to apprehend what the teaching of the Church really was. These limitations—and they are far from being unimportant—are suggested to the reader of this as of other volumes of Dr. Dale's writings. But, at the same time, what has before led us to value his work now appears again in full measure, and this last volume stands worthily beside the others. The title—chosen, we presume, by Mr. A. W. W. Dale, as the editor of his late father's discourses—cannot be regarded as a very happy one. The ten discourses on the Epistle of St. James² form less than half of the whole book in bulk, and, if we are not mistaken, slightly less still in value. They are expository in character, and borrow much, with free acknowledgment, from the Rev. J. B. Mayor's commentary on the Epistle. Mr. Dale explains in the preface what had to be done

¹ At page 11 he says: 'What would be Dante's feelings if he could see the list of translations in a variety of languages of his own great work? His opinion of the futility of the process would certainly be confirmed by many, if not most of them.'

² See Döllinger's First Age of the Church, i. 176, 235; Salmon's Introduction to New Testament, pp. 223, 562; and Bishop Sanderson's Conscience and Law, pp. 82, 92.
to fit the discourses for publication. As they now appear, with their original form wherever possible retained, they are a careful hortatory commentary upon St. James's very practical letter. That letter is singularly full of unique words and pregnant phrases, is eminently characteristic of a Jewish writer, has important relations to the Old Testament wisdom literature (p. 10) and to the sermon on the Mount, and contributes a peculiar share to the Christology of the New Testament and to its teaching upon the subject of faith. So far as these topics can be made the subjects of exhortation Dr. Dale has had something to say upon each of them, though he has more than once been unduly brief, and has not said nearly enough upon the Christology of St. James. His comments on 'the Father of Lights,' 'the engrafted word,' 'the royal law of liberty,' 'the Lord of Glory,' 'the course of nature' (pp. 24, 42, 48, 61–2, 95), all leave a good deal to be desired. In the second part of the book we have again ten discourses, but on general subjects and independent of each other. Two of these appear to us to stand out as being of special value. The first (p. 160) deals with the old objections that the parable of the prodigal son ignores the Atonement and the remission of penalties for sin in a very powerful and convincing manner, and the second (p. 174) emphasizes the atoning work of the Word made flesh as 'the central fact of the Gospel.' Of the remaining sermons, some are interesting for theological reasons (pp. 141, 227), and one in particular (p. 278) because it contains some very frank criticism upon the views which Congregationalists take of the Christian ministry. The sermons on 'Perfect Salvation' (p. 192), 'Saving Truth' (p. 204), 'Personal Responsibility' (p. 245), 'A servant of Jesus Christ' (p. 261), and a sermon for the new year on p. 302, all bear witness to Dr. Dale's power as an orator, and suggest to us the reflection that the best sons of the Church of England are needed in Birmingham to put the full counsel of God before the people, if its partial delivery is undertaken by such gifted teachers as the late leading Congregationalist minister.


The late Dean of Canterbury justly spoke of this as an important commentary. Its comprehensive object is to exhibit the history of the Hebrew monarchy in a connected narrative, with everything necessary for its elucidation. Mr. Wood has done all in his power

1 See the list of seventy-three words in Grimm's Lexicon, pp. 708–9.
2 Liddon's Bampton Lectures, p. 290, note f (ed. 8).
3 Ottley's Doctrine of the Incarnation, i. 88; Liddon's Bampton Lectures, p. 282.
4 P. 67; Newman's Parochial Sermons, ii. 183.
5 Cf. Hooker, i. v. 2; Pusey's Minor Prophets, p. 613; Ruskin's Seven Lamps of Architecture, p. 12; and S. Athan. ad Afro 8.
to make his work complete. He begins with the agitation of the Israelites for a king when they were chafing under the misconduct of Samuel’s sons, and even adds uniform notes on 1 Samuel i.–vii. for the benefit of those readers ‘whose subject is not merely the period of the monarchy, but the entire books of Samuel’ (Appendix B. p. 750). Side by side with the historical narrative are placed those portions of the prophetic books and those Psalms which, in Mr. Wood’s judgment, appear to be contemporaneous with the events recorded, or to have been expressly written to celebrate them. Very careful notes are placed below the portions of the sacred text, and we must speak in high terms of the help which is given by an excellently arranged synopsis of sections (p. 19), and by the three indices to the text, parallel passages, and notes (pp. 760, 763, 765). The range of Mr. Wood’s work may be roughly estimated by noticing how much of Holy Scripture his plan compels him to discuss. The books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles demand not only full notes, but also careful parallel study, and this they have certainly received. Thirty-six of the Psalms have been found to cast their light upon the historical narrative, and, although we cannot agree in all cases with the date which Mr. Wood assigns to particular Psalms, we are always interested in the reasons which he gives for his decisions. We rejoice that he is among those who place Psalm li. according to its traditional title in David’s life, after his sin with Bathsheba, and that the wilder theories which have been expressed about such obviously Davidic Psalms as the eighty-ninth are firmly set aside. In this connexion the notes on the courses of the singers (pp. 166–7), the gradual Psalms (p. 228), and the additional notes on p. 733, deserve to be mentioned. Mr. Wood has not, we regret to say, considered that the second part of the book of Isaiah has fallen within his scope. The result is that his note on the ‘times’ of Isaiah is meagre and unsatisfactory, and he does not enter upon the date of chaps. xl.–lxxvi. at all (p. 441). In spite, therefore, of some good notes, and in particular the additional notes on pp. 742–3, we are not satisfied with Mr. Wood’s treatment of the greatest of the prophets. Jeremiah’s prophecies and his ‘lamentations’ are more fully discussed, and enough is said upon those portions of Ezekiel and Daniel which fall within the period. A special note on the minor prophets is excellent. The notes on Obadiah are placed in a separate appendix, and the date of the book is discussed but not assigned (p. 758). Mr. Wood, however, has to meet modern requirements and to take recent discoveries into account, and we find that he has carefully studied such information as is to be derived from the Hittite discoveries (p. 735), the black obelisk of Shalmaneser III. (p. 738), the Moabite stone (p. 739), the points of contact between Hebrew and Egyptian history (p. 737), and the Biblical and Assyrian account of Sennacherib’s campaign (p. 745). An honest attempt is made to grapple with chronological problems (p. 740),¹ and some use is made of the new Assyrian chronology. A direction to the

¹ See the Church Quarterly Review, January 1886, pp. 257–71, and Dr. Driver’s note in his Isaiah, p. 12.
reader on this point, which should have been placed at the beginning of the book, will be found buried on p. 466. A few typographical errors may be detected. On p. 228 there is a short piece of thickened type, on p. 739 a parenthesis and a letter are omitted, and Mr. Wood has allowed his prejudice to betray itself by going out of his way to allude to the condemnation of Dr. Pusey's sermon (p. 730). But on the whole we can commend his laborious efforts to the attention of all Old Testament students, and indeed to all who appreciate good literary work.


There will be few readers to whom Mr. Simpson's subject is not a new one, and when the copious supply of its material is taken into account, it is perhaps surprising that it has not hitherto been more generally studied. Of Mr. Simpson's industry in the collection of facts there can be no question, and if in this respect we have any complaint to make, it is that the materials are rather too loosely connected together. Mr. Simpson has been led on from one branch of his subject to another until he has accumulated a great store of information, in the midst of which he stands somewhat helpless and very much conscious of his solitude, for he cannot reach out a hand to many other workers, if any, in exactly the same field, and he is perplexed by the problem whether all this 'wheel-symbolism was carried by means of migration, or if it originated independently in various places' (p. 263). But many men who had worked as hard and done as much as Mr. Simpson has undoubtedly done would be far less ready than he is to acknowledge the limitations of their labours. He is a collector and a pioneer, and he leaves the formation of a final judgment, and indeed the completion and assortment of his information, to others. It is as being suitable for those who are desirous of further study, and as extremely interesting to the general lover of anthropology and folk-lore, that we are led to form a favourable opinion of the book, in spite of its incompleteness and defects of interpretation. Mr. Simpson shows that the Praying-Wheel expresses praise, not prayer (pp. 3, 257), and that the circular movement is symbolical of the solar motion. His own view of his pages is that they contain an exposition of a remarkable passage in which Plato infers that 'the most perfect soul or souls carries round the heavens,' a passage which a friend pointed out to Mr. Simpson only when his work was done (pp. 2, 6). The evidence of various forms of what Carlyle called 'the rotatory calabash' (p. 3) is gathered from Tibet, India, Egypt, China and Japan, from Brahminism and Buddhism, and from the old Sanscrit books. The wheels in the Book of Ezekiel fall into their place among the usages of the Semites (pp. 125, 141), the Greek system is described (p. 156), and the various circular processions and customs of the Christian Church

1 See Perowne on Psalm lxxvii. 18.
are examined (p. 173). Among the Gauls, the Teutons, and the Celts, too, these curious circular movements in their customs abounded (p. 182); and when Mr. Simpson gets to the freedom of treatment allowed in additional notes (p. 265), he inserts quite a bewildering mass of facts about wheels, the ceremonial of sacred fires, 'clipping' (*i.e.* encircling) churches, May-day and midsummer customs, Easter-eggs, St. Vitus's dance, and the like. A word should be added upon the numerous pictorial illustrations, and if, in conclusion, we may express further desires, we will say that we shall be glad to see what are Mr. Simpson's mature conclusions when he has had time to form them upon the facts which he has collected.

**Jewish Life in the Middle Ages.** By **Israel Abrahams, M.A.**

*(London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)*

'The Middle Ages' is an elastic term, and it was on any interpretation a period which was filled with extremely interesting varieties of life, and as one district of ignorance after another is attacked we can say that we are beginning to know a little more about it. Mr. Abrahams has availed himself to the full of the freedom from fixed limits of time with which the expression 'the Middle Ages' is treated, and although he has avoided details of a later date than the fifteenth century he has not hesitated to notice traces of mediaevalism in the period between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. There are still many, it must be feared, who think of the mediaeval Jew as a ghouls solely occupied with usury and other blood-sucking occupations. But the very large collection of materials in this entertaining description of Jewish life will make that conception impossible in the future even on the part of a careless reader. Jewish influences were at work in the great European movements of the Middle Ages, and in scientific, commercial, and philosophical affairs the Jews took no small part in the march of progress by the ideas which they transmitted and the articles of commerce which they exchanged. Mr. Abrahams is inclined to think that Mr. Rashdall has hardly done justice to the influence of Jewish physicians in the mediaeval Universities (Intro. p. xx), and to put his readers in the way of judging accurately how great were the services of Jews to commerce he not only gives his own evidence, but refers to the interesting Christian treatise by Bédarride on *Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne.*

He is able to tell us (Pref. p. vii) that he honestly believes that not five in a hundred of his very numerous citations have been set down without reference to the original sources. An index of Hebrew authorities is printed on pp. 431–6, and a large number of these are quoted from the Hebrew *Responsa* literature, which contains a vast store of information in the form of rabbinical answers to questions. A general index, fairly complete, but with occasional deficiencies in cross-references, makes the tracing of particular points easy, whether they have a special chapter devoted to them or not. In this way with very little trouble we can examine a great many details about Jewish life in England, France, Germany, Spain, and Italy, the way in which the Jews were treated by various Popes and Councils, the
use of music, the customs of the Sabbath, and the habits of women. Mr. Abrahams begins with the synagogue as the Jewish centre of social life (pp. 1, 15), and with the communal organization of the Jews (p. 35). The tendency of people of one nationality to concentrate in separate quarters of towns produced the institution of the ghetto, a word derived, says Mr. Abrahams, 'from the Italian geto, or iron-foundry, in the neighbourhood of which the first ghetto in Italy was constituted at Venice in 1516' (p. 62). Here we have to note the social morals of the Jews (p. 83), their share in the slave trade (p. 96), their home life, with their customs of love, courtship, and marriage (pp. 113, 163, 186), their trades and occupations, on which some instructive appendices are given (pp. 211, 245), their relation to the stage (p. 251), their dress and the obligation of wearing a badge (p. 273), their charities (p. 307) and schools (p. 340), their pastimes (p. 373), and the personal relations which were possible between Jews and Christians (p. 399). It is clear that these subjects afford scope for all sorts of curious illustrations, and Mr. Abrahams has succeeded in rousing our thorough interest and adding very greatly to our knowledge. We can only give a few samples of his stores of information, but they will suffice to send readers to his book if they wish for much more reading of the same kind. We are told that the Jews played chess on the Sabbath; but the chessmen were made of silver, to mark the honour of the occasion (p. 388). When they were forced to go to church on Holy Cross Day the ears were examined on entering the churches, for they were suspected of stopping them with cotton, and overseers were appointed to see that they kept awake during the two-hour sermon that was delivered to them (p. 418). We can condemn this harsh folly on its own demerits, without reminding ourselves that the Jews introduced coffee into England (p. 138), or that the use of tobacco, at least in Europe, was discovered by a Jew (ibid.). They took snuff, even on the Sabbath, and it is worth noting that they almost monopolize the trade in tobacco in England to-day (p. 139). We are not surprised to find that when the house was being searched for leaven before the Passover 'the boys played many a prank,' or that they made bonfires with the boughs after the feast of Tabernacles, and roasted apples in them (p. 128), or that they were sometimes strapped, and played a Jewish game of vice versa, in which the boys dressed up as Rabbis (p. 383). These, no doubt, are touches which show that 'a Jew hath eyes,' and the rest, as Shylock said. But Mr. Abrahams need not have gravely told us that 'Jews never ate fish that was not perfectly fresh,' and that 'a similar remark applies also to poultry' (p. 129), and in a later passage it is beside the mark to point out that the Jews did not place on their table an animal slain in the chase, as a reason

1 Mr. Wilhelm Steinitz, of whom a premature obituary notice appeared in the Times on February 23, 1896, was, like many leading chess-players, born of Jewish parents.
3 The reader of ancient history will recall the severities visited on the Jews at Alexandria (Socrates, Hist. vii. 13–16).
for not eating the 'doe' which was caught at Colchester in 1267, when the bailiff and the beadle 'came upon them and carried thence the game, and had their will of it' (p. 377). But it is curious to read that on New Year's Eve a sheep's head was often eaten, and that beef was too ordinary a viand for the merry time of Purim (p. 151). It was a worthy custom to plant a cedar when a boy was born, while a girl's birth was marked by an acacia (p. 196). There is a misprint in the last sentence but one on p. 388.


Annual courses of lectures on preaching must either tend to follow a stereotyped model or must lay the lecturer open to the charge of departing too widely from the intention of the founder. Dr. Van Dyke has preferred to expose himself to this charge, and has boldly struck out a new line in his contribution to the series. The art of preaching, he says, 'is only a part of the larger art of life' (p. vi), and he frankly confesses that he has had a wider circle of men and women in view than his immediate audience. His opening lecture on 'An Age of Doubt' (p. 3) shows that he is quite familiar with current popular literature, and that he is deeply sensible of the melancholy hopelessness which has settled down upon the agnostic world. But he thinks that he sees signs of at least a yearning for a brighter day, and he maintains that this desire can be fully satisfied by the personal Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. The theme, therefore, of his second lecture is that the Gospel is not the declaration of a system of thought, but the proclamation of the life of a Person (p. 43), who was, as the lecturer proceeds to show in his next lecture (p. 83), the eternal Son of God in our flesh, unveiling the Father to man and reconciling man to God. In a series of passages of remarkable eloquence and power Dr. Van Dyke dwells upon the loyalty of the early Church in 'maintaining against direct assault and secret dissolution the real and personal deity of Christ' (pp. 107-10). And, more than this, he concludes by saying that 'to imagine that we can adapt our preaching to this age of doubt by weakening, concealing, or abandoning the truth of the deity of Christ is to mistake the great need of our times. It is to seek to commend our Gospel by taking away from it the chief thing that men really want—an assurance of sympathy and kinship with God' (p. 122). We know not on what historical grounds Dr. Van Dyke says that 'Athanasius was not an altogether lovely person' (p. 109), and we rather suspect that he is only pandering to a modern spirit when he says that 'Athanasius with all his faults was on the right side, and Arius with all his virtues was on the wrong side' (p. 110). And when he speaks of the 'sharply tri-personal Trinity of Athanasius' (p. 111) we can only suppose that he is either referring in a very loose and unscholarly fashion to the *Quicunque vult* or that he forgets the numerous passages in the writings of St. Athanasius in
which the mutual coinherence of the three Divine Persons is emphasized, and which form one excellent illustration of the fine theological balance of that great father.\(^1\) Nor must we omit to say that the fourth lecture, on ‘The Human Life of God’ (p. 125), which is intended to bring out the real humanity of our Lord, goes much further than avoiding Eutychian error. It is possible, as every student of St. John’s Gospel knows, to combine the fullest acknowledgment of our Lord’s humanity with a complete recognition of the truth of His divine Person. Dr. Van Dyke not only is betrayed into the use of dangerous language himself on the human nature of our Lord, its qualities and its limitations, but he even thinks that Dr. Liddon’s Bampton Lectures rob us of the sympathy of Christ (p. 139). We miss also, in a passage on the dogmatic definitions of the Church (p. 131), a reference to their defensive character. The heretic who attacked some truth about the Person and Natures of Christ was the real cause of the formation of a dogmatic barrier to ward off his error. We are afraid also that the lecturer lays himself open to the charge of thinness and inadequacy when he treats of ‘He emptied Himself’ on p. 147. But when we have taken all these passages into account, and some more of a similar kind which could be quoted, the result and conclusion is that Christ Himself, as presented in the Gospels and preached by the Church, is Christianity. We can go on, then, in fellowship with Dr. Van Dyke when he presents our Lord as ‘the Source of authority in the kingdom of heaven’ (p. 170). In the presence of this Master the great problems of life, the freedom of the will, the relation of God to the universe, and man’s duty to his fellow-men, find their answer. Christian Liberty, the Divine Sovereignty, and Christian Service are, therefore, the subjects of the remaining lectures (pp. 205, 247, 283), in which will be found an able statement of the theme that ‘we must enter into life by giving ourselves to the living Christ, who unveils the love of the Father in a human life, and calls us with divine authority to submit our liberty to God’s sovereignty in blessed and immortal service to our fellow-men for Christ’s sake’ (p. 317).

A very large number of extracts, chiefly from modern literature, are printed in the Appendix (pp. 321–445), of which the most striking is a village discussion on miracles (p. 420). We are prepared to put up with ‘foreword’ for preface, and with the usual forms of American spelling which occasionally meet the eye; but ‘a factual gospel’ for a Gospel of facts (p. 57), ‘Aiden’ for St. Aidan (p. 312), and ‘self-beggary’ (p. 147) are samples which are outside our ordinary experience.

**The Old Testament and Modern Life.** By Stopford A. Brooke.

(London: Isbister, 1896.)

When Mr. Brooke delivered these discourses, which are so curiously different from Christian sermons, he was in the habit of beginning each of them with a short disquisition on the various elements, mythical, legendary, and historical, which he seemed to himself to find in the

---

\(^1\) See, for example, the full treatment of St. John xiv. 10 in *Orat.* iii. 3.
subject chosen. These introductions are now omitted, or rather they are summarized and generalized in 'a word of criticism' which opens the book (p. 9). From this we learn what view Mr. Brooke takes of 'the stories which collected themselves round some of the great names in Jewish history.' He takes the great patriarchal tales in the Book of Genesis to be 'prehistoric, no more historically true than the tales of Achilles, of Aeneas, of King Arthur.' They arose, we are to believe, in the form of short lays or narrations sung or recited from camp to camp of the wandering tribes. As they were recast different kinds of legendary elements crept into them, and when they were reduced to writing 'there were two great parent documents, distinguished by the use of two different names of God' (pp. 10–1). A post-Exilic reviser wove them into a work of art, of which the most valuable part to the Jews and to us, Mr. Brooke thinks, is its representation of men and women with great characters, Abraham being the greatest of all. After the time of Genesis, when Mr. Brooke comes to Moses, Joshua, Deborah, David, and Elijah, he supposes himself to be nearer to pure history; but even here legend and theology have added more than half of the materials to the historical basis of fact. Mr. Brooke may well feel that it is necessary to explain (p. 15) how discourses can be preached upon a narrative which is thus regarded. He says what there is to be said in favour of the proceeding, that the stray elements of truth are of historical value, that the impressions left upon the stories by the various editors are themselves history, that the mode of life which they describe is the real way in which people lived in the East, and that as noble tales of human life they enable us to read the experience of our own hearts. If the Jew as earnestly as the Christian should insist that this view of Holy Scripture entirely ignores its unique character, Mr. Brooke will go so far as to admit that the stories received a religious direction from the final editor, but he goes no further. If the Christian wishes to give due emphasis to the significance of the biographies of the Old Testament as typical prophecies of the Second Adam, in whom all that is noble and good in the human family is summed up, he may do so indeed in the company of the New Testament writers, but he must entirely part company with Mr. Brooke. And if the Churchman points out that it is hopeless to understand a divinely-inspired narrative by no other faculties than human wit and literary gracefulness, and that the Church does not recognize the right of any one so to treat the Book of which she is the witness and keeper, he may be able to support his contention by the unvarying testimony of all the Fathers from the time of Tertullian's De præser. haereticorum; but Mr. Brooke is dead to the influence of this steadying force. It is only when ordinary Christians can entirely put aside the view of Holy Scripture which they have learned as little children—and why should they put aside what has brought them such unspeakable comfort all the days of their life?—that they can read Mr. Brooke's discourses with either pleasure or profit. When they have, however, done this, and taken the Bible at Mr. Brooke's unhappy valuation, they will admire his
style and his cleverness, and the ready way in which he hits off many
of the morals to be drawn from the circumstances of modern life.
But while they hold their old faith they will only be pained by so
many brilliant passages in opposition to their cherished convictions.
And as Mr. Brooke seems to regard argument on the subject as
lying outside his beat there is little to be learned about the reasons
which have led him to his present barren strand.

'The labour of many silent years' (Pref. p. vii) which Mr. Blair has
spent upon the study of the Gospels entitles his work to the respect-
ful attention of scholars. He claims textual evidence as the sole
base of his argument, and by a rearrangement of materials he obtains
a chronological memoir which, he says, agrees in outline with the
fourth Gospel, enables us to distinguish the constituents of the
second, reveals the origin of the first and third, and takes its place
as the oral tradition of the Apostles. There are two conclusions of
the Gospel problem which Mr. Blair accepts as certain. One is that
the second Gospel was in existence before the first and third, and
was used by the authors of those two Gospels. The other is that
another document was also used by these two later Evangelists.
This is the document which Mr. Blair attempts to construct and to
place before us. In his short but closely-reasoned introduction
(pp. 1-20) he tells us what has previously been done by other
labourers in this field, and he lays down the principles upon which
he has proceeded. The materials which are peculiar to St. Luke
are manifestly inserted in some cases in pursuit of a special purpose
on the part of the Evangelist. But there are other passages which
form new starting-points (p. 9), and Mr. Blair conjectures that in
these cases we have the original sequence of the apostolic document.
There are also passages in St. Matthew which complete the thought
of St. Luke, and which Mr. Blair holds to be much more numerous
than has been supposed (p. 10). From the clue of original sequence
and the study of St. Luke's omissions he also infers that the apostolic
source was chronologically arranged (p. 12). In this way he gets an
outline sketch of our Lord's ministry from the Sermon on the Mount
to the discourse on the coming of the kingdom, and then by arguing
first backwards (p. 13) and then forwards (p. 14) he feels able to in-
clude some incidents at the beginning of our Lord's ministry and the
Passion and the Empty Tomb at the close. The written document,
as thus reconstructed, contains narratives which involve miracle, and
which cannot be excluded; but Mr. Blair finds room here for the
convenient hypothesis of oral accretions (p. 17). He considers that
the testimony of Papias confirms the existence of such a primitive
Gospel (p. 19). What the contents of the document are may readily
be seen by perusing the text, which Mr. Blair prints on pp. 23-78.
We will mention a few significant points, and then refer to the
largest and most laborious part of Mr. Blair's task when he gives the
grounds for his decisions in 'a critical reconstruction of the text'
The Apostolic Gospel in Mr. Blair's hands begins with the baptism of St. John. It omits, therefore, the entire record of the nativity, infancy, and childhood of our Lord. All reference to the Resurrection, except the fact that the body of Jesus was not found in the tomb on the third morn, is also omitted. But the analysis allows much to remain which we do not know how to explain if we are not to believe that our Lord Jesus Christ was the Incarnate Son and Word of the Father, and that He rose from the dead on the third day. For example, Mr. Blair includes the miraculous incidents at the Baptism of our Lord, His temptation, many of His miracles, many passages which involve His self-assertion, His question upon David's use of the term 'Lord,' the description of the scene 'when the Son of Man shall come in His glory,' and the reply to the question of the High Priest, 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' If it be urged that a document of this kind requires us to believe either in much more or much less than it contains, Mr. Blair would reply that he has written not as an apologist, nor as an advocate of naturalism, but simply as a critic of the materials which were before him (Pref. p. vii), and he evidently believes in his own absolute sincerity and freedom from bias. He is even able to shut his own eyes to the difficulties which his text creates and to congratulate the critic who walks in his company until 'he stands beside the empty tomb with a clear conception of the ministry, a new comprehension of the teaching, and a finer appreciation of that great Personality which has gained the homage of men' (p. 16). Now upon that we have to observe that Mr. Blair appears to us to be unconsciously possessed by a spirit of strong bias, which affects his decisions all through the work of reconstruction, and which has prevented him from seeing that What think ye of Christ? is a question which must be answered. The four Gospels give the answer to that question, which is guarded by the language of the Nicene Creed; but Mr. Blair's document tells of a Person who acted as other men cannot act, while it neither says whence He came nor whither He went. Moreover, the 'freedom' of which Mr. Blair is conscious in the work of reconstruction is of such a character that a hundred men could produce a hundred books like this, and say just as much for their version of a new patchwork Gospel as Mr. Blair says for his. A great deal more than textual evidence enters into his decisions, as a few examples of his mode of treatment will show. Mr. Blair observes that St. Luke tells us that our Lord prayed at His Baptism, and that the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form. On this he says, 'The first of these additions may be adequately explained as an editorial inference intended for the edification of the readers; and the second, which makes the vision objective, is, like the voice in the first Gospel, incompatible with the mission of John's messengers' (p. 83). Here the significance of many passages in which our Lord is said to have prayed is entirely ignored, and a very shallow view of the character of St. John the Baptist underlies the second part of the comment. Mr. Blair's opening remark on the Sermon on the Mount is that it is 'the pons asinorum of the Gospels' (p. 88), but it is only fair to say
that we have found no other sentence in the book which has shocked us quite so much as this. Again, we should say that Mr. Blair's remarks on the parables of the Great Supper and the Marriage Feast were arbitrary if we did not remember that that term is supposed to describe only those preconceptions with which orthodox writers approach the study of the Gospels (pp. 209-13). For Mr. Blair's way of arguing about the identity of these two parables, their 'editorial' parts, and the 'unhistorical' character of St. Luke's context and St. Matthew's narrative, may be fairly illustrated by a so-called argument on the interpretation of the parables. 'Matthew's interpretation is ecclesiastical, and the conclusion inevitably follows that the connexion is purely editorial' (p. 211). What seems to us to follow inevitably from this, and from a very large number of similar passages, is a conclusion about Mr. Blair's work which we will only refrain from expressing because he tells us that he has worked so hard at his book for so many years. This conclusion is ratified in no place more strongly than at the close of Mr. Blair's work (pp. 392-3), where we read that the baptismal formula of St. Matt. xxviii. 19 is 'an ecclesiastical combination,' that the assurance 'I am with you alway' is 'an editorial version' of an earlier authentic saying, that the signs which, 'according to the later Mark,' would follow them that believe were 'suggested' by a passage in St. Luke, and 'finally the ecclesiastical ultimatum' of St. Mark xvi. 16 'perverts in repeating the preaching of repentance unto life.' We may be forgiven for observing that this style of treating the holy Gospels sounds more like the utterances of a lady novelist who dabbles and blunders in what she calls criticism than the serious effort of a student. But Mr. Blair holds that 'in maintaining that these commissions are genuine, theologians simply waste their words and provoke unqualified scepticism.' The reply to this is that the faith of the Church in a living and ascended Christ who delivered these commissions has enabled men to purify their emotions, to answer the inquiries of their intellects, and to satisfy the highest aspirations of their souls for nineteen centuries, while Mr. Blair gives us another Gospel, which is not another, which takes us to an empty tomb, freezes our hearts, raises endless and unanswerable difficulties before our minds, has no Christ to commune with our spirits, and leaves us in a condition, yet in our sins, of utter weariness and despair.


We do not attach much importance in themselves to the guesses and essays which this brilliant and graceful writer has put forth in his old age. His interesting personality and his attractive style will, we do not doubt, win far more attention for his book than it deserves. It may be well, therefore, to endeavour to express a true estimate of its value. Dr. Goldwin Smith has come with sorrow in his old age to say a respectful but complete farewell to the 'creed which is still that of men who are the salt of the earth' (Pref. p. vi). He still tries to
say, with as much assurance as he can command, that our hearts tell us that there is a Supreme Being, and that if we seek truth He will enable us in due time to find it, and our nature tells us that our salvation must lie in our uncompromising allegiance to it. Moreover he is moved to say that no one will rejoice more than he to see the more welcome view reasserted and fresh evidence of its truth supplied. We shall be glad if we can afford rejoicing of that kind to Dr. Goldwin Smith. He himself supplies us with one more testimony to the fact that the soul of man is only to be satisfied by the God of Christianity. This is as plainly shown by his present tone of yearning sadness as it is by Tertullian's 'anima naturaliter Christiana' and St. Augustine's 'feci nost ad Te.' In fact, the sadness which Dr. Goldwin Smith is now experiencing is commonly associated with old age when it is not illuminated by the consoling light of Christian Faith. The study of the contrast between the Christian and non-Christian views of old age is as profitable as it is remarkable and we are bound at the outset of our criticism to refer to it, and to say that it does not necessarily follow that as we grow older we also grow less likely to be led astray by delusive errors. The story of the way in which Dr. Smith abandoned his old beliefs is very simply told. For him the account of the Fall of Man was the weakest link in the whole chain of revelation. When he was once persuaded that the historical character, the authenticity, and divine authority of the early chapters of Genesis must be given up, he let go forthwith, as a necessary consequence in his opinion, his hold upon the Redemption and the Incarnation (Pref. p. vi; pp. 50, 166, 181). This will indicate the general drift of the essays on 'The Church and the Old Testament' (p. 49), and 'The Miraculous Element in Christianity' (p. 137). It is not difficult for us to meet such a position as this, because for our part we believe that the story of the Fall in Genesis describes a

1 See Church, Human Life and its Conditions, pp. 56-7.
2 Tertullian's Apology, § 17; cf. On the Testimony of the Soul, § 2.
3 St. Aug. Confessions, i. i; cf. Hooker, i. ii. 1; Newman, Parochial Sermons, v. 315; The Christian Year for the Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, stanzas 6, 9; Liddon's Advent Sermons, ii. 64.

The following references will enable our readers to study the subject for themselves: Ps. lxxi. 8, 16, xc. 10, xcii. 13, Eccles. xii., St. John xxi. 18; Johnson, Vanity of Human Wishes, lines 255-310; The Christian Year, Second Sunday after Epiphany, Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, and All Saints' Day, stanza 2; Dr. Bright's inspiring verses on 'Latter Years,' in Iona, p. 148; M. Arnold's dreary picture of 'Growing Old,' in Poems, ii. 67 (Macmillan, 1877); Crabbe's Poetical Works, p. 208; Sir E. Arnold's Light of Asia, p. 58; R. H. Hutton's comment on the genius of Wordsworth in Literary Essays, p. 91; Cicero, De Senectute, c. 5 (where he gives four reasons why old age is miserable); Pater's description of the old age of M. C. Fronto in Marius the Epicurean, i. 220; a beautiful passage in Pusey's Minor Prophets, p. 2; Besant's Eulogy of Richard Jefferies, p. 265; Ashwell's Lectures on the Holy Catholic Church, p. 33; The Spectator on 'Abnormal Longevity,' April 13, 1889, p. 507; Paley's Works (Nelson, 1860), p. 699; and Browning's descriptions of the old age of St. John and Pope Innocent, in Works, vii. 120, x. 71.
fact in the history of the human race in language which God Himself chose as best fitted for that purpose, and we should begin by asking Dr. Smith to consider that the fallen state of man is a fact which may be tested by experience and observation quite apart from the explanation given of it in Genesis. Dr. Smith admits that if there is a Supreme Being He cares for us, and we should ask him whether it is not reasonable that such a Being should step in to raise His children from their present state, as Christians believe Him to have done in the Incarnation. As he speaks of the late Dr. Mozley as 'the Butler of our day'—a true description (p. 67)—we may ask him to study that writer's acute discussion of the subject of 'originale pecatum'; and as many of the arguments which Dr. Smith employs are answered by anticipation in St. Athanasius's beautiful little treatise De Incarnatione Verbi Dei, we may commend that to his notice, with the recommendation, which we are sure will be of value in his eyes, that it hardly contains one technical theological phrase in it from beginning to end. But while we ourselves have no difficulty in meeting Dr. Smith's contention about the Fall we should read with very keen interest the answer which would be made by those divines who have gone a considerable way to meet the description which is given of the early chapters of Genesis in this book, such as Professor Bonney and one of the Lux Mundi essayists, who are referred to on pp. 50–1, and perhaps were in Dr. Smith's mind when he expressed a wish that clergymen could write with perfect freedom (Pref. p. viii), and alluded to their uneasy mental state (p. 200). We should like also to see, though we confess with less eagerness, what Professor Drummond, Mr. Kidd, and Mr. Balfour would have replied to Dr. Smith's sharp criticisms of their works in the first essay, which gives its title to the volume (pp. 9–21, 22–32, 33–44), and how Dr. Salmond would meet the treatment of his work on immortality in the essay 'Is there another Life?' (p. 99). What is of more immediate concern is the answer which Dr. Smith gives to the question, How much is left when all miracles, all fulfilled Messianic prophecies, and all belief in the Trinitarian Creed have been given up? We are sorry to say that not nearly so much is left as Dr. Smith, with a faint and wistful hope, would fain retain (p. 173). What can remain of the character of Him who claimed what was not really His? What grounds are there for supposing that all His sayings which involved tremendous self-assertion are false, while all those which infuse an ethical beauty into the Gospels are true? How many of the parables are there in which the demands of the Speaker upon the allegiance of His hearers is not as strongly marked as the unapproachable perfection of the earthly story? If the miracles are not true, how can 'the halo of miracle' be 'worthy of the figure'? Surely 'if there is a Supreme Being, and if He is anywhere manifest in human history, it is' not 'here' (p. 175). When the Gospel records are only regarded as 'four compilations of legend' (ibid.) it does not make up

1 Dr. Smith himself says (p. 130) that 'what we call evil is a part of the constitution of the universe.'

2 Lectures, p. 148.
for the countless difficulties that appear to be able to say that we are set free from the belief that the greater part of mankind is lost for ever, from belief in the God of Dante and of Predestination (Pref. p. vii). And as Dr. Smith makes no pretence of getting any positive comfort out of his present position it will be worth while to mention some passages which show that he has not apparently studied what can be said against many of his conclusions. There is, for example, no small number of passages in which Dr. Smith makes use of objections which are common in the columns of vulgar infidel newspapers, such as Mr. Ingram answers in Victoria Park on any summer Sunday afternoon, and which ought not to be repeated by a serious and educated writer, because they have received full answers. Thus he brings the sins of David's later life against the description of him as 'the man after God's own heart' (p. 72), and ignores the fact that every passage in Holy Scripture which so describes David refers to his early life, when he was chosen to be king.1 A still worse instance in a writer who may be supposed to remember at least the elements of his Greek grammar occurs in the alleged discrepancy between Acts ix. 7 (φωνησ) and xxii. 9 (φωνη) (p. 146). Dr. Smith speaks of the high 'intellectual quarters' from which the voices of unbelief come (p. 4) as if he had never heard of any great men of science or statesmen who had accepted the Christian faith with the mind of little children. With a belief in bigness which he has presumably acquired across the Atlantic he labels dogmatic religion as geocentric (pp. 5, 165), and ignores the teaching which is as old as St. John2 and St. Paul,3 and is enshrined in one of the grandest chapters of Patristic literature,4 to the effect that the Word of the Father was ruling the universe while He was here in the body. He refers to some of the Psalms 'which it is shocking to hear a Christian congregation reciting' (p. 77), and, instead of examining the ground on which the Church employs this language, contents himself with a reference to Lux Mundi. In a similar manner he refers to such matters as the 'stopping of the sun' and the 'transformation of Nebuchadnezzar' without any sign of having read what Professor Pritchard and Dr. Pusey have said on those subjects. Such instances might be indefinitely multiplied by quoting Dr. Smith's one-sided remarks on immortality (p. 82), the resurrection of the body (pp. 108, 116), St. Luke's trust-worthiness in the Acts and also in the Gospels (p. 147, 155), vicarious punishment (p. 50), the Second Epistle of St. Peter (p. 150), the date of the Last Supper (p. 157), miracles (pp. 144, 160), prophecy (p. 167), and dreams (p. 231). A few significant admissions ought to be noticed, such as that Christianity is the only religion that is universal in fact (p. 140), that Renan's Life of our Lord is as a biography 'worth no more than the rest' (p. 176), and that it might be well to find some motive for morality, at least among the masses, before they are deprived of religion (p. 199). Some words are curiously divided, such as prog-ress (p. 10), omnip-otence (p. 11), and effect-ual (p. 34).

1 1 Sam. xiii. 14; xvi. 1, 12, 18; Ps. lxxxix. 20; Acts xiii. 22.
2 St. John, i. 10.
3 Col. i. 16, 17.
4 St. Athanasius, De Inc. Verbi Dei, cxvii.
If Dr. Smith will examine his 'Guesses' from the other side, and will be fair to the filial cravings for a Father which are in every man's heart, he should end in that rejoicing which, as he confesses, he desires to experience.


The Bishop of Durham has commended these lectures 'to the study of our Clergy and Laity, who feel with a vague sense of sad helplessness the needs and sorrows and dangers of our great towns' (p. vii). We strongly advise the clergy, both in town and country, to procure this little volume, which has recently been published in a cheaper form, and study it; for they are certain to be interested, and will, probably, gather many helpful suggestions from its teaching. Canon Moore Ede writes with great vigour and earnestness, and with a complete knowledge of his facts, and though we cannot always endorse his views, we are quite in sympathy with him on many of the points upon which he insists. The first lecture deals with the function of the Church in the work of Social Reform, the other three treat of the Unemployed, the Homes of the People, and the Vices of our Towns. Three points are specially emphasized, and deserve attention, viz.:

1. That it belongs to the Prophetic Office of the Church to stir men's consciences to a sense of their responsibility for the lives of their fellow men and the conditions under which they live (pp. 26, 91-2, 126).

2. That 'the other side of love is righteousness' (Preface by Bishop of Durham, p. xi), that is to say, the principle of brotherhood involves coercion and restraint where love fails to influence (pp. 29-30, 94).

3. That, after all, Religion is the surest way of promoting social improvement, and that by 'the development of the spirit in man' (pp. 130, 131). [Compare what is said of the effects of Wesley's preaching (pp. 9, 10).]

For these principles we are most grateful to Canon Moore Ede, for though they are not new, they are often forgotten. Unfortunately, the lecturer has a strong anti-theological bias, which takes away from the effect of what he urges; for it can scarcely be said, with any truth, that the High Church party has done less than others for the social improvement of the people, or has failed to attract the masses to religion, while it has maintained the teaching of the Church in all its fulness, and has exhibited the same in an ornate or dignified ritual. Indeed the work of Father Lowder and Mr. A. H. Mackonochie will go far to prove the contrary. It is, therefore, foolish to entertain the complaint 'that the Church is so taken up with the concerns of the world to come, with theological doctrines and ritual, that it is of little use in helping to make this world brighter and better.'
(p. 22). And such a statement as the following: ‘The Church has said a great deal about the mystery of the Godhead, and comparatively little about manifesting a brotherly spirit in all our dealings with our fellow men’ (p. 23), is very misleading; so much so, that the lecturer felt bound to add a note modifying it.

Throughout these lectures there is a confusion about ‘the Church’; apparently, it is not used of her in her corporate life, but of her individual members; but this is not always clear. It would have been wiser to say ‘Churchmen’ instead of ‘the Church.’ It is clearly laid down by the lecturer that ‘the Church’ ought not to frame a programme of social reforms (p. 13), and that ‘as an organised body’ she ought not to undertake social work (p. 98), but that she is to confine herself to acting ‘as a watchman on the walls,’ inspiring democracy, rousing ‘Town councils and those who elect them to the sense of their powers,’ and creating ‘a righteous public opinion’ (p. 99); but elsewhere ‘the Church’ is told that she ought to do this and that; and we find that a note is needed (p. 30) to explain that ‘if the Church be what it should, men and women will not be found wanting prepared for this particular sphere of service.’

This is rather a ‘climb-down’ from the general tone of the lectures, and gives them an appearance of exaggeration, but perhaps it is only due to the great earnestness of the lecturer and his enthusiasm for social improvements.

There is no need to examine the book in detail, for it should be read by every one who is interested in the welfare of the poor; but, probably, the fourth lecture will appeal most strongly to the clergy, because it deals with those vices which daily confront them in parochial work. What is said of drunkenness (pp. 112–123) and of immorality (p. 126, compare pp. 82–3) meets entirely with our approval, especially this remark about the latter: ‘The Church must emphasise the sanctity of the marriage tie, and the Divine character of the Home as God’s training school for true citizenship’ (p. 126). We could have wished that more had been said about the causes and the evils of the gambling spirit which has seized upon all classes in our time. It is of no good to abuse the Turf and the Stock Exchange (p. 125), while we allow every football match in the North of England to be an occasion of gambling for men, women and children. We wish Canon Moore Ede would suggest some practical remedies for this evil, which at the present time is hindering the spiritual work of the Church more than the sufferings of the unemployed or the over-crowding of the dwellings of the poor.

_Sowing to the Spirit._ By A. B. T. (London: Eliot Stock, 1895.)

This little book is meant to be a help ‘to young people in the critical years which follow Confirmation’ (Preface). The idea is an excellent one, and the subjects are well chosen, but we doubt whether these addresses will fulfil the hope of the writer. They are thoroughly devout, reverent, and orthodox, and full of Holy Scripture, but they will scarcely attract or interest ‘young people,’ unless they be quite simple folk or very much in earnest. The truth is, the
addresses rarely rise above the level of ordinary or commonplace, though here and there is an illustration which comes as a relief, e.g. from Nicholas Herman (p. 27), from Marcus Aurelius's Meditations (pp. 105, 168), from General Gordon (p. 121), and from Mrs. Ewing's Story of a Short Life. Perhaps the addresses upon Service (Nos. xxi. xxii.), 'Called to be Saints' (No. xxv.), and Perseverance (Nos. xxvi. xxvii.) contain more that is striking than the others. Certainly the advice given to the young in one of these about purity of mind in conversation and reading is the best part of the book.

'Never listen to or take part in doubtful conversation; your own instinctive sense of right, if you do not tamper with it, will tell you what is wrong. If you are in doubt, consult some wise and trusted friend. Never laugh at sin; never think of it lightly. Never read doubtful books, but as with friendships so with books, choose the very best, those which you are sure will help you all round, informing and strengthening both mind and character. Read history, biography, travel, poetry, and some novels, but the latter sparingly, and only those by high-class authors. Beware of self-indulgence in reading works of fiction, and look upon such reading as recreation only. Begin early to take an intelligent interest in the spread of Christ's Kingdom; include missionary literature in your studies, remembering that that is but a maimed, defective, half-and-half kind of Christianity which is content to be ignorant on the most important of all topics, and which takes little or no share in the spread of the Gospel it professes to believe' (p. 179).


We have read this book with great satisfaction. The lecturer represents a reaction from the social and biological views of the world and man's place in it which are so mischievous. The strongest and best chapter in the book is certainly Lecture vii. upon the 'Extent of the relation between Morality and Religion.' The writer shows clearly that a theory of morals which denies the supernatural must be either hedonistic or utilitarian. The world regarded as a self-existent universe can never furnish any ideal motive for action. The ideal must be the transcendental, and all moral* phenomena, which of course are just as real as physical phenomena, postulate the transcendental. The bearing of this position with regard to Christianity, which is elaborated in the last three lectures, is obvious.

Turning to details, we are much interested by the opening chapter, with its subtle criticisms upon the late Professor Green's Prolegomena to Ethics. The examination of Fiske and Spencer is a little tedious, and we are disposed to think might be 'taken as read,' instead of being reproduced at length. We are inclined to repeat this criticism upon the whole of Lecture v., which reviews Mohammedanism and Buddhism with rather superfluous minuteness. But in justice to the lecturer we ought perhaps to allow that all lectures which are afterwards reprinted in book form suffer as literature from their original excellences. Delivered to special audiences they have the 'defect of their quality.'
But the book is well worth reading. The tone is sound and consistently straightforward, and, thanks to the excellent index, the reader will be able to omit the less valuable passages without at all losing the drift of the argument.

Some Records of the Life of Stevenson Arthur Blackwood, K.C.B.
Compiled by a friend and edited by his widow. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

This is a book which we find very difficult to review. There was so much that was excellent in the life and character of the remarkable man whose career is here portrayed, that we feel loath to hint anything but praise; but, on the other hand, his view of Christianity was in many respects utterly different from our own that it would be idle to pretend unqualified approval. The obvious way of cutting the Gordian knot would be by acting on Lord Melbourne's suggestion, 'Can't you let it alone?' Or, to take a higher authority than Lord Melbourne, we might follow the wise counsel of Gamaliel: 'Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of man, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.'

The case, however, is not quite analogous to that of the Jewish Sanhedrim and the Apostles; and it appears to us that the policy of non-intervention would be a cowardly evasion of a difficulty which ought to be faced manfully; so with an uncomfortable feeling that many who 'love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,' and whose zeal and earnestness we heartily admire, will group us among those who fight against God, we must gird ourselves for the ungrateful task. And first of all, for a piece of literary criticism which we may make without any hesitation or misgiving. The book is far too long; 595 closely printed octavo pages are out of all proportion to the prominence of the subject. It is an obvious instance of the truth of the old Greek maxim, 'The half is greater than the whole.' If the book were reduced from nearly 600 to 300 pages at the utmost, it would be a greater and better book. And now to the matter of it. Truth to tell, the secular part is to our mind the most interesting and the most important. Mr. Blackwood's experiences in the Crimea, where he did valuable service and gained great credit by managing successfully his share in the grossly mismanaged and glaringly unsuccessful Commissariat Department, are most lively and instructive reading: we could not afford to lose a word of this part of the book; that is, roughly speaking, of the first hundred pages. We should also have been glad to learn a little more about Sir Stevenson Blackwood's (for he was deservedly made a K.C.B.) work at the Post Office, where, in the words of the Postmaster-General, Mr. Raikes, he rendered 'so many and such great services,' and where on one trying occasion 'he encountered with fearless readiness a most serious and embarrassing combination of circumstances, the memory of which will ever serve to encourage the officers of the Department to the performance of public duty even in the face of difficulty and danger' (p. 492). This is strong com-
mendation, as coming from an official in a high and responsible position, who would, of course, measure his words; and he who earned it has a real claim upon the gratitude of his countrymen. But it is not with Blackwood the valuable public servant that this bulky volume is chiefly concerned; but with Blackwood the amateur theologian and revivalist preacher. The chief instrument of his conversion was Miss Marsh, the biographer of Captain Hedley Vicars, whose experience was in some respects similar to that of Sir S. A. Blackwood. We do not for a moment doubt the sincerity and earnestness of Sir S. Blackwood; we also readily admit that he touched many whom the ordinary ministrations of religion could not reach. But we are also afraid that he repelled some who identified Christianity with the narrow and jejune representation of it which he held forth in season and out of season. 'Believe that you are saved by Jesus Christ, and you are saved.' That was the burden of his preaching. He made, of course, the usual arbitrary distinction between different kinds of amusement; he eschewed dancing, cards, and the theatre, but he entered freely into the ordinary round of society, and he was an enthusiastic lawn-tennis player.

He was a Churchman because his social position would hardly allow him to be anything else; but it would be absurd to say that he was at all in sympathy with the Church system. He was, however, we are rather surprised to learn, 'accustomed to read the Christian Year on Sundays' (p. 421). The only exception to his generally amiable and charitable attitude towards the Church and the clergy was in the case of the unfortunate Ritualists. In speaking of them he seems quite to lose his balance.

'Our chief danger lies from the existence, in the largest section of the visible Church in this country, of a traitorous clergy—Ritualists, who were Romanists under another name; and were working insidiously, determinedly, and persistently to raise up the Romish standard, doctrine, and practice in our midst, and alas! with too widespread and fatal success all over the land' (p. 384).

It is almost needless to mention that he was an active supporter of the Church Association. It may be added that the volume contains three portraits of him at different periods of his life, all of which fully bear out the sobriquet by which he was generally known, though it does not appear in the book, 'Beauty Blackwood.'

In the Household of Faith. By C. Ernest Smith. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

We are always glad to welcome any contributions to theology from our fellow-Churchmen across the Atlantic. The truth is ever the same, whether in England, America, or elsewhere; but it may wear different aspects, according to the point of view from which it is regarded. And an American does not regard it from quite the same standpoint as an Englishman. As presented by the former, it naturally reflects some of the features of the American character. This is notably the case with the volume now before us—it is American to the backbone, with all the strong and all the weak points which that
Let us take the strong points first. There is a go-ahead fearlessness about it which contrasts strongly with the cautiousness and conservatism of the typical Englishman, and is very refreshing. Then the combination of the most uncompromising, definite Churchmanship, expressed in terms which no one can possibly mistake, with an ample recognition of the good to be found in other Christian communities, is to our mind a very happy combination. The writer does not disguise his conviction that 'the Household of Faith' in America is none other than what is most clumsily and tautologically called 'the Protestant Episcopal Church,' though he also makes it quite clear that, as the sacrament of Holy Baptism, administered with the right matter and in the right words, is the door of entrance into that household, many really belong to it, though they may no more know it than M. Jourdain knew that he had been talking prose all his life. He cannot admit for a moment that any of the sects, qua sects, are parts of the household; but he contends that many of their members are so in virtue of their baptism. And he also freely owns the good which the sects, qua sects, have done (see chap. i., Introd. p. 16). His outspokenness, again, is very admirable when he repudiates the notion that Catholicism (in the sense in which he, and in which we also, hold it) is Romanism in disguise. The passage is so good that we must quote it at length.

'Romanism is not the sumnum malum of the universe. There are worse things, and enshrined in this very accusation [of Romanizing] there is a worse thought. Rather any day would we be of Rome's most thorough-going disciples, a full-fledged Ultramontane, a typical Torquemada, Grand Inquisitor-General, than be one who, owing allegiance to another Church, is but a sorry imitator of a Church which his own declares has erred, not only in matters of ceremony, but also in matters of faith. A consistent papist we might honour; a mere apist we can never honour. The position of the one is compatible with uprightness of heart and integrity of life; that of the other is incompatible from every aspect. The one is, after all, a man; the other merely a parasite. Yet, mark this, it is of apism we are accused. We are charged to be, forsooth, as the daw in borrowed plumes, and as an ass in the lion's skin!'

'Men may, if they will, ridicule our doctrines and practices, call them absurd, medieval, and the like, and we shall feel ourselves under no obligation to reply, nor shall our feelings thereby be hurt. Such accusations are not, it may be, quite complimentary to our intellectual faculties, but they do not attack our moral character. When, however, we are accused of being parasites and plagiarists, of wearing stolen plumes, of being traitors in the camp, then justly is the fire kindled, and at the last we speak with our tongue!' (pp. 177, 178).

In all this we thoroughly agree with him; indeed, so far as essentials go, we do not know that there is any point on which we materially differ from him. But when we turn from the esse to the bene esse of the Church, and from general principles to details, especially historical details, we must join issue with him. He is dead against all union between Church and State, which he calls 'the ill-fated alliance between the Church and Caesar.'

'Church and State! We link the words together, but the things are far
apart. Their union is as unnatural as that of June and December. It is forgetfulness of Christ’s proclamation: “My kingdom is not of this world.” It is folly. Every attempt to unite the Church with this world, or to permit it to lean upon this world, has been attended sooner or later with disaster’ (p. 42).

Now, we quite admit that establishment or non-establishment is an open question, and the best Churchman may take one side or the other in discussing it without the least impeachment upon his Churchmanship. But we cannot for a moment admit Mr. Smith’s assertions in the above passage as historical facts. Never was the English Church more flourishing than in the days in which it was in the closest alliance with the State. We think of Augustine and King Ethelbert, of Aidan and King Oswald, of Plegmund and King Alfred, of Dunstan and King Edgar, when Church and State were intimately allied, and worked together in the utmost harmony; and we feel that Mr. Smith’s unqualified assertion is an absurdity. But, indeed, Mr. Smith is not very strong in his history, though he is very confident. He does not seem to have the faintest idea that there was any distinction between Britons and English, but writes as if they were all one race (see p. 58). Who ever told him that ‘the old British Church’ sent forth ‘Willibro[a]d [sic] to the country of the Franks,’ and ‘Boniface as the apostle of Germany’ (pp. 59, 60). Willibrord and Boniface (Winfred) were both Englishmen, not Britons, though Mr. Smith seems to think it all the same thing. Again, the details of St. Patrick’s life are involved in much obscurity (though Mr. Smith writes as if he knew all about them); but this at any rate is quite clear, that the year 432 was not the date of the commencement of his Irish mission, as Mr. Smith, relying upon an exploded authority, gives it (p. 75). William Tyndale was not ‘strangled at the stake’ (p. 233), and it is not strictly accurate to say that the ‘Church, after Tyndale’s death, set up Tyndale’s Bible in every parish in the land’ (p. 231); nor yet to say that ‘Bede heard the Master’s word, “It is finished,” while he was translating St. John’s Gospel, and laid down his pen and his life together’ (p. 230); at least, if it is, Mr. Smith has access to some better authority than Bede’s own most trustworthy pupil, Cuthbert. Whoever originated the rather poor joke that an archdeacon ‘spends his life in the diligent discharge of archidiaconal functions’ (that, we believe, and not Mr. Smith’s, is the correct version), it certainly was not Archbishop Tait (pp. 142, 144). It is surely, to say the least of it, a rather loose expression that, ‘the Gospels give an all-too-short account of the earthly life of the Son of God’ (p. 199); as if the Inspirer of the Gospels was not the best judge of the length! And so we might go on picking holes ad infinitum; for Mr. Smith is a good Churchman, a shrewd thinker, and a vigorous writer; but he is very far indeed from being a man of high culture or deep erudition; and we doubt whether the system of patronage in the American Church is altogether conducive to the development of culture and erudition. Mr. Smith is very severe upon private patronage, which, he says, is ‘to American Churchmen theoretically incomprehensible’ (p. 134), and
too manifestly out of harmony with present thought to be seriously defended' (p. 135). It would lead us too far afield to defend it 'seriously,' though we think it might be done; but of this we are quite sure, that the variety of patronage in the English Church is one of the reasons why clericus Anglicanus is stupor mundi. If the English clergy were appointed to livings by their congregations or by boards, we doubt whether we should get men of the same stamp; and we must confess that the experience of the American Church does not lead us to think that we should. She has produced many good and great men, but none, so far as we know, who can be called the equals, in point of learning and culture, of our Lightfoot, Westcott, Wordsworth, Stubbs, Bright, Church, Pusey, Stanley—indeed, any of our best men, to say nothing of the heroes of olden days.


This is a little book which it really does one good to read. It is the story of a noble effort made by young men of the upper class to elevate and humanize young men and lads of the lower class, and to give a little brightness and variety to their normally dull and monotonous existence. The tale is told in an easy, light, and colloquial style, with a plentiful interspersion of slang terms, which in such a connexion are not at all out of place. It represents the whole affair as capital fun, and so, we have no doubt, it was, and is, to the fresh young lives, brimming over with health and animal spirits, who took, and, we hope, still take part in it. Nevertheless, it is clear that there were difficulties to be surmounted, and inconveniences—not to say hardships—to be endured, which would be unendurable to the jeunesse dorée of the crutch and toothpick school. There is no concealment of the real names of the workers. Pilkington, Lawley, Kekewich, Dimsdale, Carter, are all names which have, as it were, an Eton ring about them, and the name of Dr. Warre occurs, generally as showing sympathy with the work. As the book is principally taken up with accounts of how the East Enders were taught to play cricket and football, to box, to run paper-chases, and, above all—for the old Etonians were mostly 'wet bobs' rather than 'dry bobs'—to row and to swim, it may be objected that 'Mission Work' is too high a title to use. With this objection we have no sympathy whatever. Rough lads must be made human beings before they can be made good Churchmen, and none are better qualified to humanize them than old Etonians. Whatever may be said against our great public schools, it cannot be denied that they give boys a sense of honour and of the necessity of submitting to discipline, which no other training does to the same extent. The old Etonians worked most amicably with the clergy; indeed, some of them were clergymen themselves.

To give the reader some idea of what the book is like, we quote two or three passages which illustrate the points on which we have dwelt. After a long experience of the working classes we can
cordially endorse every word of what Mr. Pilkington says about their attitude towards public worship, sad though it is:

'The question of the working classes not attending church is ever before the clergy, and I feel on delicate ground in alluding to the subject at all. I wish to say this much, however, on behalf of the young ones, at all events, that they do not, either from their surroundings, habits, or bringing up, consider that it is wrong to stay away, and that consequently their consciences are quite as clear as anybody else's who may go regularly to a place of worship. I never once heard one of them ridicule the idea, a fact which must speak for itself, and in their favour' (pp. 91, 92).

Again, we quite agree with him as to the necessity of the presence of men of the same calibre as himself to make their recreations 'go':

'I had a look in at the club a few months ago, and thought it looked so dull and wretched. There were no Old Etonians in the place, and none expected that evening. You boys at Hackney Wick know what I mean, and, if I know you at all, you wouldn't mind seeing two or three Old Etonians in your club every night of the week, besides at your football or cricket on Saturday afternoons. Things go a bit smoother then, don't they? Games are better played, and there is more genuine fun all round' (p. 94).

We also quite agree with him as to the reason:

'We public school boys have learnt to play games rather seriously, vying with one another, but not being jealous of each other; moreover, making no noise during play. This last point is the chief fault you have to try and eradicate. Your pupils will have been brought up 'at home,' and will not at first 'give and take,' as you are accustomed to do, and have quite wrong ideas of their own importance, being, besides, extremely jealous of one another. For instance, I have known big boys, or even grown-up men, have a serious squabble as to which of them should carry the cricket-bag or goal-posts home, until, perhaps, you had settled the question for them by slinging it over your shoulder, with the remark that they were behaving like a couple of new-born babes. Disputing with the umpire or referee, or wrangling with your opponents, is equally childish, of course, but still you have to check it and cure it. It is a great pity that these games should be played badly for want of a leader, or some one to teach the right methods' (pp. 96, 97).

We end with an appeal for personal help in the Boys' Club:

'They are ready to be led, but not by one of themselves, as is the custom of public school boys. I want you to go and make friends with the young working classes, not as their masters but as their equals. They will appreciate your help, but may not express their feelings till they have grown up into men, when they will do so freely. The child is father to the man, we are told, so that it seems wise to begin with the children' (p. 106).

We are much mistaken as to the stuff of which our young men of the upper classes are made if the reading of this book does not stimulate some to 'go and do likewise,' and others to help with their purse the good work.

VOL. XLIV.—NO. LXXXVII.
The letters of the Bishop of Gibraltar to his flock are always interesting; and even after tackling the flood of literature which was poured forth after the publication of the Bull Apostolica curae, this pastoral letter may be read with pleasure. The Bishop reviews the claims of Rome in the light of the Sacred Scriptures and the early Fathers, and concludes that ‘the pre-eminence of St. Peter over the other apostles’ is not only not contained in Holy Scripture, but is ‘rather repugnant to the same.’ Nor can the claims of Rome be looked upon as a true development of early doctrine, the germs of which are present in the Church, because these claims ‘are contradictions of the teaching given in Holy Scripture,’ which true development would not be. The Bishop notes with very proper astonishment the statement of the Pope that our Lord ‘was obliged, when He ascended into heaven, to designate a vicegerent upon earth.’ It is indeed a strange expression to use of One whom we acknowledge to be almighty with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

The latter half of the letter is taken up with a refutation of the arguments of the Bull Apostolica curae, and it may be very profitably read even by those who have been made familiar with the controversy by means of the valuable publications of the Church Historical Society. Writing in October last, the Bishop had sufficient courage to prophesy that ‘the effect which the Papal decision will have upon the English people is infinitesimal,’ and the event has proved the correctness of his forecast. Instead of sweeping 500 English clergymen into the meshes of the Roman net, the effect of the Pope’s Bull is said to be best expressed by a minus quantity; and the disappointment amongst the Vaticanists is correspondingly great.


These two books, published in the same year, are written from two very different standpoints. Mr. Boyle professes to approach the subject by a purely scientific path; and he makes a great show of entire indifference to ecclesiastical or theological controversy. To tell the truth, the tract is really written with a decided theological bias, the inspiration of which may be found in the writings of the late Dean of Westminster, Dr. Stanley, which, it may be confessed, deserve the character given them by a late Prime Minister as ‘picturesque, superficial, and inaccurate.’ How little that is fresh can be gathered from Mr. Boyle’s work the following example will show. The history and source of the vestment which the moderns call the stole are very obscure. More information would have been very welcome; but Mr. Boyle has nothing to give us but a set of well-worn quotations, that have done duty many times before. He admits the difficulty of the case (p. 20, last three lines), and a non-
controversialist would have bidden us suspend our judgment till we really do know whence the stole came; but Mr. Boyle sums up by saying that 'the one fact to be borne in mind is that the stole was originally a handkerchief' (p. 25), which is exactly the point upon which we desire proof. The accuracy of the information given in the tract may be judged by the statement that the cope is 'a vestment in later times used only by the higher clergy' (p. 27), and the carefulness with which the book has been brought out by the mention of the fourth council of Braga in 675 (p. 24), instead of the council of Braga, a blunder in printing worthy of Dean Farrar himself.

With Mr. Macalister's book we are much more in sympathy. He also disclaims all controversy, and assures us that he has based his work upon scientific inquiry. There is no vulgar declamation in the book, and we entirely agree with him that the chasuble and alb are the descendants of the civil dress of the Romans. Any other theory has been abandoned for a century or two by all who are worthy of the name of ritualist: Cardinal Bona, Dr. Bock of Aachen, Abbé Duchesne, have spoken on this point with no uncertain sound. But though it is quite true that the more ancient of the Christian vestments are Roman in origin, yet some of the more modern, the amice and the girdle, and, most strikingly of all, the rationale, have been borrowed and clearly imitated from the dress of the Levitical priesthood. The Judaizing of the 'ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof,' which went on at the beginning of the Middle Ages, is a very curious phenomenon in the history of the Church, and has never yet been thoroughly worked out. It would very well repay a careful study, and would yield, we have no doubt, very unlooked for results.

But it is to be feared that Mr. Macalister, with all his desire to be quite fair, has not as yet sufficient knowledge of his subject to be able to write with authority. The development of many of the ecclesiastical ornaments is a very difficult subject, and needs very great learning and research, and knowledge of monuments, drawings, brasses, and illuminations in England and abroad. Mr. Macalister gives us no evidence of great attainments. Some of his obiter dicta are noteworthy. We are told (p. 34) that St. Sylvester was Bishop of Rome from A.D. 253 to A.D. 257. On p. 37 he speaks of the 'St. Minerva Library at Rome,' where he intends to speak of the library attached to the church 'Santa Maria sopra Minerva.' Another wonderful piece of information is on p. 228: 'During Lent it was the practice to cover up the images in the church with a curtain called the velum quadrigestinale' (sic). Now really this was the great veil hung up between the choir and the presbytery, and it was special cloths of small size that were used to cover the images. But we have no more space at our disposal to exhibit Mr. Macalister's want of equipment, and we will only end by regretting that we cannot recommend a work which has evidently been a delight to the author, and which, when rewritten after more study and travel, may very well become a useful handbook for beginners.
The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus (XXXIX. 15 to XLIX. 11), together with the Early Versions and an English Translation, followed by the Quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature. Edited by A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A. With two Facsimiles. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.)

A single leaf of the original text of Ecclesiasticus was published in the Expositor for July 1896 by Mr. S. Schechter, Reader in Talmudical Literature at Cambridge. The appearance of this fragment, which had been discovered by Mrs. Lewis, once more attracted the attention of Old Testament scholars to this extra-canonical work, and gave rise to the hope that all, or at any rate further portions, of the original 'book of Ben Sira' might yet be discovered. This hope was almost immediately fulfilled by the discovery of nine other leaves (forming the continuation of the leaf edited by Mr. Schechter) in a box of fragments recently acquired by the Bodleian Library through Professor Sayce. These leaves form the basis of the present volume; but for the sake of completeness, and since it clearly belonged to the same MS., the Cambridge leaf (containing ch. 3915-407) has been republished in a revised and greatly improved form, and included in the text before us, which thus contains the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus 3915-4911. The Oxford edition, which bears throughout the marks of accurate scholarship and sound critical judgment, is especially worthy of commendation both for its treatment of the original and for the addition of the chief ancient versions. On the one hand the editors, as can be seen from the facsimiles, have reproduced the MS., with its marginal notes and variants, with scrupulous fidelity, and have abstained with admirable self-restraint from all emendation, 'except where the text yielded absolutely no sense.' Owing to this wise precaution the reader may feel confident that he has the actual text of the MS. before him and not the result of the critical conclusions of the editors. On the other hand the value of the work for comparative purposes is considerably enhanced by the addition of (a) Lagarde's edition of the Syriac version, (b) the Septuagint translation according to Dr. Swete's edition, and (c) the Old Latin from Lagarde's edition of the Codex Amiatinus. The difficulty of adequately rendering the Hebrew, which is sometimes very obscure, has been successfully overcome in the English translation, which is at once accurate and clear.

With regard to the language, the editors rightly describe it as classical Hebrew coloured by an admixture of late or Aramaic words and expressions, a glossary of the latter by Dr. Driver forming a most valuable addition to the work. It can hardly be denied that this judgment on the linguistic character of the fragment, in which we thoroughly concur, has a most important bearing on many of the crucial questions connected with Old Testament criticism. It is generally admitted that the 'book of Ben Sira' was written at the beginning of the second century B.C. The evidence for this date is furnished by the prologue to the Greek translation, from which we learn that the grandson of Ben Sira translated the work of his grandfather in the year 132 B.C. The discovery, therefore, of a portion
of the original work provides us with indisputable evidence as to the language employed in literary compositions of the second century B.C. The turning-point in the history of Hebrew literature is to be placed in the age of Nehemiah. The 'memoirs' of Ezra and Nehemiah and the contemporary prophecy of Malachi already begin to show traces of a later and less classical style than that which characterizes the earlier books of the Old Testament, while the change is even more apparent in the books of Chronicles, Esther, and Ecclesiastes. With the period of Nehemiah the golden age of Hebrew composition comes to an end, and the language enters into a period of transition, a period when the older language still maintains its own to a large extent, but is in process of being transformed into New Hebrew. The main features of this transition period are the introduction of many foreign words, the application of old words and phrases in a new or different sense, and the loss of that ease and fluency which characterized the classical language consequent on the substitution of later and clumsier constructions. In a period such as we have described uniformity of language and style is not to be expected. One author naturally inclines to a more frequent use of later idioms and constructions, while another attaches more importance to the reproduction, as far as possible, of the peculiar features of the older language; but all alike agree in exhibiting many phenomena which clearly separate them from earlier writers. The limits imposed on us prevent us from discussing fully on the present occasion the bearing of these observations on the date which the Higher Criticism has assigned, say, to the Book of Daniel and to some of the Psalms. However convincing the arguments based on the language appear to modern critics, they cannot be said to remove those fundamental difficulties which the Church Quarterly Review has always regarded as entitled to the gravest consideration. Yet it may be of interest to note that from the point of view of the Critic the discovery of the original text of the 'book of Ben Sira' establishes the possibility, on linguistic grounds, of the late date commonly assigned to the Book of Daniel. The question of Maccabean Psalms is affected to much the same extent. Whatever other objections—and we have no desire to disguise their gravity—may be raised against the view that any of the Psalms were written at so late a date as the Maccabean period, the evidence which we now possess makes it clear that from a literary point of view such a date is not impossible. Another objection, however, has been urged with some force against the existence of such late Psalms, viz. that based on the evidence of the Septuagint. It has been pointed out that, in a case where the interval between the actual composition of a psalm and its translation is so slight, it is improbable that the translator should have so frequently misunderstood his original. A comparison of the Hebrew of Ecclesiastes and the Greek translation sufficiently refutes this argument. In the present instance the grandson of the author himself has altogether failed in many cases to give an adequate rendering of the Hebrew, though the interval which separated the two works cannot be much more than sixty years. In connexion with this subject the
present volume, as the editors point out, 'may serve as a warning to those scholars who are inclined to overrate the authority of the LXX Version of the Old Testament' (p. ix). Even when we possess the original, the use of an ancient version for the purposes of textual criticism requires to be exercised with the greatest caution. Only after the removal of those variants which are due either to corruption in the version itself, or to misunderstanding on the part of the translator, is it permissible to compare the text presupposed by the version with the Massoretic text, and to decide which is the better reading. The specimens of attempted restorations of the original of Ecclesiastes given in this work afford a melancholy illustration of the fact that it is impossible to reconstruct an original work even with the aid of two divergent translations. We have omitted so far to mention the very full collection of proverbs attributed to Ben Sira in Talmudic and Rabbinical literature—probably the most complete collection that has yet been published. The chief importance of these quotations consists in the evidence they afford as to the interest excited by the Book of Ecclesiasticus from the earliest times.

In conclusion we would offer our most hearty congratulations to Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer not only on the excellence and thoroughness of their work, but also on the promptitude with which they have produced it. The difficulties that have been surmounted can only be fully appreciated after an examination of the two facsimiles that accompany the text, and a comparison of the revised text of the first leaf with the text published in the Expositor.

The Gospel of Experience; or, the Witness of Human Life to the Truth of Revelation; being the Boyle Lectures for 1895. By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

These lectures, which were delivered in St. Peter's, Eaton Square, and are dedicated 'to the reverent memory of William John Butler, late Dean of Lincoln,' by one who had been a curate under him at Wantage, are a really valuable contribution to English apologetic theology.

'The underlying idea which they try to develop is this: that just as the spade of the excavator is a valuable ally to the student who investigates historical records, so the spade of experimental inquiry, in the region of the spiritual life, ought to yield valuable confirmation of those facts which Holy Scripture leads us to suppose exist in our own lives, and in the constitution of things around us' (Preface, pp. vii, viii).

The plan adopted is to appeal to the human experience, not that of the average man, but of the highest forms of spiritual development, in proof of the phenomena which Revelation teaches us to look for. In this way the lecturer examines such points as the existence of God, the Fall, Sin and its punishment, the Atonement and Grace. Each lecture is constructed upon the same plan, viz. first, to examine what Holy Scripture teaches; secondly, to appeal to human experience; and, finally, to sum up the results. Those who delight in that great English classic Bishop Butler's Analogy will feel that
Canon Newbolt has studied the argument from analogy to some good purpose, and has presented it to his hearers in a simple but convincing form; not that he has said so much that is new, but he has made it thoroughly interesting, attractive, and palatable to ordinary minds. The lectures are full of illustrations from literature of all kinds and ages, but we notice, specially, how closely he follows in the steps of the late Dr. Liddon, while he borrows from writers of very different views, e.g. Romanes, Weisman, and Max Müller. The general tone of the theology is conservative; the lecturer cannot endorse the Scotist view of the Incarnation (pp. 85, 172), nor the modern theory of the Kenosis (pp. 102, 103, and 132), nor that feature of the 'Higher Criticism' which would reverse the chronological order of 'the Law and the Prophets' (p. 148, note); and incidentally he suggests a strong argument respecting our Lord's human knowledge, which, in our opinion, might apply equally well to the question of the authorship of Psalm cx. as to that of diabolic agency. Mr. Romanes had said of our Lord:

'If Christ knew . . . . He may also have known it was best to fall in with the current theory.' . . . 'If He did not know, why should He, if He had previously "emptied Himself" of omniscience?'

and Canon Gore made this note upon the statement:

'The emphasis which Jesus Christ lays on diabolic agency is so great, that if it is not a reality, He must be regarded either as seriously misled about realities which concern the spiritual life, or else as seriously misleading others, and in neither case could He be even the perfect Prophet'

Exactly so; this is the very argument that we have constantly used in regard to our Lord's treatment of the Old Testament.

Canon Newbolt's writings are full of passages which impress themselves upon the memory, not only by their epigrammatic character, but also from the clear ring of the theology. For example, (1) in Lecture II., in speaking of the tripartite division of man's nature, he writes:

'There is a second part of the incorporeal nature, called the soul, including the feelings and impulses, and the ruling faculty, which, if sense-consciousness represents the body and God-consciousness represents the spirit, may in its turn be denoted self-consciousness.'

Or (2) in Lecture III., upon the traces of a Fall, he writes in good-humoured sarcasm:

'The socially good man—is it possible to delineate him? He is the man who would have a comfortable competency, with few cares and plenty of leisure; his duties would be mapped out for him and enforced by a careful Government; he has no call to give to the poor,—that would pauperize them, and in an ideal State there would be no poor; his share of contribution to public schemes is regulated by a rate; he has no call to cultivate poverty of spirit, meekness, or patience; if his immediate environment is not such as to secure his proper development, "the getting of himself out" to the best advantage, he must agitate and complain.'

1 Thoughts on Religion (Romanes), p. 180.
We have often met such people in the different spheres of life, excellent, law-abiding, peaceful citizens, and yet, in a sense, we are free to confess that they do not represent man at his best' (pp. 64, 65).

Or (3) in Lecture VII. he insists strongly upon the freedom of man's will, viz:

'God, while recognizing the power, has also always respected the freedom of the will; there is no compulsion, no forcing to choose one course, no driving into heaven, no extirpation of enemies by main force; each step in the conquest has to be won by man for himself, acting with God: using those methods which he has devised for our help' (p. 162).

Or (4) in the last lecture the following passage on the Atonement is quite refreshing in these times:

'While we talk of expiation and ransom and redemption and rescue, we may still talk of substitution—not the substitution of the innocent for the guilty, in the sense that the guilty goes scot-free, but in the sense of the bearing of the brunt of the pain and sorrow which must fall on the Representative of all the world—on Him who alone could be the Representative of the world, as it ought to be in the eyes of God, because, in Himself sinless, He represented the ideal world; while in Himself taking up the sins of mankind, He represented the actual world' (p. 174).

Altogether, these lectures will be most helpful and valuable in suggesting lines of argument wherewith to meet the difficulties of earnest inquirers after truth; they may not be convincing to the Agnostic, because more often than not he does not care to know the truth, but they will answer the objections of those who cannot reconcile the phenomena of sin, of temptation, and of punishment for sin with the known character of God; and by the constant appeal to the highest types of human experience in support of the truth of Revelation Canon Newbolt has added an important contribution to the sum of Christian evidences.

It is a pity that Lecture VI. should be marred by an awkward phrase, recurring again and again, viz. 'the permanence of punishment on sin': we thought at first that 'on' was a typographical error for 'of'; but, as the full phrase 'permanence of punishment following on sin' occurs once (p. 133), we saw that it was intentional; but it is to be regretted.
Mr. Powell has done well in placing in the front of his Treatise an account of the views of Professor Godet on what is somewhat irreverently called the Kenosis. It is a great thing that the student should see clearly and at once what the character of this modern theory is in its full expression. As the statement comes before us in a brief and concise form, we cannot do better, as a preliminary to the remarks we have to make, than to copy it. Professor Godet remarks:

"Our Lord had been in possession of the Divine Omnipotence, and He enters upon a form of existence in which, instead of commanding and bestowing gifts, He has to receive, to ask, and to obey; and it is only at the last moment of this new stage of existence that He announces, as an event of recent occurrence, this fact: "All power is given unto Me in Heaven and on earth."

"He had been a sharer in the Divine Omniscience, and He accepts a condition in which He has ceaselessly to ask, constantly to learn, often to remain in ignorance, as when He says: "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son."

"He had been filling all things, sharing in the omnipotence of God Himself, and He confines Himself within a human body, so localized that it could be said of Him: "If Thou hadst been here, such a thing would not have happened."

"In Him there had been abiding the immutable holiness, and He accepted a state of being of which one of the fundamental laws..."
is liberty of choice, the possibility of undergoing real temptation, and consequently the power to sin.

'He had been loving with all the force of a perfect, infinite love, and this kind of love He exchanges for one which implies progress both in respect of intensity and of comprehension.

'He knew Himself as the Son, with that knowledge with which the Father Himself knows Him eternally, and (this is that putting off upon which all those we have already mentioned depend) this consciousness of Sonship, which was the light of His life, He allowed to be extinguished within Him, to retain only His inalienable personality; the individual life endued with freedom and intelligence as all human individuality is endued; for our personality is made in the image of His. By means of this humiliation He was enabled to enter into a course of human development similar in all respects to our own.

'Here we see the prodigy of love which is realized in the life of Christ, and revealed to us by His Word. If this miracle is not possible God is not free, and His love has limitations imposed upon it.'

Such is the doctrine of Professor Godet. It goes a great deal further than those among ourselves who have entered on the same path would be willing to follow. But the path is a dangerous one. We see how dangerous from the uncertainty and confusion by which the wayfarers amongst ourselves are beset. They stop short, they hesitate, they get confused, and often make statements at variance with the theory and what they have said before. One would fain hope that, warned by this very mist and darkness, they may be induced to retrace their steps. Truth is always clear and keen-edged; it is only error which hides itself in confusion.

Looking, now, steadily at Professor Godet's teaching, we see clearly that it is unthinkable. Professor Godet does not deny that the Incarnate One continued to be God; but he holds that in the Incarnate State all that He retained of His Godhead was his nude Personality. All the above named attributes—all, in a word, which constitutes the Divine Nature He exchanged, He put off. But this is unthinkable. It is true that theologians distinguish between the Personality and the Nature; but that is a mere distinction in logic. In reality the Nature is inseparable from the Person. Exchange or put off the Nature and you inevitably exchange and put off the Person.

1 The inseparability of the Personality from the Nature is further seen from the popular use of the term personality. A man's personality, in the popular use of the term, embraces not only the essential parts of his nature, but the points of his character, and even his habits and peculiarities. They all, in the popular view, make up his personality. It is
permanent one. If it were seriously taken up and held, it would infallibly lead to a denial of the Incarnation.

Then, again, see how completely Professor Godet's view destroys the rational ground on which the Church believes in the Divinity of our Lord. That ground consists of two elements: first, His claim to be God, and secondly, the verification of this claim by the facts of the Gospel History—the Epiphanies or manifestations of His Divine Glory. But, according to the theory, His assertions of His Godhead were the assertions of a fallible manhood, and there was in His Incarnate life no Divine Glory to be manifested. We ask in wonder, How could faith in His Godhead survive this catastrophe? But there is another point in Professor Godet's theory which touches us more deeply. It is clear that the theory, if adopted, would change the whole Christian system. The words Revelation, Redemption, Grace flowing forth from the Incarnate One, by which we are lifted up to the higher life, must disappear; and what have we got in their place? Nothing else but a human teacher and a human example—the teacher influenced by the ideas of a remote age, and the example sadly marred by extraordinary claims.

But our present object is not to criticize. Rather we place this statement before our readers by way of warning. We desire to point out the gulf that lies before all who in this matter depart from the settled teaching of the Undivided Church. We think those who have entered upon this path have failed to grasp all the conditions of the great problem. The great doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were finally settled after a long and weary struggle, in which were mingled much human imperfection—nay, much sin and wickedness. But the settlement was not by man, but by God. It was brought about, we entirely believe, by the guiding and working of the Spirit of God, who dwelt in the Undivided Church. And it is important to observe the principle on which all these decisions were made. It was not a desire to develop old doctrines or to introduce new ones; rather it was an impassioned determination to preserve in their integrity the revelations of the Gospels on these high matters. And in this the Church was entirely successful. These decisions in their sum form a compact and wonderful whole—a whole which no one can contemplate without a deep impression of its Divinity. And further, as a whole the decisions are so bound together that you cannot alter or add to them without clear that this popular use of the term could never have arisen except from the perception that person is inseparable from nature.
destroying the whole edifice. It is a great thing, too, to notice that they commend themselves to the consciences of mankind as the only view of the Gospel revelation which can really meet the wants of sinful and suffering humanity. Surely if ever there were decisions that were irreformable, these are such.

Mr. Powell's book, though entitled the Principle of the Incarnation, yet deals more especially with the difficult problem of the relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His human consciousness, or, as we should prefer to say, His human knowledge. He treats this great subject in three books—in the first, from the point of view of philosophy; in the second, from the point of view of theology; and in the third, from the point of view of the Gospels. Of the second and third parts we wish to speak in terms of the highest commendation. They are clear, accurate, and, in their arguments, very able, and we hope they may be extensively read and studied by all who are interested in this question. Of the first, or philosophical book, we are unable to speak in the same terms. We cannot agree with the philosophical rendering which Mr. Powell has given to our Lord's human knowledge. This we deeply regret for many reasons, and our first thought was to pass over the first part lightly, merely indicating one or two points which we thought wrong. Further thought, however, revealing as it did the effect which this rendering is calculated to have not only on the problem in question but on the faith generally, led us to alter our resolve.

It is a grave question whether the dogmas of the faith ought to be mixed up at all with philosophical principles. We have the warning of St. Paul against it,¹ and certainly the experience of the Christian Church has justified that warning. The influence of Platonism on the early Church was in many respects bad, and so also was the influence of Aristotelianism in the middle ages. But, waiving the general question, there is a special reason why, in dealing with the dogmas of the faith, we should keep clear of the philosophies at present in vogue. We believe that they rest on a fundamentally false view of things, and that their influence on theology and on Christian faith generally is wholly bad. In order to make this clear, we have thought it right to treat the philosophical problem more at large. And in doing so our first point will be to exhibit as pointedly and briefly as possible the fundamental principles which underlie present philosophies, and to

¹Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy.'—Col. ii. 8.
show their effect upon theology and ethics, and even on science.

There are two great systems or schools of philosophy at the present day—viz. the Transcendental and the Empirical; and it is of great importance that we should look at the genesis of these systems, as it is only in that way we shall be able to understand aright their drift and the leading ideas which underlie each.

The crisis which gave birth to them arose out of a remark made by Locke. Treating of concepts, or general notions, he remarked upon the great difficulty which, as he conceived, attended the formation of them. Thus in the case of our general notion of a triangle, he said, it requires some pains and skill to form such a notion, ‘for it must be neither oblique nor rectangle, neither equilateral, equicrural, nor scalenon, but all and none of these at once.’ Bishop Berkeley at once fastened upon this statement, and roundly asserted the impossibility of forming general notions. At first sight it may appear as if this were but a trifling dispute between two great philosophers. In reality, however, it was not so. It would simply be impossible to exaggerate the far-reaching importance of this decision taken by Berkeley. General notions are the productions of the intellect; they are a kind of knowledge peculiar to the intellect. In denying, therefore, their existence or possibility, he in effect denied the existence of the intellect, properly so called, and the existence of the kind of knowledge which is its product. He in effect narrowed down and limited human knowledge to the impressions of sense, and to the faint copies of these impressions which exist in the memory and the imagination.

Before going further, we would wish to point out what, so far as we know, has never yet been pointed out—the fallacy which underlay the whole procedure. Both Locke and Berkeley, and, for that matter, the whole series of their successors in the Empirical philosophy, formed, and have continued to form, a wholly false idea of the nature of a general notion. They looked upon it as a mental image; and of course, if that is so, Berkeley is right. It is impossible to picture forth in the imagination an image which shall correspond to every variety of triangle. But the nature of a general notion is something wholly different. It is not an image, but a rule or law. It is something which is perceived solely by the intellect as existing in things; and as a rule or law it is

1 Human Understanding, bk. iv. chap. vii. sec. 9.
wholly unfigured and unfigurable. If we look at general notions in this light, it is easy to see that the difficulty Locke supposed in forming them is wholly imaginary. Our general notion of a triangle, for instance, is nothing else but the rule or law of construction, which, as inhering in that figure, constitutes or makes it to be a triangle. It is a rule which is equally applicable to triangles of every description, and, so far from being difficult of apprehension, it is so clear to the intellect that a boy can be taught it in five minutes, and he will never forget it.

Berkeley, having thus eliminated the intellect and the kind of knowledge which is its product, immediately proceeded to apply his principle by denying the substantiality of the outer world. The substantiality of the outer world is a perception of the intellect. It is a perception which cannot possibly be represented by an image of sense. Hence, since by his principle human knowledge consists only of the impressions of sense and their faint copies, the outer world, so he argued, can be nothing else but impressions made upon our minds. His argument is unassailable if we admit his principle, but only so on that condition. If we deny his principle it immediately falls to the ground.

But Berkeley did not perceive that his principle went a great deal further. It was reserved for Hume to carry it out to its full extent. Reasoning after the method of Berkeley, he dealt with the human soul viewed as a spiritual entity or personality, as Berkeley had dealt with the outer world. The human soul, viewed as a personal existence, is also a perception of the intellect; and it cannot, any more than the substance of the world, be represented by an image of sense. Hence it must share the same fate as the substance of the world. But Hume pushed the Berkeleian principle a great deal further. There are other things besides the substance of the world and the personality of the soul which cannot be represented by an image of sense. There is the great principle of cause and effect. It is a principle which is quite as important in the eye of science as the personality of the soul is in the eye of theology. But as a principle it is perfectly unfigurable. Hence it, too, for this reason must be excluded from the sphere of human knowledge, and Hume excluded it. The effect was most remarkable. By this procedure Hume cut asunder the main string by which human knowledge can be assorted into system. Human knowledge, therefore, in his hands fell asunder into a disconnected stream of impressions of sense and their faint copies, sorted, it is
true, into groups, but only so by the blind principle of association.

In this way Hume laid the foundation of the modern Empirical philosophy, and to his main position, the cornerstone of the system, his followers down to the present day have held fast.¹ Let the reader carefully note and fix in his mind that main position. It may be stated thus: Human knowledge is limited to impressions of sense and their faint copies in memory and imagination. To which must be added the obvious corollary, that anything which comes before us in the guise of human knowledge which cannot be figured in sense and imagination, is not real knowledge, but simply illusion. We shall presently consider the bearing of this principle. In the meantime what we ask is that it may be carefully noted.

Let us now pass to the opposite system, the transcendental philosophy. Kant, its founder, for many years pondered over the system of Hume; and the problem before his mind was simply this: How was he to supply the strings which bind together the particulars of human knowledge into unity and system? Hume, as we have seen, had cut these strings, and had reduced human knowledge to an unordered stream of impressions and their copies; where could Kant find a principle which would again bring back rational order into our knowledge? It would have been well had he simply restored the human intellect and the concepts which are its product to the place from which Berkeley had cast them down; for the human intellect and its concepts are the real strings which bind human knowledge into unity and system. Unhappily this was not the course he pursued. He strove to attain his object by imposing a priori laws or fetters upon the human mind. The human mind, he held, is fettered in regard to sense; for it is compelled by its structure or constitution to spread out its impressions in space and to fix them in time. In like manner he imposed similar fetters upon the understanding or intellect. These fetters or a priori laws he termed categories; and their operation is to this effect—to compel the intellect to gather up the impressions of sense into bundles, and to externalize them. When this process is completed the categories of substance and of cause and effect come into play.

¹ If anyone wishes to see how entirely modern Empiricists have held to Hume's main position, let him read over the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Mr. J. S. Mill's Examination of the Philosophy of Sir W. Hamilton.
These bundles are not really substances; at least, we do not know, and never can know, whether they are or not. All that we know is that we are compelled by the structure of our intellect to think them to be substances. So also in regard to changes in the externalized entities. The changes are not really brought about by causes; at least, we do not know that they are. All we do know is, that the intellect in dealing with them is compelled to think them to be causes and effects.

If we look at these statements closely we shall see that practically Kant did not advance beyond Hume. If the outer world of Hume was destitute of all substantiality, so was also the outer world of Kant. There is only this difference between them—a difference which shows that Kant advanced further on the road to scepticism than Hume. In Hume our impressions come to us, no one knows whence; but at least we have the satisfaction of thinking they come to us ready made. In Kant, on the other hand, it is not an impression, but a stimulus, that comes to us out of the unknown; and out of that stimulus the faculty of sense manufactures the impression in virtue of its a priori laws. The remarkable result of this position is, that the world we see around us is purely phenomenal, and that it is the creation, not of the living God, but of the human mind acting in obedience to its a priori laws.

There is only one other point in the Kantian system that we need notice. We have seen that the cardinal fault of the system of Hume was that it limited human knowledge to impressions and their copies, excluding altogether the knowledge of the intellect. Kant attained exactly the same end by his principle that human knowledge is limited to experience. By experience he means that knowledge which is manufactured by the senses and the intellect; and he holds that that is the only knowledge which can properly be called knowledge. It is true that in appearance the severity of this principle was modified; and it was done in this way. Kant assumed a third faculty in the human mind—viz. the reason, which towers above both senses and intellect; and he held that the reason is set in motion by means of three ideas that are seated in it. They are the idea of God as the sum of all reality, the idea of a real external world, and the idea of a personality attaching to the human soul. But we have hardly had time to be grateful for this precious gift when it is rudely snatched back from us by the pronouncement that these ideas are not real knowledge. They are Schein—we might say in English, moonshine—pure illusion.
It was necessary to mention these points in the Kantian system in order to exhibit its drift. But we do not ask the reader to do more than to fix well in his mind the fundamental principle of that system—viz. a fettered mind, fettered senses, a fettered intellect, and, for that matter, a fettered reason also. How important it is that he should do so will be seen presently. In the meantime we would only remark, that this principle in its integrity has passed to all Kant's successors in the transcendental philosophy. It was taken up first by his immediate Pantheistic successors, and pushed further to its logical conclusion. Since their time transcendentalism has been variously modified; but in every form of it the principle of a fettered mind remains as the cornerstone. What, too, we have especially to notice is, that the fundamental principle passed into the Hamiltonian philosophy, and was developed in their own way by Sir W. Hamilton and Dr. Mansel.

Let us now look at the effect of these systems on theology, ethics, and science; and in so doing it will be necessary to follow the lines of pure logic. It is true that by doing so we may seem unfair to individuals. There are many writers, for instance, who are thoroughly imbued with the principles of the empirical philosophy who have not altogether forsaken the ground of common sense, and who do not push their principles against obvious facts. All the same, however, the principles remain in their minds, and as dull unreasoning prejudice are effective against facts less obvious. Even experts of the empirical philosophy have not uniformly pushed their principles. Neither Hume nor Mr. J. S. Mill ventured to urge their principles against science. And even in presence of other facts, such as the personality of the human soul, both Hume and Mill were staggered, and Mill candidly intimated that the facts manifesting personality agreed badly with his philosophy. But then against other facts less clearly known neither of these great writers showed the slightest hesitation. On the question of miracles Hume had no hesitation whatever; and neither he nor Mill were backward in pressing their principles against the freedom of the will. Hence we must deal with the matter from the point of view of pure logic. It is to be remembered that we are not here criticizing individuals; we are studying the effect of these philosophies on various branches of knowledge. And that cannot be done effectively except on the basis of pure logic.

Taking, then, the empirical philosophy, let us see in the first place how it affects theology. In regard to the funda-
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mental principle of theology, belief in God, it is clear that the empirical philosophy excludes from man all knowledge of God. God, like the human soul or the substance of the world, cannot be represented by an impression or its copy. Clearly, therefore, since human knowledge is limited to impressions and their copies, God lies outside the sphere of human knowledge. Hence, in presence of this fact, the obvious course for an empiricist to take would be to deny the existence of God, and set down belief in Him as an illusion. Atheism, however, is a bad name, and few writers of respectability would care to incur it. For the most part, therefore, they have limited themselves to a criticism of the proofs or manifestations of God's existence; and, as a result, finding them baseless, they have lamented their insufficiency. Quite recently, however, a somewhat bolder line has been taken. It is now asserted that we neither know nor can know whether God exists or not; and that our attitude towards this dogma ought to be one of pure agnosticism. In any case, it is clear that this philosophy shakes our faith in God to its very foundation; and this is really a portentous fact to which we must give full weight. If we consider it, we shall see how far-reaching it is. It is clear that it shakes or destroys not only our faith in Creation and Providence, but in all the dogmas which grow out of the Christian revelation. In regard to Creation and Providence, they are indeed excluded on other grounds. For, from the point of view of empiricism, there is really no world to create; and such a shadowy world as is left to us, is ordered, not by Divine Providence, but by the association of ideas. But it is as bearing on the Christian revelation that we have especially to consider the subversion of the Divine Existence. It is clear that in regard to Revelation, Prophecy, Miracle, the Incarnation, and the Supernatural generally, the ground is taken away on which they rest. For unless the Divine Existence stands out clear and certain before the intellect and the conscience, it is perfectly hopeless to argue about them.

Then look at the effect of empiricism on the hope of a future life. Our mental nature having no substantiality or personality, being in fact nothing else but a 'stream of consciousness,' the natural conclusion is that when that stream ceases to flow in death the man comes to an end. It is true that Stuart Mill has said that the immortality men desire is a continuance of our present life; and he thinks it is just as easy to believe in the continuance of a stream of consciousness, as it is to believe in the survival of a personal soul.
This, however, we greatly doubt. But, apart from this, there is this further pregnant fact. Empiricism, by a gross inconsequence, naturally allies itself with materialism. It regards the stream of consciousness as purely a product of the bodily organization. And, of course, if that be so, the stream must cease to flow on the dissolution of the body.

Let us next turn to Ethics. We need not spend time in proving that no system of ethics worthy of the name can be constructed, except on the postulate of the freedom of the will. The thing is clear enough to common sense; and in point of fact the whole battle of human life is summed up in this, that the human soul shall by its native energy struggle against and overcome opposing conditions, and so rise through warfare and suffering to the higher life. We must believe that those conditions can be overcome, else the battle cannot be fought. But to deny the freedom of the will is to believe that they cannot be overcome; and the soul which once adopts this belief inevitably gives up the struggle, and sinks down into acquiescence in its slavery. We thus see that the freedom of the will is a principle which is absolutely essential to ethics. But it is a principle which has no place in empiricism; for the freedom of the will cannot be maintained except on the further principle of the personality of the soul. If with empiricism we deny personality, and reduce the human soul to a stream of consciousness, we get an entity which cannot be supposed to be free, and which is hardly capable of fighting a battle. There is thus nothing left to the empirical philosopher on the sphere of ethics, except to construct systems of utilitarianism, which have no hold whatever on struggling humanity. Empiricism is, in truth, just as fatal to ethics as it is to theology.

If next we turn to science, we see a curious phenomenon in the procedure of the empirical philosophy. In reality empiricism is just as subversive of science as it is of theology and ethics. The essence of science is the discovery of laws of nature. Take away laws of nature, and science falls to the ground. But there is no place for laws of nature in the empirical philosophy. A law of nature is a pure production of the intellect. It is a concept or general notion; and as such is absolutely unfigured and unfigurable. You cannot by any possibility extract it from impressions and their copies. The empirical philosophy is therefore bound, if it is to be logical, to deny the possibility of laws of nature, just as it

1 For a clear demonstration of this point we would refer the reader to the opening chapter of Mr. Balfour's *Foundations of Belief.*
denies the possibility of other general notions. It is bound, in fact, to pronounce that the great body of scientific knowledge, called laws of nature, which has been accumulated by science, is as illusive and imaginary as are the dogmas of theology.

This point is so important that we desire to emphasize it. Take, for instance, our knowledge of God. That is a knowledge which is the pure product of the intellect. It is a knowledge which cannot possibly be represented by an impression or its copy; and for that, and for no other reason, it is rejected as illusive knowledge by the empirical philosophy. But the law of universal gravitation stands upon exactly the same footing. That also is knowledge which is a pure product of the intellect. It is knowledge, too, which cannot be represented by an impression or its copy. Clearly, therefore, by parity of reason, it also ought to be rejected as illusive knowledge. Why is it not rejected? For no other reason than because empiricism cannot afford to break with science. To do so would be to reduce itself to absurdity. Hence, ever since the days of Berkeley and Hume the procedure of empirical philosophers has consisted mainly of frantic efforts to extract out of impressions and their copies something which may resemble, however remotely, laws of nature. We have had theories of induction and generalization without number—theories which it has been the delight of Mr. Balfour, in his own inimitable way, to pull to pieces.

It may serve, by way of contrast, to illustrate the futility of these highly laboured and unsatisfactory theories, if we point out that the procedure of science in the discovery of laws of nature is the simplest thing in the world. The scientific intellect pondering over the composition of natural objects and their changes, decipheres or conjectures the laws which govern that composition and these changes. If amongst these conjectured laws any one stands out as at all probable, it is immediately subjected to the strictest tests. It is tested by experiment, it is tested by further observation and comparison with ascertained laws; and, if suitable, it is subjected to mathematical treatment. If it comes through all these tests unscathed it is regarded as a new discovery, and takes its place as an ascertained law of nature.

Turning next to the Transcendental system, we find that it is not less hostile to theology than empiricism. In order to see this, we have only to call to mind the particulars we have already given and to observe how they work out. The principle of a priori laws or fetters imposed upon the mind
leads inevitably to the doctrine that the world we see around us is a phenomenal world, and that it is the creation, not of the living God, but of the human mind. Of course this destroys the main proof of God's existence, and, more than this, it brings in a mode of looking at the world of things in which belief in God can have no place. It, in fact, led directly to Pantheism in Kant's immediate successors. But the knowledge of God is also formally excluded from the sphere of human knowledge by Kant's principle of the limitation of human knowledge to experience: that is to say, only that knowledge is real knowledge which is manufactured by the senses and the intellect. It is true, as we have seen, that there is some abatement from this in the fact that the idea of God formed one of the three ideas of reason. But it was not really an abatement, inasmuch as these ideas were pronounced to be Schein, or illusion.

It is only fair, however, to Kant to say that he contented himself with simply excluding the knowledge of God from the sphere of human knowledge. His successors, however, have not been contented with this reserved attitude. They have gone further, and have maintained that our knowledge of God is self-contradictory and impossible. J. G. Fichte, so far as we know, was the first who took this line, and he was followed with some hesitation and abatement by Sir W. Hamilton and Dr. Mansel. In any case, both Kant and his successors have excluded or destroyed our knowledge of God, and hence we see that, in so far as our knowledge of God is concerned, the transcendental system is as agnostic as is the empirical; perhaps more dangerously so, inasmuch as it is more closely reasoned. But what we have at present to look at is the effect that this has upon theology. Of course, the effect is precisely the same as in empiricism. God being excluded from the sphere of human knowledge, it is idle to speak of His revealing Himself; it is idle to speak of His manifesting His Presence and working by miraculous tokens; and it is idle to speak of the Incarnation or the Redemption. In regard to the question of a future life, Kant did not absolutely deny the personality of the human soul, though he excluded it from human knowledge. It might seem, therefore, that his system is not so directly in the way of future hope as is that of empiricism. But there is this incongruity attaching to the idea of a future life, if a Transcendentalist could bring himself to believe in it. Our senses and our intellect being completely fettered, it would follow that if we survived the present life our minds would imme-
diately proceed to create a phenomenal world in all respects the same as the present. Clearly such a future life would be quite alien to Christian hope.

But the most interesting part of the Kantian system is its treatment of ethics. It is clearly seen that the *Criticism of Pure Reason* is as fatal to a genuine system of ethics as it is to theology; for, as we have seen, it has no place for God, no place for freedom, no place for immortality. What, under these circumstances, did Kant do? In dealing with ethics he shook himself free from the fetters of the *Pure Reason* by introducing a new principle, the principle of faith. He postulated, as essential to ethics, the existence of an 'Author of Nature,' the hope of immortality, and the fact of human freedom. No doubt, if tested by the principles of knowledge contained in the *Pure Reason*, all these things are inadmissible; but they are none the less essential to a genuine system of ethics, and therefore they ought to be believed. From this point of view Kant constructed an ethical system in many respects admirable; but it was at the fearful price of introducing disharmony into the nature of man. We have here, in fact, the origin of that supposed conflict between reason and faith which has sat like a nightmare upon the educated mind of Europe for the last hundred years, and which has been so much misunderstood. Popularly it has been supposed that this conflict is the result of advancing science. But this is a profound mistake, for the principles which originate the conflict would, if carried out logically, be just as fatal to science as they are to theology. This we proceed to show.

The Kantian system does not attack science in the same way as empiricism does—that is, by denying the possibility of laws of nature. But it wounds science in a far more sensitive part. It is clear that science reposes on the postulate that what we term laws of nature are embodied in the objects and changes of nature. They are the laws which govern the composition of natural objects and the changes to which they are subjected; and the function of science is, by studying these objects and changes, to ascertain and decipher them. But in the Kantian system the laws of nature do not exist in the objects of nature, but only in the human understanding. It is the understanding of man which, acting on its *a priori* laws, prescribes or imposes these laws upon nature. In truth, the laws of nature, so far from being embodied in nature, are nothing but the reflection of the human understanding. Of course, if this is so, scientific men are working on the wrong
track. They are studying outer nature and its changes in search of laws; they would attain their object far more effectually if they would study the human understanding, which is the real and only source of these laws.

If, now, we bear in mind that these two systems of philosophy—the Transcendental and Empirical—have held the field almost without a rival for the last hundred years, we shall be able to understand the immense effect they have had in giving to educated thought a shape and a tendency antagonistic to theology. Science, of course, can take care of itself, and ethics also to a certain extent; but it is different altogether with theology. It lies in a higher sphere; the verities it deals with are remote from ordinary thought; and it requires a finer intellectual perception and a fuller moral sympathy to lay hold of them. They have therefore, before the forum of educated thought, no defence against those false principles which we have shown are, if logically carried out, equally subversive of science and ethics. There is no doubt but that it is the continual inculcation of these false principles which has produced that alienation from Christian faith which is so characteristic of the educated public of the present day. Some may perhaps be inclined to doubt this, on the ground that students of philosophy are comparatively few in number. They forget that between the philosophers and the public there is a whole host of authors who expound and popularize philosophical principles. These popular expositions are often exaggerated, and not seldom altogether wrong, but, being continually presented to the educated public in newspapers and periodicals, they have gradually created a tendency of thought and habit of mind antagonistic to Christian faith.

As the point is of great importance, it may be well to show how the popular exposition works. Let us take as a specimen Mr. Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma.* It is a popular polemic against the idea of God, against miracles, and the supernatural generally. In dealing with our idea of God, this is his way of proceeding. J. G. Fichte, who was the first of the Kantians to proclaim the incongruity or impossibility of the Divine idea, had said: 'Ihr habt nicht wie ihr wolltet Gott gedacht, sondern nur euch selbst im Denken vervielfältigt.' This thought Matthew Arnold turned into the racy expression: 'A magnified and non-natural man.' We see at a glance the immense effect which this phrase was calculated to have on the popular mind. It has just enough of plausibility to give it impetus. It presupposes that our

---

1 See also Professor Huxley's popular works.
idea of God is built up out of impressions of sense; and of course, if this is so, both Fichte and Arnold are right. We could only get in this way a magnified or distorted image of Him. But the case is altogether different if our idea of God is pure intellectual knowledge, a knowledge in which the impressions of sense have no place whatever. But how few of Matthew Arnold's readers would perceive the latent fallacy.¹

We think we have now said enough to show the one-sidedness and the danger to the faith inherent in both these great philosophies now prevalent, and to warrant our position that the dogmas of theology ought not to be mixed up with either. But before passing from the point, we desire, in reference more especially to the transcendental system, to extract from what we have said a golden rule, a rule of priceless value. It is this:

Just as no system of ethics worthy of the name is possible except on the postulate of the freedom of the will, so no system of theology is possible except on the postulate of the freedom of the intellect—its freedom to cognize everything that can fairly be brought before it, in the exact form in which it is brought before it.

We have limited ourselves, in drawing up the above rule, to theology, but it is a rule which applies with equal force to science. The principle of a fettered intellect is just as fatal to science as it is to theology. For, clearly, if our intellect is compelled by its constitution to cognize things only in a certain way, the vast body of laws which it has been the glory of science to accumulate are not laws of nature, but purely subjective notions manufactured by the intellect. Viewed as laws of nature they are as unreal, as illusive, as any dogma of theology could possibly be. What a pity no one has taken the trouble to demonstrate this! While the principle of a fettered intellect has been worked remorselessly against theology, no one has ventured to apply it as against science. How are we to account for this? Possibly the anticipation of the storm of ridicule that would be sure to overtake such

¹ See J. G. Fichte, 'Die moralische Weltordnung,' Werke, v. 187. In the paragraph from which the above quotation is taken Fichte insists that our idea of God is built up out of the impression we have of our human personality, and out of the empirical or waking consciousness. These two elements multiplied to infinity give our idea of God. It is a position which, from a theological point, is quite absurd. It is to be remembered, however, that the paragraph in question was penned in the heat of the Atheismusstreit, and therefore ought not to be taken altogether seriously. At all events, in later times he had more reasonable views.
an attempt has been sufficient to deter people from making it. But, if that is so, surely that anticipated ridicule is the exact measure of the hollowness of nineteenth-century scepticism in regard to theology.

We next come to consider the rendering which Mr. Powell has given to human knowledge generally, and of course also to the human knowledge of our Lord. This is the main point on which we are compelled, with very great regret, to differ from him; and our regret is all the keener, inasmuch as for his work otherwise we have the highest admiration. Mr. Powell has arrived at his conclusion on this point by taking as his guide in philosophy Dr. Mansel—a great name undoubtedly. We also have the highest admiration for Dr. Mansel's philosophical genius. He was a man possessed of wonderful mental power, and his treatment of metaphysical subjects was remarkable for keenness of insight, a firm grasp of the matter in hand, and thoroughness in carrying his theme to its logical issue. But unhappily Dr. Mansel inherited from Sir William Hamilton the great Kantian principle of a fettered mind, and much of his metaphysical career was spent in elucidating and carrying out that principle. It may be well, therefore, for the better understanding of the matter, to make some remarks on the Hamiltonian position generally.

One cannot read the famous article of Sir W. Hamilton in the Edinburgh Review without a deep feeling that he almost stumbled into the position which he afterwards held with such tenacity. The main portion of the article was directed against the Pantheistic infinite of Schelling, and not directly against the Divine infinity. What Schelling desired to establish was an infinite \( \alpha \rho \chi \nu \), or first principle, which might be the ground and root of his Pantheistic system. The idea of such an infinite first principle was nothing better than a chimera; it was an impossibility; and Schelling utterly failed in his attempt to set it up. But the whole Pantheistic system of Schelling, being charged with deep feeling, and being full of romance and poetry, was highly attractive and dangerous, so that no Christian theologian could do otherwise than rejoice at its refutation. But in refuting it Hamilton unfortunately took the ground that the human mind is so constituted as to be incapable of knowing infinity. Of infinity, Hamilton maintained, we can have no positive or real knowledge, but only a knowledge which is purely negative. We see at once that the position thus taken up, although directed primarily against the dead Pantheistic infinite, yet affects indirectly, and
in a vital manner, our knowledge of the infinite living God. In truth, Hamilton, in taking up ultimately the position that our minds are so constituted as to be capable of knowing only the finite, puts himself in line with the two great philosophies we have been considering. Hume had taught that human knowledge is limited to impressions of sense and their copies. Kant practically agreed with him when he limited knowledge to experience; and it came to exactly the same thing when Hamilton declared the only knowledge possible to us to be a knowledge of the finite.

We need not spend time in showing, what we have already endeavoured to show, how fatal this position is, not only to our knowledge of the living God, but to theology generally. But, before going further, it may be well for the sake of younger students to indicate as briefly and pointedly as may be what we conceive to be the fallacy underlying the Hamiltonian position. The arguments by which Sir W. Hamilton supports his position—that no positive knowledge of infinity is possible to us—are derived from the consideration of space, time, magnitude, number, cause, and effect. He shows clearly enough that we cannot think an infinite space, nor an infinite time, nor a magnitude, nor a number so great that it cannot be added to, nor a regress of cause and effect stretching to infinity. His argument is perfectly conclusive; but it is wholly beside the point. Why is it that we cannot think any of these entities infinite? It is because they are all forms of the finite world, and, being so, they are essentially finite. Hamilton attributed our inability to think them infinite to the weakness of our minds, constituted as they are; but it is clear that no mind, however great, could possibly think them to be other than what they actually are, finite.

The truth is, that Hamilton looked in the wrong direction for infinity. He looked to the finite world. But if we reflect on the matter, we shall see clearly that infinity, if it exists at all, is to be found, not in the finite world, but in the world of mind. And the general sense of mankind has so understood

1 There is this complication, however, in regard to space and time. Kant pointed out that space and time are not only intuitions of sense, they are also conceptions of the intellect. Hence arises the complication. As intuitions of sense, space and time are essentially finites; but as concepts of the intellect they share, with other concepts, the property of being universals or infinites. It is from not distinguishing between these two points of view that all the confusion and argumentation has arisen as to whether the universe is infinite or finite in space, and infinite or finite in time.
the matter. The Infinite One is the Supreme and Perfect Mind. In His image, we are told, the human mind has been created; and had Hamilton only directed his attention to the human mind as that which alone can be studied, he would have found—we do not say infinity, but he would have found traces enough pointing in that direction sufficient to convince him that mankind have a real and positive notion of infinity. Take, for instance, the human mind, and examine it first in reference to sense. It is certain that no object, however great, can be presented to the human mind which it will not transcend. Even the universe, great as it is, is not greater than our mind; for if we could be transported to its utmost verge our mind would still stretch beyond. In fact—setting aside the limitations of our present material existence, which might conceivably be changed, and which do not affect the innate knowing power of the mind—it is certain that no limit, at least no limit that we can conceive, can possibly be put to that knowing power. So also in the sphere of intellect, the general notions which are its product are, as logicians say, universals—that is, infinites. And in this sphere also it is impossible to set any limit to the number and variety of things cognizable by them. It is true that these are not real infinites—they are only infinites within certain limits; they are at the utmost only traces of infinity. But it is none the less certain that the human intellect, basing itself on these traces, can rise to the conception of a Perfect Mind, not subjected, as we are, to any conditions. Such a mind would be simply infinite, the Infinite One.

But we are not concerned to discuss this point further at the present moment. Our present business is with the Hamiltonian principle that the human mind is so constituted as to be able to know only the finite. It is a principle which is not peculiar to the Hamiltonian system; for, as we have seen, both the empirical and Kantian systems exclude the Divine wholly from human knowledge. And, indeed, apart altogether from philosophy, there is and ever has been a feeling of a gulf separating the Divine from the human, and that God is high above the reach of our thought. But it is as a Hamiltonian principle that we have here to consider it. Mr. Powell accepts the principle from Dr. Mansel, as Dr. Mansel had accepted it from Sir W. Hamilton. That we are not by this doing an injustice to Mr. Powell is clear from the fact that he habitually speaks of the 'structure' of the human mind, and, indeed, specifically states that our minds are so constituted as to be able to know only the finite. Let
us therefore see how the principle comes out as manipulated by Dr. Mansel. He accepts fully the Kantian position that the Divine lies wholly outside the sphere of our knowledge; but it is only just to him to say that he lays a greater emphasis than Kant did on the principle of faith. He held that, though knowledge cannot reach to the Divine, yet faith can; and it can also give us a practical assurance of the Divine existence. But this exclusion of the Divine from our knowledge—a principle which he carried to its extreme limit in his famous Bampton Lectures—has obviously this effect, that it creates an impassable gulf between the Divine and the human generally, and more especially between the Divine Omniscience and human knowledge.

Now let us see, in the first place, how this will affect the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is plain that it introduces into the life of the Incarnate One a state of utter discord, for there exist in Him two natures separated by an impassable gulf, and bridged over solely by His Person. But, as we have said, it is in the sphere of His knowledge that this gulf of separation appears in all its wideness. In regard to His other Divine attributes—His Omnipotence, for instance—it is conceivable that they might have remained quiescent during His earthly life. It is altogether different with His Omniscience. It is inconceivable that that attribute could be laid aside, or could be other than a permanent possession. Hence during His earthly life, the two kinds of knowledge, the Divine and human, are present and active, but wholly separate. They belong to different spheres, and there is no point of contact between the two. It is plain that the doctrine of the Incarnation is subverted by this view; for, according to it, no real union of the Divine and human has taken place. This idea of the incompatibility of the Divine and human, though intensified by Dr. Mansel's teaching, is not indeed peculiar to it. It has been widely felt at all times as affecting the Incarnation, and men have variously tried to solve it. The simplest solution of all has been the Socinian, which is a denial of the Incarnation. A less violent solution was Nestorianism, which, feeling the impossibility of a real union, gave to the human nature a separate personality. Last of all, we have the Kenotic theory, which, clinging to a real Incarnation, yet satisfies the supposed incompatibility by excluding from the Incarnate One everything divine except His Person.

We do not for a moment attribute to Mr. Powell any of these views, or any sympathy with them. But, having taken
Dr. Mansel as his master in philosophy, he could hardly altogether escape his influence; and he will forgive us if we point to what we take to be traces of it. In regard to our Lord's knowledge he uses the ominous word 'communicated,' meaning thereby that particulars out of His Divine Omniscience were communicated to His human soul; and he even goes so far as to intimate that there were periods in the Incarnate life when this took place. We shall have occasion to consider the point presently. In the meantime, we only mention it to show that in his idea the human knowledge of our Lord formed as it were a closed circle standing altogether apart from the Divine Omniscience. It is a position against which we had occasion to protest in a previous article, when we pointed out how perilously near it is to Nestorianism.

We have already considered the supposed inability of the human mind to rise to the knowledge of the infinite; let us add a word on this gulf which is supposed to separate the Divine from the human. It is clear that it is against the mind of the Church. The Church, while maintaining the distinction between the two natures, and denying any confusion of the one with the other, yet holds that they come together in the Person of the Son with perfect harmony as mutually adapted to each other. Thus, take the Athanasian Creed: 'For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.' The human soul as an entity is perfectly distinct from the body. It is of a different nature and belongs to a different sphere of being; and yet the two meet harmoniously to constitute 'one man.' And so it is with the Divine and human natures. Meeting together harmoniously, they constitute 'one Christ.' We might illustrate this by many analogies, but one will suffice. Take the case of Creation. It is certain that the universe is the creation of a mind which was both infinite and finite. Or, perhaps it might be more correct to say, the universe was the creation of an infinite mind, which, in the act of creating, descended to the finite. For the universe, viewed as a creation or product, is finite throughout, and all its details are finite; and yet it is the creation of an infinite mind. This shows that the Infinite Mind in the act of creating must have descended to the finite, producing and arranging details which are cognizable by the human mind. Perhaps we shall understand it better if we compare Divine with human creation. The human mind also can create. An engineer, for instance, can create a

1 Church Quarterly Review, October 1891, 'Our Lord's Knowledge as Man.'
great engineering work, an architect a grand building, a poet a great poem, and a painter or sculptor a beautiful work of art. But the human mind in creating is limited to merely thinking out the details of its creation. It cannot give objective existence to its creation. If it wishes to realize its creation objectively, it must make use of the materials and forces of nature. The Divine Mind, on the other hand, by the very act of thinking out (the expression is inappropriate, but we have no other) the details, gives objective existence to its creation. The Divine creation is perfect creation. But the point for us to notice is that the Omniscient Mind of God in creating terminates in the production of a finite universe cognizable by the human mind. In creation, therefore, Omniscient knowledge and a knowledge on the same plane as human knowledge meet together in perfect harmony.

We are told in Scripture that the Creation was effected by and through the Word. It was in His Person, therefore, that the Omniscient Mind descended to the finite, without, of course, parting with its Omniscience, but rather continuing to know both omnisciently and finitely. And in His Person it must have continued to know and act both omnisciently and finitely in the providential ordering of the world. We thus see that the Incarnation was already at the Creation half effected. It wanted only that the Divine Word should enter really into human life by assuming in the fulness of time His human nature.

We have next, in the second place, to consider the effect of the Hamiltonian principle, that the human mind is so constituted as to be able to know only the finite, upon the doctrine of a future life. We have, indeed, already considered this in reference to the almost identical Kantian principle, and we need not repeat what we have said. But the Christian doctrine of the future extends far beyond the mere survival of our personality at the moment of death. It is rather the doctrine of a higher life—a life immensely in advance of our present life. It is necessary, therefore, to look at the principle in reference to this wider prospect.

In order to bring out the point, we may be permitted to refer to what we said in a previous article on our Lord's knowledge as man. In that article we had occasion to point out the limitation and imperfection of human knowledge in contrast with the Divine. And in doing so we were careful to base that limitation solely on the conditions of our present material existence. Human knowledge as it exists at present is, in the first place, sense knowledge, all the knowledge we
have of the universe coming to us through the senses. That being so, it follows, in the second place, that it must be discursive; and in the third place, that it must be superficial—that is, limited to the outside or appearances of things. Why did we so base the limitation of human knowledge? It was in view of the Kantian and Hamiltonian principle, and its influence on the doctrine of a future life. Let us recall to mind that principle, and how it influences the hope of a future life. In the Kantian system the human mind is tied down by *a priori* laws; it is compelled to know things only in accordance with these laws; and in carrying out these laws it *creates* the present phenomenal world. It is clear, therefore, if our personality survives the shock of death and passes into the unseen, it must carry the present phenomenal world with it, or else create a new one in all points like the present. It cannot possibly, *in consequence of these a priori laws which lie in its very essence*, rise to a higher state. The principle, as it is held in the Hamiltonian system, does not go so far. It merely holds that our minds are so constituted as to know only the finite. But, inasmuch as this constitution lies also in their essence, it is clear that the Hamiltonian system also excludes the idea of a higher life in the future. On the other hand, if we base the limitation of our knowledge solely on the conditions of our present material existence, leaving the mind free and unfettered as a knowing power, we do not in any way contract the possibilities of the future. How necessary it is, in view of belief in a future life, to preserve this freedom of the mind, will be seen if we consider the revolution that must take place in human knowledge at the moment of death. It is clear that our present knowledge of the universe which we have by the senses will then come to an end. What will take its place? We know not. It may be that a new and altogether different aspect of the universe will be opened out before us. But on such a theme it is useless, even foolish, to dogmatize. The only thing we know for certain is, that we shall carry with us behind the veil the same free intellect or knowing power which we possess here; and that will form the connecting link between the present life and that which is to come.

But it is as bearing on what we are told in Scripture of the future, more especially what we are told of the Beatific Vision, that the Kantian and Hamiltonian systems are most at fault. They seem to make that Vision impossible. St. Paul indicates the wonderful elevation of the future life above the present, when He says of Christ that He 'shall change
our vile body that it may be like unto His glorious body.'\(^1\)

St. John also speaks of the same elevation, and also directly promises the Beatific Vision, when he says, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.'\(^2\) In regard to the Beatific Vision St. Paul is even more definite than St. John. He says, 'For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.'\(^3\) Here it would seem we are promised not only a vision of the glorified Christ, but also in some way of the Triune God. But how is that possible, if our minds are structured and tied down to a knowledge only of the finite? But if, on the other hand, our minds are free—if even now the intellectual knowledge which we have of the Infinite and Perfect One is a far clearer knowledge than the knowledge we have of any material object which we can see and handle and pull to pieces—the case is altogether different. We can see how, when freed from present material conditions and elevated to a higher state, we might have the vision of the Infinite God. Even then, however, our vision of Him may not be perfect. Had not St. Paul actually said it, we could hardly have presumed to think of our knowing even as we are known. The utmost point to which we could have presumed to go would have been a partial knowledge of the Infinite One. Descartes has an admirable illustration of how this might be. He supposes a man standing on the shore looking out towards the horizon. He knows that what lies before him is the ocean. He also knows a great deal about the ocean; but he cannot sound its depth. He cannot know the vast, the almost infinite, variety of things contained in it. So it may be in the Beatific Vision. We may know God as He is; we may know far more about Him than we know at present. We may know also that we are in His very presence, and with the Psalmist be ready to cry out, 'In Thy Presence is the fulness of joy'; and yet even then the depths of His infinity may be hidden from us.

Before passing from the philosophical standpoint we may make a few remarks on the picture we form in our minds of our Lord's Incarnate Being, more especially as respects the relation between His Divine and human knowledge. This may seem quite a subordinate point; but in reality it is not so. It will have a great influence on our ultimate conclusions; and if we form a wrong picture, it may lead us very far astray. Mr. Powell, in giving his rendering of human know-

\(^1\) Phil. iii. 21. \(^2\) 1 John iii. 2. \(^3\) 1 Cor. xiii. 12.
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ledge, bestows almost exclusive attention on 'consciousness.' This is very natural, following as he does in the steps of Dr. Mansel. His book, for instance, in its subordinate title is 'The relation between our Lord's Divine Omniscience and His human consciousness'; and we do not observe that in treating of the matter he ever goes beyond consciousness. In reality, however, the empirical or waking consciousness covers but a small part of human knowledge. The waking consciousness is merely the light in which the mind acquires or manipulates its knowledge. Behind the waking consciousness there is the sphere of memory, with its vast store of acquired knowledge. It is of great importance that we should take this into account in forming our mental picture of our Lord's Incarnate Being, because it gives us a ground on which, if we take our stand, we shall be able to form some notion of the relation in which the Divine Omniscience stood to His human knowledge. Taking our stand therefore on this, we arrive at this result: In every human being there is, lying behind the waking consciousness, the sphere of memory or of acquired knowledge. It is a vast sphere, the depths of which no one has ever yet sounded. There are in it things of which we have not the remotest conception—things which, when by some chance they come up into consciousness, often excite our astonishment. We may suppose that all or most of them were once in consciousness, and that they have now passed out and remain hidden in the memory, where they remain unnoticed by us, but, as we shall see, not without influence. Now, applying this to the case of our Lord, we see that in forming our picture of His Incarnate Being we must suppose that, behind His waking consciousness, He had, as all men have, this vast sphere of human memory. But His Incarnate Being did not end there. In Him there was another depth of even vaster dimensions—a depth stretching far away into infinity—the whole volume of His Divine Omniscience.

But let us look again a little more closely at this vast sphere of memory. It may lead us to important conclusions. Let us first ask, in what form does our knowledge lie in the memory? Clearly it does not possess any form; it lies in a state of solution, so to speak. But though without form it is not without some definiteness, some kind of particularity; for we have, up to a certain point, power over these stores lying in the memory. We can extract at will particulars from them. Lastly, there is a point of great moment in the present connexion. Our knowledge as it exists in the memory is perfectly formless; but in the very act of re-
miniscence—that is, the act of extracting particulars from it—we give it form, the form which knowledge existing in consciousness usually takes. Now apply this to the case of our Blessed Lord. He had, of course, as we have, the same power of extracting particulars from memory. But as we have seen, He had lying behind His consciousness not only His human memory but the infinitely greater sphere of the Divine Omniscience. What can we say of it? Of the knowledge embraced in it we are not entitled to say that it was formless; we are not, in fact, entitled to say anything regarding it; for it lies quite beyond our knowledge. But we may say thus much. Just as He could extract particulars from the sphere of memory, so also He could extract from His Divine Omniscience; and, what is noteworthy, in the very act of extracting He would translate or give to these particulars a human form. We submit that the picture thus drawn of our Lord's Incarnate life corresponds in all respects to the picture drawn of Him in the Gospels. According to that narrative, He did draw from His Divine Omniscience particulars which He used in His daily life. The case of Nathanael, for instance, or of the stater, or of the man bearing the pitcher of water, or His reading the thoughts and intents of the heart. It is probable that these instances recorded are merely selections from a greater number of cases. In any case He did convey to His disciples the impression of His being Omniscient. St. Peter exclaims, 'Lord, Thou knowest all things,'¹ and the Epistle to the Hebrews states dogmatically, 'All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with Whom we have to do.'²

But there is a further point very important to be observed. In the case of us men the vast store of acquired knowledge lying in the memory, even when not consciously extracted, yet exercises an all-powerful influence in shaping our thoughts and determining our judgments about things. In a former article,³ in dealing with the question of our Lord's inerrancy in human matters, we had occasion to signalize this. We gave as an instance two individuals contemplating the same object—say a meteor in the sky—the one an unlettered peasant, the other a scientific adept. The judgment which the former would have of the matter would probably be all wrong, while the other would form a correct judgment in accordance with science. And yet the latter in forming his judgment would not consciously extract from his memory all

¹ St. John xxi. 17. ² Heb. iv. 12.
³ Church Quarterly Review, January 1893, Art. I.
the particulars he had learned about meteors. But this is the important point. The knowledge was there. It was stored in the memory; and being there, it influenced, necessarily influenced, his mind to form a correct judgment. Now in the case of our Blessed Lord, He had not only in common with us the stores of memory, but He had continually present, as being inseparable from His Person, the whole volume of the Divine Omniscience. How could that be present without influence? Clearly it must have influenced—silently influenced, so to speak—every judgment which He formed as man. If we think of this fact, and give it due weight, we shall see how inconceivable it is that He could ever have gone wrong. We are told that He was influenced by the age in which He lived; but surely we have here an influence vastly greater than any influence that could proceed from the age. We need not, it is true, think that the Divine Omniscience was consciously brought into play; but in common with His memory it lay behind His consciousness, and silently influenced all His judgments.

In this connexion we may notice that expression used by Mr. Powell to which we have already referred. He speaks of knowledge being 'communicated' to our Lord's human mind, and he thinks it was communicated at certain periods of His earthly life. It is an expression which grates sadly on our mind; and we think it betrays an imperfect appreciation of the hypostatic union. As we understand the hypostatic union, our Lord's human soul could possess no knowledge whatever apart from His Divine Person. Knowledge can only reside in the personality, and His human soul possessed no individuality—no personality whatever. It is forgotten that what the Son of God took was not a human being—that is, an entity having an existence in itself. He took human nature, a nature in all respects the same as ours, sin only excepted—in a word, our nature. And in taking it He gave it personality and existence; He gave it His own Personality. He took human nature in order that entering into the stream of humanity, He might be able to think, speak, and act as man, and thereby rescue us from destruction. Hence every thought which passed through His human mind, every word which proceeded from His mouth, every act which He did as man, was the thought, the word, the act of Himself, the Son of God. To say that knowledge was communicated to His human soul is the same thing as to say that He communicated knowledge to Himself. This tendency to regard the humanity of our Lord as standing apart from His Divine Being is the great danger of the age. How could He have
redeemed, purified, elevated human nature if His earthly life was something apart from His Divine life.

We have taken up so much of our space with the consideration of the philosophical aspect of the question, which we considered the most important at the present time, that we have little left in which to do justice to Mr. Powell’s theological treatment of the question. This we very much regret, and we can only hope that those of our readers who are interested in the subject will themselves peruse what Mr. Powell has written. From a theological point of view we think his work is admirably arranged and treated. Mr. Powell, in commencing with his second book, is careful to place in the forefront the two crucial points in the Incarnate work of our Lord—viz. Revelation and Redemption. Our Lord came to impart to mankind a perfect Revelation, and He also came to redeem us. Surely it is from losing sight of these, the two great ends of the Incarnation, that the modern views as to Kenosis have arisen. It is clear that on the Kenotic theory Revelation disappears altogether. The Gospel is not a voice from Heaven, but a voice from Judæa, as Judæa was nineteen hundred years ago; so also the Precious Death loses its value as an atoning Sacrifice, and descends to the level of an example. We would earnestly commend this aspect of the question to many, who without due thought of consequences have adopted these views. Mr. Powell, after devoting a chapter to the consideration of these points, proceeds in his next or second chapter to a closer consideration of the Kenotic theory; and in the course of it he gives a most admirable exposition of the chief passage in dispute (Phil. ii. 7). He first compares the whole passage with the remarkable statement as to our Lord in Heb. i. 1–3; then he gives a careful exegesis of the passage; and lastly completes his account of it by giving a comprehensive sketch of the views of the chief commentators—Greek, Latin, and modern. In the third chapter we have a history of opinion in regard to quiescence, restraint, kenosis and various views tending in that direction. The chapter is divided into three sections: the first traces the history downwards from St. Ignatius to the Reformation; the second from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century; and the third deals with the theories of the nineteenth century. There is much in this chapter that is deeply interesting, and had we had space, it would have been a great pleasure to comment upon it.

Mr. Powell passes in his third book to the consideration of the evidence of the Gospels. It is in this book that
Mr. Powell is at his best. In the first chapter he deals with the evidence of the Gospels as to our Lord’s knowledge of God. We should have liked much to dwell upon this chapter, for there is much in it which is very striking; much, too, which has for the first time been brought out. We can, however, do no more than indicate its contents. He gives inductively a great array of passages, and then points out how our Lord’s knowledge of God is there described as surpassing that which is possible to man. It is also described as being commensurate with that which the Father has. Lastly, it is shown how our Lord claims that His Revelation should be received on account of the Divine character of His knowledge. In the second chapter he passes on to the consideration of our Lord’s knowledge of man. In this he distinguishes between our Lord’s knowledge and the natural gift of reading character, as well as instances of supernatural insight, such as those vouchsafed to Elijah and St. Peter. He shows in the case of our Lord’s knowledge its universality and completeness, and he points out how it must have proceeded from His Omniscience. In the third chapter he passes on to our Lord’s knowledge of facts and events. This is a chapter in which he deals critically with objections from the other side in regard to passages which are alleged as showing ‘ignorance.’ We think he is quite successful, and his victory is assured by his calling attention to the abundant evidence we otherwise have of our Lord’s perfect knowledge. In doing this he passes in review our Lord’s prediction of the details of His Passion. It is one of the most remarkable points of the Gospel history, and it is impossible on any reasonable critical grounds to eliminate it from the narrative. Besides this great event, our author brings forward also the instances of Nathanael, the stater, the colt tied, and the man bearing the pitcher of water. In the end of the chapter he deals with our Lord’s knowledge of the past and of the future.

Two other chapters complete the work. The one deals with the constantly quoted passage, ‘Of that day and that hour knoweth no man,’ &c. His treatment of this point is very good, as is also the concluding chapter on our Lord’s knowledge of the Old Testament.

In taking leave of Mr. Powell, the only thing we would wish is that he might reconsider his position in regard to the hypostatic union. As we have indicated, we hold it to be essential to the Catholic faith that we should believe that every thought which passed through our Lord’s human mind, every word which proceeded from His mouth, every act of
His life, was the thought, the word, the act of Himself, the Son of God. It may seem to some as if such a view would make the Divinity completely overshadow the humanity, and as a consequence render His temptations and His obedience unto death unreal. In reality, however, it is not so, for here the doctrine of quiescence comes in. In the rendering we have given of human knowledge, it has come out that even in our own case a large part of our knowledge is quiescent. The stores of knowledge laid up in the memory, though constantly present, and constantly influencing our thoughts and our judgments, yet for the most part do not come into consciousness. They form a background, an immense store from which at all times we may draw. It is remarkable, too, that in moments of intense interest, or in the agony of mental or bodily suffering, the consciousness of the moment completely overshadows and excludes the background. We know not how far this analogy may be applicable to our Lord's Omniscience. It might be dangerous to press it, or even to regard it as applicable. But at least we may be sure of this—that, having taken our nature with the view of carrying it through temptation and perfecting its obedience, the purpose He had in view was carried out truly and wholly. It is remarkable that our Lord in the agony of the Cross fed His human soul on passages from the Psalms; and in the gathering darkness and the last extremity He gave utterance to the opening words of the twenty-second Psalm, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' Was He at that moment completely absorbed, so to speak, in His humanity? It is a great mystery; but it is suitable rather for devout contemplation than for theological study.

ART. II.—MR. GLADSTONE'S 'LATER GLEANINGS.'


The issue of a new volume of Mr. Gladstone's Gleanings of Past Years will be welcomed by many who are not usually readers of theology. This, the eighth, volume in the series is devoted to theological and ecclesiastical topics. The first chapter of Genesis, considered in the light of the discoveries of physical science, is the subject of the first two papers. The next two are a defence of the Christian Faith against a pair of writers most unlike in their method and temper, Mrs.
Humphry Ward and Colonel Ingersoll. Then follows a trilogy devoted to the Reformation 'Settlement.' A discussion of the miracle worked among the Gadarenes comes next. The ninth essay excited some adverse comment from Churchmen when it first appeared three years ago, and is rather oddly named 'The Place of Heresy and Schism in the Modern Christian Church.' The tenth deals with 'True and False Conceptions of the Atonement.' All of these papers, except the reply to Ingersoll, are reprinted from the Nineteenth Century. The volume also includes a paper on the Lord's Day, contributed in 1895 to the Church Monthly, and a 'General Introduction to Sheppard's Pictorial Bible,' a Chicago publication. At the end of all is a 'Soliloquium and Postscript' dealing with Anglican Orders and the Papal See.

It will be seen that Mr. Gladstone handles subjects of the loftiest importance. Yet probably the chief interest of this collection of essays to many readers will reside in the light they may be found to throw on the ever-fresh and still elusive problem of the eminent writer's own mind and governing convictions. Not that Mr. Gladstone gives an uncertain sound when he writes as a divine or when he writes and speaks as a politician. His style, indeed, is periphrastically polite, and the cautious introduction of a 'hedging' clause into almost every sentence lends an appearance of caniness to his method. But no one can doubt that his theological beliefs are those of a sincere and orthodox Christian, just as no one has any doubt about his political views. The problem lies in the union of old-fashioned and pious conservatism, of adherence to historic and mystical Christianity, with ideals of a 'Manchester' and democratic cast; or rather—since the English mind is built in, as it were, water-tight compartments, and it may be too much to expect the same principles which prevail in the region of pure theology to overflow into and pervade that of practical politics—it puzzles us in that sphere where religion and politics obviously overlap, and where, to a man of eager convictions (which may often change) but few intuitions (which abide through life), there present themselves the greatest temptations to Opportunism. Mr. Gladstone's ecclesiastical proclivities, indeed, have often been a secret or avowed trial to his party. His parliamentary actions and alliances, on the other hand, have sometimes imposed a severe strain on the loyalty of his admirers among Churchmen. And yet perhaps those are right who maintain that Mr. Gladstone has never ceased in politics to be a Tory, and who
trace in his Churchmanship from the first a considerable vein of latitudinarianism.

Whatever may be the answer to these speculations, the leisure of the venerable statesman has been employed on the studies contained in this volume in a manner which will command the admiration of all. Nor is there anything in it which is inconsistent with the following remonstrance:

'As I have lived for more than half a century in an atmosphere of contention, my stock of controversial fire has perhaps become abnormally low; while Professor Huxley, who has been inhabiting the Elysian regions of science, the edita doctrinā sapientīm templā serena,¹ may be enjoying all the freshness of an unjaded appetite. Certainly one of the lessons life has taught me is that, where there is known to be a common object, the pursuit of truth, there should also be a studious desire to interpret the adversary in the best sense his words will fairly bear; to avoid whatever widens the breach; and to make the most of whatever tends to narrow it. These I hold to be part of the laws of knightly tournament' (pp. 43-4).

This does not prevent him from dealing the antagonists whom he is concerned with in The Dawn of Creation and of Worship and in The Proem to Genesis some doughty blows. The anti-theological prepossession which at the outset rules belief in the supernatural to be inadmissible, and which 'puts opposing inquirers summarily out of the way as disturbers of the public peace,' is, Mr. Gladstone's remarks, scarcely the token of 'a strictly scientific spirit' (pp. 2, 3). If to match together the Vedas, the Norse legends, and the Egyptian remains is extolled as 'comparative religion,' that peculiarly modern invention, why is a detailed comparison of Genesis with the Homeric poems to be scouted as childish? (p. 7). Professor Max Müller finds solarism in everything, like men who have looked at the sun till they can see nothing else: in Puss in Boots, doubtless, and in The Cow jumped over the Moon. But while admitting that the solar theory has an important place in solving the problems of the Aryan religions, Mr. Gladstone emphatically affirms, from his life-long study of the Olympian system as built up by Homer, that 'its dominating spirit is intensely human. It is, therefore, of necessity thoroughly anti-elemental' (pp. 75-6). Similarly he claims the correspondence of the latest ethnological science with the narrative of the dispersion and distribution of the human family recorded in the tenth chapter of Genesis. 'As an historical document the chapter stands without a peer among archaic monuments' (p. 377).

¹ Lucretius, ii. 8.
It is the defence of the 'great Chapter' one which is the immediate object of the first two papers already mentioned, and of part of the last in the book. The Proem to Genesis

'was long a favourite subject of attack, and defenders came to be somewhat disheartened and intimidated. But there has grown up a conviction that this Chapter is a great fortress of the Scriptures, not an open passage through which they may be advantageously assailed. . . . And at the very outset we ought to cast aside the poor and artificial shelter which some have sought in broadly distinguishing between spiritual matters and matters physical, in which last it is said it was not the design of Scripture to furnish us with an education. Nor is it. But spiritual facts may have a physical side, and facts physical a spiritual side; nor can a sharp or defensible line be drawn between them. The Ascension, the Resurrection, even the Incarnation of Christ, involved strongly physical elements, and the plea of defence is one fatal to their authority. Even so the announcement of Creation in this great chapter, to mention nothing else, is one of the greatest and most pregnant moral facts in the whole Bible' (p. 379).¹

Not that we may, as it were, boil down the chapter, and, skimming off the spiritual and moral truths, cast the physical statements of the narrative away. There are many who would apply this treatment to the Gospel narrative also, and, while preserving the 'spiritual truths' of resurrection and ascension, discard the miraculous history. Nor if we do the one can we refuse to do the other. If the Bible was not written to teach us physical science, neither was it written to teach us Palestinian history. The purpose of the narrative of Creation was certainly 'not to rear cosmic philosophers, but to furnish ordinary, and especially primitive, men with some idea of what the Creator had done in the way of providing for them a home and giving them a place in nature' (p. 9). But when the inspired Writer does this by means of

¹ May we not look on David's psalm, Domine, Dominus noster, as describing very beautifully the spiritual meaning of Genesis i.? 'O Lord our Governor, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world, Thou that hast set Thy glory above the heavens . . . I will consider Thy heavens, even the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained. What is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him? Thou madest him [a little] lower than the angels, Thou crownedst him with glory and worship. Thou madest him to have dominion of the works of Thy hands, and Thou didst put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea and the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air and the fishes of the sea, and whatsoever walketh through the paths of the seas. O Lord, our Governor, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world.'
a series of solemn affirmations, carefully, though not scientifically, worded, concerning the order of the Almighty's creative action, it is surely not open to Christians to push those affirmations lightly on one side. The more closely the words of the narrative are scanned the more wonderful it will appear, as revealing that which man's unaided mind could never have discovered, and confirming, rather than anticipating, that which it was within the reach of human faculties to learn. Professor Huxley, it is true, treats the class of Reconcilers with unmeasured scorn; and Professor Huxley was an unsurpassed authority on questions of physical science. On the other hand, another eminent authority, Professor Dana, wrote on April 16, 1886, 'I agree in all essential points with Mr. Gladstone, and believe that the first chapters of Genesis and Science are in accord' (quoted on p. 39). May it not be that Mr. Huxley, who had studied nature very deeply, had studied the Bible very superficially? What, after all, are the objections to the Biblical narrative of Creation? That it omits the periods of invertebrate life that should come between the creation of Plant life and the creation of Fishes, and also omits the great age of Reptiles, with their antecessors the Amphibia, whose place should be between Fishes and Birds. Mr. Gladstone, however, is no doubt right in thinking that 'what the Mosaic writer had in his mind were the creatures with which Adamic man was conversant' (p. 54), and which were placed under his dominion. Such 'creeping things' as then remained were but a sort of appendage to the mammals. The same is the explanation of the mention only of the later forms of plant life, given to man for food. If, further, it be granted that the periods of creation of the different species overlapped, the only remaining objections to the Biblical cosmogony are those ancient cavils repeated by Dr. Réville, the Hibbert lecturer for 1884, in his Prolegomena to the History of Religions (p. 42), as (1) that the heaven is spoken of in Genesis i. 6 as a solid vault (στερέωσις, LXX): whereas the Hebrew word means 'expanse,' which stands in the margin of the Revised Version; (2) that in verse 16 the Biblical cosmogony places the creation of the stars after the formation of the earth: whereas, in fact, nothing is said about 'creation,' the 'making' or appointment of the two great lights, to rule day and night respectively, being followed simply by the words, 'the stars also'; (3) that the grass,
herb, and fruit trees precede the making of the sun—an old difficulty, amply explained, however, by the now usually accepted nebular or rotatory hypothesis, which requires light to have been diffused before it was concentrated, and the sun to have been felt before it was visible through the earth's envelope of vapour. In the Hebrew, if not in the Greek, there is a marked distinction between 'creating' and making, forming or fashioning. When Dr. Réville speaks of the 'creation' of the stars and the 'formation' of the earth, he is incorrect in both cases. The original uses the word 'create' significantly and scientifically. 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' (verse 1). In verse 21 'create' is used of the beginning of animal life. Thirdly, in verse 27, 'God created man in His own image.' Further, the creation of the visible universe seems to be presented as a whole in the first paragraph (verses 1–5), and then distributively in the second paragraph (verses 6–19). The entire narrative exhibits an orderly progression from chaos to cosmos, from lower to higher, from simple to complex, divided into stages. Mr. Gladstone observes:

'If we hold that the days of the great chapter are not periods of twenty-four hours, but great chapters of action, capable of over-
in verse 14 as set in the firmament to divide the day from the night, and to be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, and probably mean the planets, which could only become spherically luminous when a sufficient quantity of light-force was accumulated on or in the sun. But their use for the service of man is subordinate and partial.

1 Mr. Gladstone observes that the reason why the Septuagint uses ποιεῖν throughout is probably that the idea of creation proper was not familiar to the Greeks, and their language contained no better word to express it (p. 10). But most commonly elsewhere κτίζειν is used of elemental creation, as at Psalm cxlviii. 5, οὗτος ἐνετελάτω καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν. At Isaiah xliv. 7 three words are used: ἐγὼ ὁ κτιστασθηκώς φῶς καὶ ποίησας σκιότος, ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κτίζων κακόν. Κτίζειν is especially used of the creation of Man, as at Deut. iv. 32, ἐκτείνειν ὁ Θεός ἑυθυρμοὺν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; and in the New Testament it is the proper word: see Col. i. 16, iii. 10; Rev. iv. 11, x. 6, &c. So 'the Creator' is ὁ κτίστης (1 Peter iv. 19) or ὁ κτίσας (Eccl. xii. 1; Rom. i. 25).

2 In this and a few other places there are slips of expression or of printing, venial if the venerable author, as is probable, corrects his own pages. 'Great chapter' is here repeated in a different sense. On p. 411, last line, 'the reliance which the loyal Roman Catholic places upon the ... action of His Church' should be 'his Church'; and so again on p. 412, line 3. On p. 35, n. 1, the bracket is closed too soon. On p. 68, line 19, 'unfolding' should perhaps be 'enfolding,' and on p. 104, last line, 'admit' should be 'submit.' On p. 116, line 8, 'in many cases' is repeated just afterwards. On p. 144, line 19, for 'Code Napoleon' read 'Napoléon'; on p. 219, line 5, for 'dauble' read 'double,' and on p. 298, last line but three, 'they' is required before 'may.'
lapping, rather than mere time, this is not a denial that the several
stages might have been accomplished in any number of our chronic
hours, however small, had it pleased the Almighty Father (p. 383).

In somewhat the same way Sir Thomas Browne, while
fantastically declaring that time is but five days elder than
ourselves, says elsewhere:

'Some believe there went not a minute to the World's creation,
nor shall there go to its destruction; those six days, so punctually
described, make not to them one moment, but rather seem to manifest
the method and Idea of the great work of the intellect of God than
the manner how He proceeded in its operation.'

But we must pass on to Mr. Gladstone's handling of
Robert Elsmere, the most noted of the new style of 'propa-
gandist romances.' A hundred years ago fiction was employed
by a gifted woman, Maria Edgeworth, to convey eternal
truths under the guise of Moral Tales. The doctrines of the
High Church revival were conveyed into thousands of pure
homes through the refined and wholesome genius of Miss
Yonge, still happily doing her beneficent work. More recently
the novel has been used by lady writers, more or less gifted,
to inculcate Broad-Churchism, positivism, agnosticism, and that
substitute for the Gospel of the Redeemer which is styled the
Service of Man. Mrs. Humphry Ward's mistake, as an artist
and a controversialist, is to set up a man of straw, a clergy-
man whose religion has rested 'on the poetical and dramatic
instincts of a passionate nature,' to be easily knocked over
by the hackneyed arguments against Christianity of a sceptical
squire. Mr. Gladstone says:

'The one side is a psæan, and the other a blank. A great creed,
with the testimony of eighteen centuries at its back, cannot find an
articulate word to say in its defence' (p. 83).

Dr. Johnson, we know, in his imaginary reports of the Par-
lliamentary debates 'took care not to let the Whig dogs have
the best of it'; but his friends considered he had shown
great impartiality. Macaulay, too, in the 'Conversation
between Mr. Abraham Cowley and Mr. John Milton touching
the Great Civil War,' contrives that the cavalier disputant
shall be defeated, but is too skilful a rhetorician not to keep
up the interest on both sides. But in Mrs. Ward's novel
supernatural Christianity goes down at a touch. Mr. Glad-

1 Religio Medici (Macmillan, 1881), p. 20.
2 Ibid. p. 72.
3 Robert Elsmere, i. 121, 123.
4 Johnson, by Leslie Stephen, p. 28.
5 Miscellaneous Writings, p. 45.
stone gives some pages to the discussion of Miracles, disbelief in which, indeed, comes rather from the set of the mind than from the reason, where there is still belief in the existence of a Will above ourselves.

' The multiplication of enjoyments, through the progress of commerce and invention, enhances the materialism of life, strengthens by the forces of habit the hold of the seen world upon us, and leaves less both of brain power and of heart power available for the unseen' (p. 99).

But he shows that the excision of the miraculous element still leaves large portions of the sacred story—all, for instance, between the Procession of Palms and the Death on the Cross—and many features of the New Testament system, quite irreconcilable with a merely human Christ. Every religion which believes in God is dogmatic, and undogmatic religion would be fiction volatilized into feeling, irrational emotion built upon nothing in the way of fact. There is a terrible disease that takes the form of a softening of the bones, the skeleton and the framework of the body, which can no longer hold itself and its members upright. A New Brotherhood religion which, by rejecting the doctrine of the God-Man and the system of sacramental grace, resolves fraternity into a mere sentiment, helpless to explain itself, is in the same case.

' The chasm between deity and the human soul, over which the scheme of Redemption has thrown a bridge, again yawns beneath our feet, in all its breadth and depth' (p. 101).

To banish the supernatural idea and character of the Redeemer, while adopting His moral teachings, is, Mr. Gladstone says,

' from my antiquated point of view, simply to bark the tree, and then, as the death which ensues is not immediate, to point out with satisfaction on the instant that it still waves living branches in the wind. We have before us a huge larcenous appropriation, by the modern schemes, of goods which do not belong to them. They carry peacock's feathers, which adorn them for a time, and which they cannot reproduce' (p. 107).

These Elgood Street brotherhoods aim, it would seem, at a reformed rather than a regenerated world. Their ideals of Progress are not only defective, one-sided, and lacking in many of the nobler and more poetic elements of life, but the instincts and aspirations of the natural man, needing neither redemption, nor new birth, nor discipline and correction, are to be its starting point. The temper of our age is Pelagian.
There is one feature which almost uniformly marks writers whose mind, as in this case, is of a religious tone, or who do not absolutely exclude religion, while they reject the Christian dogma and the authority of Scripture. They appear to have a very low estimate both of the quantity and quality of sin: of its amount, spread like a deluge over the world, and cf the subtility, intensity, and virulence of its nature (p. 114). ... I for one do believe that in many cases the reason why the doctrines of grace, so profoundly embedded in the Gospel, are dispensed with by the negative writers of the day, is in many cases because they have not fully had to feel the need of them: because they have not travelled with St. Paul through the dark valley of agonizing conflict, or with Dante along the circles downward and the hill upward; because, having to bear a smaller share than others of the common curse and burden, they stagger and falter less beneath their weight (p. 116).

In his transatlantic antagonist Mr. Gladstone has to meet an assailant of Christianity of a coarser and more thorough-going school. The discussion turns on such well-worn topics, springing up like again and again demolished nettles, as the slaying by Jepthah of his daughter, the command to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, Darwinianism, the sufferings here of the good, the injustice of punishing men hereafter for their religious opinions. On the last point Mr. Gladstone has some excellent observations, which strike at the root of a dogma of ecclesiastical Liberalism. That belief is independent of the will is shown to be 'a plausibility of the shallowest kind' (p. 152). Even a boy who brings out his sum wrong has probably been careless, or has not attended at some previous time to his teachers, and so is rightly punished. Worthy people who publish treatises proving the quadrature of the circle usually show some signs of egotism or ambition. But much more in the region of moral and religious opinion are bias, prejudice, laziness, stubbornness, conceit, and pride likely to enter. Is it conceivable that a man's conclusions, say in politics, shall not be influenced by passions and motives that can be controlled, by love and patriotism, by self-interest and prepossession? 'You will admit,' says Colonel Ingersoll, 'that he who now persecutes for opinion's sake is infamous.' Again, he describes 'the dogma of eternal pain' as 'that infamy of infamies.' Accordingly, anyone who has ever sincerely believed in eternal pain, or in the duty of saving from it men who are in error by afflicting their bodies (the early Puritan settlers in New England, for instance), is infamous. And yet opinion, he tells the public, is independent

1 Reply to Dr. Field, North American Review, No. 372, p. 477.
of the will, and men are in no way responsible for their beliefs. Did not Thuggism honestly believe murder to be innocent? Colonel Ingersoll's own conclusions in those deep and difficult matters where it is a duty to 'keep steady the ever-quivering balance of our faculty of judgment' are utterly reckless. As his critic says, he 'chooses to ride an unbroken horse and to throw the reins upon his neck' (p. 158). On such a steed he might be supposed to have 'galloped not through, but about, the sacred volume, much as a man lightly glances over the pages of an ordinary newspaper or novel' (p. 124)—that volume which 'has been to many and justly famous men a study "never ending, still beginning" . . . opening height on height and with deep answering to deep, and with increase of fruit ever prescribing increase of effort' (p. 144).

The eloquent American

'has sounded all these depths, has found them very shallow, and is quite able to point out \(^1\) the way in which the Saviour of the world might have been a much greater teacher than He actually was; had He said anything, for instance, of the family relation, had He spoken against slavery and tyranny, had he issued a sort of code Napoléon embracing education, progress, scientific truth and international law.'\(^2\)

\(^1\) Reply to Dr. Field, p. 490.

\(^2\) Ibid.

In the three papers on the Reformation period we turn to a different vein of interest. The 'great national to-and-fro of the sixteenth century,' the swaying of Church and nation first this way and then that under four successive rulers, was due to the near balance of parties; and it was not till the seventeenth century that 'the consciences of the country came to a settlement of their accounts with one another' (p. 160), the previous movement having been rather one of nationalism. The Church became under Laud a 'vast and definite force'; but Mr. Gladstone thinks it necessary to echo the old misleading Whig phrases about 'close alliance with despotism,' whereby 'in retribution for its sins it shared the ruin of arbitrary power' (p. 161). It was surely the Church that pulled the Monarchy down, more than the Monarchy the Church; and, had Charles I. saved his life and the name of king by abandoning his spiritual Mother, the Throne might have stood, but the Church, as an apostolic institution, would have been mercilessly suppressed. Whether Authority is from above or from below was the issue that had somehow to be fought out both in Church and State. Turning to Puritanism, Mr. Glad-
stone speaks of it as a 'partner ejected from the firm' in 1662 (p. 162). It was truly rather a new firm trading under the old name. At that time 'a small numerical minority of the country, but with more than a proportionate share both of its distinguished theologians and of its religious life'—can Mr. Gladstone really place Baxter and his associates so high in the great Caroline age?—Puritanism has now become 'a solid, inexorable fact of religious history' (pp. 162, 163). It represents an 'essential requisite of the national character' (p. 216). 1 Yet Puritanism was at first an imported article and not native-born. Mr. Gladstone shows with much lucidity that the Reformation changes were not manufactured for the Church, or against the Church, by the civil power, but were her own act. A basis of ecclesiastical legality for these changes was laid, not by the persons popularly known as the Reformers, but in the sanction, earlier than the rupture with Rome, of the collective national episcopate, including such names as Warham, Tunstal, Gardiner, and Fisher. The King thought the synodical action of the Convocations so essential that he pressed for it with tenacious eagerness. But the pressure which Henry exercised to procure, in 1531, the recognition of the Sovereign as 'quantum per legem Christi licet supremum caput' cannot justly, Mr. Gladstone considers, be called terrorism (pp. 171, 236). In 1534 both of the as yet unpacked Convocations—York unanimiter and Canterbury with but five dissentients—agreed that the Bishop of Rome by the sacred Scriptures has no greater jurisdiction in the realm of England than any other foreign bishop. Our Church has never denied the primatial and patriarchal pre-eminence of the see of Rome, and could not do so while appealing to antiquity. But a Divine and Scriptural right of ordinary jurisdiction outside Italy had, in the earlier stage of the Reformation, few defenders in any quarter. At the same time we feel that in breaking with Rome the men of that age only

1 'To Puritanism,' Mr. Gladstone says, 'we owe it that the doctrine of non-resistance, the birth-sin of the English Reformation and the plague-spot of the Church of England, did not undermine and absorb the political liberties of the nation' (p. 216). He would seem to speak here rather as the inheritor of political formulas than as the historical student. For, as was shown in a former number of this Review (vol. xlv. April 1897, art. 'Christian Monarchy'), there was no question from Wyclif's time to that of Hobbes and Locke about the sinfulness of resistance to lawful authority, but only as to where that authority resided—whether in pope, king, consistory, or parliament. The original maintainers of the right of resisting and dethroning the king were the Papalists and Jesuits, whose arguments were borrowed by Presbyterian and Parliamentarian. Passive obedience was to be transferred to pope, Kirk, or the Houses.
partly perceived the gravity and irretrievableness of the step, which for the first time cut off the Church of England from the sodality and communion of Western Christendom, and left it insular, weak, and at the mercy of the civil power.

The Headship, indeed, was declared on both sides to be nothing new. The province of Canterbury could not create an attribute for the king of the realm (p. 242). None of the Tudor sovereigns exercised the royal supremacy more unhesitatingly than Mary, and whatever was done in her reign to reverse the changes carried out under Henry and Edward was royal and Parliamentary, not synodical. Hence at Elizabeth's accession the pre-Marian acts of the Church itself had still ecclesiastical validity, and only needed the removal by Parliament of legal impediments to revive in full force. At the same time the field was cleared, by death and by the entirely regular deprivation of bishops intruded in the last reign, for the establishment of a legal and canonical episcopate in sympathy with the new order. Too much in sympathy, indeed. The tide was running violently towards a semi-Zwinglian Protestantism, and the bishops went with the tide. How much we owe to Elizabeth for standing almost alone in the breach is clearly brought out in these pages. Putting the reactionary Papists aside, there really was no conservative party to look to for support. Yet she not only stopped the further de-Catholicizing of the Church, but set herself to reconstruct. Mr. Gladstone says:

'The singular feature of the Queen's conduct is this, that she used arbitrary power in opposition to the sense of her prelates, in order to maintain the strict law and discipline of the Church' (p. 211).

'... She pursued her work from first to last mainly in opposition to the Church's rulers and without a party to support her' (p. 216).

Nevertheless Elizabeth repudiated the title, however modified, of Head of the Church, and, reviving the Act for the Restraint of Appeals, with its famous Preamble, reasserted in her Act of Uniformity the principle that spiritual causes are to be decided by spiritual, or at least duly qualified, persons, rather than by Cromwells, Somersets, and Northumberlands (p. 198). She restored the congé d'eslire, shelved the revolutionary Reformatio Legum, forbade the Commons to innovate upon the Prayer Book, while procuring the restoration to it, at points chosen with remarkable skill, of some Catholic features. She

'established as her ordinary method of action in Church matters that of communications from herself or her council to the Primate or the
bishops, as the actual chief magistrates of the Church, sometimes in
the tone of request, sometimes of injunction (p. 212),
and put an end to the system of commissions during pleasure.
She obtained the formal recognition of the authority of the
Church in controversies of faith, as well as of its power to
decree rites and ceremonies (Art. xx.), and the enactment that
nothing should be declared anew to be heresy except with the
assent of the spirituality and the temporality. Her policy
was strictly constructive and conservative—namely,
'to build up the Church beneath the shadow of the prerogative,
which had been used so largely under Henry and Edward to depress
and dishonour it as to threaten depriving it of all capacity to com-
mand respect, to train character, or to exercise beneficial influence' (p. 216).

The controversy with Professor Huxley concerning the
swine miracle at Gadara is narrowed to the vital point—Were
the owners of the swine under the Mosaic law? Mr. Huxley
confuses the character of the local civil government, and the
wealthy class attached to it, with that of the general popula-
tion (p. 251). Mr. Gladstone abundantly shows from Josephus
and Strabo that Gadaris, the 'country of the Gadarenes,' called in St. Luke viii. 37 the 'surrounding country of the
Gerasenes,' was from ancient time Jewish, forming part of the
old promised land (p. 274). Nor is it probable that our
Lord
'should have carried His ministry into a really Greek or Gentile
district on the only one occasion when He thought fit to run counter
to the public sentiment, and to give His action the character of a
serious interference with the rights of property' (p. 976).

This, however, presumes the story to be in its main outline
true, whereas Mr. Huxley tears it away from the Synoptist
narrative, which yet he considers that it generally discredits.
We pass on to the article already mentioned as striking what
will seem the 'Broad-Church' note in Mr. Gladstone's eccle-
siastical attitude, 'The Place of Heresy and Schism in the
Modern Christian Church.' Mr. Gladstone starts with the
declaration that Christ our Lord founded the Church as a
visible and organized society, apostolically constituted and
commissioned (p. 280). What, then, would be
'the condition of any who, acknowledging His authority, should yet
rebel against the jurisdiction then solemnly constituted, should sever
themselves, in doctrine or in communion, from His servants, and

1 St. Mark v. 1 ; St. Luke viii. 26,
should presume in this way to impair their witness and to frustrate thereby His work, so far as in them lay? This question did not escape the forethought of our Saviour, and it was dealt with by Him in the simplest and most decisive manner. "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." With this stringent law the language of the Apostles coincides, and, most markedly perhaps among them all, the language of St. John, who was especially the Apostle of love. The work of heretics and schismatics was a work of the flesh, it excluded from salvation' (pp. 280, 281).

Mr. Gladstone, nevertheless, pleads for 'an alteration in the ancient modes of dealing with' heretics and schismatics (p. 297). The Church is no longer a 'city set on a hill,' confronting a hostile world (p. 281). The elements of evil which at first carried on an open warfare with the Church 'have since the fourth century wrought against her true life and spirit more subtly from within' (p. 282). But, moreover, the evidence pointing out a clear duty of allegiance has become darkened and perplexed. During the agonizing Arian struggle 'what could be the responsibility of the individual Christian for threading his way through the mazes of theological controversy to the truth?' (p. 285). Since then East and West have parted company. The Eastern Church ceased to be homogeneous. In the sixteenth century came the breach of portions of the Western Church with Rome. And out of the loins of that severance sprang the myriad clashing sects. Nor are these last ephemeral, meteoric, transitory. Where there is no blessing from God heresy has been short-lived. But the 'massive Protestantism' of Northern Europe is 'a hard, inexpugnable, intractable, indigestible fact' (p. 287). Mr. Gladstone is here not very consistent. He remarks just before that Churches tainted with Eutychian and Nestorian error have subsisted from the fifth century to the present day (pp. 286, 307). And when he compares the durability of Dissent with the fleeting existence of 'the Gnostic, the Arian, the Donatist, the Monophysite' (p. 287), he forgets that he says himself, in another essay, that 'many generations passed before Arianism wholly ceased to be the basis of Christian profession in sections of Christendom,' while Donatism (to say nothing of Arianism and Gnosticism)

1 It is going too far, however, to say that 'they appear to enjoy equally with the Orthodox Church the prerogative of perpetuity' (p. 287). The East Syrians, among whom the mission priests of the Archbishop of Canterbury now work, once outnumbered, it is said, all the rest of Christendom. They are now a remnant of about two hundred thousand.

2 That on Robert Elsmere, p. 102.
took centuries to extinguish. The oldest of our sects counts but three centuries, and those which date before this reign have only survived by gradually discarding the Calvinism which gave them birth. Dissent will doubtless exist considerably longer as a political force and as a protest against the principle of Authority in religion. It will continue as a force opposing the Church—opposing, that is, the sacerdotal and sacramental aspects of historic Christianity. But as a system of positive, evangelical religion 'inorganic Protestantism' is almost at an end. The rationalistic and down-grade movement finds in it no logical standpoint of resistance. 'Singularly active and progressive' Mr. Gladstone calls it (p. 288). He recalls times when 'it has appeared as if the hands principally charged with the training of souls for God were the hands mainly or only of Nonconformists' (ibid.) Such disparagement of old-fashioned Churchmanship is now a somewhat facile commonplace; but, granting it fully true, it supplies the reason why Nonconformity has held its own, not why it will do so in the future. Mr. Gladstone, again, could 'but too easily quote the cases in which the Christian side of political controversies has been largely made over by the members of the English Church to the championship of Nonconformists' (ibid.) The distinguished statesman is, no doubt, thinking of some of those political controversies with which his own name is connected, though he instances the abolition of negro slavery in 1833 (p. 289). It must be remembered, however, that there are usually two sides from which a Christian may view moral questions. The Nonconformists have been Mr. Gladstone's loyal supporters as regards Greece, as regards 'peace and retrenchment,' as regards the franchise, and generally in those causes which have Philanthropy, Freedom, Democratic Progress, and the like inscribed on their banner. But the opponents of those causes also looked at the question from the point of view of principle. Even as regards slavery Churchmen were not backward (if it be so) because they or their friends owned slaves, but because they feared the disorganization of society and clung to the idea of subordination as its basis. They had their ideal, as the emancipators had theirs. Even the heathen

1 Not, however, on the Marriage question. We rejoice that Mr. Gladstone reaffirms that our Lord 'taught (according to the widest and, I believe, the best opinion) the absolute indissolubility of marriage' (p. 144). But his familiar doctrine that no bond of union should continue where union of hearts is absent surely strikes at the root of this affirmation. Unfortunately the Nonconformists and Mr. Gladstone come together again on the Wife's Sister Bill.
master or mistress was often an affectionate parent to the 
*familia* of bondservants. So the trusty slave laments Alcestis’ 
death—

\[ \text{απομαίζων ἐμὴν} \]
\[ \text{ἐπετοιμασάν, ἥ μοι πᾶσι τ' οἰκέταισιν ἔμ} \]
\[ μὴν κ.τ.λ. } \text{ (Eurip. } \text{Alcestis, 768–770.)} \]

If the Nonconformists have sometimes been more zealous for 
humanitarian causes than Churchmen it must not be forgotten 
that, just as a man has ‘les défauts de ses qualités,’ so he has 
also the qualities of his defects. A general dislike to authority, 
for instance, will predispose him to champion the oppressed. 
Revolt from dogmatic and revealed religion may make him 
earnest on behalf of ‘moral’ causes.¹

Now the break-up of Christendom is undoubtedly a reason 
for deeming more hopefully of persons who are leading Chris-
tian lives outside the fold of the Apostolic Church, and a great 
distinction is to be made between the originator of a heresy 
or a schism and persons brought up in hereditary error. 
But Mr. Gladstone appears to argue that the existing varieties 
of Christianity should at last be recognized as a permanent, un-
challengeable, and unblamable fact. He is himself fully aware 
of the gravity of ‘extenuating the responsibilities which attach 
to heresy and schism, and tampering with the securities for 
the maintenance of the true Apostolic doctrine’ (p. 304).

¹ ‘Non-Anglican Protestantism’ is praised (p. 288) in that it has 
‘built itself steadily upward without aid, generally speaking, from any 
other than internal and voluntary sources.’ What is the invidiously 
suggested comparison?
sicut tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint: ut credat mundus quia tu me misisti'? Mr. Gladstone, indeed, ingeniously reasons that the divisions of Christians are a great proof to the heathen that the Father has sent the Son, because of their 'accordant witness to the truths that our religion is the religion of the God-Man, and that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh' (p. 308)—Pentecost, as it were, amid Babel. In an eloquent passage he compares 'genuine undenominationalism' with 'spurious.' The former is thus described:

'I do not know on earth a more blessed subject of contemplation than that which I should describe as follows. There are, it may be, upon earth four hundred and fifty million of professing Christians. There is no longer one fold under one visible shepherd. Christ's flock is broken up into scores, it may be hundreds, of sections. These sections are not at peace, but at war. Nowhere are they too loving to one another; for the most part love is hardly visible among them. Each makes it a point to understand his neighbour not in the best sense, but in the worst; and the thunder of anathema is in the air. But they all profess the Gospel. And what is the Gospel?... With exceptions so slight that we may justly set them out of the reckoning, the reply is still the same as it was in the Apostolic age, the central truth of the Gospel lies in the Trinity and the Incarnation, in the God that made us and the Saviour that redeemed us. When I consider what human nature and human history have been, and how feeble is the spirit in its warfare with the flesh, I bow my head in amazement before this mighty moral miracle, this marvellous concurrence evolved from the very heart of discord.

'Such, as I apprehend, is the undenominational religion of heaven, of the blissful state. It represents perfected union with Christ and conformity to the will of God... It is the fair fabric now exhibited in its perfection, which could afford to drop, and has dropped, all the scaffolding supplied by the Divine Architect in His wisdom for the rearing of the structure.... Whatever may have been the means, God the Holy Ghost has been the worker.... In some cases the auxiliary apparatus was elaborate and rich, in others it was elementary and simple' (pp. 299-301).

The 'spurious undenominationalism' is the establishment by

1 St. John xvii. 21.
2 In the Proem to Genesis, p. 72, Mr. Gladstone says, 'It may be that Christianity itself is in some sort a scaffolding, and that the final building is a pure and perfect theism.' He tells us in a note (ibid) that Cardinal Manning and Dr. Hutton both wrote to remonstrate with him on this passage, as 'disparaging to the honour of our Lord's humanity,' but that his intention was simply to conform to 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28. To style the Plan of Redemption a mere scaffolding is surely not only disparaging but untrue.
law of this 'common Christianity' as the exclusive religion authorized in public elementary teaching. This is to manipulate the religion of our Lord and Saviour by 'uncommissioned hands' (p. 302), a 'profane and sacrilegious' 'trespass on the province of the sanctuary' (p. 304) and an invasion of the rights of the private conscience, which is the vicegerent of God (p. 309). It is not clear whether Mr. Gladstone is here attacking his own party and its backbone, or Mr. Riley and the Circular. But to return to that undenominationalism which Mr. Gladstone finds 'in the highest degree cheering and precious' (p. 299); we fear his characteristic optimism carries him too far. Those who reject the principle of sacramentalism and sacerdotalism can have but a weak hold on the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Mediatorial Priesthood. And there are abundant signs, brought out painfully in the London School Board controversy, that 'non-Episcopal Protestants' are ceasing to regard the Trinity itself as essential to be believed in for eternal life. The tendency is to regard the Christian creed as merely of the bene esse of religion. Its third paragraph he himself seems to consider as non-essential (p. 308). Further, he bears witness that if the sects are less opposed to one another than once, it is only because those who retained some supernatural view of doctrine are now giving it up and so falling into line with the rest; e.g. for Baptists baptism now resolves itself into 'a becoming and convenient form' (p. 298). And while we may be deeply thankful that so many millions of Christians profess, at least in name, common fundamentals of faith, shall we forget the vast Mahometan apostacy? In abandoning those fundamentals men cease to be Christians. We have a further criticism to make. Mr. Gladstone's plea for a recognized place for 'heretics and schismatics' (the expression is his own) in the modern Church may hold good for individuals, but cannot apply to sectarian organizations, or (as he calls them) 'Churches' (pp. 418, 424). These are of man's making, not God's. The Almighty, we are reminded, did not deal with the Ten Tribes after the Schism as He did with Korah and his company (p. 295). Yet Jeroboam 'made Israel to sin.' The modern sects are not in

1 Yet we cannot help remembering that in 1891 or 1892 the party then led by Mr. Gladstone (who, however, took no personal part in the debates) moved a set motion to enact popular control over voluntary schools.

2 Though in a postscript (p. 311) Mr. Gladstone speaks of Unitarians as a section of the Christian body, and guards himself against being thought to reflect on them.
the same case with fourteenth-century Christians perplexed between pope and anti-pope (p. 286); for so far from seeking for the rightful Apostles of the Lord, to obey them, they base themselves deliberately and avowedly on the negation of the apostolic principle and on freedom for believers to combine and organize themselves as they think right. As a convinced individualist and upholder of the divine right of the private conscience Mr. Gladstone perhaps approximates more nearly to their standpoint than he thinks.

We gladly turn to Mr. Gladstone’s defence of the Atonement evoked by Mrs. Besant’s rash and vain Autobiography. Nothing could be more weighty than his vindication of the deeply ethical, and not merely forensic, character of the vicarious Sacrifice, which ‘some preachers have so vulgarized by treating the transaction as one across the counter’ (p. 326). On the other hand Mr. Gladstone does not rest in the rationalistic explanation of the Cross as meant merely to touch the conscience of transgressors. We need actual incorporation into Jesus Christ, who ‘at the cost of great suffering establishes in His own person a type, a matrix, so to speak, for humanity raised to its absolute perfection’ (p. 322). We need a real renewal in Him. The Atonement then ‘has its foundations deeply laid in the moral order of the world’ (p. 329). It is not ‘a passport for sin’ (p. 331). This is a sufficient reply to the argument that for the One to bear the punishment of the many is immoral. Nevertheless every theory of the Atonement is inadequate by itself. The precious Blood-shedding is also in a true sense expiatory, propitiatory, satisfactory. There is a ‘wrath of God,’ an eternal law that must be vindicated, a debt that must be paid. And the surrender of life is more than a crowning act of obedience; it contains a real mystery; so that Isaac beneath the knife is an incomplete type of the ‘obedience unto death, even the death of the σταυρός’ (Phil. ii. 8). Our Blessed Redeemer’s was not any kind of ‘great suffering,’ but the sacrificial death of the representative Man. So that the Atonement is substitutional. Yet we must realize our identification with the Sufferer. There is a very wide-spread tendency to minimize the awful significance of the Atonement, and perhaps the favour which a Scotist view of the Incarnation has lately obtained among us proceeds from an unconscious reaction from ‘evangelical’ insistence on the Cross.

The essay on the ‘Lord’s Day’ has some fine and striking expressions, but is rather circumlocutory and vague. The ‘Introduction to Sheppard’s Pictorial Bible’ panegyrizes the
Bible Society's work, 'hundred-handed and hundred-eyed' (p. 358), and the efforts of 'English-speaking Protestants, chiefly of the nonconforming type' (p. 356); but for the rest covers much the same ground as earlier papers. Mr. Gladstone rightly protests against a 'shuffle of precedence' between the Scriptures and 'other Eastern books.' 'It is supremacy, not precedence, that we ask for the Bible' (p. 364), a real difference of kind (p. 372). He somewhat fences with the important question as to errors in the original, other than those of copyists and the like (pp. 388-90). There is an interesting discussion of the act of Jael, 'blessed above women' (p. 391). The two main points to bear in mind are that the house of Heber the Kenite should have been by all the ties of kindred of Israel's part in that war of extermination, and that, as in Rahab's case, every human being is bound to be on the side of 'Jehovah against the mighty.' The truth is that the modern irrational passion of pity, and the ready tolerance of any sins that seem merely rebellions against God or His Church, persuade us to think of Sisera as just an unhappy hunted fugitive. We ought to translate the matter into crimes that we do feel keenly indignant about. Suppose, e.g., that Sisera had been a malignant torturer of little children. Could we have thought any punishment too severe?

The 'Soliloquium' is a reprint of those 'thinkings aloud' about Anglican Orders which it was understood would be overheard in the city on the Tiber. The 'Postscript' is a liberation of Mr. Gladstone's mind when 'the excellent person who fills the Roman chair' (p. 415) turned a deaf ear to the proof of an 'henotic or unifying tendency' among Christians, and the invitation to the Roman communion not to stand aloof. From Pius IX., 'accessible almost beyond example to flattery' (p. 423), nothing but reaction was to be expected. But neither has his successor vouchsafed 'one kindly syllable of appreciation' of the approximations of Christians to one another, nor even 'such efforts as might have been cheaply made through the verbal medium' towards softening and mitigating difficulties (p. 423). With Mr. Gladstone we deeply regret the rigid refusal of the Papacy to consider whether anything in its history may have been a cause of stumbling. But we have to face a logical determination to exact submission *in limine*. It is for English Catholics to

1 Is there not a common confusion between 'verbal' and 'mechanical' inspiration? The Church has certainly always held something more than that the Bible contains the Word of God.

2 Judges iv. 11.

demonstrate that in questioning the divine right of Rome to unlimited submission we are contending for true authority, not for private judgment and individual self-will.

---

**ART. III.—SIR RUSSELL REYNOLDS’S ‘ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES.’**

_Essays and Addresses._ By Sir J. Russell Reynolds, Bart., F.R.S., M.D. Lond.; LL.D. Edin.; LL.D. Aberd.; President of the Royal College of Physicians of London; President of the British Medical Association; Physician to Her Majesty’s Household; and Consulting Physician to University College Hospital. (London, 1896.)

This volume contains a ‘brief sketch of the life of Sir John Russell Reynolds,’ written, as his wife’s touching Dedication informs us, by ‘one who was closely associated with him for five years as his private secretary and valued friend’; the essay on the ‘Definition and Nomenclature of Disease,’ which formed the introduction to the valuable _System of Medicine_ which Dr. Reynolds edited; and twelve addresses and lectures of various kinds.

A friend of Sir Russell Reynolds who is quoted in the ‘brief sketch’ of his life says that ‘those who knew him best’ know ‘that his incisive scientific perception was associated with a profound sense of those hidden laws of life which elude analysis, but cannot be disregarded by genuinely intellectual minds’ (p. xx).

This statement receives very copious illustration from these _Essays and Addresses._ Of the ‘incisive scientific perception’ there are abundant signs upon which it is hardly the province of the _Church Quarterly Review_ to dwell. The ‘profound sense of’ the ‘hidden laws of life which elude analysis’ is no less strongly marked, and has more to do with the standpoint from which it is natural that we should chiefly regard this book.

As far back as 1858, in an ‘Oration delivered before the North London Medical Society,’ Dr. Reynolds called attention to evils which were likely to result from neglect of the study of psychology. He spoke of the fact that medical students often enter upon their ‘career of practice’ without so much as a notion upon psychology, and with ideas of life built up only of anatomy, chemistry, and physics’; he gave a
warning that an 'idea of life' as 'merely a modification of general physical forces' was 'gaining ground and seriously affecting both' the 'teaching and' the 'practice' of the medical profession; and, while highly estimating the 'importance of accurate physical and chemical examination,' he pointed out the fallacy of resting 'satisfied with but one-half of physiological facts,' and claimed that the truly scientific attitude requires resistance to the 'temptation to suppose' that 'some' accurately ascertained 'ponderable and measurable facts' 'constitute the whole' of that which has to be known.' When, he asked, chemical analysis has done its work in investigating, for instance, the process of digestion, 'is there nothing left for us to study; is there nothing that has escaped us; nothing that we have left unweighed; nothing that we have failed in reducing to our formulæ? Is the physiology of digestion summed up in this expression of chemical results? What is there that determines the sense of hunger, of thirst, or of satiety, and how do these influence the chemical transpositions? What is the nexus between thought, sleep, anxiety, or other emotional disturbances, and those sensations; and through them, or not through them, upon this easily described action of the pepsine and its assistant acid? Where do mind and feeling come in contact with these material processes, and how do they mutually exert their action and reaction? What fits the carnivorous stomach for its food, the herbivorous for its work? How and where is the relation between them and the dental apparatus? Outside or beyond the most simple chemical results we are at once arrested by a hundred questions, as yet unsolved, and as far, apparently, from solution as they were when first suggesting themselves to the human mind. Partial answers may be given, i.e. we may advance the problem one degree further from the most easily observed phenomena; but a great gulf comes between us and the final answer; and divide as we will the narrow ground that lies between our starting point and the margin of that gulf; laboriously measure as we like, and accurately name every step of the process from the first rough fact to that brink, reached in the ages long since passed without such fine calculations, we do not by such means fill up the gulf itself, nor have we yet discovered even a plank wherewith to launch out upon the dark sea that comes between the material and the immaterial, the seen and the unseen.'

'At the one extreme is consciousness, at the other physical and chemical phenomena, and they are placed in mysterious relationship; the one class is as real as the other, and we have equally to value both; and in order to arrive at any correct general physiological principles, we must start from the two grounds, and proceed from what is known in each to what is unknown between the two' (pp. 8-12).

The same thought goes through a very valuable lecture on the 'Facts and Laws of Life' which was delivered in the
Sir Russell Reynolds's

following year (1859) at 'the opening of the Medical School of the Westminster Hospital.' The true aim of the student of medicine is there defined as being

'so to learn the facts and laws of life, in both health and disease, as to utilize his knowledge in every way, and to the highest degree, for his fellow-men' (p. 40).

From such a definition it follows that 'life' is the 'subject-matter' of his 'study'; and life, it is emphatically declared,

'embraces much more than it sometimes appears to do in' 'physiological handbooks; in it is wrapped up, besides bones, muscles, and intestines, the being and destiny of humanity. It is to be studied in the silent and solitary depths of your own consciousness, as well as in the lecture-theatre and dissecting-room; you must see it in the minds and hearts of your patients, as well as in their limbs and viscera; you have to deal not merely with that which may be analysed, experimented upon, cauterized, bandaged, or cut off and cast away; you have to do not only with those pains which may rack the body or disturb the mind; you have for your study not only the material fabric, which is so mysterious in its facts and processes; but you have also for your study its still more mysterious tenant; you have to do with that which can rise superior to all weakness, and can triumph over all pain; and which in the very article of death may utter the prophecy of a life, as yet unseen, but still felt to be, and to be more real, more strong, than that life which, though so real, is now sinking into silence and decay—a life whose witness here, having just burned into your soul's deepest creed the facts that it is, and that it cannot die, is itself, in another moment, carried beyond your sight. . . . You must see that disease is something far more important, and far deeper, than an aching head, a hurried breathing, or a fluttering pulse; that disease is something much more serious than the mere interference with the mechanism of physical life; that the measure of its evil is, not the increased rapidity of pulse, not the daily wasting of the body nor its numerical frequency in the bills of mortality, but the degree to which it so tells upon the mind, heart, will, and power of man that it prevents him from doing that work in this world which it has been given him to do . . . The mysterious material body which is your care must be regarded as but a subservient part of a more mysterious whole, and you must never forget the higher elements in your eagerness to understand the lower' (pp. 42–4).

And, to quote but one instance more of a very marked feature of the book, we find that the address on the 'Value of Competition,' delivered in 1885 to the 'medical students of University College, Bristol,' contains the emphatic sentence—

'You cannot solve the problems of the sick-room in one quarter of your cases by stethoscope, thermometer, or any such like means' (p. 241).
If there was nothing else useful in these *Essays and Addresses* but the full and frequent treatment of the point which we have been scantily illustrating, this alone would make the work of high value. Every student of details knows their absorbing power. It is easy to study history in such a way as to lose sight of the play and force of human character. It is easy in a most intimate knowledge of the physical nature of man to forget those parts of human life which no scientific instrument can reveal. And the more fully and completely the working of physical causes is ascertained and realized, the more difficult is it to be mindful of anything which underlies them. The marvels of the structure of the human brain, the beauty of the actions of muscles and nerves may easily so completely absorb the mind of him who is studying them that he has no attention left for anything beyond. We are convinced that this absorbing power of the study of physical details is responsible for the existence of much scientific unbelief.

Thus, it is of the highest importance, both in the interests of true science and in the interests of religion, that students of physical nature should be reminded that there are elements in human life besides those which may be known from physical investigations.

The way of regarding life of which this book is full forms part of a state of mind which is eager to insist on the necessity of duly considering all the factors in a problem. Sir Russell Reynolds is always conscious that, when all which is within our reach has been ascertained, there is much which remains unknown. He bids his hearers be mindful of their ignorance as well as of their knowledge. He insists on the necessity of co-relating different sides of truth.

This breadth of view may be seen in the treatment of statistical fallacies contained in the lecture delivered at Westminster, to which we have already referred. After showing that inferences from statistics cannot be accurately applied to individuals, Dr. Reynolds goes on to say:

‘Perhaps the most unwarrantable conclusion which has been drawn from the employment of the statistical method is to the effect that because events occur in such order that their numerical frequency may be calculated beforehand, therefore neither God nor man, neither Divine Providence nor human will, are operative in the world. Because there is a certain average number of suicides, for example, per annum, individual choice and general Providence have had nothing to do with the matter. To arrive at such a principle as this, at the conclusion of a survey of the history of civilization, would be, in my judgment, to conclude in opposition to both historical
evidence and true reason; but to start with such proposition, and to employ it as a method of investigation, is one of the most extreme examples with which I am acquainted of a *petitio principii*.

'Allow, for a moment, that the principle is correct—viz. that the existence of uniform averages would exclude the idea of will, either Divine or human—the past history of the world, and its present history, are such as to show that these averages have not always existed and do not exist. The ordinary course of events has been suspended, or superseded, by the extraordinary or the supernatural, and the true basis of all nature has been revealed in such suspensions. But, further than to enter protest against such interpretation of history as this is not my object now; it is to show that, even if the averages exist, they do not warrant a belief in the non-existence of will, either Divine or human. The proposition is this, that, because out of 10,000 individuals, say 100, in the course of twelve months, will do such a particular thing, therefore there was no will in the individuals who did that thing, or in those who did not. The argument in such proposition is erroneous; it is a conclusion with regard to the individual, from observation on the mass or multitude; and I have already shown that until the individual has been lost sight of in the multitude—i.e. until the accumulation is so great that it includes every possibility of action and every variety of condition—the statistical result is demonstrably untrue: the statistical law loses all force, and has to be termed a chance, when applied to the individual, i.e. to the very thing or being supposed to exert the will' (pp. 70-1).

Another instance of this characteristic of the author's mind is afforded by the address on 'Specialism in Medicine,' delivered in 1881 at the 'opening meeting of the Medical Society of University College, London.' It must not be supposed that Sir Russell Reynolds is unjust to specialists. There are indeed some scathing descriptions of those whom he thinks to degrade a noble profession; but it is clearly pointed out that 'the expansion of human life and the increasing complication of its requirements' render 'division of labour' a 'necessity (pp. 195–6), and strongly affirmed that the practitioner who, called upon to 'undertake anything and everything at a moment's notice,' is 'in the vast majority of instances' 'equal to the occasion,' was fitted for his work by 'specialists' who 'taught him, in the wards of hospitals, and in systematic lectures, and by their writings, that which their special work' 'enabled them to teach, and which they could not by any but the rarest gifts, or still rarer accidents, have obtained in any other way' (pp. 197–8). Still, the line of thought which, throughout this address, is underneath the discussion of various questions the details of which are outside the scope of this *Review*, is that an exact knowledge of a
particular group of facts is likely to lead to true conclusions only when it is balanced by what is wider and more general.

We may instance also the admirable address on the 'Present Position of our Knowledge,' delivered at the 'forty-second annual meeting of the British Medical Association' in the year 1874. At the outset it is asserted:

'Medicine is no isolated science; we cannot draw a line round the group of facts which we so denote—nor, indeed, around any group of facts—in such fashion that we may truly say that within its enclosure the whole of any one science lies, and that outside such enclosure all facts must receive a different name. The whole of any one science is the whole of all; and pathology has its biological, chemical, physical, and mathematical elements on the one hand, and its mental, moral, and social bearings on the other' (pp. 139-40).

Throughout the address which follows, this wide and balanced frame of mind is maintained. The lecturer rejoices in the growth of scientific knowledge which has enabled students of disease to ascertain the natural causes of affections formerly referred to occult influences, and to show that 'processes and phenomena which were held to be among the sacred mysteries of life' are in reality 'facts of chemistry and physics,' while the physician has become 'able so to wield the forces of life as to set right much that was wrong and bring back the functions of organs which were virtually dead' (pp. 141-2). But he will not tolerate any system which ignores facts as real as those which our new scientific knowledge has discovered; and this is one of the parts of the book which show the point we have already mentioned, that Sir Russell Reynolds's view of life was closely connected with his insistence on the equitable consideration of differing groups of facts. Thus he says:

'Granting that we have removed much of the traditional mystery which obscured the facts of life, that we have resolved many so-called living actions into chemical and physical processes, and have described them in other than "vital" terms, it may still be questioned whether or no we have advanced many steps in the solution of the ultimate and real mystery of life. The tendency of the present day is to believe, and act upon the belief that we have done so; and, as it seems to me, to push aside awkward facts as irrelevant or unreal, and to smother questionings by representing them as either solved, insoluble, or worthless' (pp. 142-3).

'However keenly and satisfactorily many of the processes of life may be referred to simpler agencies, there will, perhaps, ever remain the same kind of mystery with regard to life itself that still shrouds the nature of those simpler forces, such, for instance, as gravitation
or heat, with regard to the nature of which we have ceased to question. . . . It has been admitted that their essence is beyond our ken, and that we can but study their phenomena; we have not tried, or have failed if we have tried, to reduce them to a common denominator. But with regard to life, we have drifted away into a sort of belief that it is to be decomposed, explained away, or got rid of; and that our true line of action is to be followed by such a belief in the future results rather than in the present or the past facts of science. But I claim for life that it be treated with a respect like to that which we have accorded to gravitation; and I do so because, notwithstanding all the researches of modern science, and all the clever analogies of recent thinkers, it still stands alone, undecomposed by chemist or histologist, and presents a series of phenomena which no known physical or chemical process has explained' (pp. 147-8).

'As physicians and surgeons, it is our part to conserve life by preventing, when we can, the inroad of disturbing agencies; to preserve life in its integrity of useful work and fit association with all that makes life happy; to help it in its weakness, heal its suffering, lessen its sorrows, and soothe its closing hours; but I think we shall accomplish these purposes only by admitting its existence, its separateness from all other forces, acknowledging its mystery, bowing ourselves down before the enigma of its origin, and reverently humbling ourselves in face of its unsearchable but wonder-teeming end' (pp. 153-4).

So, too, while Sir Russell Reynolds welcomes the more accurate knowledge which has got rid of some false distinctions between man and the other animals, he will not allow the progress of science to put out of sight any set of facts about man.

'The tendency, as I read it, at the present day is to pass to the opposite extreme, and to see nothing distinctive in human life; nothing which cannot be explained in physical function by reference to the lower forms of animal existence; and nothing in the mental and moral history of ourselves which cannot be referred to analogous processes of material change' (p. 156).

'Let us not, in our haste to generalize, lose sight of the main factor in all education of both mind and limbs, viz. the directive influence of the will, which, whenever it may come, and howsoever it may work, is yet that which renders possible all the higher acts of man, and which should render it impossible for him so to forget his place in nature, that he needs to learn again the lesson that might be taught him by "the ox that knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib"' (pp. 157-8).

'I am sure that we shall do our work the better, if we come out of and above this lower ground and recognize in the suffering man the fact of qualities which transcend all that we know of the mere animal life; see in him a sense of duty and self-sacrifice, an outlook to the future and to the unseen, a weariness of the merely temporal,
and a belief in the eternal, that shall lift him into the region of our personal sympathies, and out of those simply physical ranges of action which we recognize in cats and dogs' (p. 162).

Similarly, in another address—

'There is now much modern "scientism" rather than science, a morbid condition of both mental and moral nature, which is exerting, as I think, a mischievous influence upon the lives and hopes of men. It shows itself in this way, in attaching exaggerated importance to anything or any fact which may be weighed, measured, multiplied, smelt, seen, handled or otherwise treated, by the senses or the muscles, in some mechanical manner; and, on the other hand, in assigning an insufficient value to other classes of facts which will not, and at present cannot, be made to submit themselves to such material measurement or registration' (pp. 183-4).

'There is a tendency to look at the order of events, as derived from masses of people now living and the history of the masses or nations that have lived and died, but a curious propensity to disregard the individuals of whom nations and history are made; to regard the measurable physical facts, and to ignore those other facts of mind, of morals, of conscience, and of action, which make up individual life. And yet, curiously enough, in regard to the religion of the individual, it comes to this, that it is put aside altogether, is left out of the account; and it would seem to be thought of no moment that the masses, the hundreds of thousands of persons, have believed, or felt the truth and comfort of some great principle, have acted on it, have lived and died with it as their stay and solace in the hours of keenest suffering or deepest woe; whereas the discovery of yesterday, or the fact that somebody has "determined" the atomic weight of some supposed new "element," is held to be of gigantic value. I do not wish to depreciate the value of any distinct knowledge; but what I want you to feel is, that there are complicated facts of human consciousness and belief, which are as much facts as are any others of physics or of chemistry, and these are not to be disregarded because you cannot understand them. You must take them as they stand, and let them have their weight and due value in your estimate of truth. The facts of religious life and hope are as much, are as verily facts to be taken into consideration, as are any other class of facts which the human mind is capable of feeling, of observing, or recording' (pp. 184-5).

It was this strong breadth of view, insisting on taking into account all the differing factors of a problem, which, as it seems to us, made it possible for Sir Russell Reynolds to be a pioneer and enthusiastic student in medical science, and at the same time a firm believer in the Christian Faith. He had fully and honestly faced those investigations and theories and conclusions of modern science which have made many men Materialists. He had the greatest appreciation of the
services which scientific research and discovery have performed for the medical profession and for human welfare. His high standard of knowledge, his determination to be true to the groups of facts of the spiritual order as well as to those which are subject to physical investigation, showed him that Materialism was scientifically false and mentally unsatisfying. Unless we misread some passages in his writings, he had known the agony of serious doubt; and he had emerged from it, not by shutting his eyes to any parts of truth, but by keeping them open in whatever direction he might look.

Belief in the spiritual nature of man, or the doctrine of a Personal God, or the Christian Faith, may easily be set aside when consideration is limited to particular methods of investigation or the weighing of particular probabilities. What is above all things needed on the natural side of religious inquiry is the inclusion of the various kinds of evidence, and the recollection that it is the whole state of the case, not merely isolated parts of it, which must be kept in view. Religion has everything to gain from investigations which are really impartial in their methods and wide in their scope.

This special bearing of the true breadth of Sir Russell Reynolds's outlook may be observed in the address 'delivered before the Students' Christian Association' in 1876, from which our last quotation was taken. In that address he discusses some of the advantages which such an association may supply, and is led to consider several parts of the conflict between belief and unbelief. In much of his counsel, given from the point of view which we have been emphasizing, we see the highest value.

'Have no fear of facts, have no fear of truth, however it may seem to conflict with your own experience or with testimony. Do not push aside an awkward question because you cannot answer it, there and then. Think and pray; and if, afterwards, you have no answer to give, say so honestly, and wait till you know more, or have felt more, and have found the answer' (p. 180).

'If you meet with a fact of science or history that conflicts with recognized notions, long-established dogmas, and widely spread beliefs, ascertain the nature of that fact. Be satisfied that you are not dealing with charlatans or quacks, who may give you messages through table-rappings or on slates; but be sure of your facts, and then do not fear them. What is true is of God, and you will find its real bearings on other things that are true, if you work and wait.

'Propositions that we formulate for ourselves may seem to contradict each other, or may do so; but, remember, propositions are not facts, but simply our way of looking at or representing our notions
of facts, or of something that may not be fact; and here, let me say, that it must be that you meet with such conflict. But be not dismayed; be sure of your fact and hold it fast; and again I say, work and wait. We may [be], and often are, placed in the condition of thought in which we say, “One of two propositions must be true”: for example, matter is infinitely divisible, or it is not; we can conceive no other idea; God is omnipotent, or man is free, and we may ask ourselves on which side we will place our creed; but it seems to me that we are not yet in a position to make these bold assertions and alternatives, for there may be some discovery made to-morrow which shall show a real exit from the difficulty. And so again I say, work, and wait, and trust’ (pp. 180-1).

‘Now and again some new fact appears in science which might throw discredit upon old and well-established dogma, and you might be led to doubt, say, the circulation of the blood. But there is a mass of fact upon which that doctrine is based enabling you to say, “This new theory may adequately express certain facts, yet it does not alter my conviction as to the general truth to which it seems opposed; the mass of evidence is such that this curious discovery, or this clever way of putting the case, does not drive me from my old position. I must see how it may be reconciled with that which I have held.” The weight of evidence and the impetus of thought so gained, carry you over the difficulty, and you hold to the well-formed belief; and it may help you much to know that others are with you in your scientific creed.

‘That which is true in science is true in regard to religious faith. There may be, and often are, facts which seem to shake that faith; difficulties which seem insuperable. You may question this miracle, or that statement in the Bible; you may meet with facts that seem to contradict each other, or the Bible; but let me ask you, does not the whole weight of evidence, and the impetus of its grand motor power, carry you over passages that you may not understand, over events of life that you may not witness, and enable you to say, I cannot make this out—this queer text, this inexplicable passage, this strange reversal of all that I should have thought wise or good—but it is a mere trifle when taken in comparison with the great facts of consciousness, of history and tradition, and so I work and wait’ (p. 183).

To take in all the facts, and not merely a selected set of them, not to be too sure that apparently contradictory statements may not both be true, or that apparent alternatives exhaust all possibilities, to be patient in the presence of difficulty—all these are the acts of a truly scientific mind. Yet it is impossible even to guess how many might have been saved from unbelief which was accepted in the name of science by regard to such a standpoint. That Sir Russell Reynolds should powerfully describe the inadequacy of evolution, taken by itself, to account for all that there is in
the life of man (pp. 184–90), useful as this is, must be reckoned a less valuable service to religion than his repeated insistence on great central principles of thought.

It is in harmony with the general spirit of the book that the author should protest against arbitrary rejection of parts of our Lord's life by those who are accepting other parts. Such a course of action he stigmatizes as 'dangerous and illogical.' The 'miraculous birth,' the 'life of wondrous influence and wonder-working,' the 'interferences with the ordinary course of nature,' the 'death which He could have avoided,' 'that "twelve legions of angels" might have saved Him,' 'that He rose from the grave and ascended into heaven,' 'are spoken of as facts, and they come to us' in the same way as the 'great moral teachings as to man's conduct,' the 'great teachings as to God' and 'the kingdom of heaven' (p. 191).

'It is the fashion often now to say, The morality is sublime; He put it on the highest ground; it was His purity of soul, not the washing of hands or vessels; He has taught us as no man before ever taught that rightness of motive and not only external behaviour is the sign of religious life. He gave us views of God, and told us about Him that which we could not otherwise know, and for which we are deeply grateful. But He was only a Man, and though the best of men, is not to be regarded as other than a great teacher.

'Now, this I hold to be as pernicious as it is absurd. If Jesus Christ was only a great human teacher, what did He know more about God or morality than any other man who might have arrived at his knowledge by ordinary processes? What could He know more than you or I? He may have inferred or have guessed, but what knowledge had He?

'Again, He distinctly stated that He came from God; that He was free from sin; that He had the power to forgive sin; that no man took His life from Him; that He would rise again. He promised that whatever was asked His Father in His name He would give' (p. 191).

In the passage that follows it is shown that it is unreasonable to regard our Lord as teaching anything but truth; that from the truth of His teaching it follows that 'He came from God and was not mere man,' and 'went to God and ever lives to make intercession for us'; that He has in 'some mysterious manner made God and man at one'; that 'personal association with a still living Christ' can brighten even death (pp. 192–3).

The amount of this volume that directly touches matters

1 This sentence appears to leave out of sight the possibility of a contention that our Lord, though merely human, was specially inspired.
of theology is small. The influence of the whole of it is in the direction of right thinking and right living. It is eminently calculated to infuse principles which will make men of sound judgment and of high character. Stray points in its occasional touches on theology may not always be stated as we should have expressed them. Doctors may perhaps differ on some few matters among those medical and scientific subjects which we have passed over in silence, not because we do not appreciate the skill shown in dealing with them, but because this is not the place for any such discussion. However these things may be, the book deserves a cordial welcome from all who have the highest interests of their fellows at heart. Among the many noble and useful callings which God gives to men there can be few nobler or more useful than those of the really Christian man of science and the really Christian physician. It must have been a good thing for his profession and his country that a leader and teacher of acknowledged ability and character should have impressed thoughts such as those which these Essays and Addresses contain.

**Art. IV.—ON A HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED SYRIAC VERSION OF THE APOCALYPSE.**


The first Syriac book issued from the Dublin University Press is one of which the importance will be readily acknowledged not only by all Syriac scholars, but also by those who are more especially interested in the textual criticism of the New Testament. The work falls into three main divisions—
(1) the Syriac text of the Apocalypse, with critical notes; (2) a Greek translation, with notes on the various readings presupposed by the Syriac; and (3) an Introductory Dissertation. The last, however, presents such an able and exhaustive treatment of the different points of interest connected with both the Syriac and Greek texts, as well as of the other questions of importance, that a discussion of the book as a whole naturally resolves itself into a discussion of the Introductory Dissertation. Undoubtedly the main interest of this treatise centres in the conclusion as to the origin of the version (now published for the first time) at which the learned editor arrives, after a thorough examina-
tion of all the evidence at his disposal. This conclusion, we may state at once, is that the present text forms part of the so-called 'Philoxenian version.' Hardly less important, both in itself and also in its bearing on the main point at issue, is the view adopted by Dr. Gwynn as to the Harkleian origin of the text found in the ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament.

It is well known to all Syriac scholars that the four minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude), as well as the Pericope Adulteræ (John 7:53-8:11) and the Apocalypse, were not included in the Peshitto canon. This fact is apt to be overlooked, because the ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament now contain the portions that are missing from the Peshitto version. Such, however, has only been the case since the beginning of the seventeenth century; prior to that date these books were absent from all then known New Testament Peshitto MSS., as well as from the printed editions. The Apocalypse was first published separately in Syriac by De Dieu in 1627 from a Leyden MS., the four Catholic Epistles by Pococke in 1630 from a manuscript in the Bodleian Library, and the Pericope Adulteræ by De Dieu in 1631 from a manuscript belonging to Archbishop Ussher. They appeared soon afterwards as forming part of the Syriac New Testament edited by Gabriel Sionita for the Paris Polyglot in 1633; yet, though the text exhibited in that edition differs only slightly from that of the separate editions of De Dieu and Pococke, it would seem that Sionita did not make use of the work of his predecessors, but rather obtained his text from a different copy or copies. From the Paris edition these additions passed into Walton’s Polyglot, and so into all subsequent editions of the Syriac New Testament. Previous scholars have perceived that the Apocalypse belongs to the Harkleian, and the Epistles to the Philoxenian version; and their conclusions have been confirmed by Dr. Gwynn.

The Philoxenian version is the name given to the new translation of the New Testament (and of parts of the Old Testament) executed by Polycarpus the Chorepiscopus under the direction of Philoxenus or Xenaias, the bishop of Mabug, in 508 A.D. Evidence as to this fact is afforded us by Moses Aghelheus (c. 550 A.D.), who, in a Letter to Paphnutius, prefixed to his Syriac version of the Glaphyra of Cyril of Alexandria, refers to 'the translation of the New Testament and of David into Syriac' by Polycarpus (Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. ii. 83). Again, Gregory Barhebræus in the Prozantium to his Horreum Mysteriorum states that 'after the Peshitto
the New Testament was more accurately translated again from the Greek at Mabug in the days of Philoxenus. The same or a similar statement, attributed to Thomas of Harkel himself, is found in many manuscripts of the Harkleian version. The translation of Polycarpus, however, was in its turn revised by Thomas of Harkel a century later (616 A.D.), and, as is not infrequently the case, the later work quickly took the place of its prototype. In fact so complete was the disappearance of the earlier version that, with but few exceptions, the majority of scholars have until recent times either regarded it as lost or identified it with the Harkleian revision. The latter view, however, is plainly in direct opposition to the language of Barhbræus, who, in the account of the Syriac versions of the Bible given in the Proæmium, distinctly speaks of the Harkleian as 'a third version which was rendered (Διαλεκτική) by Thomas of Harkel.' Moreover, in a note attached by Thomas of Harkel to his Syriac version of the New Testament (Adler, Verss. Syr. p. 47) the translator himself states that he used the Philoxenian version as his basis, and corrected it by the help of two (or three) Greek manuscripts. The same fact is twice attested by Gregory Barhebraeus (in his Chron. Eccles.), who frequently cites this version in his works, and his statement is of the greatest importance, since it determines the source of the version in question. Additional confirmation of this point is furnished by the more recently discovered portions of the Philoxenian, which show that it differs widely from the Harkleian.

Our manuscript authority for the Harkleian translation is fortunately very large, and there is consequently no doubt as to the characteristics of the version. The chief difficulty lies in determining its precise extent—in brief, whether it contained the book of Revelation or not. A priori we should naturally expect the version to include the Apocalypse, inasmuch as it is stated to be a translation of the New Testament, made with the help of Greek manuscripts; for in the time of Thomas of Harkel the book of Revelation had long formed an integral part of the Greek New Testament. Yet it is curious that our manuscript authority seems rather to preclude this view. It was not, indeed, until the year 1732 that manuscripts of the Harkleian version were known to contain anything beyond the four Gospels. Since that date, however, manuscripts of other portions of the New Testament belonging to this version have come to light, notably among the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum. But of the manuscripts which presumably contain the whole
version it is remarkable that none include the book of Revelation. The manuscript obtained by Ridley in 1732 (New College Library, Cod. 333) from Diarbeikr, on which White's edition (1778–1803) was based, unfortunately breaks off at Hebrews 11\(^7\), while Cod. 334 of the same library does not contain this book, and it is absent from the Cambridge MS. (Add. 1700) which contains the whole New Testament (except the Apocalypse) in the Harkleian version. Moreover in none of the three extant manuscripts which contain the Apocalypse is it associated with any part of the Harkleian. The oldest Nitrian copy (in the British Museum, Add. 17127), which is dated 1088 A.D., contains the text (incomplete) and an elaborate commentary, but no other portion of the New Testament. Similarly the Apocalypse stands alone in the Leyden MS. (Scalig. 18), from which De Dieu derived his text, while Ussher's MS. (Trinity College, Dublin, B. 5. 16) is merely a collection of the non-Peshitto portions of the New Testament (cf. supra), made by a Maronite scribe in 1625. To counterbalance the negative testimony of this external evidence we can only adduce the statement of Lelong (Bibl. Sacra, i. 191) with reference to the missing manuscript of the Apocalypse in the Florence Library, according to which the manuscript contained a note ascribing the translation to Thomas of Harkel. The scribe, Jacob of Hesron, who wrote this note in 1582 A.D., affirms that he transcribed it from his archetype, which he believed to have been written by Thomas of Harkel himself. In the absence of more decisive testimony we are thus thrown back on the internal evidence afforded by the nature and character of the translation.

The distinguishing characteristics of the method pursued by Thomas of Harkel may be summed up under two heads—(a) an exaggerated literalness, consequent on the desire of the translator to give an exact reproduction of the Greek, and (b) the use of asterisks and obeli in the text itself, together with the insertion of notes and readings on the margin. The natural results of (a) are that the Syriac idiom is habitually sacrificed in favour of Graecisms; the order of words is Greek rather than Syriac; the third personal pronoun is made to do duty for the article; possessive pronouns are expressed separately in conjunction with \(\text{\&}\), instead of by suffixes attached to the noun; Greek words are transliterated, case-endings and all. With regard to (b) many explanations have been given, which as a rule satisfy part, but not all, of the requirements of the case. Thus it has been held that Thomas of Harkel retained the text of the Philoxenian version and
added on the margin alternative readings derived from his Greek manuscripts. This is very frequently the case, but there are also many instances in which exactly the opposite practice seems to have been followed. The most probable explanation of these marginalia has been given by Dr. Gwynn,¹ viz. that the translator exercised his critical judgment in selecting the readings of his text, those which he thought less probable, but still worthy of record, being retained on the margin. When we consider the ordinary printed version of the Apocalypse in the light of these characteristic features of the Harkleian, we have no hesitation in agreeing with Dr. Gwynn that it belongs to the Harkleian version. This view was held in the last century by Ridley, Storr, and Eichhorn, and more recently by Davidson, but has been contested by Adler, Tregelles, and Professor Isaac H. Hall, though on insufficient grounds. In arguing against the Harkleian authorship of Revelation Adler contended that (1) the adoption of Greek words was infrequent, and (2) that in writing proper names the translator followed the Syriac usage as a rule and not the Harkleian or Greek. A sufficient refutation of (1) is furnished by Dr. Gwynn,² while in answer to (2) it may be pointed out that even in texts which are recognised as Harkleian considerable variation is found in the practice of transcribers. Further Adler only adduces two examples of deviation from the Harkleian method of reproduction, both of which admit of ready explanation. Professor I. H. Hall, in his article on the Syriac Apocalypse,³ likewise rejects the Harkleian origin on similar grounds to those of Adler. It is a matter of regret that the second part of his article has never appeared, so that we can only examine his arguments under two out of the five heads into which he divides the subject. As to the marginalia, it is noteworthy that the three extant manuscripts of the Apocalypse all contain traces of the system adopted by Thomas of Harkel elsewhere. We shall return to these later on, merely noting here that Dr. Gwynn was the first to discover and make known the presence of some forty asterisks in the Leyden MS. used by De Dieu. It may, therefore, be regarded as certain not only that the Apocalypse formed part of the Harkleian version, but further that the text found in ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament represents the Harkleian rendering of that book. Now we know that Thomas

¹ _Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy_, vol. xxvii. p. 271 sq.
² _Introd. Diss._ p. xxix sq.
of Harkel based his version on the Philoxenian, so that if it can be satisfactorily established that the ordinary printed text is based on the text of Dr. Gwynn's MS. the conclusion is not far to seek that the latter text forms part of the Philoxenian version. There can be no doubt that Dr. Gwynn's demonstration of this latter fact is more than sufficient. His conclusions, however, receive material support along another and distinct line of evidence, viz. from the relation that is clearly discernible between the text of the Crawford MS. and that of the 'Pococke' Epistles, additional confirmation being furnished by an examination of the Greek text underlying the two versions of the Apocalypse.

The portions of the Philoxenian version which have as yet been recovered, and which are generally recognized as belonging to that translation, are: (1) A few small fragments of St. Paul's Epistles discovered by Cardinal Wiseman on the margin of the manuscript containing what he erroneously described as the Karkaphenian version;¹ these fragments were published by him in his *Horæ Syriæ* (p. 78 sq.) in 1828. (2) Ten chapters (imperfect) of Isaiah, edited by Ceriani in his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* (v. i. 9 sq.) from a Nitrian manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 17106). The reasons for regarding these chapters as part of the translation of Polycarpus, despite the fact that no mention is made elsewhere of his having translated Isaiah, are briefly as follows: On the margin of the great Ambrosian MS. of the Syro-Hexaplar version, at Isaiah 96, a rendering is given which differs both from the Hexapla and from the Hebrew, but agrees closely with the reading of several LXX manuscripts. It is described also as taken 'from that other text which was rendered into Syriac by the care of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabug.' Unfortunately the chapters edited by Ceriani do not include this passage, but the internal evidence clearly proves that they also belong to this 'other text.' For the Greek text presupposed by Ceriani's manuscript is very similar to that of the (LXX) manuscripts which support the variant reading of Isaiah 96. Further, the method and diction of these chapters shows close affinity to the fragments preserved by Wiseman, while a comparison of the text exhibited by these chapters with the translation of Paul of Tella justifies the conclusion that they formed the basis of the latter work. Paul of Tella, as we know, executed his revision of the Syriac of the Old Testament at the same time and place—Alexandria, under Athanasius I. (Camelarius) of Antioch—as

Thomas of Harkel, and both, it would seem, made use of the Philoxenian version. Lastly, in the Syriac version of the Glaphyra of Cyril, alluded to above, there are many citations from Isaiah which agree word for word with the text of Ceriani. The four minor Catholic Epistles published by Pococke in 1630 may be regarded without hesitation as the work of Polycarpus, in accordance with the opinions of Davidson, Hall, and Gwynn. Thomas of Harkel on his own statement followed the version of Philoxenus and the dependence of the Harkleian version on the text represented by Pococke's edition is abundantly clear from a comparison of the two. The two texts not only agree very closely in their renderings, but they also reproduce the same mistranslations (e.g. treating ἐπιλύσεως as a nominative in 2 Peter 1:20 and translating διδοῦς wrongly by 'unseen' in Jude 6). Moreover, where they agree in their rendering, the Harkleian invariably presents a Græcized form of the other, in accordance with its usual practice; where they differ their disagreement is usually to be explained by the variation of their Greek exemplars. The readings of the former are also frequently preserved on the margin of the Harkleian, or retained in the text with an asterisk. Several manuscripts of these Epistles are now extant, notably a Nitrian manuscript (Add. 14623), dated 823 A.D., and the 'Williams' MS. (1471 A.D.), edited by Hall in 1886, both of which exhibit a much superior text to that of Pococke's MS. The Epistles occur in the same form also in the manuscript of Archbishop Ussher.

Professor Hall claims Philoxenian authorship for the version of the Gospels contained in a manuscript belonging to the Syrian Protestant College at Beyrouth (ninth century (?)), the Acts and Epistles included in the same manuscript being from the Peshitto. But the arguments brought forward by Professor Hall, when viewed in the light of Dr. Gwynn's conclusions, are clearly seen to be beside the point. Professor Hall, indeed, seems to be at fault in regard to two main positions which he takes up. On the one hand he appears to start from the assumption that the Philoxenian and Harkleian translations were carried out on almost the same lines, and that the former represented an earlier and less thorough attempt at a revision according to the Greek. On the other hand he seems to take it for granted that the Peshitto and

1 Gwynn, *Dict. of Christian Biogr.* 'Polycarpus' (5).
2 Cf. article on 'Polycarpus,' quoted above.
3 Cf. supra, p. 328.
4 *Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Literature and Exegesis*, 1882.
not the original Greek formed the basis of both versions. From this point of view he naturally infers that the Philoxenian would approximate more closely to the Peshitto, and since the Beyrouth Codex shows more affinity to that version than White's edition of the Harkleian, he concludes that this manuscript exhibits the Gospels according to the Philoxenian version. Possibly Dr. Gwynn is right in conjecturing that the Beyrouth MS. is an example of a 'mixed text,' but from Professor Hall's description the text appears to be Harkleian corrected after the Peshitto.

For our present purpose, however, the portion of the Philoxenian version which is most important is that represented by Pococke's Epistles. The Philoxenian Epistles are distinguished throughout by a free idiomatic Syriac style; the translator does not aim at giving a literal reproduction of the Greek, but rather at conveying the sense of the original in accordance with Syriac usage and idiom. He thus avoids Græcisms as much as possible, and strives to represent each word and phrase of the Greek by its corresponding equivalent in Syriac. The Harkleian version, however, as we have seen, is characterized by extreme literalism. Now Dr. Gwynn shows that the relation existing between his text and that of the ordinary Apocalypse is similar to that which exists between the Pococke Epistles and the same Epistles in the Harkleian version. (For convenience we follow Dr. Gwynn's example in citing the two versions as S and Σ respectively.) The former text (S) is remarkable for the manner in which it combines the preservation of Syriac idiom with fidelity to the Greek text which it represents. The language is singularly free not only from Greek forms and expressions, but also from those phenomena which characterize the later development of the Syriac language. It thus clearly reflects the Syriac of an early period, when the various forms still retained their original force and significance. The fact that Græcisms of all kinds are avoided may be in part explained by the nature of the book itself. For the Apocalypse is essentially Semitic in form and conception, being largely based on different parts of the Old Testament, and the translation in consequence offers fewer difficulties than that of the other New Testament books, more especially to an author who, as is clearly apparent in the present case, was familiar with the Peshitto version of the Old Testament. The corresponding Harkleian version, however, shows that the nature of the book to be translated was not in itself sufficient to deter a translator from slavish imitation of the Greek original, and that the purity
of the language exhibited in the Crawford version is to be placed to the credit of the translator. In illustration of this latter point we need only cite a few of the more striking examples collected by Dr. Gwynn (p. xxvii sq.): (1) the frequent use of the absolute state as opposed to the later misuse of the status emphaticus, and the employment of the latter to express the definite article, which the Harkleian represents by the personal or demonstrative pronoun; (2) the retention of the constr. state, the use of which is avoided in later writings; (3) the possessive force of the pronominal suffixes, in contrast to the later separate usage with \( \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{}}} \); (4) the preference shown for the enclitic pronoun in expressing the substantive verb rather than for \( \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{}}} \) or \( \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{}}} \); (5) the use of \( \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{}}} \) as a final conjunction as opposed to the fuller forms, such as \( \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{}}} \). In all these cases \( \Sigma \) follows the later usage, and is thus distinguishable from \( \Sigma \). The wide divergence that marks the two translations is, of course, especially noticeable in the literal adherence to the Greek which characterizes the version of \( \Sigma \), but is consistently avoided by \( \Sigma \). To these must be added another point of difference, viz. the fact that \( \Sigma \) almost invariably uses the same Syriac word or expression to represent the Greek equivalent, whilst \( \Sigma \) exercises considerable freedom of choice, and is by no means consistent in its rendering of the same word or expression. The translator of the latter, in fact, uses his critical judgment in reproducing the various shades of meaning expressed by the same word in Greek. In some cases, it is true, the change appears to be purely arbitrary, while in others it is due to inaccuracy or to misunderstanding; but these cases are rare and do not affect the high standard of excellence to which the translation as a whole attains. But as in the parallel case of the Pococke Epistles so here also we find that marked difference of method and style is accompanied by undoubted signs of the dependence of the one upon the other. Notable examples of dependence are given by Dr. Gwynn under the two heads \((a)\) of variations of rendering and \((b)\) of grammatical variations. The former class comprises cases in which \( \Sigma \) is found to depart from its habitual usage of always representing the same Greek word by the same equivalent in Syriac, and in so doing follows the variant translation of \( \Sigma \). Under the second head are included cases of exceptional usage, either as to grammatical form or construction, in which the two versions agree (p. xxxi sq.). A few more remarkable instances, in which \( \Sigma \), forsaking its ordinary method, adopts the ren-
dering of S, are added on p. lxxxii; the most striking of
these is the mistranslation of ἀβαδδών (ὡς) by حَبَّسَةَ،
which is found in both S and Σ, though the custom of the latter is
to transliterate words of this type. ‘The inevitable inference
from these and like examples seems to be that the influence,
and therefore the priority, of S is manifested in exceptional
departures, such as these, from the usual method and diction
of Σ.’ But Σ, as has been shown above, is certainly the
Harkleian version; and in view of the known dependence of
the Harkleian on the Philoxenian, the conclusion is irresistible
that S belongs to the latter version. It is supported (though
the support is needless) by the close resemblance which it
exhibits to the ‘Pococke’ Epistles and the fragments of
Isaiah (v, supra).

Further, in his elaborate and masterly examination of the
Greek text underlying the two versions (p. xxxix sqq.) Dr.
Gwynn has conclusively shown that S as a rule has preserved
a more archaic type of text than Σ, and that the latter
shows signs of dependence on S in text as well as in diction.

With regard to the Crawford MS. (Syr. 2), from which the
present text is derived, nothing more is known than that it
was purchased by the late Earl of Crawford c. 1860. The
manuscript itself is remarkable not only because it exhibits (as
has been shown) the Philoxenian version of the Apocalypse
and of the four minor Catholic Epistles (for the text of the
latter is identical with that of the ‘Pococke’ Epistles), but
also because it is practically the only Syriac Biblical MS.
which contains the whole New Testament according to the
ordinary canon. The internal grounds on which it is assigned
to the last quarter of the twelfth century can scarcely be dis-
puted, supported as they are by the authority of such experts
as the late Dr. W. Wright, Dr. Hörning, and Dr. Gwynn.
Briefly, these grounds are (i) the close resemblance of the
writing to that of other manuscripts known to belong to the
latter half of the same century, and (ii) the fact that the manu-
script was written (according to the colophon) at Tur'abdin,
in N.E. Mesopotamia.¹

The last section of the Introduction is devoted to an
interesting discussion of the evidence furnished by the
colophon as to the origin and history of the manuscript, in
which the learned editor affords yet another proof of his great
powers of research and of his extensive knowledge of the
subject, as well as of that critical acumen which is so abun-
dantly displayed throughout his work.

¹ Cf. further Dr. Gwynn, Transactions of the R. I. A. xxx. 364 sq.
Nicholas Breakspear (Adrian IV.), Englishman and Pope,
By ALFRED H. TARLETON. (London, 1896.)

We do not care to measure by how much Cardinal Manning missed his election to the Papacy, or to ask in how many other cases an Englishman has been as near as he was to that unique position. For the fact remains that Nicholas Breakspear appears in solitary grandeur in the history of his fellow-countrymen as the only Englishman who ever actually took his seat on the Papal throne. It is a satisfaction to be able to say at once that his personal character and the part which he took in the state-craft of his age were worthy of his native country, and have given him no mean place in the august line of his fellow-pontiffs. The publicity of a Pope's life did not in his case bring anything to light which need raise a blush on an Englishman's cheek. His life at Rome was what Englishmen expect an Englishman's to be, wherever he may be found. He was strong, honourable, brave, and good. He well deserves to be known by his fellow-countrymen, and the knowledge is of the kind which is greatly calculated to benefit the character of those who acquire it. But we are sorry to reflect how little the name and life of the English Pope is known among us. At the best the only facts which are at all commonly known are, that he was, the only English Pope, and that he was said to have been choked to death by a fly—a detail which we once unexpectedly found to be known by a little girl in a young ladies' seminary, and which illustrated the curiously out-of-the-way information which such middle-class private schools contrive to impart. Mr. Tarleton notices the lack of knowledge (Pref. p. v) with an expression of surprise. But the reason is at hand, and, indeed, he himself supplies us with it in his preface and in the bibliographical list in Appendix II. (p. 266). Breakspear's career has not been made easily accessible to English people, at least in any convenient separate book. Certainly we have a learned article on Adrian IV. in the Dictionary of National Biography, by Dr. Creighton, Bishop of London, and a short sketch or memoir in the publications of the Society of Antiquaries, by the Rev. E. Trollope (afterwards Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham), which Mr. Tarleton dates in 1857, but in Crockford it is dated 1856. These, however, are not generally accessible, and the only other English lives of Adrian that have been
published have been one by Richard Raby in 1849 (Roman Catholic), and a small book by the Rev. S. Baynes, which is now out of print, and is not included by Mr. Tarleton in his Appendix II.¹ The scholar who knows how to collect scattered materials will of course find sufficient details for a biography in standard histories of England, Europe, and the Papacy.² But what is required is a compact life of Breakspear which is reliable and cheap, written in a lively style, and made attractive to the ordinary reader. Mr. Tarleton's work is not of this popular kind, but he has done much to bring such a publication nearer, and the scholar who writes for the people must take care to have Mr. Tarleton's book by his side. It is a sumptuous quarto volume, brought out apparently regardless of expense, printed in large type on good rough paper, and copiously adorned with excellent illustrations. A perusal of these is interesting in itself, and prepares the way for a consideration of the Pope's history.

Fourteen initial letters have been copied from old books of various dates, such as a twelfth-century manuscript in the British Museum, Bail's Concilia, Stowe's Chronicle of 1615, Matthew Paris, Fuller's Church History (1656), the Saxon Chronicle, Ciaconius's Lives of the Popes (1687), Camden's Anglica Scripta, Dugdale's Monasticon, Muratori's Rerum Italicaeum Scriptores, and Holinshed's Chronicles. The maps which are particularly required are those of Western Europe and of Italy in the twelfth century. These are both provided (pp. 26, 237), and to them is added a third map of Central Italy, which shows the movements of Adrian IV. and Frederic Barbarossa at the time of Easter, 1155 (p. 104). A genealogical table (p. 229) exhibits the family connexions of the Countess Matilda and Frederic's relationship to the Guelphs, and so possesses a special interest for the English historian. The Pope's seal is reproduced upon the title-page, and at p. 258 we have a facsimile of one of his bulls, which is fully described in Appendix I. Among the illustrations of localities connected with the Pope's life are the fine old house of

¹ We have caused search to be made both in the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, but can find no trace of Mr. Baynes's book at either of these places.

² Some of the historians, however, devote singularly little space to the pontificate of Adrian IV., perhaps because they have allowed themselves to be too much influenced by its short duration. For example, Mosheim (i. 285) devotes but two short paragraphs to it, so inadequate and unsatisfactory as almost to expose him to a charge of suppressio veri. But he gives a reference in a footnote in loc. to the accurate and circumstantial account in Count Bunau's History of Frederic I., to which Mr. Tarleton might have referred.
Nicholas Breakspear.

Breakspear’s in the valley of the Colne, from which, as Fuller said, he ‘fetht his name’ (p. 16), reproduced from a photograph taken in 1895 by the Duke of Newcastle, the portico of the Church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, which Adrian built at Rome (p. 222; cf. p. 255), and a completed design of the high altar screen at St. Alban’s Abbey, from an etching lent by Lord Aldenham (p. 252). There is also a fine picture, copied from an old panel of unknown date, of the entry of Adrian IV. and Frederic Barbarossa into Rome in 1155 (p. 120). The portraits of those who were connected with Adrian include one of Pope Eugenius III. (Bernard of Pisa), depicted in Sacchi’s Historia in 1610. Between him and Adrian there only intervened the brief pontificate of Anastasius IV. The portrait of Cardinal Roland Bandinelli, also from Sacchi (p. 214), shows us the man who, as Alexander III., succeeded Adrian, and who canonized St. Thomas à Becket (p. 259). From prints in the British Museum, portraits have been obtained of St. Bernard of Clairvaux (p. 72), Henry II. of England (p. 156), and Frederic Barbarossa (p. 204). In special relation to Adrian himself we have a copy of a painting, by B. Venuti (Rome, 1895), which shows Adrian’s tomb, and a fine portrait from a mosaic in the Vatican collection (frontispiece). The tomb is a large sarcophagus of red marble, now in the crypt of St. Peter’s. It bears the deer’s skull, which is the sign of St. Albans, and two English roses in bas-relief, with the simple inscription ‘Hadrianus Papa IIII.’ (p. 246). The epitaph which he is said to have written for himself was not placed upon his tomb: ‘Adrianus hic situs est, qui nihil sibi infelicius in vita, quam quod imperaret, duxit’ (p. 255). The other portraits of Adrian, which differ curiously from each other, are taken from Sacchi (p. 65), from Ciaconius (p. 150), and from the British Museum (p. 196). Beneath this last is reproduced a full-sized facsimile of the Pope’s signature (see p. 259). The one point about the illustration of the book which does not satisfy us is the futile character of the small devices which are intended to embellish the page at the close of each chapter. These are unworthy of the rest of the volume. From the illustrations we will now turn to the details of Adrian’s career. For these there are three primary sources of information open to us: Matthew of Paris,¹ whose great tendency to exalt the magnificence of St. Alban’s Abbey requires his story to be used

¹ What Mr. Tarleton says as possible of Matthew of Paris on p. 2 he says as certain on p. 179—that his history is a compilation from other histories.
Nicholas Breakspear was born in, or near, the year 1100. The name, like Shakespeare's, lends itself to various forms of spelling, and we find Brekspere, Brakspere, Brekespere, and Breakespeare—in early French Briselance, and in early Latin Hastafragus. Matthew Paris calls his father Robert de Camera, and we can only guess what was the origin of this name. It may have been that he was connected with a small camera or preceptory near his home, or, that when he afterwards went to St. Albans, he became camerarius or chamberlain there, as his kinsman, Boso, became at the Vatican (pp. 14–15). It seems impossible to say with certainty where Nicholas was born. Two places are traditionally connected with his birth: Abbot's Langley in Hertfordshire, which belonged to the abbots of St. Albans; and Harefield, on the Hertfordshire border of Middlesex, where the small country house named Breakspers is situated, having borne the name at least since the end of the twelfth century. Camden, and Fuller, who follows him, both allot the honour to Abbot's Langley (pp. 10–12). A third place, Brill-on-the-Hill, in Buckinghamshire, has also been claimed as the birthplace of Nicholas, apparently without even the authority of tradition (p. 17). There is a general agreement in the early accounts that Robert, the father of Nicholas, entered the monastery at St. Albans, being a man of slender means and some education, but there are considerable discrepancies and improbabilities in the answers to the inquiry how long he lived there, or what were the circumstances of the relation of Nicholas to his father and to the Abbey. Matthew Paris, whose account contains at least one palpable error and more than one unlikely detail, tells us that Nicholas applied to the abbot for admission, but was kindly told that he was as yet insufficient in learning (p. 2). William of Newburgh, of whom Mr. Tarleton speaks very highly (p. 9), says that Nicholas was driven away by his father (p. 4). The only other piece of evidence which deserves to be put on a level with these two writers' testimony is the statement of Cardinal Boso, if he be the author of the Life of Adrian IV. in Muratori, that Nicholas
Nicholas Breakspear.

left his own country 'being ambitious of extending his knowledge' (p. 6). We are bound to say, in spite of Mr. Tarleton's preference for William of Newburgh, that Boso's too brief account rather supports Matthew Paris, who seems to us in this particular to have given the true account of the rejection of Nicholas at St. Albans. Whatever the reason was, we have his own authority (pp. 19, 132) for saying that he tried in vain, by a mishap which Fuller quaintly says was rather a happy miss, to gain admission to St. Albans (pp. 12, 19). He worked his way to France, and there is evidence to show that he spent some time in, or near, Paris. Mr. Tarleton thinks that he stayed with Suger, the great ecclesiastical warrior statesman, who was Abbot of St. Denys, and Mr. Trollope speaks of him as studying in the University of Paris (pp. 27, 35). He is now at any rate to be regarded as started upon his career; and at this point Mr. Tarleton takes the opportunity of giving a short account of the condition of England and France in the first quarter of the twelfth century. We cannot follow him into the details of this sketch, although we must say in general terms that the chapter (p. 21) in which it is attempted is rather thin and very rambling. But enough is said to enable us to form some idea of the setting in which the early life of Breakspear was placed and of the extent of the Pope's temporal power. On pp. 32 and 108 Mr. Tarleton reveals his own standpoint to us as that of a modest sound Anglican Churchman.

Breakspear did not stay long near Paris, but wandered across the Rhone to Arles in Provence, then politically a part of the German empire, and from there he went to Avignon. In this neighbourhood he sought for admission to the abbey of St. Rufus, a large monastery of Augustinian canons (pp. 37–8). He was now a most painstaking scholar, possessed of rare qualities of temper, endowed with a natural gift of eloquence and a sweet voice, cautious of speech, cheerful in spirit, obedient to authority, and of much personal beauty (pp. 35–7). It is not surprising, if this is even only approximately an accurate description, that he became most popular

1 Such a combination of ecclesiastical and secular functions was forbidden by the seventh Chalcedonian Canon. See The Canons of the First Four General Councils (Clarendon Press), p. 39, and Dr. Bright's Notes on the Canons, pp. 148–50; cp. the passage on Episcopal warriors and statesmen in Dr. Liddon's Clerical Life and Work, p. 306. The danger now arises from the demands upon the time of the clergy for sports, social amusements, and popular forms of recreation, or again for committee work in connexion with secular philanthropy. Cp. 2 Macc. iv. 14; St. Matt. iv. 8, 9.
among his brethren, and so esteemed by the abbot that he was made prior. In 1137 he was unanimously chosen by the brethren to be their abbot, and at once showed that power of command which is always displayed when a man of strong will, rigid principle, and knowledge of mankind is placed in a responsible position (p. 40). The easy-going members of the order had not reckoned on having a strict abbot, and the inevitable dissatisfaction which arose led to complaints more than once before the Pope, Eugenius III. (Bernard of Pisa), a man whose character bore a good deal of resemblance to that of Abbot Breakspear himself. The Pope quickly took the measure both of the monks and their abbot, and at last he dismissed the brethren and kept Breakspear about his own person. As the deputation of monks withdrew, if they congratulated themselves on getting free from their severe superior, they may also have learned, from the scathing words with which they were dismissed, that there was a punitive character for them about the removal of their abbot, and it must have been a surprise to them to discover that their complaint had only ended in placing Breakspear on the high road to further advancement (p. 45).

It was apparently in 1146 that Breakspear was made Bishop of Albano and a cardinal. Arnold of Brescia was in uncontested possession of Rome, and the disastrous episode of the second crusade was about to begin. St. Bernard was rousing the enthusiasm of France and Germany, and Eugenius III. not only wrote a celebrated letter to the King of France to stir him up, but also went to Paris in the Easter of 1147, accompanied, it seems, by the Bishop of Albano, and presented Louis with the pilgrim's staff and wallet in the Abbey of St. Denys. The grand scene must have stirred up deep emotions in the heart of Nicholas Breakspear. 'Prince, cardinal, bishop, a high and puissant lord of the Holy Church, he rides in, the confidential friend of the Pope himself, through those abbey gates at which he had begged, a humble suppliant for admission, a few short years before' (pp. 46-7). He now rapidly advanced in reputation, and we find him signing bulls of Eugenius III. in 1151 and 1152, and in this year chosen, and wisely chosen on account both of his character and of his nationality,1 as Papal Legate to Scandinavia. Denmark, or as Mr. Tarleton prefers

1 The natural sympathy between the English and the Norsemen was illustrated conspicuously by the reception accorded to Dr. Nansen, and by his reply at the Royal Societies' Club banquet on February 5; see the Times, February 6, 1897.
with some pedantry to say Danemark, obtained an independent metropolitan see in 1102 at Lund, having previously been under the Archbishop of Hamburg. Moreover, the Churches of Norway and Sweden were transferred from Hamburg to Lund, and this led to a magnificent mission of protest to Pope Eugenius III., who appointed Cardinal Breakspear Papal Legate, with full powers to settle the affairs of the Church in Norway and Sweden. It is recorded that the legate passed through England on his journey to Norway, and, although his own account of his visit is unfortunately (p. 255) not forthcoming, there are a few lingering traces of his doings in his native land, and it seems to have been about this time that Boso, his nephew, became his secretary (p. 55). The mission to Scandinavia was accomplished with remarkable success, and many difficulties were triumphantly overcome. It is not necessary to go into many of the ecclesiastical and civil details of Scandinavian history which Mr. Tarleton has carefully summarized. It will be sufficient to trace the outline of Cardinal Breakspear's work, and to notice the impression which he made upon the northern people. He made Nidrosia, the modern Drontheim, where the bones of St. Olaf reposed, the seat of the archbishopric of Norway. Mr. Tarleton's note upon the additions to the see is much confused (p. 58), but it is a point of interest to the English Church historian to notice that parts of the See of Sodor and Man were taken away from the province of York and added to the new province, where they remained for two hundred years. Breakspear thoroughly reformed the Norwegian Church, swept away abuses, checked the growth of heathen practices in Catholic ritual, bound Norway to pay Peter's pence, and accomplished considerable civil reforms, both in public and in private affairs. He became the hero of the whole nation, and 'Snorrow, the historian, relates that no foreigner ever came to Norway who was so honoured, or whose memory is so cherished as that of Nicholas Breakspear. To this day his name is mentioned among the greatest in Norwegian history, and is included among the national saints' (p. 59). He departed to Sweden amid universal lamentation. Here the Swedish bishops and the Gothlanders each claimed the honour of the archbishopric, and the legate made up his mind not to create a province for Sweden at all. He exhibited masterly diplomatic skill by handing over the pallium intended for the Primate of Sweden to the Archbishop of Lund, who was naturally vexed at the loss of Nidrosia, and conferred other rights and honours upon him, which were not,
however, all subsequently confirmed at Rome (pp. 61, 64). In Sweden too he tried, though unsuccessfully, to make peace in civil affairs. His achievements earned for him such titles as ‘the Apostle of the North ’ and ‘the Good,’ and he returned to Rome covered with the honour of two, if not of three, nations. On one page (64) Mr. Tarleton says that he arrived in Rome early in 1154, and on the next that he did not return to Rome until the November of that year. At any rate, Eugenius III. was dead, and on December 3, 1154, his successor Anastasius IV. died also. He had been a benevolent old man of ninety at his election, and his reign, distinguished chiefly for his charity to the poor, lasted only seventeen months. When he died the minds of the cardinals were filled with the great deeds of Cardinal Breakspear in the north, and he was unanimously chosen to fill the vacant throne.

‘By sheer merit and force of character he had risen step by step to the topmost rung of the ladder, never flinching, never losing his head, overcoming every obstacle with indomitable courage, and above all with that simple faith and clear character which has ever helped those who on the thorny path to greatness, have been blessed with these invaluable and divine gifts’ (p. 66).

Why he took the name of Adrian we do not know.

The first serious matter with which the new Pope had to deal is connected with the name of Arnold of Brescia, the enthusiastic pupil of Abelard—‘Goliath’s armour-bearer’ in fact, as St. Bernard scornfully called him. We cannot be drawn aside by the fascinating subjects which are suggested by the mention of Bernard and Abelard,1 for they do not really belong to the history of Adrian IV. Mr. Tarleton, however, allows himself to be allured into rather too many of the by-paths which lead away from his main track, and, with an evident desire to press onward, he stays to trace to some extent the career both of St. Bernard (p. 71) and Abelard (p. 75), and the conflict between them (p. 79). We need not even try to estimate how far Abelard is to be held responsible for the notions which filled the mind of Arnold, though we may remember that history is not without some instances in which the excesses of a pupil have injured the reputation of his master, never more so perhaps than in the stain by which Photinus sullied the memory of Marcellus of Ancyra, in the fourth century. Whatever could be said on

1 The chief references to these two great names in various articles in the Church Quarterly Review are given, with allusions to other works, in our review of Mr. Sparrow Simpson’s Lectures on St. Bernard of Clairvaux, No. 83, pp. 240-1.
this topic, Arnold of Brescia appears in the face of ecclesiastical grandeur, laxity, and corruption as the socialistic agitator of the twelfth century. He was ambitious, clever, and more enthusiastic than wise, and had had some predecessors in the demands for reform, but none who tickled the ears of the powerful citizens of Lombardy so cleverly as he. He spread the doctrine that the Church would be spiritualized, and the more fitted for her holy work, when she was deprived of her wealth, as if he were the chairman of a twelfth century Liberation Society. He escaped to Zürich when he was condemned with Abelard, and his power was undermined during the pontificate of Eugenius, but on the election of Adrian IV. he prompted the senate of Rome to demand that the Pope should recognize the temporal authority of the republic. Adrian at once rose to a position which called for strong and decided action. The description of his triumphant victory is finely described by Cardinal Boso, of whom Mr. Tarleton interposes at this point—unhappily, we think, from an artistic point of view—some graphic details from Ciaconius (p. 94). When Arnold had refused to obey the Pope's order to leave Rome, and when a venerable cardinal had been openly attacked on his way to the Papal presence, the city for the first time was laid under an interdict, and was compelled to expel Arnold and to submit entirely to the Pope (p. 100). The dark and awful episode of the execution of Arnold by those who were in charge of Adrian's interests, is impartially narrated and discussed by Mr. Tarleton, and he leaves the impression upon us, which we hope is correct, that the Pope neither knew nor subsequently approved of the way in which Arnold was put to death—practically, as we should now say, by lynch law.

The crisis of Adrian's pontificate brings us to the great name of Frederic, whose German surname, Rothbart or Redbeard, was rendered into Barbarossa by the Italians. He is one of the greatest national heroes of German history, and the most powerful of the Hohenstaufen emperors, who took their name from the castle built by the founder of the family on the Hohenstaufen, a hill over two thousand feet high, not far from Stuttgart in Württemburg. Very scanty ruins of the castle remain to this day. Mr. Tarleton tells us as much of Barbarossa's character and history as we need to know to appreciate the struggle between him and Adrian (p. 114). Frederic was by far the most powerful monarch in Europe when Adrian became Pope. Louis VII. of France was weakened by the losses of the second crusade, and the recent
death of Suger, who died in 1152. Henry II. had only just become the king of a disordered realm, and was busy with a war in Wales (p. 115). Frederick aimed at absolute imperial supremacy on the Tiber as well as on the Rhine and Danube, and declared that he derived his power from God alone, and not through any mediation of the successor of St. Peter. In Adrian IV. he encountered a pontiff whose notions of Papal supremacy were every bit equal to those of Gregory VII., and the meeting of two such mighty potentates was watched by the whole of Christendom. Both were alive to the possibility of its momentous consequences, though no one then could know that the contest which was beginning would ultimately end in the overthrow of the Hohenstaufen dynasty. Mr. Tarleton falls under the spell of the grand scene, and we can gather from his description some lively ideas of it (pp. 116-121). The immediate point in dispute between the two was one of those ridiculously trivial matters which are seized upon in all ages of the world's history as the cause of battle when tremendous issues really lie behind the combatants. The Pope insisted that the Emperor should pay the ancient homage of holding the Papal stirrup as its owner dismounted. There was a protracted, and as it may have appeared to the outward eye a very unequal, struggle, but it ended in a decisive victory for the Pope. The Englishman thoroughly vanquished the German, and when Frederic had dismounted, advanced on foot, knelt down, held the Pope's stirrup, and assisted him to dismount, Adrian gave him the kiss of peace, rode with him in triumphal entry towards Rome, and received him there on June 18, 1155, a day of the month which was again to mark a great English triumph in 1815 when Waterloo was won.

Englishmen like to know that their fellow-countrymen keep a tender place in their heart for the old country amid the engrossing affairs of life in other regions, and they will turn with a peculiar and patriotic interest to the chapter which describes Pope Adrian's relations with his own country (p. 127). More than once indeed (pp. 19, 41, 151-2) does Mr. Tarleton refer to the Pope's wish that he had never left his native land. Though only once, as Cardinal Breakspear, did he ever revisit England, and no particulars of that visit are at hand, yet his nephew Boso was always with him to talk of English life, and when visitors came from England they were warmly received. Two accounts are fortunately extant which are full of interest on the reception of such visitors. One of these is in the Chronicles of St. Alban's Abbey, and describes how
Abbot Robert went upon a congratulatory embassy from Henry II. to the Pope, and took occasion to complain of the cruel oppression of the Bishop of Lincoln, and to win a special privilege of freedom from episcopal control for his abbey (pp. 127-33). The other is the most valuable personal record that we have of Pope Adrian, and is to be found in the writings of John of Salisbury, of whom Mr. Tarleton, after his manner, interposes some account (pp. 137-52). It is unfortunate that John of Salisbury mentions without comment the important fact that Adrian issued a Bull which granted Ireland to Henry II. (p. 149). This Bull has been a matter of much dispute, and a whole chapter is devoted to the subject (p. 153). It must suffice here to summarize the chapter, and to say that the Latin text and an English translation of the Bull are given, the state of Ireland in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is described, and a very fair review of the evidence is put before the reader. The result appears to be that the Bull played an extremely insignificant part in Henry's Irish policy (p. 167), although its genuineness is accepted as indisputable by such authorities as the Rev. J. Dimock and Dr. Creighton (pp. 153, 180). We must add that in no part of the book has Mr. Tarleton shown more signs of his desire to be an unbiased and complete biographer than in the treatment of this difficult question.

The troubles which beset Adrian from the South in connexion with William II. of Sicily (p. 182) need not detain us long, and that for two reasons. In the first place, Adrian's firm and dignified behaviour towards William does not add to our idea of his character, though it undoubtedly confirms it; and in the next place the Papal claim of temporal power over Sicily is really part of the larger question which gathers round the name of Frederic Barbarossa. The Norman kings who ruled in Sicily claimed the rights of conquest over it, played off the Pope against the Emperor, and were inclined to side with the Pope as the better geographical ally of the two. Adrian's fine diplomacy was on the point of bringing affairs to a satisfactory issue with William, when it was thwarted by the German party in the college of cardinals, and on this account it was only after William had inflicted some serious blows on Southern Italy, and after the supreme spiritual weapons of excommunication and anathema had been put in force, that the Pope obtained the submission which he required. It was at this time that Adrian received a deputation of bishops from the Eastern Church, which, relying upon his reputation for justice, came to complain that
the Knights Hospitallers had abused the privileges granted to them by the previous Pope (p. 200). This little episode must be noticed in connexion with Adrian's desire to reconcile the Eastern and Western parts of the Church, in furtherance of which he had much correspondence with the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Byzantine Emperor, and which he might have done more to promote if his last few years had not been filled with stormy conflict about the temporal power (p. 201).

The friendly relations between the Pope and the Emperor Frederic were in the nature of things—as so well described by Milman in a passage quoted by Mr. Tarleton (p. 206)—liable to be disturbed at any moment. The Emperor's actions were on many occasions such as to exalt his own imperial claims and to depreciate the sovereignty of the Pope, and when some independent German knights had plundered the Archbishop of Lund with impunity, Adrian decided to interfere. His legates fairly represented the high claims of their master, and justified the confidence which he placed in them, but it seems to the outside observer as if they might have been a little more conciliatory in tone and manner. The Pope, they said, sent his greetings to the Emperor, as his father, and the cardinals claimed to be his brothers. This second claim at least, if logical, was audacious, and the legates made a further blunder when they haughtily allowed the term 'beneficia' to be interpreted in its feudal sense (pp. 212, 268), though the Pope had used it in his letter to the Emperor in the ordinary sense of 'benefits.' The indignation of the nobles of the Emperor knew no bounds, and when Roland, the senior legate, afterwards Pope Alexander III., had calmly asked of whom Frederic held his empire if not of the Pope, his life was only saved by the physical intervention of the Emperor. But Frederic was hardly less indignant than his nobles at being treated as a feoff of Adrian. He chose to misunderstand the significance of the blank documents with the papal seal attached which were found in the possession of the legates, and, riding roughshod over all considerations, he ordered them to go straight back to Rome. It was not until Adrian himself had written a clever diplomatic letter to the Emperor that a temporary reconciliation was again established between them (pp. 208–24).

When both sides made such tremendous claims no permanent peace was possible, and the Pope's charitable and domestic duties in Rome were soon rudely to be thrust aside by a bitter and final conflict with the imperial power. There were
many complicated matters which made up the sum of the controversy. On Frederic's side the political condition of North Italy, the growing independence of the small republics in Lombardy and the towns of Tuscany, the precarious character of his claim upon the estates of the Countess Matilda, and the unfriendly attitude of the powerful King of Sicily, were all causes of anxiety. On Adrian's side there were the insignificance of his temporal resources, and the doubtful loyalty of the German bishops; but at the same time the vast reserve of spiritual weapons of which the force was in that age fully recognized, and the consciousness of the undoubted justice of his claim upon Matilda's property under her will, which must be admitted whatever view is taken of the larger question of the claim of temporal power over the Empire. We will not go into the history of Matilda's possessions, though she belongs to the ancestral history of our own royal house, nor into the military manoeuvres of the Emperor in Northern Italy (pp. 225-34). But we must notice that in November 1158 Frederic appointed one of his German nobles, a sub-deacon of the Roman Church, to be Archbishop of Ravenna. Adrian courteously declined to approve of the appointment, and refused to confirm it when Frederic sent the Bishop of Vercelli to obtain the confirmation. Other encroachments and acts of cruelty followed, and Adrian quietly encouraged the North of Italy to resist the Emperor, strengthened the military posts in the neighbourhood of Rome, and wrote more than one severe letter to Frederic. The situation quickly developed into a grave crisis, and at last Adrian delivered a final claim which it was impossible for Frederic, from his point of view, to accept (pp. 241-242). Adrian therefore prepared to excommunicate the Emperor, and was on the point of putting this mighty engine of the Church into motion when he was overtaken at Anagni by an attack of quinsy, and breathed his last on September 1, 1159, having been elected Pope on December 4, 1154. Among the legends that have been circulated about his death is the usual accusation of poisoning, and a story is also told, invented it is said by the followers of Frederic, that, in the quaint words of Fuller, he 'was choak't with a fly: Which in the large Territory of St. Peter's patrimony had no place but his throat to get into; but since a flye stopt his breath fear shall stop my mouth, not to make uncharitable conclusions from such casualties' (p. 13, cf. p. 245). Frederic comes before us for the last time in a very noble light, for although Adrian was only prevented by death from
excommunicating him, and although the sentence of excom-
munication was carried out by the faithful Roland who had
been elected Pope while the German party put up a rival in
Octavian, yet the Emperor 'desired all respect and honour
to be paid at the obsequies of his staunch opposer' (p. 246),
and we desire to pay him all honour in his turn for his
generous chivalry.

A few details remain to be mentioned before we conclude
our review of the life of the English Pope. He was, as we
might expect, thoroughly versed in the English and Latin
tongues; we are also told that he was accomplished in French
and Norse (p. 251). By these four languages we are re-
minded of his nationality, his pontificate, his rule as Abbot
of St. Rufus, and his work as Papal legate. His literary
works are not extant, though Mr. Tarleton believes in the
genuineness of an English rendering of the Apostles' Creed
and the Lord's Prayer, which he prints on p. 254, and he is
able to tell us that Adrian wrote a history of his mission
to the North, catechisms for the Swedes and Norwegians,
homilies, and a treatise on the Immaculate Conception. He
also did much building during his short pontificate (p. 255).
An account of his Bulls, and a list of the cardinals whom he
created, are given in Appendix III. (p. 269).

Among a small number of errors and slips, we notice that
'deacon' is a misprint for 'dean' on p. 39, and 'throes' is
spelt wrongly on p. 69. We cannot unravel a tangled sentence
in the second paragraph of p. 105, and we feel sure that the
title of a standard work of reference is incorrectly given on
p. 260. Occasionally there is a slipshod sentence, as in the
omission of the relative on p. 256, while on p. 285 the type of
the last line but one is slightly disturbed.

Adrian's career up to his election to the Papacy is a con-
spicuous illustration of the way in which God has 'exalted
the humble and meek' to the high places of His Kingdom, and
when we look upon the brief but full period of his occupation
of the Papal Chair, and marvel at his sudden removal from
the critical scene, we are reminded of the words of the
Wisdom of Solomon: 'He being made perfect in a short
time fulfilled a long time: for his soul pleased the Lord:
therefore hasted He to take him away from among the
wicked.' As we ask ourselves where we are to place him among
the great names of the Christian Church, Mr. Tarleton comes
to our aid and points out that in the High Altar screen of
St. Alban's Abbey Adrian is placed between the Venerable

1 Wisd. iv. 13, 14, and see verses 15-20.
Bede and St. Hugh of Lincoln. We recognize at once the fitness of the position, next to Bede who loved his country with the truest and deepest affection,¹ and next to Hugh who could stand up bravely for the King of kings when it was necessary to rebuke the encroachments of any earthly sovereign.² If ever patriotism and Christian courage were fully represented in one man, it was in the person of Nicholas Breakspear, Pope Adrian IV.

ART. VI.—LIAS’S MANUAL ON THE NICENE CREED.


If it is possible that some of Chancellor Lias’s readers may be inclined to question parts of his preface, the statement he there makes about the design of his new book is likely to elicit much interest and sympathy. After mentioning his wish to provide a satisfactory text-book for candidates for Holy Orders, a ‘restatement of theological truth in the light of recent scientific discovery,’ a manual which will supply the clergy with the ‘first principles’ of the ‘science’ of ‘theology,’ and a work which as an Eirenicon may be of service in promoting the restoration of the visible unity of the Christian Church (Preface, pp. iv–vi), he goes on to speak of his hope that the book may be useful to lay members of the Church as well as to the clergy (ibid. p. vii), and at an early point in the work itself tells his readers that ‘the present treatise is designed for those who are willing to accept the teaching of Christ, but desire more information as to the nature of that teaching’ (p. 27).

We have noticed many valuable features of this manual, but before we proceed to call attention to them we wish to refer to less satisfactory matters, about which it is our duty to write.

Our perusal of his book has left on our mind a very

¹ For example ‘Erat doctus in nostris carminibus.’ Bede’s Works, i. clxi. (ed. Plummer).
² See the late Archdeacon Perry’s Life of St. Hugh of Avalon.
uncomfortable feeling of doubt whether Chancellor Lias is sufficiently equipped for the task he has undertaken. There are signs with regard to historical accuracy and patristic knowledge, to clearness of thought, and to power of interpretation which suggest that in each of these important respects the author is not fully equal to the requirements of so great a work as his combined objects demand. The apparent distinction between the ‘Patripassian’ and the ‘Sabellian’ heresies, and the description of the former as teaching that ‘the Father became incarnate’ (p. 125, note 2), do not inspire confidence. The repeated emphasis on the unanimous character of the Council of Nicaea (p. 127) does not convey the idea that the author realized the exact facts at the time when he wrote. The statement that St. Cyril of Alexandria ‘is the only Eastern Father who at all approximates to the language of the West’ on the subject of the Procession of God the Holy Ghost (p. 256) is not consistent with the existence of passages in the writings of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, and in a Creed preserved by St. Epiphanius, which certainly contain approximations to the Western phraseology. To say that ‘in 589 King Reccared of Spain inserted the words Filioque’ in his copy of the Nicene Creed, and caused it to be recited thus at the celebration of the Holy Com-

---

1 Patripassianism is simply a Western name for the Sabellian heresy, regarding it from the point of view that if there are not three Divine Persons, but only three manifestations of one Person, it would logically follow that He who in one method of manifestation is the Father in another method of manifestation suffered on the Cross. That ‘the Father became incarnate’ is rather the logical inference drawn by opponents of the heresy than the teaching of the heresy itself.

2 It is, of course, true that the Council of Nicaea was almost unanimous, and we might have passed by without comment Chancellor Lias’s phrases in the text ‘unanimously resolved,’ ‘this unanimity.’ But when he directs special attention to them in a note, and emphatically repeats ‘the decision was unanimous,’ it is necessary to remember that Theonas, Bishop of Marmorica, and Secundus, Bishop of Ptolemais, persisted in refusing to accept the Creed; and that the eventual withdrawal of a similar refusal by Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, Theognis, Bishop of Nicaea, and Maris, Bishop of Chalcedon, was not regarded as a sincere act. And the note to which we have referred does not give a just idea of the discussions which preceded the acceptance of the Creed.

3 St. Ath. Expos. fid. 4; Orat. c. Arian. i. 15; Ep. ad Serap. i. 2, 20, 32, iii. 1. See also De Trin. et Spir. Sanc. 19, where, though the Latin text in which alone the treatise exists may have been amplified, it is unlikely that the teaching on this point is an actual addition; and De Incarn. et c. Arian. 9, which, if not by St. Athanasius, is at any rate Eastern.

4 St. Basil, De Spir. Sanc. 46.

5 St. Epiph. Ancor. 121; cf. ibid. 6; Adv. Har. lxii. 4.
munion’ (pp. 256-7), is not an accurate representation of what appear to have been the facts. The assertion that the ‘reason’ why the ‘witness of the’ ‘Churches founded by the Apostles was invariably appealed to in early days’ ‘was that copies of the Scriptures were at that time, for various reasons, few in number’ (p. 294) is altogether contrary to the evidence on the subject. The statement that ‘in the Western Church’ Confirmation ‘has been wisely deferred, on the principle that the gift in Baptism cannot have its perfect work until each baptized person has taken the step of conscious self-dedication of himself to God’ (p. 315), appears to rest upon a misconception about the history of Confirmation in the West. Another passage seems to imply ignorance or forgetfulness of ordinary teaching within the Roman Church with regard to the ‘accidents’ in the Eucharist and the supra-local character of the Sacramental Presence of Christ (pp. 326-7). To assert without qualification that ‘such eminent divines as Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia were Universalists’ (p. 417, note 1) is misleading in view of the facts that the teaching of the former on this point was self-contradictory, and that the latter came to be notorious as a heretic rather than ‘eminent’ as a ‘divine.’ On some minor matters it is

2 The language used at the Council of Toledo of 589 A.D. appears to imply that the Creed was recited in the form already known in Spain as the ‘Creed of Constantinople’ without any intentional addition. The acts of the Council are given in, e.g., Hard. Concilia, iii. 467-90. This and the instance previously noticed are not the only cases of inaccuracy about the history of the Creeds.

2 See St. Irenæus, C. Harr. i. ix. 3-x. 1; Tertullian, De præscr. hær. 13-19, 36.

3 Chancellor Lias writes as if he supposed that the Western Church separated Confirmation from Baptism by a deliberate act. The separation appears to have arisen simply from the difficulty of access to a bishop. There are some useful references on this subject in the Church Quarterly Review, October 1886, pp. 71-2.


6 In some passages in his writings St. Gregory of Nyssa asserts Universalism of a complete kind which includes the devil and the subordinate spirits of evil as well as man; see Catech. Orat. 26, 35; De anima et resurr. But the teaching in Adv. eos qui differunt Baptismum contradicts this opinion.

7 The teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia was expressly declared to be heretical by the Fifth Ecumenical Council in its twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth anathemas: see Hard. Conc. iii. 197-202. The essentially heretical character of his views was fully treated in the article entitled ‘Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought’ in the Church Quarterly Review for October 1875.

not satisfactory to find a thought of St. Augustine referred to as if it had been originated by the modern writer Godet (p. 175);¹ the idea of a well-known utterance of St. Bernard ascribed without further reference to Dr. Milligan (p. 231);¹ and the phrase 'extension of the Incarnation,' which Bishop Jeremy Taylor used to summarize the patristic view of the work of the Church by means of the Sacraments, spoken of as if it was due to the accomplished and learned author of the Bampton Lectures for 1891 (p. 283 note 3).³

In the matter of clearness of thought we are gravely dissatisfied with the treatment of certain terms sometimes used as descriptions of God (pp. 52-3),⁴ and with the references to the doctrine of grace (pp. 142, 272),⁵ the teaching of Apollinaris (p. 149),⁶ and the 'merely negative view of moral evil' (p. 185);⁷ while we are of opinion that a clear thinker, with adequate theological and historical knowledge, ought not to accept 'Mr. Matthew Arnold's' phrase 'as a kind of "magnified and non-natural" Roman Emperor' as a 'felicitous' description of the mediaeval and modern Western way of regarding God (p. 50).⁸

In matters of interpretation we may illustrate what we mean by the statements that Abraham was 'tortured by an anxiety lest the "Judge of all the earth" should not "do

¹ St. Aug. De Trin. i. 21; In Joan. Ev. Tract. cxxiv. 6.
³ Jeremy Taylor, Worthy Communicant, i. 2.
⁴ What was needed was not the mere rejection of the terms 'the Absolute,' 'the Infinite,' 'the Unconditioned,' but an explanation in what senses they are true and in what senses they are untrue.
⁵ An accurate theological use of the phraseology 'habitual' and 'actual grace' is not at all inconsistent with the retention of the 'Scriptural' 'conception' of the perpetual indwelling of Christ in the human heart through His Spirit.
⁶ It would have been much more satisfactory to state exactly that Apollinaris asserted the existence of the ψυχή ἄλογος in our Lord, but denied the ψυχή λογική or πνεῦμα, than to say inaccurately 'Apollinaris' 'taught that the Godhead supplied the place of the human soul and spirit of Jesus,' and then add in a note, 'Apollinaris conceded a kind of ψυχή to our Lord.'
⁷ It is true enough that St. Augustine and some of the schoolmen exaggerated the negative character of evil. But Chancellor Lias does not appear to recognize the profound truth which underlay their teaching—namely, that evil is always a perversion of good. This truth is thoroughly patristic and Catholic: see, e.g., St. Athan. C. Gentes, 6, 7; St. Basil, Quod Deus non est auctor malorum, 6; St. Aug. Enchir. 12, 13, 23, 24; St. John Dam. De fide Orth. ii. 4, 12; St. Thom. Aqu. S. T. i. xlvi. 1, 3; xlii. 1-3, ii. i lxxv. 1.
⁸ It is worth while to refer to a very acute and historically true criticism on a similar misconception about the thought of the Middle Ages in Pullan, Lectures on Religion, pp. 333-4.
right' at the time of his pleading for Sodom (p. 81), had grave doubts whether God was 'in truth a just' 'Being' (ibid. note 2), and that it was a 'doubt whether this Mighty Ruler and Judge might not require to be propitiated by human sacrifice' which led him to be willing to offer up his son Isaac (pp. 81–2).

When we turn to the doctrinal teaching of the book there is again much to which exception may rightly be taken. Protest is needed against an unfounded and dangerous speculation towards which the author inclines, but which he does not expressly make his own. 'The manhood' of our Lord, he says, 'though “taken into God,” remains true manhood still, though capable of infinite growth and development, by reason of the “unity of Person,” until, it may be, it ultimately becomes co-extensive with, or absorbed into, the Divine' (p. 166).

Elsewhere he writes—

' The only conclusion to which I can come is that Christ's mediatorial kingdom shall then' (i.e. at the time of 'the end' spoken of in 1 Corinthians xv. 28) 'have come to an end; in other words, that His mediation, as Man, will no longer be necessary, but that each one of the redeemed shall enjoy the blessed privilege of immediate access to God, by reason of the completeness with which Christ's Humanity has been inwrought into theirs. What shall have become of Christ's Manhood in that Day—whether it shall be at last swallowed up in the Majesty of Godhead, or whether it shall continue to exist, though it be no longer necessary as the medium of our approach to God, or whether it is destined ultimately to coalesce, in some mysterious way, with our own—it were presumptuous to express an opinion' (pp. 252–3).

And it is stated—

' It would appear that when the time of restitution of all things has arrived, we shall no longer, as in this life, and even as in Paradise, need to approach God through the medium of His Incarnate Son, but that we shall thenceforth “see Him as He is” in Himself' (p. 427).

We recognize that there is room for differing opinions as to the way in which the Blessed shall behold God in the

1 The right interpretation of Gen. xviii. 25 is surely that Abraham had a strong conviction of the justice of God, and, taking that justice as a fixed point, appealed to it.

2 It seems to us impossible to take the words ascribed to God in Gen. xxii. 1–2 as being a 'doubt' which 'haunted' Abraham, and the words ascribed to the angel of the Lord in xxii. 11–12 as a 'special revelation from above.' The natural interpretation of the chapter is that God tested the faith of Abraham by calling on him to do what was strange and painful.
eternal future life, and as to the right interpretation of St. Paul's mysterious saying that 'the Son also Himself' shall 'be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all.' But we cannot see how a strong hold either on the truth of the Incarnation or on the realities of the spiritual life is to be maintained if it is supposed that the Manhood of Christ has no eternally permanent existence. The personal union in the Incarnation implies that, as the Manhood can never be divided from the Godhead, so also it can never be absorbed. The real existence of the Humanity is precious to men not only in the time of their probation, or in the preparation for the future glory which the Intermediate State affords, but also throughout eternity. The context shows that St. John's words, 'we shall see Him as He is,' refer to the Second Person in the Holy Trinity; and the vision of Him which the Blessed shall possess throughout their eternal happiness would fail in part of its joy if they did not behold the Nature in which He redeemed them and through which He has communicated to them their union with his Godhead and the means of their sanctification. And if the speculation which Chancellor Lias regards somewhat favourably has no philosophic or spiritual attraction it certainly is without authority. We do not know of any evidence by which it could be supported from Holy Scripture or Catholic tradition, while there is very much in both which is inconsistent with it. The comparison of our risen life with that of our Lord, which has so prominent a place in the teaching of St. Paul, naturally leads on to belief in the eternity of His Human Nature. The Revelation of St. John speaks of the Lamb as an eternal guide and temple and light in Heaven. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the High Priesthood which our Lord exercises is represented as being in some sense an eternal Priesthood. Christian thought has continuously regarded Him as eternally the Son of Mary. Amid all the varying interpretations of the words about the subjecting of the Son, the one fixed point is that they cannot mean that the Manhood of Christ shall cease to exist. To Origen and the Gregories and St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Chrysostom, not less than to St. Ambrose and St. Hilary.

---

St. Jerome¹ and St. Augustine,² to St. Thomas Aquinas³ as well as to St. John Damascene,⁴ it is an inconceivable thought that the Human Nature which the eternal Son of God united unto His Divine Person shall ever be abandoned or destroyed. Eastern and Western, Father and Schoolman alike, can find no place in their theology for such an idea.⁵

There is an error, scarcely less likely to be fruitful in evil results, in the teaching about sin. ‘Temptation,’ it is said, ‘involves a state of things in which evil necessarily exists. From this point of view the Fall appears to us as a moral necessity, and evil itself as a stage in the development of good. For, were there no evil, all the higher forms of goodness were impossible. . . . There is no scope, in a world where sin and suffering are unknown, for what we call noble actions. . . . Our moral constitution bears witness to the fact that evil is no more than a step in the development of the race—a term in the series whose sum is the ultimate happiness of mankind—a factor in the problem, by the solution of which that happiness is attained’ (pp. 67–8).

So, a little later, we find the statement—

‘The existence of evil, supposed by some to be incompatible with the existence of the Perfect Good, is in reality necessary to the evolution of the highest kind of goodness’ (p. 77).

And, again, further on, it is said—

‘The more we insist on the doctrine of evolution, the more probable the Fall becomes. Given a being inheriting animal characteristics, and for the first time endowed with a capacity for transgressing, and this necessity becomes more strongly marked than ever’ (p. 187).

Thus Chancellor Lias asserts that the Fall of man was necessary in two ways—firstly, because sin was needed in the world for the development of human character; and secondly, because the constitution of man’s nature was such that, when he had the opportunity of sinning, he could not help doing so.

The first of these considerations is founded on a confusion of thought. The need of the possibility of sinning in order that man may be proved is a different thing from a supposed

¹ St. Jer. Ep. lv. 5. ² St. Aug. De Trin. i. 15.
³ St. Thom. Aq. In Ep. i ad Cor. cap. xv. lect. 3; cf. S. T. 1. xlii. ⁴ ad 1.
⁴ St. John Dam. In Ep. i ad Cor., on xv. 25–9.
⁵ The significance of the passages to which we have referred is that it is uniformly asserted or assumed that there is no indication of any cessation of the existence of the human nature of our Lord. The list of writers and the references to those we have mentioned might be largely increased.
necessity that the first man should actually sin or that subsequent men should have the defect and taint of original sin.

The second consideration ignores facts it is vital to remember. The rebuke of Adam and Eve by God, and the punishment inflicted by Him on them and their posterity, are not compatible with a theory that they had only done what they could not help doing. Whatever the fascination of sin may or may not have been to a being who had as yet no experience of it, there must be placed side by side the power for goodness in a nature into which nothing evil had yet come, which had been created in the image of God and had received the gift of moral likeness to God. The tremendous consequences of Adam's sin are morally explicable only when it is remembered that it was the one human sin which has been committed in a nature into which the bias towards evil had not come. If the first three chapters of the book of Genesis teach religious truth at all, they teach that in unfallen man there was close spiritual union with His Creator, and that his Fall was not a necessity, but a grave offence.

We are compelled to criticize also some parts of the treatment of the doctrines of the Church and the Sacraments. The statements on the subject of Holy Baptism are by no means satisfactory.

'Catholic theologians,' it is said, 'have been accustomed to see in Infant Baptism not only a declaration of the Will of God to save and sanctify the soul of the infant thus brought to be admitted into Christ's Church, but an actual conveyance of the powers without which such salvation and sanctification would be impossible. But such conveyance of the necessary powers has never been regarded as absolute, but merely potential.' That is to say, it is the Will of God that the Divine gift of salvation shall be placed within the reach of every soul, without exception. But the extent to which that gift becomes the actual inheritance of each individual soul will be in precise proportion to the extent to which that soul realizes its possession of it' (p. 173).

'We see that these promises made in Baptism are conditional, first on our acceptance of them, and next on our resolution to use them. The power to use them comes from God. Without His help we cannot even stir hand or foot to help ourselves. But Baptism is a proclamation of His willingness to give us the help of which we stand in such sore need; in fact, it tells us that the power is actually conferred upon us, and that all we have to do is to use it. In other words, our co-operation with the power of the Life of Christ,'
imparted to us by the Spirit, is necessary in order to obtain the results such a power is able to work in us’ (pp. 309-10).

‘In the case of the infant, the Christian society is content with the promise that the child shall be taught to reverence and follow Christ, and instructed in the nature of the gift which it has at least potentially received. But both the infant and the adult are alike in regard to the gift of the Life from on high. That gift is as absolute on God’s part to the one as to the other. In neither case is the gift itself contingent on faith. In each case it is the expression of the Divine Will, which has willed the salvation of the whole world. But the gift once given, the intelligent co-operation of the human will, through the medium of faith, is required to make it effectual. Without this, the gift of the new and higher Life will remain inoperative, and will, if the recipient persist in his disobedience, be ultimately withdrawn’ (pp. 314-5).

Now there are indications in these passages, and also in some passages which we have not quoted, that Chancellor Lias means to assert the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and that his anxiety is lest it should be thought that all who have been regenerated in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism will, of necessity, be ultimately among the saved. If that is the case, we have no hesitation in saying that much greater care than he has taken was needed to make this clear. The expressions that the ‘conveyance of the powers which are necessary for obtaining salvation and sanctification’ is ‘merely potential’ (p. 173), and that the baptized infant ‘has at least potentially received’ ‘the gift’ (p. 314), are particularly objectionable. The gift of regeneration, the sacramental union with the Humanity of Christ, the reception of God the Holy Ghost, the possession of the Baptismal ‘character’ are absolutely bestowed upon the soul in the Sacrament. About this communication of supernatural gifts from God there is nothing potential. Nothing can make the person who has received them cease to be a member of Christ. His righteous acts rest upon the powers of his Baptism. His sins are the sins of one who, amid whatever defilement, possesses always the ‘character’ of the baptized. The fact that by sin he may fail to produce the true fruits of Baptism, and may at last forfeit the inheritance of eternal life, does not imply that there is anything of a ‘potential’ character in the gift itself.

Nor can we commend the language that is used about the Holy Eucharist. The author leaves us in doubt as to what his own belief is with regard to the Presence of the Sacred Humanity in the consecrated elements. His note on Dr. Pusey’s work (p. 335, n. 1) on the Real Presence leaves much to be desired. It is perhaps true that Dr. Pusey in his great
catena printed many passages from the Fathers of which it was only true that they might be the outcome of belief in the Real Presence, and that if the list had been limited to instances which could not mean anything else it would have been greatly reduced. But when all allowance is made for such considerations, it remains true that a consensus of patristic teaching from all parts of the Church testifies to a universal Christian belief that in the consecrated elements of bread and wine there is present the Sacred Humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ. And while Chancellor Lias asserts plainly enough the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, it does not give confidence in his doctrinal attitude about it to find him saying—

‘There is a special fitness, moreover, in the teaching of God's Word, that it is Christ's Death which is presented here below, His Life which pleads for us in the courts above. For here the Church is militant; there her Head stands at God's Right Hand triumphant. Here the Church is suffering; there her Head dwells in joy and bliss unspeakable. Here we are struggling to free ourselves from the dominion of sin by the Virtue of the Adorable Sacrifice; there the Lamb, once sacrificed, stands above all created things, presenting the Life in which Sacrifice is now consummated in Victory, and Majesty, and Glory’ (pp. 241–2).¹

Holy Scripture certainly speaks of Christians showing forth the Lord's Death.² But in it our Lord speaks also of a ‘memorial of me.’³ Thus the Eucharist is the presentation not only of the Death of Christ, but also of Christ Himself. It is the living Christ coming to dwell in us at Communion who enables us to struggle 'to free ourselves from the dominion of sin.' It is Christ, risen and ascended, having passed through death into glorious life, whom we offer to the Father. The traditional language of Christian worship, East and West, testifies to the strength of the Church's conviction that it is not only Christ's Passion and Death, but also His Resurrection and Ascension that are in mind, as He Himself is the Sacrificial Victim whom we present. To speak of His Death as presented on the earthly altar, and His Life as pleading in heaven, is to risk a separation between the Sacrifice of the Church and the Heavenly Offering of our Lord, which would be altogether destructive of the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

Nor is the teaching on the subject of Absolution satis-

¹ The italics throughout this passage, as in all our quotations, are the author's.
² 1 Cor. xi. 26.
³ St. Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.
factor. It is argued that because the 'presbyter' 'can but act ministerially, as commissioned by Christ,' therefore the 'power inherent in the Church,' and 'given to each one of her ministers,' 'can only be declarative in its nature' (p. 367). The practice of Confession is considered from the point of view of the value of 'the private ministrations of a wise, experienced, and truly earnest clergyman,' who 'will be able to point out mistakes, to suggest remedies, and in a thousand ways to speak peace to the troubled soul' (pp. 368-70). The truth is that through the ministrations of the priest Christ Himself actually communicates to the penitent soul the merits of His death, so that by His Blood its sins are remitted; and what is sought in Confession is not primarily advice, however useful that may sometimes be, but Absolution from sin.

We fail to find historical ground to support the doubts cast on the necessity of Episcopal Consecration and Ordination to preserve the Christian Ministry (pp. 349-60). It is hardly true to say that 'the earliest evidence' in support of such a necessity is 'a passage in Cyprian' (p. 349). While St. Ignatius does not expressly connect the need for Bishops with their work of consecrating and ordaining, it is reasonable to suppose that this was one reason of a necessity which his writings show him to have regarded as sacramental as well as disciplinary.1 If Hegesippus2 hardly does more than assert a fact, there are passages in St. Ireneeus3 and Tertullian,4 both of earlier date than St. Cyprian, which cannot be rightly interpreted except as asserting the need of Bishops in order to maintain the Apostolical succession in the Church. When it was contended by Dr. Langen that the Churches in some parts of the West were governed by colleges of presbyters (p. 351), he meant by presbyters who had received, in addition to the powers of the second order, the powers now limited to Bishops.5 When Canon Gore abstained from condemning this theory (pp. 356-7) he expressly stated that he did so on the ground that the presbyters would in such a case have received episcopal powers.6 Neither of these

1 St. Ignat. Ad Eph. 5, 20; Ad Trall. 7; Ad Philad. 3, 4; Ad Smyrn. 8.
3 St. Iren. C. Har. iv. xxvi. 2, 5.
4 Tert. De prascr. har. 32, 36, 41. When these passages are considered together, it may be seen that Chancellor Lias's attempt (p. 355) to avoid the significance of the first of them cannot be held to be successful.
5 Langen, Geschichte der römischen Kirche, i. 95-6.
6 Gore, Mission of the Church, pp. 29-32. Chancellor Lias does not
writers, then, can rightly be claimed as doubting the necessity of the existence and retention of the episcopal powers. The method of their exercise is a wholly different question from the fact of the possession of them.

Indeed, we could wish that the whole idea of the Church which Chancellor Lias puts before us were less confused. There is no clear teaching on the objective unity which consists in the common possession of the one Life of Christ as distinct from the subjective unity of intercommunion. It would be difficult to justify the statement that 'no doctrine, however widely received, no practice, however general, can claim to be Catholic—i.e. universal—and therefore binding on the conscience of a Christian man, unless it has been expressly taught, enjoined, or practised by the apostles of Christ. And we have no other means of ascertaining what was originally so taught, enjoined, or practised, but the Christian Scriptures' (p. 290).

The views expressed as to the fallibility of the Church (pp. 387-400) would naturally lead to doubt whether the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils are entitled to all the respect which Catholics have habitually paid to them, and we notice that the author evades the question whether these decisions may ever be reversed by saying 'it will be time enough' 'to discuss' 'whether it is possible for the Church to review' them 'when her members call upon her to do so' (p. 395). Moreover he fails to grasp the true significance of the maxim 'Quod semper,' or the connexion between discipline and doctrine, or the relation of local Churches to the whole Church (pp. 387-400).

appear to have grasped the significance of a passage in the long quotation he makes from Canon Gore's lectures. That Canon Gore's meaning was as stated above is made clear when he says, 'Now if the order of presbyters at any time held the right to ordain, that was because it had been entrusted to them by apostolic men. It no more disturbs the principle of apostolic succession than if your lordship ordained all the presbyters in this diocese to-day to episcopal functions. There would ensue a great deal of inconvenience and confusion, but nothing that would violate the principle of apostolical succession. On the other hand, the departure from this principle is manifest when presbyters in the sixteenth or subsequent century took upon themselves to ordain other presbyters. They were taking on themselves an office which, beyond all question, they had not received, which was not imparted to them in their Ordination' (ibid. pp. 31-2). And that Canon Gore's opinion is distinctly opposed to Chancellor Lias's contention may be further seen in the former writer's The Ministry of the Christian Church; see especially pp. 344-5.

1 It is, however, right to say that, while the two forms of unity are confused, the objective unity is recognized: see especially pp. 288-9, 301.

2 Without entering upon the innumerable questions which this statement brings up, we should like simply to ask Chancellor Lias on what he bases the obligation of keeping Sunday.
We regret exceedingly the suggestion of the possibility that the probation of the soul may not end at death (pp. 423-5). The belief that the present life is the only time of probation does not rest simply, as Chancellor Lias appears to imagine, on 'a single passage in Ecclesiastes.' It rests also on the profound sense which pervades Holy Scripture and the Fathers of the importance of the decisions of this life, on the representations of the Day of Judgment spoken by our Lord Himself, on the entire absence of anything in the Bible or in Catholic theology to support another view, on the words put by our Lord into the mouth of Abraham in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus,1 and on the inferences which may be drawn from the practice of the Liturgies and the teaching of the Fathers with regard to prayers for the departed.2 He who knows what is in man can tell even from a life which to our imperfect sight seems to have been no probation at all what is the decision which His justice and mercy may rightly determine. We do well in the existence of real perplexities to put our trust in the unerring wisdom and perfect goodness of Almighty God rather than to devise speculations which disguise the true issues of life and death.

We hope the criticisms which it has been our duty to make will not lead any of our readers to think that our general attitude towards this book is one of condemnation. On the contrary, we recognize very much in it which is of considerable value. The teaching on 'faith' (pp. 15-25), if in some ways it might well be supplemented, is distinctly helpful. The validity of the appeal to miracles and prophecy is vindicated (pp. 75-6). We have observed excellent treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (pp. 91-102); a wise statement on the interpretation of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis (p. 108); an acute and just remark on the weak points of 'German criticism' (p. 138); a needed repudiation of the possibility of 'any change' in the essential nature of God in consequence of His taking the Man-

---

1 Our Lord represents Abraham as saying both that there is an impassable barrier between the saved and the lost (St. Luke xvi. 26) and that if the opportunities afforded by the Providence of God are not used no other opportunities would be (ibid. 31). We observe that Chancellor Lias (p. 421) assumes that Dives was not among the lost. This view is contrary to the general texture of the parable, to the express words in verse 26, and to the traditional interpretation of the passage: v. Corn. a Lap. in loc.

2 The prayers used in the Liturgies and commended by the Fathers are for those whose salvation has through Divine grace been won in the probation of this life.
hood,' 'into Himself' (p. 157), and of various ideas connected with the 'kenotic' speculations which have become popular (pp. 160-5);¹ an excellent illustration of the doctrine of Justification (pp. 178-9), with a valuable statement on Predestination and Election (pp. 179-80); a useful summary with regard to the Papacy (pp. 381-7); and some opportune remarks on the Resurrection (pp. 408-10).

And, since we have commented on what we think imperfections in the teaching about the Church, we desire to quote the following passage as one with which we entirely agree, while we wish that the principles involved in it had been more consistently carried out in other parts of the work:

¹ Before leaving the question of the Ecumenical Councils and their decisions, it may be well to say a few words on the functions of the Church in developing the doctrine which Christ has commissioned her to disseminate. It must not be supposed that there is any infallibility attaching to the decisions of a General Council as such. As we have already seen, those decisions, when promulgated, were almost invariably fiercely, and for a time successfully, challenged. Their binding nature consists in the fact of their ultimate acceptance by the vast majority of the members of the Christian Church. That acceptance was, no doubt, followed by the exclusion of the minority from the pale of Catholic Christendom. But unless this exclusion had been a just exclusion we may be quite sure that the logic of facts would have compelled the majority to abandon their attitude. The best justification for the action of Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Flavian, Theodoret, and Leo is the disappearance, more or less complete, of the doctrine of their antagonists from the face of the earth. We conclude therefore that the general consent of Christians at large, and not the mere verdict of Councils, is the principle on which the dogmatic teaching of the Church is based.

¹ Some notice of a passage on p. 164 is called for. Chancellor Lias there attacks the statement of Dr. Bright (The Incarnation as a Motive Power, p. 299) that in the Incarnation our Lord 'divested Himself of' 'that unreserved exercise of Divine prerogatives which would be incompatible with the acceptance of the limitations attaching to humanity as He was to assume it,' and appears to think that it differs materially from his own assertion that 'it was impossible, in the very nature of things, that' the Divine 'prerogatives could be manifested, or even exercised in their fulness, in and through the Manhood' (p. 165, n.). We are confident that Chancellor Lias has misunderstood Dr. Bright, and that the meaning of the latter's words is simply that the Son of God voluntarily restrained the exercise of the Divine powers which He continuously possessed. This is shown by pp. 291-2 of the same work (a passage referred to with approval by Chancellor Lias in his note on p. 161), and also by Dr. Bright's Morality in Doctrine, p. 333, n. 1 ('an actual surrender of Divine prerogatives or perfections by a Divine Person is unthinkable'), and Waymarks in Church History, p. 393 ('As a rule, He held in reserve, by a continuous self-restraint, the exercise of Divine powers').
A further consideration tends to strengthen this conclusion. The dogmatic decisions of the early Church were rather negative than positive. They were intended to exclude error, not to proclaim new truth. They were danger signals rather than developments. It was found, by actual experience, that if it were taught that the Godhead of the Son was not identical in Essence with that of the Father, the whole Christian scheme, as it has been handed down in Scripture, collapsed in a moment. So again it was found that if the doctrine of the One Person of Christ were not firmly held, men came to believe, not in the Word made Flesh, but in two separate beings, one of them more or less closely united to the other; while, on the other hand, if the two natures of Christ were not strongly insisted on, the true manhood of Christ disappeared altogether, and men either regarded it as absorbed into the Godhead, or they conceived of a being who, subsequently to the Incarnation, was neither God nor man, but a kind of intermediate being compounded of the two. But the Christian scheme is only conceivable under the hypothesis that "God and Man is one Christ" (pp. 154-6).

This new work on the doctrines of the Nicene Creed contains much that is useful. It may suggest lines of fruitful thought. It is in some ways calculated to be helpful in the circumstances of the present time. By greater accuracy and clearness, and, above all, by the removal of some questionable opinions, it could be greatly improved. We cannot think its respected author was well advised in inviting comparison with Bishop Pearson's work on the Apostles' Creed, or even with Dr. Mason's Faith of the Gospel (Pref. pp. iv-v). It lacks the accuracy, the method, the robustness, the learning of the former of these books. If it is free from one or two unfortunate features of the latter, it is without the general grasp on Catholic truth and the great merit of showing the harmony and consistency of the Christian Faith regarded as a whole system which marked Dr. Mason's work. To recur to the various objects mentioned in the preface, the book is likely to be of value to candidates for Ordination, the class for whom it is primarily intended, if they obtain from other sources a clear knowledge of doctrine which will enable them to exercise discretion in their study of it. Under the same conditions it may help some of the clergy. It has hardly sufficient grasp on the great principle upon which alone satisfactory reunion can take place, the acceptance of the authority of the Universal Church, to make it fitted to be an Eirenicon. Most of the laity, we think, will find other books of greater service to them.

We may add that we are certain that the time has not
yet come when either candidates for Ordination or the younger clergy can afford to lay aside the great treatises of Bishop Pearson and Richard Hooker. They may call for patience and require thought, they may sometimes need explanation and comment from a living teacher; but, as the products of master-minds, they have the power of impressing great principles on those who study them rightly and of teaching lessons, often little realized at the time of perusal, which may be of permanent value for the whole of life.

ART. VII.—ST. CATHERINE OF GENOA.


2. Vita mirabile e Dottrina santa della beata Caterina Fiesca Adorna. Da GIUSEPPE BOTTARI. (Genova, 1667.)


In a recent number of this Review an account was given of St. Catherine of Siena. It is possible that some of our readers may be glad to compare with her another saint, who, bearing the same name, and partaking of the same holiness, presents a singular contrast to the prophetess who rebuked a Pope at Avignon.

Exactly a century had elapsed since the birth, at Siena, of the more eminent Catherine when Catherine Fieschi was born, in 1447, at Genoa. It is probable, though we know of no evidence on the point, that she was named after the earlier saint. The daughter of the Sienese dyer, Benincasa, becomes a Dominican nun, is deeply absorbed in politics in their religious aspect, travels from place to place in furtherance of a peace to be founded on repentance and righteousness, stands like a conscience before the Pope at Avignon, and stings him to return to Rome, where she herself dies, worn with stress and travel, at the age of thirty-three. The daughter of the Genoese noble is thwarted in her desire of entering an Augustinian convent, is forced into an unhappy marriage, never apparently leaves her native city, and never alludes to its political vicissitudes, spends a long life in ministering to the sick in a hospital, and dies after many years of excruciating disease at the age of sixty-three.

1 Church Quarterly Review, January 1897.
The absence of political interest in the later Catherine is not accounted for by her lot being cast in quieter times. She was a girl of eleven when Genoa, which had been subject for more than a century to the house of Visconti at Milan (1353–1458), cast off their yoke and submitted to Charles VII. of France. Three years later (1461) the city revolted against France and restored her republican institutions, but only to fall into the misery of constant feuds between the Fregosi and the Adorni, into which latter family Catherine was unwillingly married two years later, when she had hardly reached the age of sixteen years. The following year the city again submitted to Milan in the person of the great condottiere, Francesco Sforza, and remained subject to his degenerate family for thirty years, when Ludovico il Moro opened her gates to Charles VIII. of France, and she became the base of his impotent yet important invasion of Italy in 1494. In 1499, when Catherine was fifty-two years of age and a widow of two years, Genoa, led by the nobles, submitted to Louis XII. of France in his assumed capacity of Duke of Milan. Eight years later the reluctant people rebelled and set up a republic, which lasted less than a month before it was suppressed with a heavy hand by Louis. Thus, during Catherine's lifetime, her city passed under eight forms of government; and such transitions were not in those days easy and peaceful changes, but such as filled the streets with blood and the hospitals with wounded men and starving children. Yet there is not in Catherine's writings a single allusion to any of these changes, or to the misery which accompanied them.

The same silence is observed with respect to the ecclesiastical history of her time. Her birth coincides with the election, and her first eight years with the reign, of Nicolas V., who ended the last papal schism. Her girlhood passed under the papacy of Calixtus III., the first Borgia, and of Pius II., who canonized the Sienese Catherine, and strove to promote a last crusade. In her eighteenth year the morose Paul II. succeeded; in her twenty-fifth year the Caligulan Sixtus IV.; in her thirty-eighth year Innocent VII., who, to provide his acknowledged sons with money, sold sacraments and broke promises, deceiving the people as he had deceived God. Yet he seems almost innocent indeed when compared with his successor, Alexander VI., whose eleven years cover Catherine's life from the age of forty-five to that of fifty-six. After the phantom pope of a month succeeded the warrior, Julius II. She lived through such events of interest as the fall of Constantinople (1453), the introduction of printing into Italy.
(1465), the discovery of America by her countryman (1492),
the preaching and death of Savonarola (1489–98); in 1492
she must have been a spectator of the death, in the harbour of
Genoa, of such hosts of Jews, exiles from Spain, that their
corpses infected all the Italian coast with pestilence; but of
none of these things does she say a word. She does not
mention her family, her marriage, her husband’s death. Yet
all this time she was not leading a sequestered life in a
cloister. For several years she occupied a place in the
noblest society of Genoa. She was afterwards, as we should
say, matron of a large hospital; she was constantly en-
gaged in works of mercy outside its walls; she was sought
as adviser by numbers of men and women. To these and
other occupations, and the events with which they brought
her into contact, she hardly gives a word. A friend has told
us how, during a slow day’s journey up the Nile, the boat
moved by the side of an Arab who all day long uttered the cry
of ‘God! God!’ St. Catherine’s absorption reminds us of this
ascetic. Her one concern was to describe, as she apprehended
it, the manner in which God was purifying her for Himself.

At first sight we may be disposed to censure her for her
indifference to the world around her. And if it is pleaded in
her defence that the Gospel is equally empty of the details of
secular history, the answer is ready that the Gospel tells
enough of the history of the world to fix the chronology
of our Lord’s life, and is full of details of the working,
wondering, stumbling world, of which we find not one in
Catherine. But then it must be remembered that St. Cathe-
rine’s books are not a general biography of her, but a record
of a certain (the most important) aspect of her life; and that
human frailty is not to be blamed if it sees in part and
prophesies in part. We would yield to none in emphasizing
the sacredness of daily life, the illustration of God’s provi-
dence in history, the danger lest absorption in our own
spiritual concerns should make us forget the world which
surrounds us and depends on us. But we must in justice
remember that Catherine’s absorption was concurrent with
the most noble service of the sick and miserable.

It is singular how little reference she makes to most of
the articles of the Creed, and to the Sacraments. She alludes
but once, we think, to Holy Baptism, to Penance, to the Holy
Eucharist, never to Confirmation; yet we learn from her
biographer how, during an interdict, she walked a mile out-
side the town for her daily communion, and ‘her desire to
unite herself with her Beloved was so great, that it seemed as
if her body reached as quickly as her soul the place where she might find Him.' She does not speak of the Pope, or of the Saints, or even of the Blessed Mother of our Lord. She apparently knew little of Holy Scripture, and we cannot but regret that she missed the wholesome breadth of life to be learned from the Gospels, the balanced truths to be gathered from the Epistles, the varied aspirations of the Psalms, with which she would have been more familiar had she been bound by rule to the daily recitation of the divine office. But if St. Catherine found almost all the revelation of God which she could apprehend in the secret of her heart, she does not blame those who find a revelation of Him elsewhere; nor should she be blamed because she pursued a singular path to which we are not called. No doubt her religion is one-sided, but it is genuine; and we may be thankful to her for her vivid presentment of grace as a reality, of God as willing to reveal Himself to His children, and of man's mind as capable of the highest exercise when we 'see God for ourselves, and not another.'

Little as she tells us of her outward life, it is yet best to study her spiritual experiences in the light of the facts recorded by her disciple, a layman, Ettore Vernaccia, who wrote her Life in concert with her director, C. Marabotto, together with scattered statements elsewhere, which are admirably brought together in the Life prefixed to his translation by M. de Bussierre.

The family of Fieschi to which Catherine belonged was one of the most illustrious in Genoa, and had given two Popes (Innocent IV. in 1243, and Adrian V. in 1276) to the Church. It was one of the few families which enjoyed the singular privilege of ornamenting their palaces, like the cathedral façade, with bands of black and white marble. Of the two parties which divided mediaeval Italy—the one derived from the remains of the old Latin civilization, and the other from the invading Germans—the Fieschi belonged to the Latin or Guelfic party. At the time of the saint's birth, in 1447, Genoa was at the height of her magnificence, soon to be reduced, like her rival, Venice, by the strife of factions, by the fall of the Eastern Empire, and by the diversion of commerce in consequence of the discovery of America and the circumnavigation of the Cape. The biographer of Catherine, though

1 Such is the judgment of the Bollandist, U. S., who uses this Life as the basis of his Commentary. He inserts also an anonymous Life, translated from the Acts of her canonization.

2 Acta Sanctorum, Sept. 15, p. 130.
he tells us how contemptible are bodily charms, dwells with some detail on her beauty—her tall, graceful figure, her balanced head, her oval face, her regular features, her splendid hair and long black eyelashes, the height and purity of her brow. But from an early age she despised the advantages of beauty and wealth. A faultless childhood was marked by singular habits of prayer, and a desire to share the Passion of the Lord. At the age of thirteen Catherine urgently desired to enter a convent of Augustinian nuns, the Madonna delle Grazie, of which her elder sister was already a member, and won the consent of the director of the community, but not that of the nuns, who, with all their regard for her, would not break their rule to admit so young a novice. Their decision was no doubt as wise as their rule; but it says something for the reality of the child's vocation that her disappointment led to no prejudicial reaction. She had already learned that sanctity consists in conformity with the will of God, whether in the cloister or in the world; and at a later time she repudiated with fire the suggestion of a Franciscan that in the religious state she might have loved God better than in married life.

For no other life than this was imposed on her. Her parents seem to have been God-fearing people, who put no obstacle in the way of their elder daughter becoming a nun; but her father was now dead, and her brother, anxious to strengthen the Guelf party in opposing Paolo Fregosi, bandit, pirate, archbishop and doge, was determined to attach to it Giuliano Adorno, a Ghibelline, but an enemy of the Fregosi, by a marriage between him and Catherine. The girl had hoped that in a few years the way would be made plain for her to enter a convent; but she submitted, sorely against her will, to marry a man who was violent in temper, dissolute, and a gambler. The marriage took place on January 13, 1463. Giuliano, who had no affection for his wife, continued his reckless course till he had wasted all his fortune and that which Catherine brought him, and persecuted her for her austerities. It is impossible not to pity both parties to this unsuitable marriage. His wife's singular devotion was naturally irksome to the gay young noble; and it is possible that a good woman of a less exalted type might have won him to better ways. It is true that in the end Catherine's gentleness and prayers led to his repentance before his death in 1497.

The first five years of her married life were spent by her in great misery. She abjured society, she fasted, she spent
nights in watching before the crucifix, she grew so thin that all her beauty was lost. Then, when her friends persuaded her that such a course of life was really suicide, she changed her habits, entered society, and associated with ladies of her own rank. There is not a suggestion in her works that she ran into any excess which would seem to most people culpable. At this point in her life the narrative of her friends is supplemented by her three books of Dialogues, which are really her confessions. In the first book of these she speaks of a journey on which Soul and Body set out together, agreeing that each should enjoy the delights that attracted it, whether spiritual or natural; and, in case they should disagree, Self-love (Amor Proprio) should accompany them as umpire. When the Soul leads, the Body rebels, and enlists on its side Self-love. When the Body leads, the Soul is continually dragged down, loses her heavenly tastes, and lives in constant dread of being involved in further compliances. Her fall was not into any conspicuous sin, but from conspicuous holiness, a fall into tepidity and laxity which so easily happens, which so few treat seriously, and from which the recovery is often so difficult. It would ill become us to censure so genuine a saint for the remorse with which she viewed this lapse; yet it is impossible not to wish that she had regarded the conduct of life less from the standpoint of an ideal, and more in the light which is thrown upon it by the example of our Lord Jesus Christ. He who began His ministry at a feast, who 'came eating and drinking,' who accepted the bodily ministrations of St. Martha, who was content to interrupt His meditation that He might serve the Samaritan woman, and did not find inconsistent with His love for all men a special love for some, might have taught her that it is possible to live in the world yet free from its evil. But there is nothing to indicate that Catherine was in the habit of meditating on the Gospel history, or indeed was generally familiar with it. Her practical knowledge of it seems almost confined to the crucifixion. It would be difficult to speak warmly enough of the value of meditation on the whole life of the Lord Jesus as the method whereby the spiritual life may be made broad and equable. Those who use books of devotion instead of the Gospel may find very likely nothing that is not true in their books, but they are likely to find only one aspect of truth; and the purpose of the Christian life is not only that we may be made partakers of Christ's death, but that we may come 'unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' But while we regret St. Catherine's apparent lack of
familiarity with the 'life of our Life,' we must not forget that liberties which are wholesome for some persons are dangerous for others. She was one who felt strongly a vocation to the religious life, which she only renounced under compulsion. To her the ordinary amenities of life, not rejected by our Lord, nor generally forbidden to His disciples, were incongruous. She was not made to be a lady of rank. No doubt she felt rightly that social life was wrecking her spiritual life. Each of us is only capable of reproducing ever so dimly a portion of Christ's character; and that Catherine could not imitate the Guest at Cana should not dim the praise that she could and did imitate the Sufferer in the Garden.

The end of the tenth year of her married life found her in the deepest distress. She had not won her husband, and she seemed to have thrown away her soul. On the eve of St. Benedict (March 20), 1474, visiting the church of that saint, she begged him to procure for her an illness of three months, feeling, as so many have felt, that the compulsory retreat of a sick-bed was her only way of 'recovering her breath.' The following day her sister Limbania urged her to consult the director of the Augustinian nuns, a priest of great enlightenment and holiness—whether the same who had sympathized fourteen years before with her desire for the religious life we cannot say. After some hesitation she sought this priest and asked him to receive her confession; but as she took her place, a ray of heavenly light, disclosing for a moment the work of the Lord Jesus Christ in her as well as her miserable want of love, robbed her of all power of speech. The priest, supposing her to be occupied with preparing her confession, left her for a time, and returned to find her still silent. At last she contrived to ask leave to defer her confession; she rushed home, shut herself into her room, cast off the ornaments of secular vanity, and plunged into the contemplation of her own sinfulness and of the preventing love of God. Then she received a vision; our Lord appeared, bearing His Cross, covered from head to foot with blood. 'Seest thou this blood?' He said; 'it was shed to the last drop for love of thee, and for satisfaction for thy sins.'

This was the beginning of her conversion and of the divine communications by which she was sustained. We use the indefinite term 'divine communications,' for it is not clear whether they usually took the form of visions. It is perhaps most likely that they were of the nature of sudden and pungent realizations of spiritual truths—less like visions than

1 Dial. i. 11.
that startling insight of which most of us are conscious, when a familiar truth bursts through its shell and displays itself as living and life-giving. In this way she was led from one stage of penitence to another. She often professes herself unable to give words to her inward experience. She perceived that 'the Self [questo Essere del huomo] of fallen man is, so to speak, no less bad and malignant than God is good;' that her ill could have no remedy but in the Lord.

'Lord,' she said, 'I give myself to Thee, for I perceive that by myself I can but make of myself a hell. I propose to Thee an exchange: I put into Thy hands my malignant being, for Thou canst bury it in Thy goodness, and so rule me that nothing more of myself may be seen in me. Do Thou on Thy side give me the indwelling of Thy pure love, so that it may quell in me every other feeling, may cause me to be annihilated in Thee, and may keep me so absorbed that no strange thing may find time or place to dwell with me.'

The proposed exchange was accepted.

'At that moment the malignant part of her memory was taken away, and she had no more anxiety about it; while a ray of love was shed in her heart which . . . took away from her every love, appetite, pleasure, possession, which she had ever had, or could have, in this world.'

The view of herself no longer caused her any pain, for

'her most merciful God had taken away from her all affliction in this respect; yet she saw clearly what she was, and how the Lord sustained her.'

St. Catherine uses the language of devotion rather than that of accurate theology. In her abasement of humanity she seems almost to forget that it is still God's creature; in her repudiation of selfhood she hardly bears in mind that God made men Selves—personal, self-conscious, originative. The language of depreciation of man may be misused to depreciate the handiwork of God. Ten years after the period we have reached was born one who, after entering the Augustinian order which Catherine desired to enter, was led by his intense conviction of sin to push to its logical extent the depreciation of man which we are noticing in her. According to Luther, man is so debased by the Fall that he can never do things really pleasing to God; all that he can hope is that by his faith he may have imputed to him the righteousness of Christ which can never be his own. Faith, in the new theology, is the substitute for good works really pleasing to God, not the

1 Dial. i. 12.
root out of which such works may grow. Our saint indeed
was no Lutheran before Luther; she never doubted that God
desires men to be, and not only to be accounted, righteous.
Yet her extreme depreciation of man may seem to cloud in
some way the filial relation of man to God—to represent
human personality as that which God will not sanctify but
annihilate. Although our danger may be rather from undue
self-estimation than from undue self-depreciation, yet it is
well to bear in mind that a saint is not necessarily infallible,
and that St. Catherine's language is more fervent than accurate.

Though God had 'taken away from her all affliction in
respect of' her past sins, she conceived herself directed by
Him (she had at this time, and for long after, no human
director) to mortify the flesh by wearing a hair shirt, by
praying six hours daily on bare knees, by mixing bitter
powders with all she ate till the sense of taste was destroyed.
Her eyes were ever cast down: 'she had always the mien of
grief, yet she was very happy.' She tried to rob herself of
sleep by putting sharp things into her bed; but 'whatever
she did, God never deprived her of sleep; she slept though
she would not.' It does not seem to have occurred to her to
question whether God's refusal to use one of her proposed
means of mortification suggested that the other means which
she adopted were less divinely prompted than she thought.

Meanwhile, her Humanity (for so she called the lower
element in herself, or rather perhaps her Self regarded as
striving to be independent of God) murmured and longed for
death. Once indeed, after Communion, she had a happy
moment in which soul and body alike seemed to be in
heaven, and she grasped the meaning of the Psalm, 'My
heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.' But she
thought herself guided to pray that such moments should not
be repeated, lest she should seek for happiness, whose true
end was to seek for God alone by pure love.¹

Soon after her conversion, apparently in 1475, she joined
the ladies of the Misericordia in their charitable work of
seeking out the poor and sick in the hovels of which even
now Genoa contains not a few; and she also visited the
lazaretto for the incurable poor. Before long she was led
to occupy a house within the precincts of the hospital; for
her husband had dissipated his fortune and hers, so that they
were reduced to live on alms. This is one of the very few
incidents in her life to which she alludes.² Their loss
turned to their gain, for Giuliano became penitent, entered

¹ Dial. i. 14. ² Ibid. i. 19.
the Third Order of St. Francis, and associated himself with his wife in her works of charity; but his violent temper, and the resentment with which he bore sickness, continued to distress her for the remaining twenty years of his life; though on his death-bed he received the gift of patience. About 1478 Catherine was appointed matron of the great hospital, a post which she was directed by the Divine Voice to accept, and filled with great success, though it brought her much pain from the rudeness and indolence of the paid servants. She was probably even more distressed by the pleasure which she found in her work. Was it not a sort of 'accidental love,' incompatible with the pure love by which she aspired to be led? But this pleasure was only given her in a limited degree; it aided her humanity in doing the necessary work brightly and well, but when the work was done the memory of it passed away.¹ She regarded her promotion to the matronship as a test whether, at the call of popular praise, her 'malignant part' would revive.

'She did her work very quickly, and never rested, in order to gain distraction from the fire which every day besieged her more and more. . . . Then the Spirit, who had governed the Humanity in this manner, said, 'Henceforth I will no more call her a human creature, for I see her all lost in the Lord, and find nothing in her which comes from the purely human principle apart from God.'²

With these words she closes the first book of her Dialogues. A hasty reader might think her in great peril of conceit of her own holiness; but her prevailing thought is not that she had attained to any degree of sanctity, but that God, without her co-operation for the most part, had wrought a wondrous work in her. She was, we conceive, no more self-satisfied than St. Paul was when he recounted his labours and sufferings, and said, 'By the grace of God I am what I am.' The second book is far more difficult to understand. It does not seem to follow the first in a chronological order. She recurs to the earlier moments of her conversion to describe them from another point of view. Hitherto the contrast and the strife have been between the soul and the humanity, which is equivalent to the body, or, in St. Paul's phrase, the flesh: now the Word of God pierces 'even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit.' It would be vain to look for any precise distinction between these two: Catherine is not a philosopher but a saint; but, like the holiest of women, she is conscious that there is a distinction—that, while the soul's

¹ Dial. i. 21. ² Ibid.
office is to 'magnify the Lord,' the spirit's condition is to 'rejoice in God the Saviour.' God, the Spirit, draws her spirit into Himself, where it is buried. The soul, inseparable from the spirit, follows it, and is in a way partaker of the bliss of the saints, but without knowing it, because it surpasses formal knowledge. The body, having no longer any understanding, memory, or will for the things of this world, yet being incapable of spiritual pleasure, stands outside both worlds in a state of dubiety and torment. It can only cry like a hurt beast: it suffers, not knowing why it suffers. The soul, too, pleads that once it had great peace and joy in God, but now it is bare and spoiled of all; yet it is satisfied to be so spoiled; all its powers have found their rest in God; it knows not, yet is content to be ignorant. Then a ray of Divine Love filled the soul, and even refreshed the body, as if they were already in Paradise. Such raptures are intermittent and partial: the soul perceives that God 'cannot but love that which He hath created,' but what this pure love is she cannot yet understand; she must wait in peace. She must wait in peace. Meanwhile God makes the body a purgatory for the soul. She must learn that all she has yet performed—penances, alms, fasts, prayers—were duties to which she was obliged as a servant; she has not yet attained to real virtue, which is not the performance of obligations, but the service of perfect freedom—that is to say, of perfect love. It would seem as if the saint had been assailed by some movements of self-complacency, which had to be eradicated by this instruction.

The spirit then undertakes the instruction of the soul. It recalls how, in the old days, it had been cruelly treated by the soul, being excluded from its true place in God. Now it will, in glorious revenge, treat the soul with the like cruelty, exclude it from all it loves, make it empty and bare, subject it to a long and irremediable martyrdom, teach it what it is to be separated from the spirit. The soul had long been filled with the works of God, filled with His goodness, as it were in Paradise; but she has taken some of the credit to herself. Now she must be excluded from all this joy, that she may know that in herself she is nothing; she must wait awhile outside the gates within which the spirit is shut up in God.

Such was the saint's position for many years. At times what she calls a 'correspondence' was permitted between

1 Dial. ii. 1, 2. 2 Ibid. ii. 4. 3 Ibid. ii. 5. 4 Ibid. ii. 8. 5 Ibid. ii. 9.
spirit, soul, and body—that is to say, by a realization of the unity in which they were created, the joy of the spirit, hid in God, was reflected in the soul, and even sustained the body. But more frequently the body was filled with purgatorial pains, in which the soul was required to dwell (and to dwell content) in an increasing darkness and ignorance of the purpose of God; while the spirit was buried in the secret joy of pure love. The cries of the soul were taken to show that it was not yet fully surrendered to God, nor its purgation complete. A hope was held out to the humanity that when its life should be consumed it should be less conscious of pain, or at least of the fearful anticipation of it. But the work was in God's hands, and in His alone. He had undertaken her perfection, and would leave her no share in it, not even the understanding of His work.

The dates which fix the chronology of the second book of Dialogues are the twenty-five years after her conversion, during which she remained without a director (1474-1499), till C. Marabotto was appointed to that office, and his removal after ten years, in 1509). His absence seems to have been brief, though it was the completion of her suffering. The third book of the Dialogues seems to belong to the last year of her life, 1510. Not only is the seraphic fire of the earlier books to be traced here even more conspicuously, but we find in the last book a deeper self-knowledge, a humility more oblivious of self. We may trace a subtle touch of this latter virtue when she says that those who 'bear within them Paradise' are very rare in this world; if they were known they would be worshipped upon earth; but God keeps them unknown to themselves and to others, even to the hour of death, when the true will be distinguished from the false. To have used such words with the least suspicion that she was one of these singular ones would have been an excess of arrogance; to be ignorant of her rank among them was supreme humility. The third book consists chiefly of colloquies between the soul and her Lord, and has something of the nature of retractations. Here she expresses with more caution what had been more broadly stated elsewhere. For instance, her forgetfulness of the past is shown not to have excluded a partial and occasional reminiscence of it; and the sole work of God in sanctifying the soul by pure love leaves room for the penitent soul to cast out its imperfections. 'Thou art so efficacious,' she cries to

1 Dial. ii. 11.
2 Ibid. ii. 10.
3 Ibid. iii. 10.
4 Ibid. iii. 8.
the Divine Love, 'so illuminative, that Thou drawest out of the hidden depths of our hearts all our imperfections, and settest them before our eyes, in order that we may remedy them and purify ourselves of them.'

The treatise on Purgatory differs little in essence from the Dialogues, for the latter work describes as carried out in Catherine upon earth the same work of purgation which with other persons is perfected after death. Hers is no mediaeval purgatory whose grotesque penalties could hardly be lifted to sublimity even by the pen of Dante. There is no suggestion of indulgences shortening the time, or mitigating the severity, of a soul's suffering. In this connection it may be noticed that Catherine herself would never avail herself of Papal Indulgences, nor would she even beg the prayers of others, with the intention (we suppose) of seeking relief from pain. She knew too well, what modern Rome no less than modern Protestantism too often forgets, that the Christian's hope and the promise of the Gospel is the remission of sins, and not the remission of their penalty. She would place herself in the hands of God, and not try to evade the least part of the penalty she deserved.

'Not one farthing of the payment is remitted to the souls in Purgatory, for it has been ordained on God's part to satisfy eternal justice. And if alms, shortening the time, are made for them by their survivors in the world, they cannot turn to regard these alms with affection, save as subject to the just scale of God. They yield themselves to God in everything, and He pays Himself as pleases His infinite goodness.'

She begins her treatise abruptly:

'The souls in Purgatory (as I seem to understand) could have no choice to be elsewhere than where they are. They do not regret that for having committed such and such sins they are there: they cannot say, This or that soul will pass out earlier than I. They have, neither for good nor for bad, any memory of their own which works in them an increase of affliction; but are so content to be at the disposal of God that, amid their sharpest sufferings, they cannot think of themselves. . . . They see one single time, at the moment of passing from this life to another, the cause of the Purgatory which they have in themselves: thenceforth they see it no more, lest there should be self-will (una Proprietà) in them. . . . There is no contentment to be compared with theirs but that of the saints in heaven; only the soul's rust (ruggine) of sin, which prevents it from the clear vision of God, causes an agony which is never diminished till the

1 Dial. iii. 4. 2 Acta Sanct. p. 163; De Bussierre, p. 116. 3 Purg. chap. xiii.
rust is burned away. As the "beatific instinct" (instinto beatificio) awakes in a soul it creates a fire which is, in all but the guilt of sin, like that of hell. Hell itself, though interminable in continuance, is not infinite in intensity of pain. God might with justice have inflicted far heavier penalties; and to be out of hell would be for the sinner far worse torment than to be in it; for at least he is in God by way of justice.  

The soul would find a thousand hells more tolerable than to rush with the least imperfection into the presence of God. To find that the soul has in itself things displeasing to God—to know its many offences against infinite Goodness—this pain surpasses all others; and therefore God gives the knowledge of sin in only a small degree, and

'by a supreme act of love He works without man's co-operation; for there are in the soul so many imperfections that, if it saw them all, it would live in despair. . . . It is only when they are annihilated that God shows them to the soul, that it may learn the divine operation wrought in it by the fire of love.'

Such, in a condensed form, is the teaching of St. Catherine in this treatise. She concludes by showing how this purgatorial work is accomplished in her:

'My contentment is that God be satisfied; and I could find no greater torture than to depart from His ordinance, so just do I find it, and accompanied by so great goodness. . . . Finally, let us understand that God, most good and most great, causes man to lose all that is of man, and that Purgatory purifies us.'

Thus we have tried to describe the contents of St. Catherine's two works. Before we proceed to discuss some points in detail it may be well to mention the few external facts of her later life which are recorded. Her husband died in 1497. In 1499 Catherine, who had been without a human director for twenty-five years, was allowed to find one in Cattaneo Marabotto, who, after her death, wrote her biography, and assisted her disciple, Ettore Vernaccia, in the publication of her works. She was sought by many persons for counsel and help. Her bodily sufferings were terrible; her flesh was consumed by a burning fever, which is said by her assistants to have heated the vessels she touched and the water with which she was washed. She was subject to frequent ecstasies, which she herself called simply 'giddiness' (vertigines). A celebrated physician, Gianbattista Boerio, who thought her illness imposture, declared his ability

1 Purg. chap. i., iv., and vii.; compare Dial. i. 8, and iii. 13.
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to cure her; her friends urged her to submit to his treatment, and for a moment she allowed herself in a hope of recovery, for which she suffered an access of purgatorial pains. The physician owned himself defeated and mistaken. About the same time she suffered intensely from the absence, apparently for only a few days, of her director. On August 26, 1510, God showed her in a vision her soul wholly divested of carnal and spiritual affection—not, of course, of the pure love of God which she had so long practised and coveted. On September 14, the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, she seemed to revive a little. Shortly after midnight she was asked if she desired to receive the Blessed Sacrament. Her daily Communion had been, for years, her one joy; and whenever it was perforce intermitted, she suffered acutely in body as well as mind. But on this last day of her life on earth it seemed as if she had passed beyond the need even of that holy sacrament, for it would appear that she did not receive it, but pointing to heaven, as if expected there, and breathing the words, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit,' she passed to the immediate enjoyment of that Love which she had sought so eagerly for thirty-six years.

Her sanctity was at once recognized by the people, and was supposed to be guaranteed by the usual miracles. Shortly after her death she was beatified by her compatriot, Pope Julius II. She was canonized by Clement X. in 1675.

We have given, together with an account of St. Catherine's life, a description of her books, not pausing to discuss her views, though our silence must by no means be taken for universal assent. To criticize the words of one who has lived very close to God is a task from which we shrink. Such a person is like a traveller who has penetrated a strange land: we may sometimes think that he misunderstands what he saw there, but after all he has been there and we have not. Yet we should fail to do our duty if we refrained from offering a few remarks on three points which seem to us of great practical importance: we mean (1) Catherine's teaching as to the relation of the body to the soul, (2) her teaching as to suffering as satisfaction to God, and (3) her teaching as to the operation of Divine Grace without man's knowledge or co-operation.

(1) Not content with distinguishing between body and soul, St. Catherine seems to regard them as two entirely separate beings, only coupled by a sort of accidental bond. The 'correspondence' between them is sometimes renewed,
but oftener broken. The body complains\(^1\) that it suffers while the soul rejoices, though the soul, possessing reason and freewill, is capable of sinning, which the irrational body is not. It does not seem to occur to her that, if the body were so separate from the soul and so irrational, it could not argue its cause. She treats the body as an enemy, as an accursed thing, as a mere burden on the spirit; though there are times when (taught by the Creed) she looks forward to its resurrection and felicity. In this respect she is saved by her Catholic faith from the manicheism which, in some Protestant mystics, makes the body no more than a ‘muddy vesture of decay,’ a temporary prison-house, soon to be abandoned for ever; yet we cannot but think that at times she is near this error. Is the body, with its senses and tastes, a thing merely to be hated and crushed? Has it not a worth and dignity from God who made it, endowed it with its beauty and powers, provided it with instincts which protect it from danger, and subjected it to laws which, being His laws, cannot be violated without temerity and loss? Let us take one instance from the saint’s life. To overcome the loathing which she, like other nurses, felt at the sight of certain matters, she forced herself to swallow the thing which caused her disgust. But if a thing is revolting not to the pampered taste of a few, but to the natural bodily instinct of every man, was it not a sort of presumption to force upon the body what its nature so prompted it to abhor?

It is true that the science of hygiene hardly existed in Catherine’s time. Even the learned knew nothing of the chemical value of foods, and the germs of disease which are teeming in corruption. It is not to be blamed in St. Bernard that he fed on beech-leaves, knowing them indeed to be unpalatable, but not knowing them to be unwholesome. For us to adopt such a diet would surely be not lawful self-denial, but suicidal disregard of God’s laws of health. It is indeed well for us to be reminded by the austerities of such saints that bodily life and health are not the chief concern of man. They startle us into a dutiful criticism of the prevalent assumption that the first duty of man is to keep his body alive and well, even at the cost of luxury or perhaps of sin. Yet while we learn to repudiate this ignoble doctrine of materialism we must not forget that the body is, in our complex being, that which needs to be subdued and taught to serve, but must not be trampled on as an enemy.

\(^{(2)}\) The second point in Catherine’s doctrine on which we

\(^1\) Dial. i. 16.
have to remark is the way in which she regards suffering as satisfactory to God. It is stated in her Life\(^1\) that after fourteen months of severe penance which followed her conversion God revealed to her that she had abundantly satisfied His justice. This view of the satisfactory character of suffering is indeed no peculiarity of hers, but is common to many, both Catholics and Protestants: with this great difference, that, whereas Catholics believe that the satisfaction of God is wrought by the suffering of the penitent himself, united to Christ, the Protestant supposes that it has been once for all accomplished by the sufferings of the Saviour on the cross, so that no more is demanded of the sinner than that he should believe in the payment of his debt. There is, no doubt, an element of truth in both views. It is true, as all generous minds feel, that the sinner ought to suffer—that he at least, if not God, can only be satisfied by submitting to his penalty. It is true also that the love of God, supremely displayed by the death of the ‘Son of His love,’ allows not the extreme penalty to fall on those who believe in Him, and that the union of Christ with us gives such potency to suffering shared with Him, that our cleansing is proportioned not to the amount of our suffering but to the grace which purges us through it. But it may be feared that language such as that to which we have referred has done double harm. It has led some (though not St. Catherine) to suppose that by merely bearing certain penalties we can pay the last farthing of our debt, and claim forgiveness as a right; and others (again not our saint) to think harshly of God, as if He desired the death of the sinner, and could take pleasure in his agony.

The debt which we owe to God is not our pain, but ourselves, made for His glory. It is a debt which we are bound to pay, not because we have sinned, but because we are His. That which really satisfies Him is not our suffering, but the obedience which we learn, the cleansing which we acquire, through suffering. He can only be satisfied with the hearty self-surrender of those whom He has made and loves. Christ on His cross made a perfect satisfaction for our sins, because He made our suffering, which He bore to the full, no longer mere suffering, but effectual discipline and purgation.

(3) We turn to the third element in St. Catherine’s teaching on which we purpose to comment—the operation of God’s grace without the knowledge or co-operation of man.

We suppose that, without the use of technical expressions,

\(^1\) *Acta Sanctorum,* p. 154; *De Bussierre,* p. 49.
the general sense into which Western belief settled down after the controversies of the sixteenth century may be stated in some such terms as these. In the salvation of man two factors are engaged—the grace of God and the will of man. The first moment indeed comes from God alone, who loved us when we had no love for Him. But His grace only becomes effectual when, approaching man's will, it is discerned and welcomed. From that point the two factors work in cooperation: God gives grace, man recognizes, accepts, and uses it.

That this statement is mainly true is no more contradicted by St. Catherine than by ourselves. But she adds to it a further statement which is less familiar: that, beyond a certain stage, God takes the whole matter of salvation into His own hands, leaving for man no part but that of simple acquiescence; removes the memory of past sins, so that we have no further need to lament or to eradicate them; and inflicts pain without enlightening the soul as to the causes for which it is sent.

In estimating her doctrine we must not suppose that she lays down her own experience as the rule for all men in this world, though it may be in the world to come; nor must we leave out of sight the very real place which she provides for man's will. The work of salvation began in her with a very clear revelation of her past sins. She was

so crushed and swallowed up in the sight of the sins which she had committed against God, that she was more like a frightened beast than a reasonable being. This came from the clear knowledge which had been given her of the gravity of her offences, and of the damage proceeding from them, so that, if she had long retained this clear knowledge, her body would have been consumed, even had it been of diamond.1

This self-knowledge was accompanied by an equally vivid realization of God's goodness. 'She began to confess her sins with so deep a contrition as was wonderful.'2 She resolved to submit herself to God and to all that He might do for her; and this resolution, made once for all, was adhered to all through her life. She speaks indeed as if it were impossible for her ever to turn back from it, not because of any fixity of her own will,3 but because God had taken possession of her will and emptied it of self. Moreover, although the detailed memory of past sins was taken from her, the deep conviction of her sinfulness remained;

1 Dial. i. 12. 2 Ibid. ii. 3. 3 See Dial. ii. 11.
nor indeed was the remembrance of sins so entirely removed as some earlier passages would lead us to suppose.

God, then, taking into His own hands the entire conduct of her soul, sent her a multitude of afflictions which she was not allowed to connect with special sins as the penalty which they deserved. She could not say, 'This pain reminds me of such an act which I must confess with more sorrow, rectify with more zeal, and avoid with more prudence.' But she submitted to the pain as the necessary and right dealing of Infinite Mercy with a sinner who was being restored to union with Him.

This unconsciousness of hers puts us on our guard against what may be called a practical semi-pelagianism. We have escaped from the falsehood of supposing that man's will apart from God's grace can find salvation; but we are still in danger if we regard man's will as co-ordinate with grace. We must not regard salvation as man's work, in which God aids him, but as God's work, in which He concedes a certain share to us. Our sanctification is rather the will of God than our will. When Joshua asked the Stranger by Jericho, 'Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?' he thought he had put the only possible alternatives. But the answer reproved him: 'Nay; but as Captain of the host of the Lord am I now come.' He was not come as helper of the Israelites against their foe; but, as Captain of God's host in its universal battle with evil, he would permit a share in a single engagement to Joshua and his people. That God's part in our sanctification should extend far beyond our co-operation, far beyond our understanding, is only to be expected. Our salvation is but an incident in the much wider war of God against the evil one.

It is just as likely, in consideration of the mysterious nature of grace, that much of its operation should be outside our consciousness. While the husbandman 'sleeps and rises night and day' the seed 'springs and grows up, he knoweth not how.' And we are led to think that many persons, reviewing their lives, thank God for grace of which, at the time when it was given, they were quite unconscious; they become aware of what may be called a cumulative effect of sacraments, ill-received at the time and not turned to effect, yet laying up a secret store of grace, which in due time overflowed its store-chamber.

In this connexion it may be well to remember how frequently enlightenment as to the real character of a sin is

1 See Dial. iii. 8.  2 Josh. v. 13.  3 St. Mark iv. 27.
only gained after the sin has been overcome. We gave it up with little or no perception of its badness, and only knew the greatness of our deliverance when we looked back upon the dead bodies on the shore of the sea which we had passed.

The detailed remembrance of our sins is indeed necessary for us at one stage, for two reasons: because vague impressions can only create a weak conviction of our sinfulness, and because clear recollections of the past tell us what we have to confess and amend and resist in future. Therefore the promise of forgiveness is made not to him who confesses that he is a sinner, but to him who confesses his sins. Yet more is needed than the detailed remembrance of sins. It is possible (as any priest may learn in the confessional) for the knowledge of details rather to obscure the conviction of sinfulness; for a person who can recall the precise circumstances and number of his falls into this or that sin may yet be far from contrition, because he regards each fall as an isolated event, not detecting the 'root of bitterness' which springs up in each such act, the 'law of sin' which binds them into a terrible unity. We do not for a moment depreciate the detailed knowledge and confession of sins when we point out that special instances should be used as indices of a general law of sinfulness, of which, without the memory of the particular instances, we should have remained unconscious.

The unconsciousness, then, of particular instances of sin may, in such a case as St. Catherine's, be almost equivalent to a perfect consciousness of an almost universal state of sinfulness or distance from God. An illustration of this observation may be borrowed from the will. Some acts we perform by simple automatism or by mere instinct. A higher series of acts are those which we perform by a distinct exercise of volition. But, again, repeated volition tends to produce a habit, by which we perform almost unconsciously acts which, some years ago, required energetic and perhaps painful self-determination. Yet what thoughtful person will confuse the automatism which lies beneath volition with the self-determined habit which is volition's crown? The Pharisee and St. Catherine are alike unconscious of the sin which they committed ten years ago: the Pharisee, because he has never searched his conscience; the saint, because the searching of her conscience has led her beyond that particular act of sin to the law of sin of which it was an expression.

But God, who hates sin, sees our sins not as isolated events, but as effects of a 'law of sin' which He will destroy, but

1 St. John i. 9.
of which we are at most only partially conscious; so that we shall find our consciousness and co-operation not indeed excluded from the work of our salvation, but not covering the whole ground of it. His battle against sin brings pain to us, and necessarily of this pain the immediate cause will often be unknown to us.

Pain is the consequence which properly belongs to the violation of His laws. He lets us suffer that we may be roused to the horror of the sin into which we gaily walked; so that we learn to hate sin first by the penalty of a temporal loss, or the stings of a wounded conscience, or the anticipation of a dreadful future. Pain in this respect is profitable just in proportion as it revives the memory of sin, and awakes the consciousness of present evil which needs to be burned out. But there is what may be called a secondary connexion between sin and suffering. Sin has placed us, more or less beyond our consciousness, in a wrong position with regard to God. The error which bound the body to earth, which made the soul the slave of the body and a rebel against the spirit, which made the spirit dream of satisfaction elsewhere than in God, has to be corrected; and the whole blessed process of correction is death and pain. There is the pain of the healing of a wound as well as the pain of its infliction and its continuance. This pain of healing need not necessarily be closely associated with recollection of sins, because it is not the appointed remedy of sin, but rather the concomitant of its cure.

And this is, we believe, the experience of penitents. A man has sinned: his conscience is grieved, he is stung into humbling himself by confession, he learns from pain to watch against relapse: for this purpose a clear recollection of his evil act is necessary. But even if in process of time the particular sin is forgotten, he still suffers from a lasting sense of alienation from God, which kindles a more burning spirit of what St. Paul calls 'revenge.' Who is there who, after many years, could repeat the details of his first confession? Yet that first confession has perhaps first lighted a fire of hatred of sin which ever grows in fervour.

It seems to us that this secondary aspect of pain may be of help in those cases, so trying to the faith of many, when terrible suffering comes on those who seem least to deserve it, and least able to learn from it. For the debauchee to suffer from broken health, for the murderer to die at the hand of the law, for the idler to come to want, even though the sinner be now in each case penitent, is evidently just; he owns it to
be just, and learns through his penalty a deeper hatred of his sin. But the temperate man likewise may die of a fearful disease, the innocent may share the scaffold with the criminal, the industrious man may be ruined by misfortune. Or, more perplexing still, the little child, regenerate and as yet incapable of actual sin, may spend its few days on the rack of hopeless disease; or the old man may drag out a life of distress, no longer able to gain strength by endurance; or the insane person may live under imaginary terrors which he cannot control, and from which he is not even capable of learning the lesson of patience. Is it not a comfort, when we contemplate such cases, to suppose that the pain is not intended to teach these persons a lesson, but is a concomitant of the gracious work of God bringing such souls through birth-pangs of death to the true life? And may we not stretch the same thought to cover the abundant sufferings of the lower creatures, incapable of sin and incapable of learning through pain? May not all pain be ultimately something much deeper than a lesson—even the Blood of the Cross by which God is redeeming to Himself a fallen world?

Again, St. Catherine's suggestion about forgetfulness of past sins may help us to conceive, however dimly, the future happiness of the saints. Many have said, 'God does, I trust, forgive me; but I can never forgive myself. I cannot forget my sins, that I have led others astray, that I have crucified Christ afresh; and I fear to be reminded for ever of my shameful past not by my own scars only, but by the wounds of my companions, and by the marks of the Lord Jesus.'

It is promised that God will remember our sins and iniquities no more. Whatever is, He cannot fail to know: for Him to forget implies that the sins have ceased to be. He promises not the ignoring but the remission—the sending away—of sins. May we not hope that to us also, His children, when we are completely at one with Him, the hideous phantasmagoria of sin may pass into nothing, so that we shall see things as He sees them, who is of too pure eyes to behold iniquity?

The strange lives of certain saints, and of Catherine among them, encourage us to endure in the hope that the perfect vision of God will be, and will make all things, stranger still.
ART. VIII.—THE POETRY OF GEORGE MEREDITH.

2. Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life. By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1887.)
3. A Reading of Earth. By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1888.)
4. Poems. The Empty Purse, with Odes to the Comic Spirit, To Youth in Memory and Verses. By GEORGE MEREDITH. (London, 1892.)

What distinguishes Mr. Meredith—of whose works a new and complete edition is now appearing—what distinguishes Mr. Meredith among living writers is not so much his possession of this or that quality, the intensity and variety of his sympathies, the power or peculiarity of his style: it is that in an era of talent, in an era in which we may be said to suffer from a plethora of talent, his work is so unmistakably beyond the reach of talent, so far, too, beyond the reach of labour added to ambition and desire—it is so unmistakably the work of genius. Readers of Mr. Meredith's novels long ago discovered in him the man with the key to a new garden of romance which matched the best loved of old, to a new gallery in art whose portraits might hang unabashed beside those of the old masters. From a little clan the readers of his prose have grown into an army; but for the readers of his verse, these may even now easily be numbered. Yet it is not beyond possibility—though the Meredith of to-day is indisputably the novelist—that the Meredith of the twentieth century may be the poet. 'All novels in every language,' said De Quincey, 'are hurrying to decay'—a judgment not without a germ of truth. Posterity, at all events, if one may venture to predict the future from the present—posterity will possess a considerable body of literature of its own, and will be necessarily impatient, as the present generation is impatient, of surplusage and bulk in the literature of the past; will do honour to the works of justest proportions, and harbour prejudices in favour of beauties apparent at first sight, and of excellence displayed in narrow ground. And in some sense poetry is excellence displayed in narrow ground, and may be
regarded as prose cleared of the superfluous, transfigured prose, the sublimated essence, its precious sentiment close packed and embalmed for a long journey down the stream of Time.

It cannot be said of Mr. Meredith that no writer of his century has challenged the like serious attention in the field of poetry as well as of fiction. To leave a great name—that of Scott—out of account, there are other and not inconsiderable rivals. But Mr. Meredith has achieved a strikingly uniform success, such a success as makes it difficult to place his prose above his poetry, or his poetry above his prose, without misgivings that the verdict may be reversed by the critical court of the later generations. One thing is indisputable and noteworthy: Mr. Meredith's verse bears a very close relationship to his prose—it supplements, reinforces, and interprets his prose. Essentially a dramatic artist, he has none the less experienced the lyrical passion for the deliverance of his own soul, and in his verse has set free his thought in his own person. It is precisely the dramatic artist entering through his imaginative sympathy into the characters and situations of his \textit{dramatis persona} who presents 'the imaginary utterances of so many imaginary persons, not his,' and suppresses himself the while; it is precisely the dramatic artist, we may naturally suppose, in whom the impulse towards self-revelation exists most strongly. He is the wide and clear-eyed spectator of life who sees and pictures it best, but is for the most part content to remain unknown behind his creations. And in Mr. Meredith's fiction, as in Shakespeare's, a persistent and impenetrable irony veils the artist himself; the author lurks undiscovered behind the humourist. So was it not with Thackeray, who steps forward ever and anon to speak \textit{in propria persona}. So was it not with Scott, whose sympathies there is no mistaking. Shakespeare in his sonnets, the popular theory has it, laid aside the mask of humour, and 'with the sonnet-key unlocked his heart.' Let this be so or not, it is certain that Mr. Meredith lays aside in his verse the mask of humour worn in his novels. His poetry is more essentially serious than his prose; it is grave almost throughout; a personal utterance, the expression of the individual philosophy of the man. The reader of the novels is in contact with the dramatic artist, the spectator and student of life; the poems are the outspoken utterance of the man who is himself one of the \textit{dramatis persona} in personal relation with the facts of the world. Taken together, this prose and this verse constitute an autobiography—the outlook and the
inlook of life. To Mr. Meredith's poetry belongs therefore a special, because a near and personal, interest; it supplements his prose, as has been said, and stands to it somewhat in the relation of interpretative criticism. Not the ignoble curiosity which pries into the private life of an author, but a legitimate intellectual curiosity is here satisfied. One is grateful to possess the individual view of so ardent and so brilliant a student of life, especially if, as in Mr. Meredith's case, no discord is introduced into the harmony of the entire impression received from his work. The predominant note in Mr. Meredith's work as a whole, both prose and verse, is its invincible fortitude, its cheerful acceptance of things as they are. He belongs to that company of artists who have looked the world in the face, and expressed neither disappointment nor dissatisfaction therewith. In an epoch in which poets are neither few nor insignificant, Mr. Meredith shares with Browning the distinction that he has never for the briefest season dwelt in the melancholy shade. Here is poetry in which prevails no sense of sadness, no overpowering sentiment of pity for the vexed human race, no Virgilian cry with its sense of tears in mortal things, no wistful regrets, no torturing doubts. Even so interesting and so great a writer as Count Tolstoi suffers at times a sense of hopelessness to overcome him, and involves us in his own despair. But Mr. Meredith's citadel of mind and heart is impregnable, and, while he will have us see the naked truth, fortifies us for its reception. In this poetry there is ever scant sympathy dispensed for weak nerves and apprehensive hearts. Read *Earth and Man*, or this *Whisper of Sympathy*:

'O hawk or shrike has done this deed
Of downy feathers: rueful sight!
Sweet sentimentalist, invite
Your bosom's Power to intercede.

So hard it seems that one must bleed
Because another needs will bite!
All round we see cold nature slight
The feelings of the totter-knee'd.

O it were pleasant, with you
To fly from this tussle of foes,
The shambles, the charnel, the wrinkle!
To dwell in yon dribble of dew
On the cheek of your sovereign rose,
And live the young life of a twinkle.'

1 *Ballads and Poems*, p. 63.
'Part of the test of a great literatus,' said Whitman, 'shall be the absence in him of the idea of the covert, the lurid, the maleficent, the devil, the grim estimates inherited from the Puritans, hell, natural depravity, and the like. The great literatus will be known among us by his cheerful simplicity, his adherence to natural standards, his limitless faith in God, his reverence, and by the absence in him of doubt, ennui, burlesque, persiflage, or any strained or temporary fashion.'

How luminous a saying—but how shattering to the pretensions of the majority of our literati! The absence of doubt, ennui, burlesque, persiflage, or any strained or temporary fashion! Yet it is thus Mr. Meredith may be known among his contemporaries as the great literatus; by his cheerful simplicity, his adherence to natural standards, his limitless faith in God, and by the absence in him of doubt and ennui. And this though we have passed and are passing through times unfavourable to literature possessed of these qualities, times whose spiritual winds are chill, and whose skies grey with the greyness of the sea in winter. Too surely the modern world is not all that it was expected to be; it has disappointed expectation, and we moderns have reaped from it a plentiful crop of discouragement. Since the Renaissance, that birthday of the modern world, brought with it a sense of buoyancy, of widening horizons, and incalculable advances, and endless triumphs for humanity, since then only a poet here and there has been a minister of hope and promised great things in a day that was not very far off. These eager spirits on the watch-towers of thought saw at times, or thought they saw, the breaking light of some great morning of the world—a light that was about to fill the heavens and orb into humanity's perfect day. Wordsworth and Coleridge had these purple visions in youth, but the disillusioning years dealt hardly with them. Shelley could not bring himself to believe that the light that filled his own soul did not shine in the open sky. But we of the modern world do not suffer from these illusions, and the happy enthusiasts among us who put their trust in the progress of science seem also to suffer from disillusion. They are reluctantly brought to confess that while science has given liberally to humanity with one hand, she has taken away with the other. While, however, the majority of the latter-day poets have felt the absence of inspiring motives in the atmosphere of the time, Mr. Meredith breathes the keen disillusioning air without pain and without discouragement, and declares it to be spiritually bracing. The season is autumn, and the grey mist
‘Narrows the world to my neighbour's gate,
Paints me life as a wheezy crone. . . .
I, even I, for a zenith of sun
Cry, to fulfil me, nourish my blood ;
O for a day of the long light, one!’

But here is the last word :

‘Verily now is our season of seed,
Now, in our Autumn ; and Earth discerns
Them that have served her in them that can read,
Glassing, where under the surface she burns,
Quick at her wheel, while the fuel, decay,
Brightens the fire of renewal ; and we?
Death is the word of a bovine to-day,
Know you the breast of the springing To-be?’

The majority of the poets seek refuge when the psychological climate of the times is unfavourable to poetry, the majority seek refuge in the limitless romance of the past. Not so Mr. Meredith. He is a poet of a sæculum realisicum, and the only romance for him is the real romance of the present, the inexhaustible romance of the future. The poetry with the passion for the past, the poetry that would hang its richly wrought arabesque in gold and purple between us and the facts of life, has here given place to the poetry with an undivided allegiance to the present, and to truth palatable or unpalatable. Goldsmith, that tender, human-hearted poet, wrote of his favourite books as being those which, amusing the imagination, contributed to ease the heart, and in another of his exquisite sentences defined the office of the poet-sage—

‘Innocently to amuse the imagination in this dream of life is wisdom.’ The wisdom of Mr. Meredith's poetry is made of sterner stuff. If we are to be cradled in comfortable philosophies, transcendental or mystical, lapped in soft Lydian airs, or borne in a car of song by the instinct of sweet music driven, we must read poetry other than this. And Mr. Meredith declines, too, the sad task in which Matthew Arnold engaged, the task of 'sweeping up the dead leaves fallen from the dying tree of faith.'

‘These are our sensual dreams ;
Of the yearning to touch, to feel
The dark Impalpable sure
And have the Unveiled appear.’

Poetry such as this, devoid of the sentiment of regret, devoid of that tender melancholy so characteristic of Matthew

1 A Reading of Earth, pp. 2-4. 2 Ibid. p. 89.
Arnold; almost devoid, too, of the sentiment of pathos; poetry which seems to shun the elegiac sentiment in which so much of the world's poetry is steeped, and by which it makes its appeal; poetry like this strikes a strange and original note. The chords to which Mr. Meredith trusts for his effects are chords seldom heard upon the lyre; his is a poetry of almost exclusively intellectual interest—the music from an iron string. It is not to be expected that this poetry should give us the full sense of vitality as Chaucer gives it, of the mere joy of living, or charm us to dreamful ease as Spenser charms.

'He who has looked upon Earth
Deeper than flower and fruit
Loses some hue of his mirth.'

But poesy has an infancy, an adolescence, an immortality Protean. Mr. Meredith's is not the buoyant spirit of Chaucer, but the virtue of his poetry resides none the less in its astonishing vitality and in the power to communicate that vitality. To the freshness and buoyancy it possesses is added a flavour of intellectual bitter that springs from its devotion to reality, and it is by reason of its rarely mingled elements, its freshness and buoyancy, and its strenuous devotion to reality that Mr. Meredith's poetry achieves a new poetic triumph.

'I am certain,' said Keats of his own Lamia, 'I am certain that there is that sort of fire in it which must take hold of people in some way—give them either pleasant or unpleasant sensation.' The poetry of Mr. Meredith, too, is not negligible; it has that sort of fire in it which takes hold of one, and gives him either a pleasant or unpleasant sensation. This is verse that will not suffer a reader to pass by in peace, and, if it makes not music for him, he will, with Hotspur, prefer to hear the dry wheel grate on the axle-tree.

'Square along the couch, and stark,
Like the sea-rejected thing
Sea-sucked white, behold their king
    Attila, my Attila! . . .
Him, their lord of day and night,
White, and lifting up his blood
Dumb for vengeance. Name us that,
Huddled in the corner dark,
Humped and grinning like a cat,
Teeth for lips! 'Tis she! She stares
Glittering through her bristled hairs.
Rend her! Pierce her to the hilt!'

1 Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth, p. 30.
2 Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life, p. 93.
Discriminating readers of Mr. Meredith's novels have no doubt felt the presence of the poet even in his garment of prose, but probably few suspect that the poet preceded the novelist. His first public appearance was with a volume, published in 1851, simply entitled Poems, and dedicated to his father-in-law, Thomas Love Peacock. It was not until some years later that he took the field with a novel, The Shaving of Shagpat. The second volume of Poems appeared in 1862 (three years after Richard Feverel), Modern Love and Poems of the English Roadside, with Poems and Ballads; the third, Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth, in 1883; the fourth, Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life, in 1887; the fifth, A Reading of Earth, in 1888; the sixth, The Empty Purse and other Poems, in 1892. Of these the first volume is now a rare treasure, more especially as the author has not cared to reprint his Juvenilia, and the second contains, besides many verses never reprinted, the original Modern Love, which was selected by the author for republication as a separate volume in 1892, accompanied by some new poems.

The best order in which first to read Mr. Meredith's poetry is not, I think, the chronological order. If one begins with A Reading of Earth, and passes to the remaining volumes by way of the Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth, one moves more easily, receives a more continuous, a more unbroken impression, and enters at once into sympathy with the attitude of the author. And Mr. Meredith's attitude, his choice of subject, and his method require to be acquiesced in—'not to sympathise is not to understand.' A poet commonly places himself en rapport with his audience by his choice of subject or by the adoption of a familiar method, and he is accustomed as artist to retire to a distance from his work and to contemplate its effect from a point of view not entirely his own. He has during the creative process his audience in his eye. If he is unable or unwilling to gain this remoteness from his own creation, if he declines to place himself either by choice of subject or by the adoption of a familiar method at the universal point of view, he demands an unusual intellectual activity from his readers, and wins his way with them certainly more gradually, perhaps not at all. Approval of his choice of subject, approval of his method, are not assured him until it be granted that the effect has justified the means. For a law of parsimony holds in art: the old methods are sealed by acceptance, and a new, if not successful, is an impertinence.

The onus probandi rests with such a poet to show good
reason for his departure from accredited poetic example. The progress of Wordsworth through ridicule to fame was the progress of a poet of determined independence in choice of subject as well as in poetic methods. Yet opposition once overcome, it is the poet with the note of strangeness in his voice to whom we return—the note of strangeness is the note of individuality. In poetry, too, as in all art, there is a compromise effected, and the note of strangeness is the mark of the fresh compromise, the alteration of balance effected by the new method, the new choice of subject. Or rather let us say that with each original poet a novel aspect of things is brought into the foreground, a new predominant purpose is displayed. With Tennyson the main purpose was to bend his language to his thought so that no verse should escape him unenriched by a musical cadence, that no arrow unfeathered with melody should leave his bow. With Mr. Meredith the main purpose is achieved if no line, no phrase escape him uninformed by force, if he discharge no shaft unwinged or unweighted with thought. Hence obscurity is the charge brought against him; he has been called an inarticulate poet, and indisputably he is at times obscure. But like Browning's, Mr. Meredith's obscurity arises out of the number and fervency of his ideas; he is obscure because he has so much to say and is in such haste to say it, and moreover insists upon his own point of view and demands from his reader that flexibility of intelligence, that intellectual activity necessary to the appreciation of an unfamiliar poetic method. And obscurity is after all the vaguest of charges. Gray was accounted obscure; Shelley intolerably obscure; Tennyson, even our popular Tennyson, in the days of his early triumphs was censured for his obscurity. And if the readers of Browning are content to travel far, and at times even with lagging step, to catch sight of splendours such as this—

'I shall keep your honour safe;
With mine I trust you, as the sculptor trusts
Yon marble woman with the marble rose,
Loose on her hand, she never will let fall,
In graceful, slight, silent security,'

then the readers of Mr. Meredith may well be content to undergo occasional mental fatigue for the sake of, let us say, such a magnificent *Meditation under Stars* as this—

'We who reflect those rays, though low our place
To them are lastingly allied.
So may we read, and little find them cold;
Not frosty lamps illumining dead space,

*Vol. XLIV.—No. LXXXVIII.*
Not distant aliens, not senseless powers.
The fire is in them whereof we are born;
The music of their motion may be ours.
Spirit shall deem them beckoning Earth and voiced
Sisterly to her, in her beams rejoiced.
Of love, the grand impulsion we behold
The love that lends her grace
Among the starry fold.
Then at new flood of customary morn,
Look at her through her showers,
Her mists, her streaming gold.
A wonder edges the familiar face:
She wears no more that robe of printed hours;
Half strange seems Earth, and sweeter than her flowers.\(^1\)

It may freely be granted that in general we have too
continuous a strain, too unrelieved an emphasis in Mr. Mered-
dith's poetry. It lacks breathing spaces, points of repose
for the imagination. Once we have ascended his poetic car
we are borne along at full speed, a speed that is rarely
slackened until the goal be reached. Thus it comes that
one cannot read for long in these volumes, as in Tennyson's;
one cannot fleet the time carelessly with this poet as with
Mr. William Morris. Mr. Meredith is not of the singers
who simply say the most heart-easing things, who lead us
to their favourite haunts by wood or stream and discourse
music to us that we may drink oblivion of care and pass into
a many-coloured dream of flitting shadows. And if he fall
short as a poet, it is that his poetry is too strenuous to be alto-
tgether peaceful, and that the impressions received from it are
too crowded to permit of that leisurely sipping of the cup, that
tranquil enjoyment which is essential to the due appreciation
of poetry. Poetry and haste are eternal incompatibles.
One cannot bolt a stanza in the five minutes' interval between
engagements, nor can one find perfect happiness in the com-
pany of a poet whose pace is always a gallop. Mr. Meredith's
verse has caught contagion from the hurry and the bustle of
modern life. And his utterance, too, is a staccato utterance.
It would be untrue to say of him that there was no light and
shade in his conceptions, but there is often an absence of light
and shade in his expression. And though Mr. Meredith
conceives aright the sensuous as well as the intellectual life,
his poetry usually, though with brilliant instances to the
contrary, lacks the sensuous element, usually fails to express
that element as vividly as it expresses the intellectual. Lan-

\(^1\) *A Reading of Earth*, p. 12.
guage, especially the language of poetry, has an office other than that of mirroring with precision a train of ideas; it must make appeal to the senses, to the eye and to the ear, to the memory and its associations, to the imagination and its dreams. Yet this is not the day nor the hour to complain of poetry in which the intellectual element outbalances the sensuous; rather we owe to poetry of which this is true a debt of gratitude. A little thought goes far in modern verse, and the critics assure us that even that little is unnecessary. 'Poetry,' Mr. Henley tells us, 'is style.' And in Mr. Meredith's poetry the very force and intensity of his thought communicate a beauty to his phrase—the beauty that shines in strength. Take this of Byron's \textit{Manfred}—

\begin{quote}
'Considerably was the world
Of spinsterdom and clergy racked
When he his hinted horrors hurled,
And she pictorially attacked.
A duel hgeois! Tragic? Ho!
The cities, not the mountains blow
Such bladders; in their shapes confessed
An after dinner's indigest.'\textsuperscript{1}
\end{quote}

But we should wrong Mr. Meredith by saying that his is always the music from an iron string. That he is master of a manner besides this of rugged force is easily demonstrable. The critic will need to search diligently through English poetry to discover a poem of more blithe and gracious sweetness, more radiant with the dew and sunshine of morning, with the captivating joyance of youth than \textit{Love in a Valley}. The measure—and it may be noted that in metres Mr. Meredith greatly and successfully dares—the measure itself dances to the tripping pulses of the young blood.

\begin{quote}
'Cool was the woodside; cool as her white dairy
Keeping sweet the cream-pan; and there the boys from school,
Cricketing below, rushed red and brown with sunshine;
O the dark translucence of the deep-eyed cool!'\textsuperscript{2}
\end{quote}

'Could I find a place to be alone with heaven,
I would speak my heart out: heaven is my need.
Every woodland tree is flushing like the dog-wood,
Flashing like the white beam, swaying like the reed.
Flushing like the dog-wood crimson in October;
Streaming like the flag-reed south-west blown;
Flashing as in gusts the sudden-lighted white beam;
All seem to know what is for heaven alone.'\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life}, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth}, p. 95.
Here, and in a pastoral not reprinted from his earliest volume, Mr. Meredith's verse bubbles, and creams and ripples from the very founts of spring and summer.

'Come, and like bees will we gather the rich golden honey of noon-tide
Deep in the sweet summer meadows, bordered by hill-side and river. . . .
O joy thus to revel all day in the grass of our own belov'd country,
Revel all day till the lark mounts at eve with his sweet "tirra-lirra;"
Thrilling delightfully.'

The lyric beauty of poems such as these will recall to readers of the novels the passion-brimming lyrical enchantments woven in the 'Ferdinand and Miranda' chapters of Richard Feverel, beside which I do not know that there is anything in literature to be placed since Romeo and Juliet itself. In others of the Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth is heard the same clear lark-like trill of gladness, a music as of the early world untouched by human pain or sorrow, a song of the elements—

'Water, first of singers, o'er rocky mount and mead,
First of earthly singers, the sun-loved rill
Sang of him, and flooded the ripples on the reed
Seeking whom to waken and what ear fill.'

But to enter into the true spirit of Mr. Meredith's poetry of nature, we must come to it by way of A Reading of Earth. We are constantly assured by modern criticism and by the practice of modern poets that it is no part of the poet's duty to be a teacher, that the exposition of belief lies altogether outside the province of art. Mr. Meredith abides by the tradition of the greater English poets, Spenser and Milton and Wordsworth, and his poetry frankly outlines a faith, delineates a philosophy of life. It is a creed of full and lasting 'joy in the old heart of things;' but how hold and live by that creed in the face of the certain sorrows, the uncertain issues, the unavoidable partings of life, the knowledge that

'The word of the world is adieu
Her word; and the torrents are round
The jawed wolf-waters of prey?

To preserve for the human race during its dark hours the heart of hope, the faith that there is some soul of goodness in things evil, that evil itself is not immortal, and that the

1 Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth, p. 73.
2 A Reading of Earth, p. 71.
destiny of man is something more than to die, to preserve this heart of hope and this faith is not the meanest achievement of the poet. Yet, when this faith and this hope are threatened, so exclusively does the poetic spirit seem to feed upon the beauty and the pathos of life that the poets often offer us no more than a sad philosophy of 'indifference,' or a fuller life of the senses, the worship of the flesh in despair of soul. But Mr. Meredith in this also abides by the poetic tradition of the greater poets and refuses to despair of soul. The resurgent brood of questions to which Earth, our mother, replies not are but the brood of unfaith, and earth's silence argues no indifference to her children. Of those who ask them

'Earth whispers they scarce have the thirst,  
Except to unriddle a rune;  
And I spin none; only show,  
Would humanity soar from its worst,  
Winged above darkness and dole,  
How flesh unto spirit must grow.  
Spirit raves not for a goal.  
... it trusts  
Uses my gifts yet aspires  
Dreams of a higher than it.'

In *A Faith on Trial* and in *Earth and Man* Mr. Meredith sets forth a spiritual philosophy of courageous faith, a philosophy akin in some respects to that of Wordsworth, but informed by the later spirit of scientific realism. The poet is now, as the man of the future will be, as we are all fast becoming, neither idealist nor realist, neither one nor the other because both. If Mr. Meredith in his poetry rejects with the unalterable mien of physical science any mystical explanation of things which leaves the facts and laws of the great external world of our physical nature out of account, he rejects with equal firmness the philosophy of immediate conclusions based upon the slight and meagre knowledge we possess. Like the Christian's, Mr. Meredith's word is 'Faith till proof be ready.' Only when the lesson of

'A fortitude quiet as Earth's  
At the shedding of leaves'

has been duly learned, only when the attitude of

'unfaith clamouring to be coined  
To faith by proof'

has been abandoned, can the inheritance of the children of

1 *A Reading of Earth*, p. 99.  
Earth be entered upon, the children whose love is without fear, who have taken to heart Earth's counsel,

«And if thou hast good faith, it can repose,»
She tells her son.¹

The poem which stands first in the volume of Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth conveys a warning on the threshold to those about to enter on the inheritance, the harvest of full delight in companionship with Earth. These are enchanted woods, and the only charm that affords protection is a spirit of courageous confidence.

Enter these enchanted woods,
You who dare,
Nothing harms beneath the leaves
More than waves a swimmer cleaves.
Toss your head up with the lark,
Foot at peace with mouse and worm,
Fair you fare.
Only at a dread of dark
Quaver, and they quit their form,
Thousand eyeballs under hoods
Have you by the hair.
Enter these enchanted woods,
You who dare.²

Few among Mr. Meredith's poems are more quaintly, and at the same time more powerfully, conceived than this, The Woods of Westernmain. The very spirit of the forest is abroad in it, a mystery of life lurks in the thicket and among the leaves. With it should be read Melampus—

'Where others hear but a hum and see but a beam,
The tongue and eye of the fountain of life he knew.'³

Here, as in all his nature-poems, Mr. Meredith moves with the firm step of one to whom the path is a familiar one: a subtle accuracy of observation shines in every epithet. There is no poet since the death of Wordsworth for whom nature has meant so much as for Mr. Meredith. From many of his poems one might conceive him as entirely preoccupied with nature, a close and eager student, to whom the world of individual men and women was little more than a shadowland. How far this is wide of the truth readers of Mr. Meredith's novels are indeed aware; and perhaps we need go no further for convincing proof, if any were needed, of the mental grasp and breadth displayed in his work, a breadth and grasp un-

¹ Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth, p. 128.
² Ibid. p. 1.
³ Ibid. p. 83.
matched in the work of any living man. The place occupied by nature in modern poetry since the advent of Wordsworth must in large measure be associated with the growth of a knowledge of nature, and the desire for that knowledge displayed in scientific investigation. With Mr. Meredith nature is not so much, as with Wordsworth, an object of impassioned contemplation, an encompassing presence, the source of spiritual ecstasy. She is rather nature as revealed to us by science, the eternal activity, the nature that overflows with individual life. And an enduring place among the English poets is assured to Mr. Meredith if for this alone, that he is the first to accept fearlessly the view of nature offered by modern science, and not to accept it only, but to find that view vitally poetic and inspiring. For this he will be remembered. He will be remembered and honoured as that courageous spirit who, when his companions were assailed by fears, embraced with ready welcome the entire unbroken ring, the whole result of science, and, claiming this too as a province of art, drew from the new truths fresh auguries and hopes and lessons for humanity.

Mr. Meredith's study of nature is that of the naturalist, the naturalist who has become the passionate lover. He would have us believe that a closer intimacy with nature will serve to prove her

'Mother of simple truth,
Relentless quencher of lies,
Eternal in thought,'

and to dispel the unworthy apprehensions which, judging her with shrinking nerves, make her 'a cruel sphinx,'

'A mother of aches and jests;
Soulless, heading a hunt,
Aimless except for the meal.'

She is before and above all the Earth our mother, instructress of her children; and to prate of other worlds ere we have mastered this and its lessons seems to Mr. Meredith the hugest of follies. Through the knowledge of earth, 'never misread by brain,' we approach a fuller consciousness of the issues and meanings of life,

'T'ill brain-rule splendidly towers.'

Mr. Meredith is at times obscure, but he is never intangible; he is at times difficult, but he is never unreal. Sureness of grasp, concentration, force, significance—these are the splendid

1 A Reading of Earth, p. 78. 2 The Empty Purse, p. 28.
qualities of his style, and at times one catches an accent, a phrase, a verse exquisitely tuneful, a melody wholly his own. How much of the poetry of talent, how much even of the poetry of genius, fails because it does not go deep enough, because it does not lay hold of reality! Mr. Meredith's poetry of nature lays firm hold of reality. Just as Browning had no fear of the real, but delighted in the uncouth, the forbidding, the extravagant natural forms—

'See our fisher arrive
And pitch down his basket before us; all trembling alive
With pink and grey jellies, your sea-fruit; you touch the strange lumps,
And mouths gape there, eyes open, all manner of horns and of humps'—

so Mr. Meredith does not fear the real, and does not reserve himself to celebrate nature in

'Her pomp of glorious hues,
Her revelries of ripeness, her kind smile.' ¹

His 'cosmic enthusiasm' is without reservations, his spiritual freedom untrammelled and entire.

_The Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life_ display Mr. Meredith in his characteristic, his unmistakable style, the style which is the despair of so many readers. Here are ballads, indeed, but not of that species which may be defined as the simplest and most direct form of narrative poetry. To disentangle these tales one must proceed warily, and piece each together, like a mosaic, from hints, reflections, apostrophes, and the future may not find ballads of this order acceptable. Save in _The Nuptials of Attila_, the vigour of the manner hardly compensates for the harshness of the narration. But _The Nuptials of Attila_ is a notable exception, a notable poem. It is not only a notable, it is an altogether marvellous and indescribable poem. To read it is to hear the tread of armies, to mingle in the tossing tumult of barbarian camps, to catch one's breath in the presence of the Queen of Tragedy herself. There is no poem with which it can to any purpose be compared. From first to last it displays the characteristics of Mr. Meredith at his best and strongest, and will take rank among the great achievements of modern verse as a _tour de force_ of unique power and splendour.

The volume containing these ballads, which represent the poet in his most disdainful mood of the accepted poetical

¹ _Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth_, p. 119.
methods, represents him also in his docile mood of almost academic 'correctness,' content to move in familiar ways of art. The sustained magnificence of diction in 'France, December 1870,' recalls the historical accents of our English speech, the English language as written by its greatest masters, as we have grown to love and hope to preserve it.

'The Gods alone
Remember everlastingly; they strike
Remorselessly, and ever like for like.
By their great memories the Gods are known.'

'Lo, strength is of the plain root-virtues born;
Strength shall ye gain by service, prove in scorn,
Train by endurance, by devotion shape.
Strength is not won by miracle or rape.
It is the offspring of the modest years,
The gift of sire to son, thro' those firm laws
Which we name God's; which are the righteous cause,
The cause of man, and manhood's ministers.'

'Soaring France,
Now is Humanity on trial in thee;
Now may'st thou gather humankind in fee;
Now prove that Reason is a quenchless scroll;
Make of calamity thine aureole,
And bleeding, lead us thro' the troubles of the sea.'

This is the English of Milton, and Southey, and Wordsworth, the English that speaks the character and power of the English race. It is evidently not because Mr. Meredith finds it beyond his power to write a simple and direct style that he indulges in the style characteristic of him. In France, and in that remarkable series of poems entitled Modern Love, he moves with ease and dignity within the strictest traditions of poetic diction, and if the latter exhibits any obscurities, they are certainly not obscurities of expression. The works of ancient art, said Sainte-Beuve, 'ne sont pas classiques parce qu'ils sont vieux, mais parce qu'ils sont énergiques, frais et dispos.' Modern Love is a series of sonnets—we may call them sonnets—modern in phrase, modern in sentiment, modern in their treatment of a subject unknown to ancient art, yet if Sainte-Beuve be right, then is Mr. Meredith, the author of Modern Love, already a classic. On the appearance of this poem in 1862, the Spectator spoke of the author as dealing here with 'a deep and painful subject upon which he has no convictions to express.' But the aim of Mr. Meredith's art is neither to persuade nor to tranquillize. He is neither a concise doc-

1 Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life, pp. 117, 119, 126.
trinaire with ready-made conclusions for his readers, nor the type of poet who affords agreeable shelter for the imagination from the strain and the stress of life. Throughout his poetry this strain and stress is exhibited; the fingers of the artist are upon the pulse of the modern world. The web and the woof of Mr. Meredith's poetry is its resolute devotion to the conditions that are present, his achievement as a poet is the singular exactness with which these conditions are presented by him, and elevated to poetic rank. He has extracted inspiration from conditions which seemed incapable of supplying inspiration, which seemed hostile to it, and from the dull or commonplace or dispiriting aspects of life has rescued the stimulus or interest which, properly approached and viewed by the artist, they offer. Sedatives are abundantly supplied in the poetry of our day and generation in the poetry for example of Mr. William Morris; in its tonic properties consists the virtue of Mr. Meredith's poetry. It kindles energy because energy is its preponderating quality, and if he has not cared to provide for his readers the graces and harmonics to which they have grown accustomed, compensations are not wanting. Let it be granted that the familiar accessories of colour and rhythm and impassioned feeling are subservient to the heart of thought. Thought is his familiar, and finds him in every mood; finds him intense and eager, finds him pensive or lyrical, or passionate or mirthful, finds him careful or careless of his art, but is his constant, his ever-present familiar, and the wise will be willing to accept Mr. Meredith in all his moods.

If the music seem harsh or the strain a jangled one,

'But listen in the thought; so may there come
Conception of a newly-added chord,
Commanding space beyond where ear has home.'

As to the greatness of *Modern Love* in respect of execution Mr. Swinburne may be left to speak.

'Take almost any sonnet at random out of this series, and let anyone qualified to judge for himself of metre, choice of expression, and splendid language decide on its claims. And, after all, the test will be unfair except as regards metrical or pictorial merit, every section of this great progressive poem being connected with the other by links of the finest and most studied workmanship. Take, for example, that noble sonnet, beginning

'We saw the swallows gathering in the skies,'

a more perfect piece of writing no man alive has turned out; witness these three lines, the greatest perhaps of the book:

‘And in the largeness of the evening earth,
   Our spirit grew as we walked side by side,
   The hour became her husband and my bride;’

but in transcription it must lose the colour and effect given it by its place in the series; the grave and tender beauty, which make it at once a bridge and a resting-place between the admirable poems of passion it falls among.’

It needs but to read this sonnet-sequence, or some other of the finer of Mr. Meredith's sonnets—*Lucifer in Starlight* or *The Spirit of Shakspere*—or to recall lines like these:

‘In tragic life, God wot
   No villain need be! Passions spin the plot;
   We are betrayed by what is false within;’

or these:

‘The city of the smoky fray;
   A prodded ox, it drags and moans:
   Its Morrow no man's child; its Day
   A vulture's morsel beaked to bones:’

it needs but to read such poetry to feel that it follows the best traditions of English verse, owing its effects, not to verbal ingenuities, but to simple gravity of thought expressed in words which follow a natural order, whose music is the wholly unforced music of the greater poets.

The poetry of Mr. Meredith gives a new aim to art, and demands a new feeling for the results attained in pursuance of that aim and the altered conditions essential to it. But the lovers of the poetry of an elder day will not find it impossible or even difficult to accommodate their vision to the changed surroundings. There is a sentence quoted by Professor Dowden in his essay from Edgar Quinet which seems to me to express with admirable strength and conciseness the impressions that will finally be left upon the reader of Mr. Meredith's poetry: 'Each day justice has appeared to me more holy, liberty more fair, speech more sacred, art more real, reality more artistic, poetry more true, truth more poetical, nature more divine, and what is divine more natural.'

1 *Modern Love*, p. 58.  
2 *A Reading of Earth*, p. 29.
ART. IX.—BRIGHTMAN'S EASTERN LITURGIES.

Liturgies Eastern and Western, being the Texts, original or translated, of the principal Liturgies of the Church. Edited, with Introduction and Appendices, by F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A. Vol. I. Eastern Liturgies. (Oxford, 1896.)

In the year 1878 the Rev. C. E. Hammond edited for the Clarendon Press a collection of 'Ancient Liturgies,' under the title of Liturgies Eastern and Western. It was a most useful book; it brought the study of Liturgiology within the reach of ordinary students, and became the text-book of the limited number of persons who took in that special subject in the final honour theological school in our Universities. The best proof of its usefulness is afforded by the fact that the book is now out of print. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press, accordingly, determined to issue a second edition, and on Mr. Hammond declining to superintend its preparation, transferred the task to Mr. Brightman. Hence the present volume. But it has blossomed out into a much altered and far larger work than the book of Mr. Hammond—so much larger, indeed, that the new work is to consist of two volumes instead of one, and what we have before us is the first part only of Mr. Brightman's labours, and deals with Eastern Liturgies alone. Western Liturgies are to follow hereafter. We can only add that if they are treated in the same scholarly and thorough manner in which Eastern Liturgies have been treated in the volume before us, Part II. will be a great gain to theological, and especially to liturgiological, literature.

The difference in bulk between Mr. Hammond's and Mr. Brightman's books will be best seen by exhibiting their contents, as to texts represented, in parallel columns. It must, of course, be remembered that Mr. Hammond's book included certain Western Liturgies as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Text</td>
<td>Source of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac Liturgy of St. James.</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy of Constantinople with Anaphoræ of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom (ad normam hodie acceptam).</td>
<td>An English translation from nine different sources MS. and printed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Liturgy.</td>
<td>See below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Alexandrian Family.</td>
<td>See below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy of St. Mark.</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Ordinances.</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopic Liturgy (of the Apostles).</td>
<td>Ditto (in English).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. East Syrian Family.</td>
<td>III. The Persian Rite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy of SS. Adæus and Maris.</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englished from the editio princeps, printed at Urmi, 1890.</td>
<td>Englished from Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 545 (xvii. cent.) with additions and corrections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting.</td>
<td>From the Barberini MS. c. 800., with additions.</td>
<td>Liturgy of Constantinople, with Anaphorae of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom.</td>
<td>Liturgy of the Presanctified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>Armeni Liturgy.</td>
<td>Engleashed from an edition printed at Constantinople, 1873.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that so far as bulk of text is concerned, Mr. Hammond's and Mr. Brightman's books stand on the same level, with the exception that Mr. Brightman gives us a late eighth or early ninth century as well as a nineteenth-century text of the Liturgy of Constantinople, and also the same late eighth or early ninth century text of the Constantinople Liturgy of the Presanctified, which was not represented at all in the earlier volume. These additions are taken from the earliest known extant MS. of the Rite, the famous Barberini MS. at Rome, which had, however, been previously printed by Goar, Bunsen, and Swainson. But, apart from bulk, in mode of treatment and in method of presentation of text, Mr. Brightman improves upon his predecessors in the following particulars of lesser or of greater importance.

1. Cues are expanded, and headings and titles are introduced, which very much clear up the order of the services, especially in the older MSS., where helps of this sort scantily occur. All such additions are within brackets, so that they can be distinguished easily and at once from the actual con-

tenets of any MS. text. Rubrics, explanatory of the course of
the service are introduced in the same way.

2. Passages of Holy Scripture, of which these ancient
Liturgies are full, are printed in small uncials, so that the
eye can catch them at once, and there is at the end of the
volume a very full and carefully constructed index of Biblical
quotations and cross-references.

3. The modern mode of punctuation, and the modern
use of capital letters, as introduced by Dr. Swainson, are
abandoned, and the usage of the MS. in these respects is
faithfully copied. Where capital letters, in the shape of large
uncials, are employed in the MS. they are reproduced in the
text; though, strangely enough, they are here omitted by
Dr. Swainson. Compare Swainson, p. 78, col. 2, line 2, with
Brightman, p. 318, col. 1, line 2.

4. Textual accuracy has now been achieved for the first
time. Compare the list of instances on page 408 where the
text of the Barberini MS. of the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil,
as represented by Dr. Swainson, differs from the same as
printed by Mr. Brightman. We have not, indeed, got the
Barberini MS. in front of us to test the list by, but it would
be a violation of the law of probability to suppose it possible
that we have here, not a list of thirty-one inaccuracies in
Swainson's text, but a list of thirty-one inaccuracies intro-
duced into the text for the first time by Mr. Brightman. We
do not say that the inaccuracies are of literary or doctrinal
importance, but in a professed verbatim representation of a
MS. text accuracy is to be commended and valued for its
own sake.

We have taken the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil as a test case
at haphazard, and it is not uncharitable to suppose that it
may be accepted as a fair sample of the rest of the volume,
and as a proof of the textual accuracy of Mr. Brightman's work
as compared with that of his predecessor.

5. An alteration has been introduced into the mode of
presenting Liturgies which exist in the Syriac, Armenian,
Coptic, and other Oriental languages, ancient or modern.
The ideal way would be, of course, to print each Liturgy in its
own language. But the result would be an expensive volume,
unintelligible to the vast majority of readers. How many
graduates, for instance, of the Universities of Oxford and Cam-
bridge can read or understand Armenian? The plan adopted
by most liturgical editors—e.g. Renaudot, Hammond, &c.—has
been to present these Liturgies to their readers in a Latin
translation. Mr. Brightman translates them into English, and
probably this is the fairest way, because such Latin words as
*sacerdos*, *ara*, &c., have, or may have, a history and usage of
their own which do not equally belong either to the original

**Swainson’s Edition as corrected by Brightman’s Edition.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Col.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>add τὴν δόξαν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>add καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td><em>add ἀναπεμπόμεν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>omit τοινν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>omit άθωσ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>add ἡμᾶς after κόσμος</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>omit ἡμᾶς after άγαγόν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for ἐπίδει read ἐφύλε</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>omit ἐπίδε</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>add ἀ λαχ. 'Αμὴν after Πνεύματι</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for ὁ διάκονος λέγει read λέγει ὁ διάκονος</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>for Χρονοθύμι read χρονοθύμι</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for Σεραφίμ read σεραφείμ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for κατακλύστουσι read κατακλύστουσιν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>add τὸ after πρὸς</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεία read τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>after τε read αὐτῶν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for πάλιν γενεσίας read πάλιν γενεσίας</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>for ἔργα read ἔργων</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for ἥλιος read ἥλιον</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for σύμμορφος read σύμμορφος</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for συμμορφός read συμμορφός</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>for εὐδοκησέν read εὐδοκήσεν</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>for τὴν ἁμαρτίαν read τῆς ἁμαρτίας</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>omit σοῦ</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Part of p. 81, the whole of pp. 82, 83, and the greater part
of p. 84 are unrepresented in the Barberini MS., owing to an
unfortunate *lacuna*. That MS., in its present condition, re-
commences after the first two syllables of ὧρθο]τομοῦντων,
and not as Dr. Swainson indicates at Μνήσθητε.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Col.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>add ἡμῖν after ἀναδείκτας</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>add ὁ λαός. 'Αμὴν after πατρὸς</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>omit square brackets.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>add σῶν after λαῷ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>add εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>omit square brackets.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These missing pages have been supplied by Dr. Swainson from
Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 22749, but not very accurately. See review in
Guardian of July 30, 1884.
Armenian, Persian, &c., words, of which they are a translation, or to their English equivalents, priest, altar, &c. More special or less usual liturgical terms are sometimes not translated, but transliterated. The result would be sometimes confusing if it were not for an admirable Glossary of Technical Terms, which enables a reader at once to understand such an appalling rubric, at first sight, as 'When he [the Celebrant] drinks the deaconess, he says' (p. 107, line 32).

The most important variation from Mr. Hammond’s arrangement remains yet to be mentioned. The latter arranged Eastern Liturgies into three classes: 1, West Syrian; 2, Alexandrian; 3, East Syrian; the distinguishing mark of each class being the position of the Great Intercession for quick and dead. Mr. Brightman splits up Class 1 into two families—the Syrian rite, and the Byzantine rite. According to Mr. Hammond’s test, they form one family or class, because in both of them the Great Intercession comes after the completion of the Consecration by the recital of the words of Institution, the Oblation, and the Invocation; but on other grounds the separation of this family into two families must be allowed to be justified. Linguistically, even when both Liturgies are Greek, the substance of the prayers is different; geographically, Constantinople is not in Syria, though, perhaps, this difficulty might have been got over by inventing some less narrow term than West Syrian to cover so broad an extent of ground; ritually, there are points of difference of some importance: e.g. in the Syrian rite the Kiss of Peace comes after the Creed; in the Byzantine rite it comes before it. In the latter rite there is the peculiar ceremony of the infusion of warm water into the chalice just before the Communion, which is not known to exist in the Syrian St. James’s, or in any other Liturgy, Eastern or Western. Further and minor points of difference might be pointed out. On the whole, though we regret the increased complexity caused by having to recognize four instead of three families of Eastern Liturgies, yet we think that Mr. Brightman has proved his case, and that for the future his quadripartite division of Eastern Liturgies, and not Mr. Hammond’s tripartite division, will have to be recognized and accepted.

One more most helpful alteration in the presentation of the text must not pass unnoticed. Synchronous portions of a Liturgy are presented in parallel columns, not consecutively. Thus the words and actions of the priest which are used at the Offertory in the Greek Liturgy of St. James, while the Litany is being chanted by the deacon, are placed side by side.
side with that Litany (pp. 43-47); and so elsewhere. Without this arrangement, it would be difficult for any person, not practically familiar with a Liturgy from his youth, to understand the exact order and sequence of the various parts of the service.

We have hitherto spoken only of the superior accuracy and plan of Mr. Brightman's work. Its chief value lies in the vast amount of liturgical information which is brought together—much of it for the first time—and for the skill with which it is marshalled and condensed, partly in the Introduction, partly in the seventeen Appendices at the end of the volume. Take one question only—a question of great difficulty and importance—the date, authorship, and provenance of the Clementine Liturgy, which, as the author points out, involves the date, authorship, and provenance of the Apostolic Constitutions, or, at least, of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, in which it is embedded. No more important and no more complicated subject exists within the domain of liturgiology, or in connexion with any piece of early ecclesiastical literature. Ever since the popular belief in the Apostolic date and Apostolic authorship of these Constitutions was abandoned, at least by all persons of any literary acumen whatever, the most various theories have been entertained by the many scholars who have handled them. It is not worth while to recapitulate exploded theories, or even theories which, though still in the field, are bound to vanish before the latest positions won by the research of foreign scholars like Lagarde, Harnack, Funk, and of such ancient and modern English scholars as Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Lightfoot. Nothing shows, perhaps, Ussher's pre-eminence in learning, and his advance in front of his age, more than such a fact as this, that he was the first to make a suggestion which, after lying dormant for more than two centuries, has been at length accepted as a fact with regard to the origin of the Apostolic Constitutions, viz. that the compiler of them was identical with the Pseudo-Ignatius, the interpolator of the seven genuine epistles and the forger of the remaining six of the long recension of the Ignatian Epistles. The same person was also the compiler of the Canons at the close of the eighth book known as the Apostolic Canons.

The reasons for this conclusion are found in certain marked literary and theological characteristics which are admirably and clearly summarised by Mr. Brightman on pp. xiv–xxviii. The skill and clearness with which they are placed before the reader demand the highest praise, and the same remark refers
to the varied internal evidence brought together to substantiate the following positions or conclusions with regard to the same compiler and forger: namely, that he was 'a divine of unorthodox but otherwise not clearly determinable theological affinities, who wrote at Antioch or in its neighbourhood in the latter half of the fourth century.' We cannot here recapitulate or reprint the evidence for this statement. It must be sought and studied in Mr. Brightman's luminous Introduction. It is something to have discovered the home and the date of the Pseudo-Ignatius. Shall we ever discover his name? Mr. Brightman does not venture on a suggestion, and we are not bold enough to venture where he fears to tread. One thing is self-evident: a compiler and forger on such a large scale, and the successful launcher of interpolated documents of so much importance, must have been either a bishop or a person holding some other high and influential ecclesiastical position. Some person of literary skill and slightly heretical tendency must be found like Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa, who, however, died in A.D. 360, some quarter of a century too early for the purpose, and enough of whose writings have not survived to enable any sure inference to be based upon them.

With equal skill and clearness Mr. Brightman enumerates and shortly describes the original materials out of which the Pseudo-Ignatius expanded and upon which he compiled his work. These materials have either only come to light in recent years, or have only in recent years begun to receive the treatment which they deserve at the hands of students of the organization and worship of the early Church. The last word has by no means been said about them; but the pith and marrow of what has been said, and the cream of all available information about them is dished up and placed before the reader in a most compact but also most digestible form in pp. xviii–xxiv of the Introduction.

Books I.–VI. are based upon the Didaskalia Apostolorum, a work produced in Syria in the first half of the third century, and only known at present to exist in a Syrian version which was printed by Lagarde (Leipzig, 1854). A reconstruction of the text in Greek was made by Lagarde for Bunsen, and published by the latter in his Analecta Ante-Nicaeana (London, 1854); but a critical edition of this important Syriac document, with a Latin, English, or German translation of it, is still a desideratum in theological literature. Probably early versions of it in some other language than Syriac are lurking in European libraries, and only waiting for discovery and publication.
Book VII. 1–32 is expanded from the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the well-known work of the second, if not of the end of the first, century.

Book VII. 33–49 is, so far as is known, the work of the compiler, including certain portions of Holy Scripture within its limits.

Book VIII. 1–2 perhaps includes an otherwise lost book of St. Hippolytus Περὶ χαρισμάτων.

Book VIII. 3–27, including the Clementine Liturgy, is the arrangement, though not entirely the composition, of the compiler.

Book VIII. 28–46 is a collection of directions and formulæ found in certain other early documents, the relationship of which to one another has not been ascertained, and which perhaps, with the present materials for judging, cannot be yet ascertained.

Book VIII. 47, containing the Apostolic Canons, is derived partly from the Canons of the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341), partly from the Apostolic Constitutions themselves, as its main sources. The sources are not completely known, but it has been ascertained that twenty Canons are derived from those of Antioch (A.D. 341), eighteen from the Apostolic Constitutions, six from the Canons of Nice (A.D. 325), and three from those of Laodicea (A.D. 361).

The other early documents referred to as akin to Book VIII. 28–46, though their exact relationship to each other and to the Apostolic Constitutions needs further elucidation, are:

1. A document, which bears no special name, but which appears in many MSS. and in various shapes, about the origin, authorship, dates, and character of which different opinions have been held by leading modern authorities. These opinions have been admirably summarized by Mr. Brightman in the small print paragraphs on p. 20, but his opinion is that 'perhaps the only view of it which is possible at present, is one which regards it as a preliminary draft of the eighth book by the hand of the compiler himself, or an excerpt from such a form.'

2. The Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons, cc. 63-79, of which Boheiric and Arabic MS. versions also exist, form a document substantially coincident with, but exhibiting variations from, the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions.

3. A Syriac document, published by Lagarde from a Paris MS. (S. Germ. 38), under the name of the Clementine Octateuch, but practically an excerpt from the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions.
(4) The *Egyptian Church Ordinances*, forming cc. 31-62 of *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons*. This document contains much of the matter in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but with variation of detail and order, and is considered by Mr. Brightman to be a source, or akin to a source, of that book.

(5) The *Ethiopic Church Ordinances*, forming Statutes 21-71 of the *Ethiopic Statutes of the Apostles*, and corresponding, with variations, to cc. 31-62 of the *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons*. The variations point to their being earlier than the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

(6) The *Canons of Hippolytus*, which, though their attribution to St. Hippolytus is not proven, are a body of Canons of the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, and of Roman origin, are the source of (4) and (5), and ultimately through them of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

The above are the documents older than or contemporaneous with, or possibly in some cases, according to some authorities, more recent than, the *Apostolic Constitutions*. We do not believe that so clear and succinct an account of them is to be found in any other book in the English language. The last word indeed has not been said about them. No. 5 has not been fully published or translated. Eminent authorities vary in their estimates of the date and position of Nos. 1 and 6, but anyone wishing to possess a clear account of the materials which exist up to date for settling questions connected with the origin of the Clementine Liturgy and of the whole of the *Apostolic Constitutions* must possess himself of Mr. Brightman's volume and master the contents of his Introduction.

Thus it will be seen that the range of Mr. Brightman's Introduction extends beyond the strict border line of liturgiology, and discusses questions of the greatest importance concerning many early ecclesiastical documents.

We have already referred to the seventeen valuable Appendices which follow the liturgical texts. For the material of some of them Mr. Brightman acknowledges his indebtedness to predecessors in the same field of labour, such as Goar, Dr. Probst, Mr. Hammond, &c. Many of these Appendices, however, present material all but inaccessible before, and in some cases now printed for the first time; and even where Mr. Brightman makes use of the previous labours of others, the succinctness and lucidity of arrangement are all his own.

The catalogue of subjects treated in these Appendices will be found on p. 460. They cover the whole field of liturgical
information (barring future discoveries) which lies behind the Barberini MS. so far as that ground can be covered by extant liturgical fragments and by gleanings from the writings of Eastern writers before the ninth century. We cannot discuss each Appendix with the fulness which it deserves, but will call attention to a few of the earlier and more important of them.

Appendix A gives us in an English translation the full text of the liturgical forms of the Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons. Their relationship to the Apostolic Constitutions is uncertain, but they are a document of about the same date, and their inclusion is a matter of importance, especially as Archdeacon Tattam's translation is possessed by few, is probably now unpurchasable, and is not so accurate as the translation now offered by Mr. Brightman.

Appendix B gives us the construction, with some of the wording, of the Palestinian Liturgy in the fourth century drawn from the well-known Procatechesis and the Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, with copious notes and illustrations drawn from St. Jerome, the Passio S. Procopii, and especially from the recently discovered and not hitherto fully utilized Peregrinatio S. Sylvia, and from other authors and sources.

Appendix C reconstructs the Antiochene Liturgy of the latter part of the fourth century, with copious illustrative notes, from the writings of St. Chrysostom. In drawing up this important Appendix the editor had the previous work of Dr. Probst and Mr. Hammond to start upon, but he here for the first time completely disentangles St. Chrysostom's evidence for Antioch from his evidence for the liturgical forms in use at Constantinople, and this lends a special value and additional importance to this Appendix.

Appendix D accumulates evidence for the character of the Syrian Liturgy from the fifth to the eighth century. It is chiefly, but by no means exclusively, drawn from the writings of such comparatively little known authors as Hesychius the Presbyter, Cyril of Scythopolis, S. Anastasius Sinai, as well as from St. John of Damascus, and Joannes Moschus.

We need not go further and fill pages with a mere recapitulation of the valuable material contained in the remaining thirteen Appendices. Not one of them is superfluous or unwelcome. All of them testify in different degrees to features in Mr. Brightman's volume, which perhaps may be regarded as specially attested by the work involved in Appendix D: namely, industry, exactness, and completeness. We find that whereas in certain Appendices he has merely had to utilize and rearrange material collected by predecessors
in the field of liturgiology, in Appendix D as well as in other parts of the work he has collected fresh material and has placed it before his readers for the first time. Absolute completeness is of course unattainable in this or in any other department of literature. If completeness were attained to-day it might become incompleteness to-morrow, owing to the discovery of further material or other MSS. But within the limits which Mr. Brightman has imposed upon himself, and considering only the material with which it was possible for him to deal, he has produced an ideal handbook, which is a great advance on previous attempts of the same kind, admirable and useful as they were, and which at all events approximates to completeness. As further examples of the qualities referred to, we might call attention to the quotations in illustration of the Egyptian Liturgy culled from writers of the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh centuries on pp. 506-9; to the exhaustive list of MSS. of the Syrian rite on p. lx, and to many similar points. Very useful, too, to beginners will be the description of Greek service books on p. lxxxii, and the general belief in the inelasticity of the Oriental rite will be somewhat shaken by the list of the nine or more different languages into which the Byzantine Liturgy has been translated, and in which it exists in use (p. lxxxii). Where so much help has been given it may seem hard to ask for more, but would that there had been a general Index, including within itself both subjects and proper names! It would have been a gigantic compilation, and would have added to the bulk of the volume, and one can well imagine that the editors shrank from it, but it would certainly have added to the usefulness of the volume both to the beginner and also to the more advanced investigator of the history or use or frequency of liturgical terms, ideas, persons, and things.

One passage in the Preface seems to us to be possibly capable of misinterpretation. The author says on p. xi, 'In the Greek texts I have marked as a quotation anything I have noticed as agreeing with any reading in the New Testament or the LXX; but it is possible that in some cases the Biblical reading is derived from the liturgical text.' He must not be suspected of meaning that he is in favour of the strange (we might almost say the absurd; we may surely say the impossible) theory advanced or supported by such high authority as Dr. Neale and Mr. Gerard Moultrie, that the composition of some of the Liturgies is earlier than the composition of the books of the New Testament, and
that certain passages found in the latter are quotations from the former. We fear, however, that the mediæval belief in the Apostolic origin of certain Liturgies is not universally exploded yet, and that Mr. Brightman may live to see his Preface quoted in its support. Yet his real meaning is so obvious that we will not insult the intelligence of our readers by explaining it here.

The book is singularly free from misprints. There are certain inferences or suggestions made in the course of the voluminous notes on which opinions may freely differ; they are on points of minute importance, and it would be captious to dwell upon them here. In passing, however, may we ask the editor if the definition of 'Trisagion' on p. 590 covers the use of the same word on p. 482? On p. 479, n. 22, he quotes from the De Proditione Iudaæ famous words of St. Chrysostom which attribute the force of consecration to the words of Institution, and which seem to stand alone among the writings of Eastern Fathers and among the texts of Eastern Liturgies in so doing, the prevailing tendency of Eastern theology being to attribute the consecrating force to the epiklesis of the Holy Spirit. These words are bracketed by Mr. Ffoulkes as spurious,¹ or at all events as not representing the doctrine of St. Chrysostom, and as probably being due to Eusebius of Emesa. It would take too long to reproduce and discuss the arguments of Mr. Ffoulkes, and to weigh their value. Probably, as there appears to be no textual evidence against their genuineness, Mr. Brightman did not feel himself at liberty to treat them as otherwise than genuine, or even to hint at the doubt which has been cast upon them.

Some remarks of a general character suggest themselves as we rise from the perusal of a volume which, though not a complete Eastern Codex Liturgicus, tells us all that can be told at present with regard to the origins and the earliest forms and gradual growth of the Liturgies of Eastern Christendom.

(a) The dearth of early liturgical MSS. The West is better provided than the East in this respect.

If we except such fragments as that of the Persian rite printed in Appendix L, and some others, we have no text of any completeness earlier than the Barberini MS. of the Byzantine rite c. A.D. 800. In the case of the other Eastern rites the absence of early MSS. is still more marked: e.g. for the Syrian rite Mr. Brightman has to print the Greek Liturgy of St. James from a fourteenth century MS., and the Syriac

¹ Primitive Consecration, London, 1885, p. 172.
Liturgy of St. James from MSS. varying from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, with the inter-mixture of even more modern material still. In the Egyptian rite the earliest MS. of the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark is of the twelfth century, and the earliest MS. of the Coptic Liturgy of St. Mark is of the thirteenth century. Ethiopia and Armenia are in an equally bad or in a still worse position. The Ethiopic Liturgy has to be translated from a seventeenth century MS., and though there are Armenian liturgical MSS. of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Mr. Brightman thinks it well to present a translation from a nineteenth century service book. Possibly the corruptness of the MSS. and the difficulty of obtaining a reliable translation in the present dearth of Armenian scholars may have influenced him in adopting the course which he has here pursued. Of course the antiquity of a liturgical prayer or rubric is by no means settled by the earliest extant MS. copy of it. The Old Testament would be a very modern composition if its date depended upon the date of extant MSS., and with the Clementine Liturgy in our hands, which can be referred safely to the fourth century, and with the mass of information and allusion collected together and printed in these Appendices by Mr. Brightman, we are in a much better position to obtain a knowledge of the character and contents of Eastern Liturgies than might be inferred from a mere glance at the dates of surviving MSS.

(6) In Appendices M and N we have in a collected form all the evidence which can be produced as to the character of the Liturgy of Asia Minor both in the Dieceesis of Asia and in the Dieceesis of Exarchate of Pontus, which together made up the whole of that country. The evidence is of an extremely fragmentary character, but so far as it goes, and it is not likely to increase in quantity or to go further, the Liturgy of Asia does not betray any signs of affinity, parental or otherwise, to the early Gallican Liturgy which, together with its sister Liturgy of Spain, has commonly borne the name of Ephesine, from its supposed derivation, in whole or in part, from Asia Minor. The absence of signs of affinity does not absolutely disprove the Asiatic origin of the Gallican rite, but it at least justifies the modern dislike of the epithet 'Ephesine' as begging the question. This is no doubt a point which Mr. Brightman will discuss, and which we shall be glad to hear him discuss in his forthcoming volume on Western Liturgies.

(c) There is a very curious and, whether genuine or not,
important liturgical tractate or treatise entitled *Δόγματος περὶ παράδοσεως τῆς θείας λειτουργίας*, or *De Traditione divina Missae*, attributed to St. Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople, and to the year 446. It is printed as such by Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, tom. lxxv. col. 849. Whether all the statements contained in it are true or not, it seems to us to be a document of much interest and importance, and we wish that Mr. Brightman had devoted an Appendix to it, and told us something more of his opinion as to its value and date, instead of making but a passing reference to it (and that a reference of somewhat uncertain sound) on p. xlv.

Several interesting subjects for investigation are suggested by Mr. Brightman's volume. We will content ourselves with mentioning, and to a limited extent handling, one of them. How far, in the course of the last eleven hundred years, has the text of the Eastern Liturgies been altered? and what is the nature of such alterations as have taken place? Such questions can only be asked—or rather, can only be answered—in the case of the Byzantine family, for in no other family of Eastern Liturgies are there MSS. in existence covering so long a period of time. But the famous Barberini MS. was written in A.D. 800, and we can compare the Byzantine Greek Liturgy of that date with the same Liturgy as it is in use to-day. In making such a comparison, we must avoid falling into the common mistake into which, as Mr. Brightman points out, even Dr. Swainson has fallen,1 of inferring that everything in the printed text of to-day which is not found in the older MS. text is therefore a development or addition. Such is not the case. The old liturgical MS. contains only the priest's part, or little else besides; the rubrics, the responses, the deacon's part, so much larger and more important in the East than in the West, together with certain variable elements, are to be sought in the Τυπικόν, the Ἑρωδιακονικόν, and the other liturgical volumes usefully and carefully described by Mr. Brightman on p. lxxxii. Just in the same way in handling Western service books it would be a mistake to compare the Missale plenarium of to-day with a Sacramentary of the tenth century or earlier, which contained only the celebrant's part, and to infer that the elaborate arrangements as to vestments, incense, and other points of ritual not mentioned in the latter are therefore the upgrowth of the intervening centuries. The Ordines Romani, the Graduals and other books must be examined to find out the history of the rubrics, the ritual,

and the variable parts of the service. All that we can do legitimately by the aid of the older MSS. of the Liturgy, strictly and technically so called, is to compare the text of the priest's part of a thousand years ago, more or less, with the text of the priest's part as it stands in print to-day. We have performed this operation on the text of the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil, and present our readers with the result.

There are in round numbers about fifty variations of text. This sounds a large number, but the majority of them are of the slightest possible importance, or rather of no importance whatever. Some are purely orthographical, such as σεραφεὶμ altered to σεραφίμ, σύμμορφος to σύμμορφος, &c.; some are purely grammatical, e.g. οὐκ ἕστι μέτρον τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας τῆς ἁγιωσύνης σου is altered to οὐκ ἔστι μέτρον τῇ μεγαλοπρε- πείᾳ κ.τ.λ. Others consist of merely a variation in the order of the words used; others of the addition or omission of some unimportant words, generally a particle, an article, or a pronoun, occasionally a substantive in the vocative case, such as δέσποτα or κύριε, in one case only of an additional adjectival epithet, τὸ ἁγιόν σου σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα having become amplified into τὸ ἁγιόν καὶ ἁχραντὸν σου σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα.

Leaving, then, all such cases as the above on one side as having, except perhaps in the last quoted instance, no liturgical or even literary importance whatever, let us pass on to the cases where a noteworthy change of reading has taken place. They are so few in number that they may be mentioned and briefly discussed in the order in which they occur in the text.

1. In the prayer of the Cherubic Hymn (p. 318, line 23) the whole of the following sentence has been added after δούλον σου: 'καὶ καθάρισον μου τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἀπὸ σωτικὴσιας ποιητὰς.' It is an addition which has no special theological significance.

2. In the same prayer (lines 30, 31) 'μηδὲ ὑποδοκιμάσης με ἐκ ποδῶν σου' has been altered into 'μηδὲ ὑποδοκιμάσης με ἐκ παίδων σου.' 'Spurn me not from thy feet' is a different sentiment from 'Exclude me not from among thy children'; yet we cannot but think that the change is solely due to a confusion between two similar words, ποδῶν and παίδων.

3. In the same prayer, in the important passage 'Σὺ γὰρ ἐὰν ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφέρομενος καὶ ἁγιάζων καὶ ἁγιαζό- μενος,' the last four words have been changed into καὶ προσ- δέχόμενος καὶ διαδεχόμενος. It is not easy to see the reason of this change. Both statements are theoretically true.
Perhaps the latter phrase is rather easier of interpretation than the former.

4. In the intercessions accompanying the diptychs of the living the curious epithet εἰρηνικοῦς has been omitted in the following sentence, 'δύμβρων εἰρηνικοῦς τῇ γῇ πρὸς καρποφορίαν δῷρησαι' (p. 337, l. 3). It may well have been omitted on the ground of the difficulty of placing a rational interpretation upon it.

5. In the prayer introductory to the Lord's Prayer the word μερίδα has been substituted for ἐλπίδα in the passage 'ὅσος ἁμών... ἀριων ὑποδέχεσθαι τὴν ἐλπίδα τῶν ἁγιασμάτων σου' (p. 339, l. 4). The reason of this change is plain—μερίδα is a much more natural word to use and an easier word to explain in the sentence in question.

6. In the prayer just before Communion the words 'καὶ ἑπτὸ θρόνου δέξῃς τῆς βασιλείας σου' have been added to the words 'ἐξ ἀγίου κατωκητηρίου σου' (p. 341, l. 7). This is merely an instance of verbal enrichment, and is destitute of any other significance.

We now come to the two concluding prayers of the Liturgy, which exhibit great variation of text. They are hardly part of the Liturgy itself, but coming after the dismissal, and being said, the first in the middle of the nave and the second in the sacristy, have been looked upon as appendages to the Liturgy, and as liable to freer handling in the matter of alteration and adaptation. We have printed them in parallel columns, exhibiting in the second column the alterations from the earlier text:

(7) Ἐντὴ ὠποισάμβων.

Barberini Codex, A.D. 800. Ad normam hodie acceptam.

'Ὁ εὐλογων τοὺς εὐλογοῦσας στ., κύριε, καὶ ἀγάλων τοὺς ἐπὶ σοι πεποιθότας σώσον τὸν λαὸν σου

κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν

σώσον τὸν λαὸν σου,

καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομιὰν σου.

tὸ πλήρωμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ διαφύλαξον

ἀγίασον τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας τὴν εὐπρεπεῖαν τοῦ οἴκου σου

οὗ αὐτῶν ἀντιδόξασον τῇ θείκῃ σου

dυνάμει, καὶ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἡμᾶς

ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπὶ σοὶ·

eἰρήνῃ τῷ κόσμῳ σου δῷρησαι,

tαῖς ἐκκλησίαις σου, τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, τοῖς βασιλευσιν ἡμῶν, καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ σου.

id. id.

id., but om. ἐν εἰρήνῃ id.

id, id.

id. id.

id. id.

id. id.

id. id.
This completes the list of variations of text. They are neither numerous nor important, and they enforce the fact, which we should have expected to be the fact on other and independent grounds, that the Greek Church has been extremely conservative in guarding her liturgical language, and in preserving her Liturgies from change.

It would be an interesting point if we could discover exactly when the changes of text above enumerated either crept into the Liturgy of St. Basil, or were formally and publicly introduced into it. An examination of the text of Lady Burdett Coutts' MS. iii. 42, as published by Dr.

1 The eleventh century MS. of St. Basil's Liturgy as printed by Swainson from Lady Burdett Coutts' MS. iii. 42 reads \( \lambda προντον \) instead of \( \alpha \nuρ\chiν\) (Greek Liturgies, p. 171).
Swainson (Greek Liturgies, pp. 151-171), proves with regard to changes (1) (2) (3) (6) (7) (8) that they are at least as old as the eleventh century. We can arrive at no conclusion as to (4) and (5) because, unfortunately, Dr. Swainson has not printed in full those parts of the text of St. Basil's Liturgy in which they occur, and we have no opportunity of access at this moment to Lady Burdett Coutts' MS.

We have not pursued this inquiry in regard to the development of other texts, either of Byzantine or of other Eastern Liturgies. A collation of texts of different dates is a work yet to be done. Some enthusiastic and competent liturgist will no doubt some day do it. Will Mr. Brightman? We hope not until he has completed his more important task of launching before an expectant and appreciative, if limited public, his second volume, on Western Liturgies.

Art. X.—CHURCH'S 'OCCASIONAL PAPERS.'

Occasional Papers selected from the 'Guardian,' the 'Times,' and the 'Saturday Review,' 1846-1890. By the late R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L., sometime Rector of Whatley, Dean of St. Paul's, Honorary Fellow of Oriel College. Two vols. (London, 1897.)

The preface which Miss Church has written to these volumes shows how large a contributor to periodical literature the late Dean of St. Paul's was. An incomplete list of the reviews and articles which he wrote for the Guardian numbers over a thousand. From 1846 to 1871 he appears to have contributed to that newspaper one or more articles as well as a review every week. He wrote also for the Times, and was a regular contributor to the Saturday Review. We may add that articles from his pen occasionally appeared in the British Critic, the Christian Remembrancer, and our own pages.

Two years ago we ventured to express our regret that there was no magnum opus by Dean Church. Our opinion on that point has not been modified by some criticisms of it which have come under our notice. We recognize, indeed, the high value of the literary work which the Dean actually did. We are not blind to the immense influence which must have been exercised on English thought by the continual appearing of articles from his pen in the Guardian and the

1 See Church Quarterly Review, April 1895, p. 102.
Saturday Review, to say nothing of the Times. Our sorrow is that it was not possible for him, either in addition to these or by some limitation of them, to write what might have remained as a standard work of permanent value. A History of the Papacy from his pen might have been of quite incalculable service to the Church.

The two volumes contain fifty-four papers, all of which have been published as articles or reviews with ‘the one exception’ of ‘the “Fragment on Elizabeth,”’ which was written in 1889, and is included here among other papers touching on various aspects of the ecclesiastical and political history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, abroad and in England’ (Preface, p. vi). This ‘fragment’ was intended to form the ‘opening chapter to a volume on Queen Elizabeth which the Dean had undertaken to contribute to Mr. Morley’s series of English Statesmen’ (i. 401).

To glance through the titles of the papers is to be struck by the versatility of the writer. ‘Carlyle’s Cromwell,’ ‘Stanley’s Lectures on the Jewish Church,’ ‘Epictetus,’ ‘Thierry’s St. Jerome,’ ‘Dean Milman’s Essays,’ ‘Guicciardini,’ ‘Jansenist Expositions of Scripture,’ ‘Lamennais,’ ‘Döllinger on the Reunion of Christendom,’ ‘Brewer’s Henry VIII.,’ ‘Mr. Gladstone on the Royal Supremacy,’ ‘Mozley’s Bampton Lectures,’ ‘Ecce Homo,’ ‘Life of Baron Bunsen,’ ‘Newman’s Parochial Sermons’—these are sufficient to show how varied are the subjects treated. With some writers such a list of titles would at once arouse suspicion as to the worth of the papers. With Dean Church we expect to find, and we do actually find, that the treatment is as deep and thoughtful as the subjects are various.

The opening paper, which consists of three reviews from the Guardian on ‘Carlyle’s Cromwell,’ is in some ways very unlike much of Dean Church’s work. The style of it, in our judgment, differs much from most of his writings, but there is a greater difference in the fact that it makes no attempt at a full and fair estimate of Cromwell. As a severe attack both on Carlyle’s book and on Cromwell himself it has, we understand, been subjected to some adverse criticism. We are not disposed to regard it as either vindictive or unthinking. Rather, as it seems to us, it is a deliberate setting out of one side of things, chosen purposely, instead of a complete estimate of character, from a sense that the immediate need, when the review was written, was such an emphasis on a particular part of the matter. We should not ourselves now write all that Dean Church then said about Cromwell, but we are not clear
that the method which he adopted may not have been that best calculated to expose the faults of Carlyle's book and the fancy character of the portrait of Cromwell which he had drawn. Where it does differ from what Dean Church generally wrote is, not in any trace of intentional unfairness or bad temper, but in his resting satisfied without the complete and careful allowance for every factor which a problem contains.

For the most part, the characteristic features of Dean Church's work appear in the present volumes. We are accustomed to look for his balance of thought, and we find an instance of it in the recognition of the value of scientific inquiry, side by side with a clear sense of the limitations of science, in the review on Lyell's Explanations: a Sequel to 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation,' a review which, as it is worth while to notice, he wrote in the year 1846. Thus, almost at the end of the review, there is this striking passage:

'If science is to advance, it must be cultivated freely: if it is to be more than a vestibule to the workshop, it must be cultivated not only freely but philosophically, by minds trained to appreciate harmony and greatness in system as well as arrangement in details. And if moral truths and religion are not to suffer, it must be, not by allying them with the physical sciences, but by defining with breadth and precision of thought the impassable limits between the moral and the physical; by maintaining the substantive independence of those two incommensurables—on the one hand, the free will and thought of men, and on the other the sequences of nature. Keep in view the great principle that belief in God does not depend upon the natural; that nature is not the real basis of religion, and we can safely afford full and free scope to science. . . . In a world of widening and self-sustained order, an Epicurean Atheism is not so difficult: something deeper than the facts of natural science is required to undercut its premises. It is the metaphysician, the abstract thinker, who is wanting in the field. It is not special pleading, or timid, indecisive fighting about details, which will meet the march of that science which openly threatens to be infidel because no one will help it to be Christian' (i. 64-5).

The great justice of the Dean's mind appears again and again. His strong sense of the weak points in Dean Stanley's work does not hinder him from expressing a very high opinion of the real merits of his Lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History as showing forcibly the 'purely human side,' the 'scenic and dramatic,' 'personal and individual' elements in the history of the Church (i. 67, 71). In the same way, while he lays great stress on the natural features of the Bible history
which are emphasized in the same writer's *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, there is a very valuable passage on the light which the Incarnation and the Resurrection throw on the character of the Old Testament:

'\n
The history of the Old Testament wears a different aspect according as it is simply looked at in itself or as it is connected with the Incarnation and Resurrection of the Son of God. These were, in the highest and fullest sense, which nothing can get over, miracles; events utterly different from anything else that we know of in the world or in history. A course of things which was a preparation for and part of such events as these, as it confessedly runs on into miracles without parallel and analogy, is on a different level from any other history in the world. A different scale of probability, a different standard of judgment in many important particulars, may be expected to apply to it. It is a question of fact and evidence, of course, in each case, not to be settled a priori, of what nature its records are, what they really say, what really happened, how God chose that the occurrences of that preparatory time should be understood and transmitted—how much, in fact, we are permitted to know of that early history. But as God dealt with the world differently from all the ordinary ways of His dealing with it when the Son of God was made flesh and rose from the dead, the mind, impressed with these miracles, is not surprised to find the whole precedent history pervaded with the supernatural, and marked with the assumption of the miraculous. It is this that ordinary readers are impressed with in the Old Testament history. The Call of Abraham and the miracles of Moses do not stand alone as separate alleged instances of Divine interposition; they are felt as steps and links in the train of working which went on till "the Word was made flesh," and the Crucified arose from the dead. They belong to a system of things of which these last wonders are a part. On them is reflected from these latter a Divine character which separates them from all other things which could happen to men, or have been done by men, not thus linked with the coming of God into the world' (i. 77-8).

'It is doubtless true that there are coarse gross ways of understanding the Divine dealings, and that very often it is more religious and more reverent to abstain from precise assertions when we are speaking of the ways and works of God. But there are limits to this. The Call of Abraham would have been equally a Divine work, if it had been like the call which summons a missionary of the modern world to devote his life to carrying truth to strange lands; but it is idle to say that it makes no difference to our thoughts whether the Call of Abraham was something more than this, something unlike all our experience. The Decalogue would have been as binding on the conscience of man even if it had not been given on Sinai; it would have been almost as wonderful if it had been the code produced by the enlightenment and elevation of the leader of a desert tribe of those days; but it is unreasonable to say that, if it
is indeed the monument of a direct communication between God and man, it is the same thing in interest and importance as if it had been something thought out by the spirit of man under the influence, as we know it now, of the Author of all goodness and wisdom. And so with other things. Parts of the Bible history may have been read and understood as supernatural, which are either purely natural or what we call providential. But the great hinges of it are more than this. No arguments in favour of indefinite rather than too limited and literal views, no warnings against narrow and human conceptions of God's ways, can get rid of the presence of the miraculous. Not only is it interwoven with the very sense and reason of the history, but it is indissolubly linked with that of which the life of our Lord was the climax. Let us learn where we were wrong in supposing a miracle. But it is not philosophical nor religious to shrink from the miraculous, as such, if it really comes before us; to be content to subordinate it to the providential, or to hold up the providential so as to obscure it' (i. 81–2).

The Dean is no less just in estimating the characters of great men of history or the significance of a particular series of events than he is in reviewing a modern writer or insisting that due weight must be given to all considerations which bear on the Old Testament records. There is an instance of his treatment of an individual in the paper entitled 'Thierry's St. Jerome.' St. Jerome is one of those of whom it is easy to form an unjust estimate in one direction or another. He has been subjected to indiscriminate praise and to indiscriminate abuse. From either point of view the real complexity of his character, mixing remarkable weaknesses with remarkable elements of strength, has been lost sight of. We can forgive M. Thierry his failure to grasp what St. Jerome was like, since it supplied the occasion of Dean Church's interesting review and most just estimate.

'St. Jerome,' he says, 'is one of whom it is impossible to write with reality and justice unless plenty of room is made for his ruggedness, irritability, and coarseness, and for the odd and ludicrous contrasts between the ideal of saintliness and the matter-of-fact outbursts of his ultra-Johnsonian roughness and impetuosity of temper. . . . What is wanted is to do real justice to a very remarkable man —remarkable in his self-dedication to religion and study, and remarkable also in his fierce energy, and coarse loves and hates; to be sensible of his ungovernable rudeness and extravagance, and of its abundant grotesqueness and frequent repulsiveness, yet to be alive also to the strength and unselfish laboriousness of that robust and indefatigable nature' (i. 128–9).

'Jerome, the Romanized Provincial, the harsh and violent Dalmatian in blood, the Roman in artificial culture, but utterly without taste or justice or moderation, one of those products of the contact
of high civilization with ambitious and aspiring barbarism so common in his day and not unknown in our own, was a combination of the ascetic, the student and critic, the satirist and pamphleteer, and the director and guide of aristocratic religious ladies. When all these characters were grafted on a nature in the highest degree passionate, enthusiastic, inexhaustible in its rough vigour, self-confident, and without the faintest notion of checking and restraining itself, the result is at any rate not a commonplace one. And no writer of the same class, not even St. Augustine or Tertullian, has told us so much about himself, and impressed the stamp of his personal character so curiously on his writings' (i. 129).

Another instance of justice in the same department may be seen in the verdict on St. Bernard, than whom there have been few characters in history more perplexing in their own lives or in the ways in which they have been regarded. At the end of a careful survey of the varying phenomena of his life, the Dean says of him:

'As the prophet and enlightener of his age, Bernard would have been greater and more complete if he had not been the preacher of the Crusade and the vanquisher of Abelard, or even the stern satirist and reformer of the corruptions and abuses of his distinguished pupil's Court at Rome. He was meant for the privacy and quiet of a life of thought, and all that such a life creates. He added to it the dazzling glory of a life of brilliant practical achievement. The pages of history have gained more from it for their varied and sad display than has the perfection of character in him who was to bear the torch of spiritual light to his age, the last of the Fathers. He is a warning to all Christian explorers and expounders of truth—a warning all the more emphatic for the singular disinterestedness of his purpose, and the success of much which he attempted—not to be tempted, by the influence which their work in retirement has given them, into those entangling and difficult paths of public activity from which, when once a man has entered on them, it is hard to draw back, and in which it is so easy for the thinker, the divine, the teacher, to pass into the religious partisan, the religious manager and meddler and contriver, forgetting, at once in the purity and elevation of his purpose, and in the intoxication of success, the inherent snares and dangers of power in any human hands' (i. 237).

Or, we may notice the description of Cranmer as—

'the most bewildered and vacillating of public men, who knew so much, and yet too much ever to make up his mind for good—humane and considerate by nature, yet who had lent himself to some of Henry's worst acts, and could consent to the burning of an Anabaptist' (i. 398).

Passing on to the justice shown in dealing with classes of men or the significance of events, we come to an excellent
statement about the ascetics of the early Church. Here again there is great danger of opinions that become false through ignoring one side of things. The ascetics may easily be ridiculed by those who cannot transplant their minds out of the nineteenth century; they have been idealized by those who can see nothing wrong in a canonized saint. Dean Church is very far indeed from idealizing, yet he sees with clearness the real service which the ascetics rendered to Christianity:

'It is a perpetual mistake in historical judgments to insist on requiring from men what it was impossible, in the nature of things, that at the time they should be. The ascetic fervour of the early and middle centuries is wrongly judged unless, with all our dislike of it in itself, we look upon it—as indeed we can see it to have been—as a first step, not perhaps in intention yet in fact, tentative; an attempt, rude and wild, to apply to life the Gospel standard.

'When we remember what were the enormous, blind, intractable forces on the other side, in the days when it arose, of fierce, reckless, unrestrained sensuality, it seems as if nothing but such an enthusiasm, as inconsiderate and unmeasured, could balance or swing back, on a scale necessary for the progress of the world, the tremendous, ever-renewed, and accumulating pressure in favour of self-indulgence. . . . The monks and ascetics have perished, as soldiers and workers have perished; but what have they left behind? What have they done to print images, softened now by distance, of moral greatness, strength, height, unselfishness on the mind of society? What would those ages have been, being what they were, and separated by impassable intervals from the possibility of what is so commonplace to us and ready to our hand—what would they have been without this direction given to their grossness and fierce temper, without those examples of fierce self-bridling, and of proportionate discipline? So asceticism taught mankind, though by extravagance and with degeneracy and failure at the end, the hard lesson of the incomparable superiority of the higher over the lower nature. We may doubt whether the greatness of free modern morality—of which part of the greatness is that it is a thing, not of a school or of a choice aristocracy of feeling and mind, but popular, common and public—could ever have been formed and fixed without passing through the terrible agony of asceticism' (i. 223–5).

Now, it is by no means the case that there is no need at the present time of the ascetic spirit. Rather, there are many circumstances and conditions of our present life which imperatively call for the protest against selfishness and the emphasis on the pre-eminence of what is spiritual and supernatural, which asceticism is calculated to supply. But, if it is to do its work, it must differ in very many important respects from its forerunner in the early Church. Conse-
quently there is a possibility of the true value of the work of the early ascetics failing to meet with a just recognition from any quarter. Those who idealize the past may ignore the fact that they were in many ways faulty and that their methods cannot be the methods of our age. Those who are full of the modern spirit, and the modern spirit only, are inclined to depreciate and ridicule them. Even those who recognize a place for asceticism in our present life may, in proportion to the extent in which they realize what its methods must be, run some risk of failing to understand how great was the task which the ancient forms accomplished. What is needed is to observe how the very exaggeration, as it seems to us, of the great heroes of the past, made an indelible mark stamping on human thought the knowledge of the possibility of chastity and bearing its witness to the unimportance of everything else compared with the spiritual union of the soul with God. If we in our day, by the methods which may be ours, do as much for the Christian Church and for human life as those whom we so easily despise, it will be a good thing for us and for those whom we influence.

With Dean Church's estimate of the early ascetics we may compare a passage about the Reformation.

Though there are still some who see nothing absurd in the assumption that opinions and decisions of the Tudor Reformers are the final law and settlement of a Church which had, after terrible trials and almost ruin, to be reorganized afresh in the following century, the time has gone by when it seemed irreverent to criticize the words and deeds of the Reformers, and when it seemed an act of piety to put a good meaning on the most questionable of their words and deeds. We feel at liberty to judge the Reformation as we might judge the French Revolution, or the system of the Papacy, or the proceedings of the Long Parliament. We do not feel ourselves bound to take it en bloc, as pure in its origin and unmixed in its blessings. We can venture to examine the motives, the capacity, the learning, the honesty of its chief representatives. We have been freed from a superstitious deference to it; and any school or party will be ill counselled which attempts a revival of that feeling for it. It may become an instrument of ruin. It never will be a bond of peace. It is no longer safe to view it as it was viewed at one time, as almost a second revelation. Our authorities about it are no longer Foxe's untrustworthy stories, but the letters and records of the men themselves and their contemporaries; and our guides and interpreters are no longer Burnet and Merle d'Aubigné, or even Hallam and Macaulay, but writers of the severe and judicial temper of Bishop Stubbs and Dr. Brewer' (i. 393–4).

'Judicial temper' is the very phrase we should have
chosen to describe the chief characteristic of Dean Church's own writings. A reader feels that every element of the problem, whatever it may be, has been kept in view, every argument given its due weight, the whole question impartially considered. To some minds any approach to a complete consideration of the different sides of things is paralysing. If they see the force of differing points of view, they remain powerless between them. To know the whole case is to have no clear line of thought. It was not so with Dean Church. Students of his works are familiar with the strong clear judgments which come out of his impartial thinking. They know the spectacle of the man who, having weighed all that is to be said on every side, has vigorously made up his mind. Some of the quotations we have already made are illustrative of this. It is very markedly shown in passages on such different subjects as the character of Henry VIII. and the value of much German criticism of recent date.

In one place Dean Church describes Henry VIII. as

'...more like an Asiatic Sultan, or the Ottoman Mahmouds and Solimans and Selims, in his sensuality, his fanaticism, his caprice, and his cruelty, than like any other Western king' (i. 396).

In another place he writes that Wolsey

'...was sacrificed and struck down at last by the almost incredible baseness and ingratitude of the King, whom twenty years of prosperity, the gain of Wolsey's stedfast loyalty, had utterly spoiled and corrupted, and turned from the high and noble prince whom all Europe had once admired, into the shameless adulterer, beginning, in Wolsey's ruin, a career, as yet unknown in England, in which the words and forms of law were used with audacious and cynical deliberation to cover some of the most monstrous cruelties recorded in English history. The divorce, with all its revolting accompaniments of craft and trickery on all sides, was the miserable end, not altogether undeserved, of Wolsey's otherwise splendid ministry. When it made its portentous appearance his downfall was rendered certain; it would have been better for his fame if he had perished earlier, in withstanding its very first stages. But the special form and mode which the King's brutal malice chose to give to his overthrow—the Praemunire sued out at common law for the exercise of the Legatine authority which he had assumed and exercised by the King's wish, and by his sanction, and for his interests, and the wholesale and immediate ruin which Praemunire brought with it—has scarcely a parallel among the worst inventions of tyranny.

'In that perfidious and violent age things were done more cruel and more bloody; but there is nothing to be found so base, so full of the sickening and hypocritical meanness of an ostentatiously bluff and outspoken nature, as Henry's treatment of his great minister.'
Then he seized the power which Wolsey had created for him; and in his hands, which none controlled and none resisted, English history became a byword in Europe for reckless and insolent dealing with the most sacred interests, for all the shame of monstrous caprice, of unbridled selfishness, and of appalling bloodshed (i. 389-91).

And in the paper entitled 'The Author of "Robert Elsmere" on a new Reformation' we read on the subject of some types of German criticism:

'German criticism, to which we are expected to defer, has its mode. It combines two elements—a diligent, searching, lawyer-like habit of cross-examination, laborious, complete, and generally honest, which, when it is not spiteful or insolent, deserves all the praise it receives; but with it a sense of the probable, in dealing with the materials collected, and a straining after attempts to construct theories and to give a vivid reality to facts and relations, which is not always so admirable; which lead, in fact, sometimes to the height of paradox, or show mere incapacity to deal with the truth and depth of life, or make use of a poor and mean standard—mesquin would be the French word—in the interpretation of actions and aims. It has impressed on us the lesson . . . that weight and not number is the test of good evidence. German learning is decidedly imposing. But after all there are Germans and Germans; and with all that there has been of great in German work there has been also a large proportion of what is bad—conceited, arrogant, shallow, childish. German criticism has been the hunting ground of an insatiable love of sport—may we not say, without irreverence, the scene of the discovery of a good many mares' nests? . . . Criticism has pulled about the Bible without restraint or scruple. We are all of us steeped in its daring assumptions and shrewd objections. Have its leaders yet given us an account which it is reasonable to receive, clear, intelligible, self-consistent and consistent with all the facts, of what this mysterious book is?

'Meanwhile, in the face of theories and conjectures and negative arguments, there is something in the world which is fact, and hard fact. The Christian Church is the most potent fact in the most important ages of the world's progress. It is an institution like the world itself, which has grown up by its own strength and according to its own principle of life, full of good and evil, having as the law of its fate to be knocked about in the stern development of events, exposed, like human society, to all kinds of vicissitudes and alternations, giving occasion to many a scandal, and shaking the faith and loyalty of many a son, showing in ample measure the wear and tear of its existence, battered, injured, sometimes degenerate, sometimes improved, in one way or another, since those dim and long distant days when its course began; but showing in all these ways what a real thing it is, never in the extremity of storms and ruin, never in the deepest degradation of its unfaithfulness, losing hold of its own central unchanging faith, and never in its worst days of decay and
corruption losing hold of the power of self-correction and hope of recovery.... And the Christian Church is founded on a definite historic fact, that Jesus Christ who was crucified rose from the dead; and coming to us from such an author, it comes to us, bringing with it the Bible.... It may be that even yet we imperfectly understand our wondrous Bible. It may be that we have yet much to learn about it. It may be that there is much that is very difficult about it. Let us reverently and fearlessly learn all we can about it. Let us take care not to misuse it, as it has been terribly misused. But coming to us from the company and with the sanction of Christ risen, it never can be merely like other books. A so-called Christianity, ignoring or playing with Christ's resurrection, and using the Bible as a sort of Homer, may satisfy a class of clever and cultivated persons. It may be to them the parent of high and noble thoughts, and readily lend itself to the service of mankind. But it is well in so serious a matter not to confuse things.... A Christianity which tells us to think of Christ doing good, but to forget and put out of sight Christ risen from the dead, is not true to life. It is as delusive to the conscience and the soul as it is illogical to reason.'

There are very many other passages we would gladly quote, as a statement of deep interest when we hear a good deal, as we did a little time ago, about the possibility of the revival of the temporal power of the Papacy (i. 153-4), a very characteristic judgment on Savonarola (i. 160-1), some words of wisdom on the personal character of the Popes (i. 163-4), a paragraph on the effects produced on the mind and works of Guicciardini by growing old (i. 173-4), or the careful distinction between real narrowness and the 'inevitable appearance of narrowness and severity which must always be one side which a man of strong convictions and earnest purpose turns to those whose strong convictions and earnest purpose are opposite to his' (ii. 305-7).

But, passing by these and also, among much that is of highest interest, the excellent papers, four in number, on some of the works of Renan and the greater part of the contents of six delightful articles on Cardinal Newman, we must hasten to observe the treatment of a question which is prominent at the present time. Several of the papers are on the subject of the reunion of Christendom. Dean Church reviewed the first part of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* at great length in the *Times* in 1865 (i. 334-66). The review in the same paper in the following year on Dr. Newman's reply was also from his pen (ii. 398-440). Seven years later he wrote on Dr. Dollinger's *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches* for the *Saturday Review* (i. 367-79). There are many circumstances of the
time when the first of these articles was written which resemble circumstances familiar to us now. In it Dean Church says:

'Here we have the real state of the case. While he [i.e. Dr. Pusey] is speculating on the possibilities of reunion, down comes the Encyclical with its train of pretensions and consequences. While he is cautiously examining the language of formularies by the rules of a learned theology, the living belief is growing and asserting itself loudly to a perpetual revelation; and we have Dr. Faber proclaiming the "advent of the Age of Mary," and Archbishop Manning branding the English Government as "the most Anti-Christian in the world" for being neutral in the defence of the temporal power. Dr. Pusey is striving to place some reliance on the more moderate language of great French divines, like Bossuet, more than 150 years ago; but the language of the distinguished ecclesiastic who actually fills the first place in the Roman communion in England is that the "dogmatic Bull of the Immaculate Conception, and the Encyclical of last year, will, as he believes, mark an epoch in the reconstitution of the Christian order of the world."

'Nor is there really any pretence for saying that these views are the unauthorized exaggerations of an advanced party. They are the views of the Pope himself. They are the views of all who claim to speak with authority, and to represent the legitimate and the prevailing belief' (i. 361-2).

So also, in the second article of those which we have mentioned last, it is said:

'Dr. Pusey's Appeal has received more than one answer. These answers, from the Roman Catholic side, are . . . assurances to him that he looks at the question from an entirely mistaken point of view; that it is, of course, very right and good of him to wish for peace and union, but that there is only one way of peace and union—unconditional submission' (ii. 398).

'The Archbishop of Westminster, not deigning to name Dr. Pusey, has seized the opportunity to reiterate emphatically, in stately periods and with a polished sarcasm, his boundless contempt for the foolish people who dare to come "with swords wreathed in myrtle" between the Catholic Church and "her mission to the great people of England." On the other hand, there have been not a few Roman Catholics who have listened with interest and sympathy to what Dr. Pusey had to say, and, though obviously they had but one answer to give, have given it with a sense of the real condition and history of the Christian world, and with the respect due to a serious attempt to look evils in the face' (ii. 399-400).

Now, we do not want to exaggerate the parallel between those days and these. Obviously there are great differences between Pope Pius IX. and Pope Leo XIII., and perhaps still greater differences between Cardinal Manning and Cardinal
Vaughan. But the general features of the situation, and especially the extinguishing of hope for the time being by official words from the Pope and his chief representative in England, are strikingly alike. Now, as then, there are no signs in official quarters, whatever there may be here and there among private individuals, of the coming of that which Dean Church described as the 'first hopeful day for the reunion of Christendom,' 'the day on which the Roman Church ceases to maintain that what it holds must be truth because it holds it' (ii. 440).

Recent events have caused much discouragement to many who are unwavering in their conviction that the present claims of Rome cannot be accepted consistently with loyalty to Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Universal Church. For any who are so discouraged it may be well to think of some of the ways which Dean Church points out in which the Church of England has fulfilled a special function of peculiar difficulty. In his paper on 'Coleridge's Memoir of Keble,' published in the Saturday Review in 1869, he writes thus:

'In him [i.e. in Mr. Keble] was eminently illustrated the characteristic strength and weakness of English religion, which naturally comes out in that form of it which is called Anglicanism: that poor Anglicanism, the butt and laughing-stock of all the clever and high-flying converts to Rome, of all the clever and high-flying Liberals, and of all those poor copyists of the first, far from clever, though very high-flying, who now give themselves out as exclusive heirs of the great name of Catholic; sneered at on all sides as narrow, meagre, shattered, barren; which certainly does not always go to the bottom of questions, and is too much given to "hunting-up" passages for catenas of precedents and authorities; but which yet has a strange, obstinate, tenacious moral force in it; which, without being successful in formulating theories or in solving fallacies, can pierce through pretences and shams; and which in England seems the only shape in which intense religious faith can unfold itself and connect itself with morality and duty, without seeming to wear a peculiar dress of its own, and putting a barrier of self-chosen watchwords and singularities between itself and the rest of the nation' (ii. 303-4).

He had already in 1864 written in the Guardian that a 'review' of the 'various turns and vicissitudes of' Dr. Newman's 'English course'

'makes us feel more than ever that the English Church, whose sturdy strength he underrated, and whose irregular theories provoked him, was fully worthy of the interest and the labours of the leader who despaired of her. Anglicanism has so far outlived its revolutions, early and late ones, has marched on in a distinct path, has developed a theology, has consolidated an organization, has formed a character
and tone, has been the organ of a living spirit. The "magnetic storms" of thought which sweep over the world may be destructive and dangerous to it, as much as, but not more than, to other bodies which claim to be Churches and to represent the message of God. But there is nothing to make us think that, in the trials which may be in store, the English Church will fail while others hold their own' (ii. 396-7).

There is one other passage bearing on the same subject which we cannot forbear to quote, partly because it is itself of a very striking character, and partly also because it appears to us capable of being to a certain extent misunderstood. It is as follows:

'Without infallibility, it is said, men will turn freethinkers and heretics; but don't they, with it? and what is the good of the engine if it will not do its work? And if it is said that this is the fault of human nature, which resists what provokes and checks it, still that very thing, which infallibility was intended to counteract, goes on equally, whether it comes into play or not. Meanwhile, truth does stay in the world, the truth that there has been among us a Divine Person, of whom the Church throughout Christendom is the representative, memorial, and the repeater of His message; doubtless the means of knowledge are really guarded; yet we seem to receive that message as we receive the witness of moral truth; and it would not be contrary to the analogy of things here if we had often got to it at last through mistakes. But when it is reached there it is, strong in its own power; and it is difficult to think that if it is not strong enough in itself to stand, it can be protected by a claim of infallibility. A future, of which infallibility is the only hope and safeguard, seems to us indeed a prospect of the deepest gloom' (ii. 393).

We remember that in The Oxford Movement Dean Church made a similar reference to Infallibility. He there spoke of Mr. Newman feeling, when he wrote Romanism and Popular Protestantism,

'the inherent contradiction of the notion of infallibility to the conditions of human reception of teaching and knowledge, and its practical uselessness as an assurance of truth, its partly delusive, partly mischievous, working.'

He mentioned also

'the certain fact that in the early and undivided Church there was such a thing as authority, and there was no such thing known as Infallibility.'

This last quotation, we think, shows the meaning of the other two. In the early Church there certainly was no such  

1 Church, The Oxford Movement, pp. 183-4.  
2 Ibid. pp. 184-5.
thing as Infallibility in the sense of a localized authority, able by virtue of its own specific inherited power to give infallible decisions on matters of faith and morals. The whole course of the controversies of the early Christian centuries is witness enough to that fact. But, side by side with this, it can hardly be doubted that there always was the conviction that the true and ultimate voice of the whole Christian body would, when fully and permanently made clear, represent the teaching of God. In the former sense, it could not be truly said that there is Infallibility in the Church; in the latter sense, it could not truly be denied that the Church is infallible. And, while Dean Church's statements on this point do not seem to us altogether free from ambiguity, a careful consideration and comparison of them leads us to think that his denial of Infallibility in the first sense existed together with a belief in it in the second sense. That there should be any ambiguity on a point of this kind may be compared with a certain amount of hesitancy which occasionally characterized his utterances on dogmatic questions where we should not beforehand have expected to find it: a particular type of hesitancy which was perhaps the only exception to the power we have already noticed of strong and vigorous decision after duly weighing every side. But, with regard to Infallibility, as we have stated, we think there was no hesitancy of mind, but only a particular method of expression which might mislead those who should not fully examine all that the Dean said on the subject.

The reading of these two volumes has been throughout a most enjoyable task. Our sincere thanks are due to Miss Church for the excellent selection and careful editing of the papers they contain.
ART. XI.—THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.


Nine months ago we had occasion to notice the first volume of the late Dean Burgon's literary remains,1 which had then recently appeared under the editorship of Mr. Miller; and almost simultaneously with that article the second volume was published, of which we shall have something to say in the following pages. Since that date a further contribution has been made to the controversy on the textual criticism of the New Testament, in the shape of a small volume from the pen of so well known and universally respected a scholar as Dr. Salmon. Of neither of these works can it be said that it opens up a fresh field, or a fresh line of enquiry, in textual criticism; but both derive importance from their bearing on the theory which has held the field for the last fifteen years, and is known by the names of Westcott and Hort. Textual theories are always more or less upon their trial, and therefore it is no sign of a parti pris to say that the theory of Westcott and Hort is still upon its trial. It is the dominant theory among the younger generation of scholars; it is on the lines laid down in Dr. Hort's famous Introduction that nearly all textual work, so far as it relates to the New Testament, is being done to-day. A volume which directly impugns that theory strikes therefore at the root of contemporary progress; while a volume which criticizes it in certain details enables us to form some estimate as to how the theory has stood the test of time.

The second volume of Dean Burgon's and Mr. Miller's work is in plan a sequel to the first, though in execution it is to a far greater extent than that was from the hand of the Dean himself. Mr. Miller has contributed some sections at the beginning and end, and has occasionally supplemented the

1 'The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established.' See Church Quarterly Review, xliii. 238.
Dean's remarks in the body of the treatise; but all such additions are now indicated by the use of brackets,¹ which enable the reader to know whether he is perusing the arguments of Dean Burgon or his editor. It will be remembered that the main theme of the earlier treatise was an attempt to prove that the 'traditional text' of the Gospels, which is substantially that which is contained in the later uncial manuscripts, the great mass of the cursives, and the 'textus receptus' of our ordinary Greek Testaments and Authorized Version, has stronger claims on our acceptance than that which is supported by the two oldest extant manuscripts, with a few other uncials, a handful of cursive s, and the earliest versions, and which has been preferred by most modern editors, and forms the groundwork of our Revised Version. In the volume now before us this position is assumed to have been established, and it is supported by a classification of the various ways in which the traditional text has been corrupted into those forms which we find in the 'critical texts' now in favour among biblical scholars. Some of the headings of this inventory have been fully worked out by the Dean; others were only sketched by him, and have been more or less supplemented by his editor; but between the two a considerable number of instances has been collected, in which, as they believe, the inferiority of the readings adopted by such editors as Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers, to those of the traditional text can be established and their origins explained.

The headings under which the various causes of corruption are arranged are as follows: First, those arising from accident, which include (1) mere slips of the pen, (2) homoioateleuton, where words have been omitted through lines or sentences ending with the same word or syllable, (3) mistakes due to manuscripts being written in uncials without division of words or clauses, (4) the confusion of certain vowel sounds which is known as itacism, and (5) errors caused by liturgical influence, such as the omission of passages which were not read in church, or the insertion of introductory phrases which were required when detached passages were read without their context. Secondly, there are intentional corruptions caused by (1) harmonistic influences or the altering of one passage to resemble the corresponding passage in another Gospel, (2) assimilation or the transference of phrases from

¹ Or nearly all, for various references to the Lewis Syriac MS., in passages which purport to have been written by Dean Burgon, must have been inserted by Mr. Miller.
one evangelist to another—a slighter manifestation of the same cause of error as the last, (3) attraction or the altering of the terminations of words so as to resemble those of neighbouring words, (4) omissions, (5) transpositions of words, (6) substitutions, (7) additions, (8) glosses, (9) corruption by heretics, (10) corruption by the orthodox.

Now, it is obvious at first sight that in this classification there is a good deal of cross division. An error of omission may be due to accident, or homoioiteleuton, or liturgical influence, or harmonistic influence, or corruption by heretics or orthodox. An addition may be due to most of these causes or to a gloss. Harmonistic alterations must always take the form either of omission or addition or substitution. No doubt the incomplete state in which the Dean’s materials were left accounts for much that is unscientific and confusing in the arrangement of the volume. His editor has not unnaturally preferred to leave the discussions of the various passages under the headings to which the Dean had assigned them, and has not felt at liberty to recast the whole material into the logical and scientific form which either writer, if working alone, would presumably have adopted. The result, however, is that the volume consists rather of materials for a treatise than a systematic treatise itself.

Further, it will be seen that the classification in itself adds nothing to our knowledge. It contains no new touchstone of truth, no new formula for the detection of error. It contains substantially just those propositions which are either the commonplaces of textual science or are well-known features in the special department of New Testament criticism. Such a classification, apart from its unscientific arrangement just mentioned, might be adopted equally by the most devoted disciple of Dr. Hort. The difference would lie in the application, in the details assigned to the various heads of the classification. Where Dean Burgon considers one reading correct and another due to ‘corruption by heretics,’ Dr. Hort may consider the latter to be the original text and its rival a ‘corruption by the orthodox.’ Where one invokes ‘omission’ to explain the existence of divergent readings, the other will find ‘addition.’ ‘Harmonistic influence’ will be universally admitted to be a frequent cause of corruption, but there is considerable difference of opinion as to the specific instances in which it has been at work.

In saying this, we are making no charge against either Dean Burgon or Mr. Miller, but are merely trying to make clear to the reader what he may expect to find in
their volume. There is here no new panacea for a corrupted text, no new solution of the standing problem. It is merely the discussion, and often a very superficial discussion, of a number of isolated passages in the New Testament, where there are more or less serious divergences in the textual tradition. And these discussions are on the basis of the principles which have been formulated in the Dean's earlier volume. Those who have not been convinced by that volume of the superiority of the mass of the later uncials and the cursives over the handful of witnesses which cluster round B and $\pi$, will find nothing here to shake them in their preference of the latter. In nine cases out of ten the Dean's proof of the superiority of the 'traditional' reading consists of nothing more than a statement of the evidence and a triumphant assertion of the immense numerical preponderance upon his side—a preponderance which his opponents do not for one moment question, but which they claim to be a preponderance in quantity only, and not in quality. The most that can be said for the Dean's work is that in a certain number of instances it may make it desirable that the judgment of Westcott and Hort should be reconsidered; not on the ground that their principles are unsound, but that the application of them in particular cases is questionable.1

The general issue, then, as to the soundness or unsoundness of the theory propounded by Westcott and Hort remains unaffected by the volume before us, which does not aim at reinforcing its predecessor, but at applying its conclusions to a number of individual cases. Its publication, moreover, followed too soon on that of the first volume to admit of Mr. Miller noticing more than a few of the earlier criticisms which that volume elicited. There is nothing in it which requires us to reconsider the opinion already expressed in our previous article as to the general attitude of Dean Burgon and Mr. Miller on textual questions; and the present is hardly a suitable occasion for the discussion of particular details.

While, however, there does not appear to be any necessity to consider anew the conclusion to which we previously came as to the general truth of Dr. Hort's theory, it does not follow that we are bound to accept that theory in all its details and without question or criticism. Indeed a preference

1 For instance, in Matt. xxii. 23, where WH. (and R. V.) read λέγοντες for οἱ λέγοντες of the T.R. Since the preceding word is ζαδυοναίοις, the loss of οἱ is so easily explicable that it seems unnecessary to suppose that St. Matthew here said anything different from St. Mark and St. Luke, who have respectively οίνους λέγοντιν and οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες. See Burgon, p. 49.
for some qualifications of it was indicated in the article to which we have referred; and not a few writers who have accepted Dr. Hort's main conclusions have dissented from one or other of his subordinate dicta. It is criticism of this class which is contained in the little volume recently issued by Dr. Salmon. With regard to the broad issue between Dean Burgon and Dr. Hort, the learned Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, is unhesitatingly on the side of the latter. Referring to the volumes published under Mr. Miller's editorship he says, in words which will express the feelings of most scholars:

'Most readers will feel that they are asked to try again a ruled cause; and the general verdict is one which I have no desire to reverse.'

And again:

'I think that the majority of any readers I am likely to have will not require me to state at length my reasons for being unable to accept Burgon's principles, and for feeling no confidence in an investigation conducted with such manifest resolve to bring out a predetermined result. And though some of the points which Burgon's learning and ingenuity have raised perhaps deserve more discussion than his adversaries have been inclined to give them, I feel that in the present state of the controversy there is more profit in speaking about Westcott and Hort's work than about Burgon's.'

It is, accordingly, with the work of Westcott and Hort, and especially with the Introduction, for which Dr. Hort was primarily answerable, that Dr. Salmon's criticisms are concerned; and they raise several points which are well worth considering. They are not, it is true, all entirely new; but it is useful to have them brought together in a formal manner, and published under the authority of so competent a scholar as Dr. Salmon. To make a fetish of any theory or any teacher is fatal to science; and it is in the free criticism and examination of the Westcott and Hort hypothesis that the best hope of progress lies in the domain of textual research. Even if the foundations of it prove to be unassailable, it may well be that the superstructure is capable of development and improvement.

Dr. Salmon's first criticism relates to the nomenclature adopted in Hort's Introduction; and here, as he is not the first to raise the objection, so it will be found to be shared by many other scholars. None of the terms employed by Hort to designate the various families into which he divides

1 *Thoughts on Textual Criticism*, p. 2.  
the textual authorities is free from difficulty. 'Syrian,' besides its inconvenient resemblance to 'Syriac,' localizes unduly and not quite accurately a form of text, which, it is generally agreed, was of universal acceptance after the fourth century. 'Western' is still more misleading, since this type of text is also found in several Syriac authorities, and almost certainly had its origin in the East and not in the West. On the other hand, Mr. Miller's description of it as 'Syro-Low-Latin' is too cumbersome for ordinary use. 'Alexandrian' has always been felt to be a rather vague description, the readings so classified being difficult either to define or to identify. Indeed there is much force in Dr. Salmon's argument that the attestation of Hort's 'Neutral' readings is very largely Alexandrian, and that the readings which he denominates as 'Alexandrian' are 'those readings which are Alexandrian in their origin and are not recognized by Codex B.'1 Finally, Dr. Salmon objects to the term 'Neutral' as question-begging, and proposes to substitute 'early Alexandrian' for it, as sufficiently denoting the ascertained character of that class of text, without begging the question as to whether the text current in Alexandria in the second or third century was or was not a very close approximation to that of the autographs of the New Testament Scriptures.

On this point of nomenclature it is easier to assent to Dr. Salmon's criticisms than to devise any satisfactory alternatives; and it may further be felt that the point is not one of fundamental importance. When a terminology such as this is new, the several descriptions no doubt carry with them some external associations, and tend to characterize, as well as merely to label, the several classes of text; but the more they are used, the more they become mere labels, and the less are they felt as descriptions of character. It may be doubted whether the textual student is now either misled or embarrassed by the use of this terminology. He is quite aware that the term 'Syrian' denotes the text generally current since the fourth century, and that 'Western' texts are not confined to Western lands and languages. The terms have become tickets, and have ceased to mislead, if ever they have done so.

There is more substance and importance in Dr. Salmon's argument as to the Alexandrian character of Hort's 'Neutral' text; and his conclusion may be best set forth in his own words:

1 *Thoughts on Textual Criticism*, p. 51.
'I do not think I underrate the immense service which WH. have rendered to Biblical criticism, if I express my opinion that what they have restored is not the text of the original evangelic autographs, but the text of a MS. which came very early to Alexandria—probably in the third century and possibly before the end of the second.'

Of course this conclusion still leaves unsolved the problem of the character of this supposed archetypal manuscript; but it may be taken in connexion with the suggestion thrown out elsewhere by Dr. Salmon, that the Alexandrian and the Roman textual traditions were different from the first, and that it is unnatural to suppose that, where they differed, the Alexandrian school was always right and the Roman wrong. It must be remembered, however, that we have comparatively little evidence as to the nature of the Roman tradition. Dr. Salmon seems to identify it with the 'Western' text; but although one of the main homes of the Western text is to be found in the Old Latin version, it is also true that this version does not seem to have had its origin in Rome, and that the common ancestor of the Old Latin and Old (or Curetonian) Syriac must apparently be sought rather in Asia than in Europe. We have no early manuscripts which can be shown, or are even suspected, to have been written at Rome (since the evidence which connects B with Caesarea is too strong to be resisted), and we have no Roman Fathers who occupy at all the position with regard to the textual tradition at Rome that Origen holds with regard to Alexandria. Further, there seems to be reason to believe that Christianity had a far greater command of literary resources and textual scholarship at Alexandria than at Rome. Apart from the fact that for Greek literature generally the authority of Alexandria would stand higher than that of Rome, it is clear that the Christian Scriptures had a better chance of arousing literary interest and attention in Alexandria, with its active school of Jewish religious thought and literature, than at Rome, to which Christianity came as a faith and a life, not as a literature or a philosophy.

There would therefore seem to be substantial grounds for looking to Alexandria as the place in which a good textual tradition would be most likely to be preserved, and for giving, consequently, a general preference to the authorities which appear to embody that tradition. But they do not deprive Dr. Salmon's suggestion of all weight; on the contrary, we regard that suggestion as embodying the real problem with

1 *Thoughts on Textual Criticism*, p. 52.
which textual critics are now confronted. This is, in the fewest possible words, what is the weight to be attached to Western readings? It is in the Western text that the centre of interest is, at the present time, to be found. It is a problem of great complexity, and at the same time of great interest. There is a type of text characterised by the extent and boldness of its departures from all other types. It is found in several forms—in the Greek text of D, in the old Latin manuscripts (and with many variations among themselves), in the Curetonian Syriac, in the Lewis Syriac (so near akin to and yet so different from the Curetonian), in various Syriac Fathers, in Tatian’s Diatessaron, and, to some extent, in the Armenian version. Further, it is plainly of very early origin, traceable back to the second, possibly even to the first century. What, then, is to be said of this text, and what weight is to be attached to its evidence? Or, as preliminary questions, on the answers to which our conclusions on the main issue must depend, where and how did this type of text come into existence?

It is manifestly impossible to examine such a problem exhaustively within the limits of a Review article; and indeed the problem is one which cannot yet be fully solved. Much research is still needed before an answer can be given; and it is satisfactory to know that it is engaging the attention of several scholars, who show their respect for Dr. Hort’s teaching by carrying out the investigations for which he laid down the lines. Something may be learnt from a consideration of the conditions under which copies of the Scriptures circulated during the first ages of the Church, when systematic copying by trained scribes can have been possible only in a few centres, such as Alexandria or Ephesus, while elsewhere private copies, written (like many of the Greek papyri recently discovered in Egypt) in non-literary style, passed from hand to hand, and from church to church, among the less cultivated communities of Syria and Asia Minor. In copies such as these, unauthorized additions are very intelligible, and still more so are the transpositions and interchanging of words which characterize Western manuscripts. If it is difficult to understand how aiwójντες came to be substituted for εὐλογούντες in St. Luke xxiv. 53,1 is it not equally difficult to understand how ἀνδραπατοδόθη came to be substituted for εὐήθη (or vice versa) in the Phaedo of Plato (68 Ε), or

1 Salmon, p. 70; Mr. Miller, in his essay on ‘Conflation’ (p. 278), misses this point, and simply asserts his preference for the traditional reading, aiwójντες καὶ εὐλογούντες.
Another explanation is put forward by Dr. Salmon, namely the possible existence of more than one version proceeding from the original author, or of oral additions or elucidations by the author to the original narrative. The hypothesis of a second edition from the author's own pen was suggested, in the case of the two books of St. Luke, by Bishop Lightfoot, and has recently been elaborated and brought formally within the range of criticism by Professor Blass. Dr. Salmon extends this hypothesis by the suggestion that St. Luke 'may have continued to reside at Rome after the expiration of Paul's two years, and may there have given readings of his work; and that explanatory statements which he then made were preserved in the West.' Similarly with regard to the other books of the New Testament, 'the first publication of the Gospel story was oral and official;' and where the story was told *viva voce*, verbal alterations may easily have been introduced, and so have found their way into the written copies. No doubt, if the problem were merely a literary one, this would tend to discredit the Roman evidence as compared with the Alexandrian, where the traditions of literary scholarship were more scientific; but if we wish to know what the apostles and evangelists recorded of our Lord's life and teaching upon earth, we cannot altogether discard the additions and glosses of the Western text. At the same time it may be right to adopt the stricter literary tradition as our standard, and to relegate such additions and glosses to a lower place; especially as it is quite impossible to determine whether, in each individual case, they proceed from an apostle or evangelist, or from some teacher of less authority.

These speculations concerning the origin of the Western variations appear to us the most important part of Dr. Salmon's work, because, as we have said before, the explanation of the character and origin of the Western text is now the special problem to be investigated by textual critics. There remain two other topics in this suggestive little book to which we should like to call attention. The first of these relates to the origin of the 'Syrian' or 'traditional' text. It is well known that Hort referred it to a deliberate revision at a definite time, or rather at two definite times, since he held that there must have been an earlier and a later revision, the corresponding revision of the Syriac text, to which he referred the origin of

1 Salmon, p. 140.
the Peshitto, having taken place between the two. It has from the first been felt to be a difficulty in the way of this hypothesis that no reference has survived in Christian literature to either of these revisions. We know the names of revisers of the Septuagint and of the Latin versions; but we have no mention of the more important undertaking with regard to the Greek New Testament. Hence it has been held more probable that the process of revision was gradual and informal, the result of a school of criticism with a general tendency in one direction rather than of a formal revision by one or more definitely appointed revisers. Dr. Salmon's explanation comes to much the same as this. In each Church, on his view, the bishop had complete authority over the text of the Scriptures read in that Church; and verbal alterations, especially if, as is the case with the 'Syrian revision,' they tended in the direction of clearness and fullness, would be likely to be accepted by the congregation without remark. Hence, in a great see like that of Antioch, a bishop with a turn for textual criticism, such as Origen or Eusebius would have been, or such as our own Archbishop Parker, might go far in the way of introducing a 'Revised Version' of the Scriptures. As Dr. Salmon points out, we have a proved instance of the introduction of such changes, on an even larger scale, in the substitution of the version of Theodotion for that of the Seventy in the Book of Daniel as read in the churches, though we know neither when nor how this change was brought about. This hypothesis stands halfway between the formal and official revision supposed by Hort and the silent and multitudinous process of change which has been preferred by others; but it is manifest that it fits in easily with the latter view, being in fact only an intensified expression of the tendency therein supposed.

The remaining subject to which we desire to call attention is the bearing of the synoptic problem on textual questions in the first three Gospels. In Westcott and Hort this is only taken into consideration so far as it explains certain corruptions due to what Dean Burgon calls harmonistic influences. If one Gospel contains a certain phrase, while in the corresponding place in another Gospel the authorities are divided between that phrase and a different one, it is held that there is an \textit{a priori} probability that the latter reading is correct, and that it has been altered in some manuscripts so as to correspond with the version in the other Gospel. But, as Dr. Salmon points out, the justice of this argument depends on the view we take as to the origin of the common matter in
the Synoptists. If the three Evangelists were wholly independent authors, then, no doubt, complete identity of phrase would arouse suspicion; but if, on the other hand, they were drawing from a common source, identity is natural, and divergence is a ground for suspecting corruption. The question then arises, How are we to account for the existence of variations in some authorities, which, moreover, are generally very early authorities, such as B & D and their associates? On this Dr. Salmon's suggestion is that in the earliest times the Synoptic Gospels probably circulated separately. Few persons and few churches would possess all three, and for the most part each would be attached, so to speak, to a different district. Hence it is quite possible, and even natural, that divergences would be introduced during this period of separate circulation, which lies behind the earliest date to which our textual evidence can be supposed to carry us. On this hypothesis, although B and its associates preserve for us very early readings in the class of passages under consideration, they are in fact very early errors, which the 'Syrian revisers' rightly expelled from the text edited by them. This, it need hardly be remarked, is a point of view which is practically identical with that of Dean Burgon and Mr. Miller, except that they appear to assign the 'corruptions' of B to a later date and to semi-Arian influences.

The conclusion to which Dr. Salmon's argument would seem to lead will be, then, to the following effect. If, as is now generally held, there is a common document (and not merely oral tradition) underlying the three Synoptic Gospels, then, wherever the Evangelists differ in their representation of a passage derived from that document, we have to consider (1) what, on their joint evidence, was the form of words in the common original? (2) Is the variation which we find in our authorities more likely to have been introduced by the Evangelist himself or by a later copyist? The second question may be differently answered in different cases; but it is right that it should be clearly put and fairly considered.

We do not profess to have exhausted the topics included in Dr. Salmon's book; but we hope that enough has been said to show its character and its interest. Its special value lies in its suggestiveness. While claiming to be no more than the tentative suggestions of a Biblical student who has taken no special part in textual research, it does in fact set forth, temperately and sensibly, the acute criticisms of a trained intellect; and it will have a greater effect because it does not claim too much. Dr. Salmon fully recognizes a fact which
the avowed antagonists of Westcott and Hort often forget, that Hort's *Introduction* is nothing more than a summary of conclusions, with brief extracts of the evidence on which they were founded. In this respect it corresponds closely with Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and, like it, has consequently been charged with arriving at conclusions on insufficient evidence. Hort, like Darwin, devoted immense pains to the accumulation of minute particulars, and no critic or opponent can do him justice who does not recognize, not only in word but in practice, that, whether his conclusions be right or wrong, they were neither rashly formed nor hastily put forward. To assail his theory as a whole requires, in the first place, a detailed and sympathetic study of it; and that is what Dean Burgon was constitutionally incapable of giving to it. A display of prejudice, the suspicion that an opponent's arguments are not fairly treated, inevitably deprives a criticism of half its effect. If Hort's theory is to be shaken, it is far more likely to be brought about by criticisms in the manner of Dr. Salmon, which, while showing the fullest respect to Hort's care, learning, and diligence, and recognizing that his evidence has not yet been fully placed before the world, yet suggest considerations which may, if followed up, go far towards modifying some of his extreme conclusions.

It has been announced that a selection of the papers left behind him by Dr. Hort is being prepared for publication, and it may be that some of the criticisms, whether of Dr. Salmon or Dean Burgon or Mr. Miller, will there be found to be fully answered. It would not be wise, however, to base great expectations on this announcement. As the case of Dean Burgon shows, it is very difficult to build up the scattered papers of a dead scholar into a satisfactory representation of his views. The very respect which the editor feels for his author must deter him from handling the material with the freedom which the author himself would have used. Much, too, may have been in the master's mind which was not in his

1 An instance of this may be seen in Mr. Miller's appendix on 'Conflation,' where he begins an examination of the eight examples offered by Hort in his *Introduction* by asking the reader to 'remark that eight is a round [] and divisible number. Did the author decide upon it with a view of presenting two specimens from each Gospel?' He then proceeds to suggest that, as the examples are all taken from St. Mark and St. Luke, Hort evidently failed to find suitable examples in the other Evangelists. This is merely setting up a dummy in order to knock it down again, and prepares the reader unfavourably for the consideration of the rest of a paper on a very proper and legitimate subject of criticism. We only call attention to this point because we think that Mr. Miller, quite unconsciously, does himself an injustice by methods such as these.
note-books, and which the pupil cannot fully supply; and it is very seldom that one man can state another man's views, as gathered from his scattered papers, as effectively as the original author could have done himself. These considerations forbid us to hope that the work, even of the competent editors whom Cambridge can provide, will fully make good the loss of Dr. Hort himself. The best results will rather be obtained by working on the lines which Dr. Hort laid down, and in the spirit of fearless and independent research, of which he set so striking an example. If his foundations were good, they will bear the superstructure which his disciples place upon it; but if they are unsound, we may be sure that, in an age of eager criticism like the present, its weakness will not fail to be discovered, and that speedily.

ART. XII.—MASPERO'S 'MÉLÉES DES PEUPLES' AND THE S.P.C.K.


The first volume of Professor Maspero's great work on the history of the early Eastern nations was so warmly received in England on its appearance in 1894 that it is not too much to say that the second was even eagerly looked for. It will not disappoint its readers, though to many it cannot be quite so interesting as Les Origines. In this latter volume the author had confined himself chiefly to the history and archaeology of Egypt and Chaldæa, and dealt with them in the most able and masterly manner. The Premières Mêlées des Peuples naturally, as its title shows, has for its scope a far wider field, and needs must embrace not only the histories of Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria, but those of the Israelites, the early Canaanitish tribes, and the Phœnicians, &c. It is a stupendous task that Professor Maspero has set himself, and one which few but he would have dared to undertake; for, besides the vast stores of learning necessary for such a work, it requires untold patience to search out and sift evidences, a clear brain to arrange them in order when found,
a complete grasp of this wide subject, and an immense capacity for being able 'to do drudgery' in the shape of details. That the learned author is possessed of all these qualifications we have abundant evidence throughout the book. His statements, when not made from his own personal knowledge, are generally supported and verified by references to the writings of the best authorities. This is invaluable to the student; but, on looking carefully through the footnotes, it is difficult to determine what is his principle of selection. Some of the references are to works now a little out of date, and some authors are even conspicuous by their absence.

In substance Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples is historical and critical rather than archaeological, although in Chapter V. we have a most lucid and fascinating account of some of the celebrated Egyptian temples, with critical remarks upon their decoration, an account of Egyptian society and art under the Ramessides, and a very charming selection from their love-songs, maxims, and moral dialogues.

Professor Maspero brings down Les Origines to Dynasty XIV. of the Egyptian Empire, a date for which he does not even suggest; for the student or for those well up in Egyptian history this, perhaps, does not signify much, but to the general reader the '14th Dynasty' would probably only produce a vague and unsatisfactory sensation. Professor Petrie, who has devoted much time and care to the question of Egyptian dates, places the XIV. Dynasty about B.C. 2112–1928.1 By this time there was a general feeling of stir and unrest among the peoples, notably among the tribes in Syria and Chaldaea; a desire for the acquisition of territory and power was manifesting itself strongly, and some of the foreigners were already endeavouring to force their way into the fertile lands of the Delta. The scenes which year after year appear to have taken place in the plains or among the mountains of Syria remind one forcibly of what has for long gone on among the peoples of the Balkan States.

Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples opens with a vivid description of the country lying between the Orontes on the north and El Arish on the south, and, as Maspero truly points out, from the very conformation of the land it never could—unless under the sway of some dominant power—be other than a perpetual battle-ground.

1 Sa position fait d'elle en effet comme un carrefour, où la plupart

1 History of Egypt, by Petrie, p. 227.
des races militaires de l'ancien monde finirent par arriver tôt ou tard et par de choquer violemment. Resserrée entre la mer et le désert, elle offre la seule route de trajet facile qui mène les armées d'Afrique en Asie, et tous les conquérants que les richesses accumulées aux rives de l'Euphrate ou du Nil ont attirés en Mésopotamie ou en Égypte, ont dû lui passer brutalement sur le corps, avant d'atteindre l'objet de leurs convoités. Elle aurait échappé peut-être à cette fatalité du site, si le relief et l'agencement des terres dont elle se compose lui avaient permis de grouper ses nations en faisceau, et d'opposer leur masse compacte au flux des envahisseurs, mais l'ossature des montagnes sur laquelle elle s'appuie la morcelle en bassins isolés, où ses habitants s'enferment et végètent dans l'hostilité les uns des autres (p. 4).

An admirable description is given of the physical features of Syria, and the illustrations made from photographs taken in the country render it even more lucid than it already is.

Who peopled this wild land in the third millennium before our era, and what relics have they left us to tell of themselves and their history? These are questions well-nigh impossible to answer with anything like accuracy. Excavations prove the existence of peoples who were at any rate partly civilised, and place-names that have found their way into Egyptian, Babylonian, and Hebrew writings betray in many cases a Semitic origin. Maspero is of opinion that, roughly speaking, the northern part was peopled by tribes who had wandered into the country from beyond the Taurus Mountains, while the centre and south were colonised by Semites. The foreign visitors who in the XII. Dynasty (circa B.C. 2778-2565) brought their offering of mes'tem, or eye-paint, to the great feudal lord, Khnem-hetep, at Beni Hasan, have distinctly the Asiatic type of face, and their leader, Absha, has a Semitic name. This expedition was clearly a pacific and possibly a commercial one; but we find a little later on the Pharaohs alluding to the 'princes of the desert' with ire, and when their insolence could no longer be tolerated, expeditions were sent from Egypt against them. The wild Syrian country, alternately subject to storms and droughts, was one in which we know scarcity was often prevalent, and what could be more tempting to the wild nomadic tribes of the south than a raid down into the fertile country of the Delta? On the northern side the people

1 Petrie's dates are given throughout, except when otherwise specified.
appear to have had dealings with the Babylonians, who received materials from the Amanos; possibly even some of their cedarwood from Lebanon. In reconstructing Babylonian history we feel that Maspero is not on his own ground, and we wish that he could have seen his way to associate with himself for this portion of his book one of his learned Assyriological colleagues. Some of the finest scholars on that subject are to be found in Paris. The statements concerning the kings mentioned between pp. 29-39 are by some considered open to question, and attention was drawn to that fact in the Athenæum of April 24, p. 535. The learned writer therein calls attention to the fact that Maspero has quietly adopted a view of Professor Sayce's which demonstrably cannot be maintained. Apparently Sayce and Schrader have, without themselves examining a certain Babylonian tablet, given it as their opinion that the identification of a name (broken) with that of Eri-aku or Rimsin, made by Pinches, is correct; while

'The greatest living authority on Babylonian tablets holds the opinion that the two fragments formed part of tablets of an astrological nature wherein matters of various kinds were mentioned, from the price of garden stuff upwards; in any case they have no historical value, for they belong to so late a period that they might well have been written by scribes who were conversant with the Hebrew narrative of Genesis as possessed by the Jews in Babylon about B.C. 300.'

This much is, however, quite certain, that Kudur-lagamar (Chedorlaomer) and his allies sallied forth to quell the rebellion of the cities by the Dead Sea, and were victorious. This is the beginning of the struggle to found an Elamite dynasty.

From the battle of the four kings with five, Maspero turns directly to discuss that much- vexed question of the Hyksös invasion. That about B.C. 2098 a wild horde of invaders from Asia poured down into the Delta and there settled themselves is undoubted, but who they actually were is still more or less wrapped in mystery. Lepsius and Maspero think the Hyksös were Canaanites; Meyer and Steindorff, that they were of Phœnician origin; Winckler, that they were Elamites; and Mariette came round to the view that they were of Mongol origin. Professor Flower, in England, and Dr. Virchow, in Germany, relying upon the statement made by certain eminent archaeologists that the heads found at Damanhûr, and the curious figures of the fish-carriers now in the Gizeh Museum, and also the granite head now in the British Museum,
were Hyksōs, have pronounced the type to be Mongolian.

'In spite of the facts we possess, the problem therefore still remains unsolved and the origin of the Hyksōs is still as mysterious as ever' (p. 56). Professor Naville offers yet another suggestion as to the origin of the invaders and directly couples their incursions with the Elamite rising.¹ After pointing out the strongly Turanian type of face as shown particularly by the heads found at Bubastis, he goes on to say that—

'The presence of a Turanian race in Mesopotamia at a remote epoch is no more questioned by most Assyriologists. It does not mean that the whole bulk of the invaders, the entire population which settled in Egypt, were of Turanian origin. It would be contrary to well-established historical facts. It is certain that all that remained in Egypt of the Hyksōs, in the language, in the worship, in the name of Aamu, by which they were called, everything points to a decidedly Semitic influence. But the kings may very well not have been Semites. How often do we see in Eastern monarchies and even in European states a difference of origin between the ruling class, to which the royal family belongs, and the mass of the people? We need not leave Western Asia and Egypt; we find there Turks ruling over nations to the race of which they do not belong, although they have adopted their religion. In the same way as the Turks of Bagdad, who are Finns, now reign over Semites, Turanian kings may have led into Egypt and governed a population of mixed origin where the Semitic element was prevalent. If we consider the mixing up of races which took place in Mesopotamia in remote ages, the invasions which the country had to suffer, the repeated conflicts of which it was the theatre, there is nothing extraordinary that populations coming out of this land should have presented a variety of races and origins. Therefore I believe that, though we cannot derive a direct evidence from ethnological considerations, they do not oppose the opinion stated above, that the starting point of the invasion of the Hyksōs must be looked for in Mesopotamia, and that the conquest of Egypt by the Shepherds was the consequence of the inroads of the Elamites into the valley of the Tigris and Euphrates.'²

The arrival of these hordes in the Delta was ushered in—so says Manetho, writing in the days of the Ptolemies—with cruelty and excesses of all kinds;³ but as Maspero points out, 'the brutalities attending the invasion once past, the invaders soon lost their barbarity and became rapidly civilised' (p. 57).

¹ Bubastis, p. 18.
² ibid. p. 28, by Ed. Naville.
grands et petits : le protocole des Amenemhait et des Ousirtasen, adapté à ces Princes des terres étrangères, fit d’eux les descendants d’Horus et les fils légitimes du Soleil. Ils respectèrent les religions locales, ils favorisèrent même ceux des dieux dont les attributs leur paraurent s’approcher le plus à ceux de leur divinités barbares. Le plus haut des êtres qu’ils adoraient, le Baal, le seigneur de tous, était un soldat violent et farouche ; il ressemblait si fort au Sit ennemi et frère d’Osiris, qu’on le confondit avec celui-ci, mais en ajoutant au nom une terminaison emphatique, Soutkhou, le grand Sit’ (p. 58).

Petrie suggests that the Hyksôs ‘became more civilized probably by the culture inherited from the Egyptian mothers of the second and third generation.’

It was towards the close of the Hyksôs occupation that the Beni Israel, or Sons of Israel, seem to have made their way into Egypt. Tradition says it was during the reign of Apepi, one of the last of the foreign kings. We could have wished that Professor Maspero had entered more fully into the details of Joseph’s life at the court of Pharaoh and into the Israelite history generally during the period of the 430 years’ sojourn in Egypt. He sums it up very tersely and graphically thus :

‘Le pays de Goshen s’intercalait entre Héliopolis au sud, Bubastis à l’ouest, Tanis et Mendès au nord ; les troupes enfermées dans Avaris pouvaient le surveiller aisément et y maintenir l’ordre, tout en défendant contre les incursions des Monâtiou et des Hîrou-Shâittou. Les Bné-Israel prospérèrent dans ces parages si bien adaptés à leur goûts traditionnels : s’ils n’y devinrent pas le grand peuple qu’on imagina par la suite, ils n’y subirent pas le sort de tant de tribus étrangères, qui, transplantées en Egypte, s’y étioient et s’éteignaient, ou se fondent dans la masse des indigènes au bout de deux ou trois générations. Ils continuèrent leur métier de bergers, presque en vue des riches cités du Nil, et ils n’abandonnèrent point le dieu de leurs pères pour se prosterner devant les triades ou les Ennéades des Egyptiens ; qu’il s’appelât déjà Jahvéh ou qu’il se contentât du nom collectif d’Elohim, ils l’adorèrent sans trop d’infidélités en face de Râ et d’Osiris, de Phtah et de Soutkou’ (p. 72).

It is from the Sallier Papyrus that we read of the struggle which took place between the Hyksôs and the native Egyptians, and which finally resulted in the ejection of the former into Syria. It appears that the whole land lay in the power of the ‘Fever-stricken,’ but that there was no supreme ruler. At Thebes dwelt Seqenen Ra, a native haq or prince, and Apepi was the foreign magnate in the northern city of Avaris. Now Apepi paid homage to the god Sutekh, and

raised a temple in his honour outside the palace gates, and offered sacrifices and garlands of flowers daily. He then bethought him that the people of Thebes should be made to include his god in their cultus, and sent word to them to that effect. This Seqenen Ra declined to do. Maspero thinks that a century and a half elapsed between the commencement of hostilities consequent upon Apepi's imperious message and the final defeat of the Hyksös, when Thothmes I. forced them back into Syria. They were, however, first of all pushed back into the Delta, where Seqenen Ra III., surnamed the Brave, died fighting. The learned author thinks that the prince may have been the victim of some plot (p. 79), but Professor Petrie believes him to have received his death wounds on the battlefield. His wife, Aah-hetep, was the mother of the celebrated black queen, Nefertari, whose worship extended through many generations. The nationality of Queen Nefertari has often been called in question, as her portraits represent her either with a blue or black face, and Wiedemann has suggested that she was the daughter of an Ethiopian king. Maspero, however, strenuously maintains that she was of pure Egyptian race, and explains that the dark hue given her was on account of her being admitted among the funerary goddesses (p. 99). Petrie believes that Nefertari's father was of Berber extraction, and that therefore she may have been 'three-quarters black.' Unsettled times followed the death of Seqenen Ra, until finally the 'Plague' had been ousted, and a race of kings arose who devoted themselves to the aggrandisement of their country. First among these was Thothmes I., whose very interesting coronation letter is preserved to us: the following copy was addressed, as will be seen by the contents, to the governor of Elephantiné. It runs thus:

'This is the royal rescript to announce to you that my Majesty has arisen King of the double Egypt, upon the seat of the Horus of the living—without equal, living for ever, and my titles are as follows:—The vigorous bull Horus, the beloved of Maäêt, the lord of the Vulture, and Ûræus, who raises itself as a flame most valiant—the golden Horus whose years are good and who puts life into all hearts, king of the two Egyptians, Aa-kheper-ka-Ra, son of the sun, Thothmes, living for ever. Cause, therefore, sacrifices to be offered to the gods of the south and of Elephantiné, and hymns to be chanted for the well being of the King Aa-kheper-ka-Ra, living for ever, and cause the oath to be taken in the name of my

1 Petrie, History of Egypt, p. 8.
3 Petrie, History of Egypt, p. 9.
Majesty, born of the royal mother Sen-senb, who is in good health. This is sent to thee that thou mayest know that the royal house is prosperous and in good health and condition—the 1st year, the 21st day of the 3rd month Phamenoth, the day of coronation.¹

At this point in the Egyptian history Professor Maspero breaks off to review rapidly but clearly the rise of the Cossœans, and to describe most graphically the Syrian peoples who were approximately contemporaneous with the Hyksōs in Egypt (pp. 111 et sqq.).

The Kahshu or Cossœans originally had their home in the wild country of Zagros, which borders on Media and Elam. They were, as might be expected, a lawless horde who improved every opportunity that presented itself of suddenly dashing down into the fertile plains of Chaldaea, raiding them and making off with as much plunder as they could lay their hands on. Once in their mountain fastnesses again the frontier garrison preferred not to meddle with them. They were star-worshippers, and but semi-civilized. However, in the eighteenth century B.C. they succeeded in taking Babylon, adopted Bel as their own divinity, and venerated his temple at Ekur. They, in fact, played the same part in the Euphrates valley that the Hyksōs did in the Nile. It is quite clear that they were an undisciplined wild people, quite ready to adore their kings one day and murder them the next.

The inhabitants of Syria appeared to the Egyptians at this time to be divided into four branches, which are not always clearly defined from a geographical point of view. They were the Kheftiu, the Zahi, the Lotanu and the Kharū. Roughly speaking, the Kheftiu were the Phœnicians, and the dwellers on the sea coast, the Zahi, occupied that wide border of Syria joining on to Egypt; the Kharū lay to the south-east of this, and included part of Mount Seir, and the Lotanu dwelt among the hills which divide the Shephelah from the Jordan (p. 121). We know the look of many of these people from the vivid drawings on tomb and temple walls in Egypt, where their racial characteristics are strongly insisted upon by the artist. The series of racial types published by Professor Petrie is invaluable to the student of ethnology, as it contains photographs of every type and race sculptured by Egyptian artists. These people are all alluded to shortly by Maspero, and it is quite evident from his method of dealing with them in this work that his object is not so much to give their history as to let his readers understand who they are, and to

¹ Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache, xxix. 117.
enable them to realize their exact position in the ancient world. After all, at this date the only nation which had a history of sufficient interest to be minutely recorded was the then great world-empire of Egypt, and it is only in so far as these people are referred to by, or as they affect, the history of Egypt that Maspero writes of them. For years after the rise of the Thothmes, in fact all through the XVIII. and XIX. Dynasties, Egypt was warring with Syria and her various tribes and with the great Hittite kingdom; so that this chapter on the Syrian and Phœnician peoples is invaluable.

One very interesting archaeological statement Maspero makes, and that is that Medinet Habû was a Migdol (p. 129). Now that marvellous building of Ramses III. has been for long a great puzzle to archaeologists; some have contended that it was merely a temple, and others have seen in it a fortification added to the already existing temple of Thothmes III. Some have even thought it a palace. Maspero sees in it a copy of a Canaanitish watch-tower. These towers appear to have been erected in villages, at the bends of roads, by ravines, and by fords: if possible, they were generally perched up on the spur of a hill. They were surrounded by double-enclosing walls, and guarded by massive gates; and an attack on a large Canaanite Migdol was a serious undertaking, even for the well-disciplined troops of the Pharaoh.

"Ces boulevards de la civilisation cananéenne, qu'elle avait accumulés par centaines sur le chemin des envahisseurs, nous n'en apercevons plus la trace aujourd'hui, soit qu'ils aient été tous rasés en entier pendant l'une des révolutions qui ont si souvent bouleversé la face du pays, soit qu'ils dissimulent leur débris sous les ruines amoncelées comme à plaisir depuis plus de trente siècles. Les tableaux de victoire gravés sur les parois des temples thébains nous rendent, il est vrai, plusieurs traits de leur physionomie générale, mais l'idée que nous pourrions nous créer d'eux d'après ces reproductions serait des plus confuses, si l'un des derniers parmi les Pharaons conquérants, Ramses III, ne s'était avisé d'en construire un à Thèbes même, afin d'y enfermer sa chapelle funéraire et d'y loger le peuple des serviteurs attaché à son culte. Une partie en a été renversée aux siècles grecs et romains, mais l'avant-mur subsiste encore du côté de la plaine, ainsi que la porte, battue sur la droite par une saillie de l'enceinte, et flanquée de deux corps de gardes rectangulaires dont les terrasses dominent la cour d'un mètre environ. Dès qu'on la franchie, on se trouve en face d'un migdol en maçonnerie, presque carré, avec ses deux ailes, avec ses parois trouées de lucarnes, avec sa cour qui va se rétrécissant par ressauts, et l'examen des lieux nous révèle plus d'un arrangement que la médiocre perspective des Egyptiens nous empêchait de soupçonner. Nous
apprenons ainsi que le gros œuvre se dressait sur un soubassement en talus qui mesure cinq mètres à peu près. Il servait à deux fins : d'abord il augmentait la résistance contre la sape, ensuite les projectiles que les assiégés lançaient du chemin de ronde, ricochant avec violence sur l'inclinaison du plan, tenaient l'ennemi à distance. Le tout a fière mine, et s'il faut admettre que les architectes royaux chargés de satisfaire cette fantaisie souveraine y ont apporté un souci du détail inconnu aux peuples dont ils copiaient l'œuvre, ils ont imité les dispositions de l'ensemble assez fidèlement pour que nous concevions bonne opinion du modèle. Transportez ce Migdol de Ramses III en Asie, sur l'un de ces mamelons où les Cananéens avaient accoutumé de jucher les leurs, répandez à ses pieds quelques vingtaines de cabanes basses et sales, et la silhouette de ce village improvisé rappellera de façon étrange celle de Zérin, de Béitín, ou de telle autre bourgade moderne qui rallie ses maisons de fellahs autour d'une grande fabrique en pierre massive, hôtellerie pour les voyageurs attardés ou château du temps des Croisades’ (p. 129).

Professor Maspero, in this second chapter, gives a first-rate résumé of the salient features of the local cults prevalent in Syria, with the names and functions of the chief gods and goddesses (pp. 154 et seq.). Their religious rites and their atrocious sacrifices form a strange contrast to what is known of the Egyptian religion and forms of worship. This part of the chapter is particularly interesting as throwing some strong side lights upon incidents that are mentioned in the Old Testament, such as the sacrifice of Mesha’s firstborn son upon the city wall (2 Kings iii. 27), the mourning of the Jewish women for Tammuz (Ezekiel viii. 14–16), and the cutting of their flesh by the prophets of Baal (1 Kings xviii. 28), &c.

The Phœnicians do not commend themselves to our notice, and there is every reason to accept Maspero’s account of them as impartial and unprejudiced. They were ever liars and pirates, whatever good qualities they may have added on to these traits; and the incidents told of them by the classic writers do not tend to raise them in our estimation :—

‘Etaient-ils plus marchands que pirates ou plus pirates que marchands ? Ils n’en savaient trop rien eux-mêmes, et leur conduite vis-à-vis des bateaux qu’ils rencontraient en mer ou des tribus qu’ils fréquentaient se réglait sur les circonstances du moment. Lorsqu’en abordant ils ne se sentaient point les plus forts, le marchand prévalait aussitôt et il imposait silence aux instincts du pirate. Ils débarquaient paisiblement, se conciliaient par de petits présents la bienveillance du chef et des nobles, puis ils étalaient leurs pacotilles, et ils se contentaient, au pis-aller, du gain légitime que l’échange leur procuraient. Ils n’étaient jamais pressés, séjournaient dans un endroit aussi longtemps qu’ils pensaient ne pas en avoir épuisé les
ressources, s'entendaient merveilleusement à acharner la denrée qu'ils déballaient. Ils avaient des armes d'usage ou d'apparat pour les hommes, des haches, des glaives, des poignards damasquinés ou ciselés à poignée d'or ou d'ivoire, des bracelets, des colliers, des amulettes de toute sorte, des vases émaillés, des verroteries, des étoffes teintes en pourpre ou brodées de couleurs criardes. Quelques fois les indigènes, surexcités à la vue de ces belles choses, essayaient de s'en emparer par ruse ou par violence : ils assassinaient les hommes descendus à terre ou surprenaient l'équipage pendant la nuit. Le plus souvent c'étaient les Phéniciens qui abusaient de la bonne foi ou de la faiblesse de leurs hôtes : ils fondaient en traîtres sur la foule désarmée au moment où le trafic battait son plein, ils dépouillaient et tuaient les vieillards, ils enchaînaient les jeunes gens, les femmes, les enfants, puis ils les emmenaient vendre en esclavage, sur les marchés où le bétail humain était taxé au plus haut prix. C'était un métier comme un autre, mais qui les exposait au danger de représailles et qui soulevait contre eux des haines féroces' (p. 195).

Having given us some insight into the characters and social ways of Egypt's neighbours, Maspero returns once more to his favourite theme, and in the third chapter we follow the fortunes of the XVIII. Dynasty, one of the most fascinating periods of history, containing the life and works of the great Queen Hatshepsut and her warrior nephew, Thothmes III., the Alexander of Egyptian history, and the attempted reformation of religion and art under Amenhetep IV., otherwise called Khu-n-aten. Thothmes I. at his death left but one son—Thothmes II., who succeeded him. This prince's mother, Mût-nefert, although distantly related to the king her husband, was not sufficiently distinguished by pedigree to admit of her son being declared heir-apparent; the throne would therefore have descended to Hatshepsut, the king's daughter by Aahmes, who was of the direct royal line, and who was, moreover, older than her half-brother. To obviate this the king, shortly before his death, married Thothmes II. to his half-sister Hatshepsut, thereby securing to him the succession. He appears to have lived but a short time, and from the examination of his mummy—now in the Museum at Gizeh—it is certain that he suffered from bad health.

Hatshepsut is one of the most interesting figures in ancient history. Clear-sighted, clever, and very determined, she appears to have brought the country to a condition of prosperity unequalled by any other monarch. Having reduced the Syrian tribes to submission, she turned her attention to the arts of peace and, aided by her chief architect Sen-mût, beautified Thebes with that magnificent and unique
temple of Dér-el-Bahari, which Professor Naville, on behalf of the Egypt Exploration Fund, has so carefully excavated during the past three years. On the walls of it are recorded most graphically, in a series of pictures with accompanying hieroglyphs, the story of the expedition to the Land of Punt for the purpose of bringing back the incense trees to plant in the garden of Amen Ra, at Thebes. Perhaps the treaty made between the Prince of Punt and the ambassadors of the great queen was the earliest pacific treaty of commerce made between Egypt and the outside world. Certain, we believe, it is, that the transplanting of those incense trees is the earliest recorded occasion of an attempt to acclimatise plants in the country, an attempt which, judging from the charming representations of Thothmes III.'s garden on the walls of the temple of Karnak, must have been thoroughly successful. It is to this queen also that the temple of Amen was indebted for the red granite obelisks, raised that 'my name may remain and live in this temple forever.' They were quarried each of them in one single block in the mountain side at Aswán, under the direction of Sen-mût; and in seven months' time these great monoliths were polished, inscribed, and stood upright in their places. One only is now erect, and quite dwarfs its neighbour raised by Thothmes III.; the other lies fallen, broken in two. After a time Hatshepsut seems to have expended some of her energies in bringing the Delta, a somewhat neglected part of her kingdom, into order; and the canals were cleared out and the roads improved.

At the death of the queen, her nephew Thothmes III. came into possession of a country whose resources had been husbanded, and which had been saved from the strain and expenditure of war. Hatshepsut was a quiet, peace-loving woman; her successor was essentially a restless warrior, and from his reign dates the line of kings whose one and only idea was the extension of Egyptian territory at the expense of the very life of the country. Superficially the empire of Egypt was at its zenith under the reigns of the Thothmes and the Ramessides of the XIX. Dynasty; but to the student of history there were already visible the signs of decay. Although it was the proud boast of Thothmes III. that he 'placed his boundaries where he willed,' and Ramses II. vaingloriously declared, 'I repulsed millions of people by myself alone,' we know that when the troops of Egypt found themselves face to face with the Hittite warriors the victory was not decisive, and after fifteen campaigns a treaty
of peace was signed, which was ratified by the marriage of the Hittite princess to Ramses II.

In drawing to a close the history of the Theban Empire, and the rise of the priestly power in Egypt, Professor Maspero, in the fifth chapter, turns aside to give a learned analysis of the social life of the people at this period. At page 159 we learn that in the land of Kamit of old the life of the sovereign was not any safer than it is in the Effendina’s to-day. Ramses III. nearly fell a victim to a harim conspiracy, conceived upon a large scale, in which many of the court officials were implicated. Its discovery led to the execution of forty men and six women; while Pentaur, who seems to have really been the instigator, was made, as a supreme punishment, ‘to die of himself.’ Sir Peter Le Page Renouf has given one of the best analyses of this famous trial, which is contained in no less than three papyri, and it was he who first pointed out the force of the peculiar reflective form of the Egyptian verb, and suggested the real meaning of it.

The people of Egypt were as a nation rapidly degenerating at this time, the upper and lower classes alike. The former lived a life of idleness and luxury; while the foreign element, which for two centuries had been assimilated and had steadily increased in strength, was surely making itself felt, and not for the good of the country. The very language even was changing under this influence, and under the Ramessides we notice a large number of Semitic words and affectations both of writing and speech. The religion of the country was becoming seriously affected also, and it is not speaking too strongly when we say that by the end of the XX. Dynasty Egypt was priest-ridden, and steeped in superstition. Magical rites, incantations, and spells had given place to the religious spirit which is so clearly to be observed in the Early and Middle Empire; and the mental and moral and spiritual tone of the nation was feeble. It is at this period that the Egyptian section—which is by far the most interesting and important—of Les Premières Milles des Peuples breaks off, leaving the fall of the Empire to be told in the third and concluding volume of the Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient.

It has been said by some reviewers that the notes in this history seem to be poor in some places when compared with the wealth of them in others. To this criticism M. Maspero has himself given an answer. The notes are added proportionately to the facility of obtaining books upon the
several points. With regard to certain vexed questions of Egyptology, &c., much of the information can only be gained by the laborious search through numbers of pamphlets, proceedings, transactions, &c., stowed away for the most part in the libraries of public societies or learned bodies. In these cases indications are given as to where the information can be obtained; where books upon the subject in question are better known and in more frequent use, they are not suggested.

The *Premières Mêlées des Peuples* is a splendid contribution to the history of antiquity, and invaluable to scholar and student alike. The former will find it replete with information admirably backed up by references to the works of other authors; and the latter will find the story of antiquity told so simply and graphically that perforce he will read it, and may be he will be led to study it.

The point at which the *Church Quarterly Review* must record, regretfully but decidedly, that it dissents from some of the opinions of the learned author, is when he draws certain strongly defined conclusions based upon the shallow speculations of the 'Higher Critics.' The *Church Quarterly Review* has over and over again set forth—and that with no wavering voice—the grounds of that dissent, and want of space alone prevents us from once more setting them forth to our readers. Professor Maspero undoubtedly gives an admirable résumé of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and part of 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles, but some of the conclusions to which he comes are such as this *Review* cannot possibly tolerate.

After entering this caveat we may be permitted to express the surprise with which we heard that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—a Society of reputed orthodoxy—had undertaken the translation of a book which in the first place is scarcely in its 'line,' and in the second could hardly, in the Hebrew section, have been in harmony with that form of sound teaching which it was founded to champion and promulgate. From the advertisements of the S.P.C.K. we are led to expect a translation, and this, if faithfully carried out, must, in parts of one chapter at least, have required the Society to set its *imprimatur* upon opinions which in honesty to its subscribers it not only cannot promulgate, but is bound to combat.

Turning now to the English edition of *Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples*, we are at a loss to know how to deal with
and the S.P.C.K.

it, or from what point of view to regard it. The S.P.C.K. wishes the public to accept it as a translation, but an inaccurate paraphrase, full of blunders made either from haste or from inadequate knowledge of French—in which the author's views are in some places distorted, his notes added to, subtracted from, and, in some cases at least, omitted—would be a better description of it. It is, in fact, full of literary 'sins, negligences, and ignorances.'

Its very title-page is inaccurate. The learned author calls this volume Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples only. The translator omits the Premières altogether, and translates the title The Struggle of the Nations—Egypt, Syria, and Assyria. The book is edited by Sayce, but why it is necessary to have an editorial preface it is hard to say, and certainly the exceedingly feeble production from the pen of the Professor of Assyriology at Oxford will not assist it to find favour with the scientific public. Professor Maspero most wisely has put neither preface nor introduction to his second volume of Ancient History, and indeed it requires neither.

It is impossible to discover what has been the principle adopted; for even allowing every latitude to a translator, the book is full of blunders and inaccuracies. This is surprising to us, as Professor Maspero's French is so exceedingly simple and wonderfully free from technical expressions. It seems to us, also, that the translator's license has been stretched beyond its rightful limits; for on carefully comparing the two volumes throughout, we must confess that it is not a translation, but a very free paraphrase. In many places, also, the point of a word is lost by the failure to represent it by the equivalent English one. In one instance (page 69) a serious blunder has been made, causing Maspero to make a very false historical statement; Professor Sayce here rushes into the fray, and apparently without comparing the English version with the French original, commits himself to a note he never would have added had he done so. The mistake arises solely from the inability of the translator to distinguish between 'construire pour lui' and 'se construire pour lui.'

What is to be thought of blunders such as the following?

On page 10, notes 1 and 2 are misplaced.

On page 18, note 3 states that the earliest cuneiform tablets of Syrian origin are not earlier than the 'XVI siècle,' translated as 'XIV century.'

On page 18, in note 5, after line 3, the following phrase is left out, 'désigne à la fois ouest, puis le vent d'ouest.'
Note 2 of page 28 contains the following interpolated sentence—'whom Mr. Pinches has found in a contract table associated with Pungunila as king.' What right has either translator or editor to add to the author's text without calling attention to the fact?

Page 29, note 2, line 7.—'La glose' is missed out.

Page 45, note 3.—'In the Minæan inscriptions of Southern Arabia the name is found under the form of Ammi-Zadiq,' is not in the original.

Page 15, line 1, 'vers le XVI siècle' is translated as 'about the VI century B.C.' On line 3 'les ports' is left out.

Page 442, line 10, 'une version accessoire du même récit ajoute des détails précis sur leur condition' is rendered, 'Further details on their condition are supplied in the following verses of the Biblical narrative.'

Page 444, note 2, 'reculer' is translated 'assign.'

Page 690, note 2, 'qui est aussi la plus courte' has been missed out of the text.

Page 710, line 5, 'son seigneur dans la paix et dans la guerre' has been translated 'their appointed lord.'

We wonder why a 'héros mythique' should be a 'mythical hero,' while a 'héros solaire' is a 'solar deity,' and we do not consider 'arbitrary' the correct translation of 'spéculatif.' The word 'harim' can have but one rendering; but the translator, in the case of Solomon, prefers to use the Western but incorrect term, 'household.' She also does not seem to perceive the difference between an 'étalon' and a 'haras;' and she has blundered sadly between 'les milices' and 'la milice.' 'Chars' are not 'charioteers,' neither is 'se succéder' to be 'successful;' and we hardly think that a 'moment propice' is of necessity a 'decisive moment,' nor are 'ces femmes' 'these princesses;' and we should not think 'death' the suitable translation of 'suicide,' nor 'according to the treaty' of 'après la tradition.' These probably are all faults of ignorance.

The following parallel passages speak for themselves of the careless method of translation, and are only a few examples among the many of like kind which prevail throughout the book:

'Keturah was not the wife of Abraham.—1 Chron. i. 32.'
'Les rois *Hyksôs* (p. 72, l. 15).

'Les rois et les vicaires de Lagash s'étaient mesurés contre elle avec des chances variées ainsi que ceux d'Oourou et de Larsam.'

'Qu'il s'appelât déjà Jahvéh ou qu'il se contentât du nom collectif d'Elohim, ils l'adorèrent *sans trop d*'*infidélités* en face de Ra,' &c. (p. 72).

'The kings and vicegerents of Lagash had measured force with Anshan as well as with Ur and Larsam.'

'Whether he was already known to them as Jahveh or was worshipped under the collective name of Elohim, they served him *with almost unbroken* fidelity, even in the presence of Ra,' &c.

'The centuries of rule attributed by the chronicles.'

'Semites . . . . pushed forward as far as the east bank of the Tigris.'

'The name has been transcribed Ammiditana.'

'Almost opposite to the stronghold taken from them.'

'Had no words of comfort for the god-forsaken man who had troubled his repose.'

If sins of ignorance and carelessness such as the above were the only ones of which the Reviewer had to complain, it will have been seen that they would in themselves make a formidable array, and condemn the translation as utterly inadequate; but when to these must be added that of altering the author's text, the charge becomes serious. Unfortunately this charge, grave as it is, must be brought against the translator and the Society, at whose instigation possibly the mutilation of the text was made. On certain questions of the textual criticism of the Old Testament Professor Maspero's opinions are altered, toned down to accord with the views of the S.P.C.K., and in many cases so completely twisted round as to be hardly recognisable. We do not hesitate to say that the whole portion of *The Struggle of the Nations* which is concerned with the history of the Hebrews or their writings is absolutely worthless as a translation. It is perverted from beginning to end. We give part of pages 703, 704 as a specimen—and that by no means the worst—of the method employed for adapting Maspero's views to those of the S.P.C.K.

'Un de ses chefs, Samson, 'One of their chiefs, Samson, avait laissé une réputation had a great reputation among
d'audace, et de vigueur extra-
ordinaire, mais le détail de ses
actions véritables avait été oublié
de bonne heure. On ne savait de
lui que les bons tours joués aux
Philistins, et l'on s'égayait volon-
tiers des armes bizarres qu'il avait
employées : n'avait-il pas assommé
mille d'entre eux avec une mâchoire
d'âne ? n'avait-il pas brûlé leurs
récoltes en y lançant trois cents
renards liés et trainant des
torches aux queues ? Une nuit
qu'il avait aventuré dans Gaza
pour y courtiser une hiérodule
on avait renfermé sur lui les portes
et l'on se flattait de le tenir
prisonnier : il démonta les van-
taux, les huisseries, la barre, et
charria le tout sur ses épaules
jusqu'au sommet de la montagne
qui est en face d'Hébron. La
trahison de Dalila le livre enfin
à ses ennemis. On lui crève les
yeux, on le condamne à tourner
la meule dans sa prison, et un
jour de fête, les princes de Gaza
l'amènent au temple où ils ban-
quetaient avec leurs clients :
tandis qu'ils se raillent de lui, il
renverse d'un suprême effort les
deux colonnes entre lesquelles
on l'avait placé et le plafond,
écrasant, écrase du même coup
la multitude assemblée pour rire
de sa honte.1 Les Danites finirent
par se lasser de ces luttes sans
résultat, et ils se résolurent à
chercher des parages défendus
moins opiniâtrement. Ils envoy-
èrent cinq émissaires explorer ce
pays. Ceux-ci en traversant la

1 'Samson a été considéré par
plusieurs savants comme étant un
héros solaire (H. Husson, La
légende de Samson et les Mythes
Solairees, 1869. Steinhal, Zeitschrift
für Völkerpsychologie, tome ii., pp.
110-120, 129-178. Goldziher, Der
Mythos bei den Hebräern, p. 128.)'

them for his bravery and bodily
strength, and we have some details
of his history. The episodes which
have been preserved deal with some
of his exploits against the Philis-
tines, and there is a certain
humour in the chronicler's account
of the weapons which he em-
ployed: "with the jawbone of an
ass have I smitten a thousand
men:" he burned up their harvest
also by letting go three hundred
foxes with torches attached to
their tails among the standing
corn of the Philistines. Various
events in his career are subse-
quently narrated, such as his
adventure in the house of the
harlot at Gaza, when he carried
off the gate of the city and the
gate posts to the top of the
mountain that is before Hebron.
By Delila's treachery he was
finally delivered over to his
enemies, who, having put out his
eyes, condemned him to grind in
the prison-house. On the oc-
casion of a great festival in honour
of Dagon he was brought into
the temple to amuse his captors,
but while they were making
merry at his expense, he took
hold of the two pillars against
which he was resting and " bow-
ing himself with all his might"
overturned them, "and the house
fell upon the lords, and upon all
the people that were therein."1
The tribe of Dan at length be-
came weary of these unprofitable
struggles and determined to seek
out another and more easily

1 'Some learned critics con-
sidered Samson to have been a sort
of solar deity (H. Husson, &c.)'
montagne d’Ephraîm consultèrent un éphod qu’un certain Michée avait consacré sur ses terres : Jâvhîh leur prêdict le succès de leur entreprise, et, de fait, ils découvrirent vers la source du Jourdain une ville de Laîsh, dont les habitants tranquilles et confiants viviaient à la manière des Sidoniens, sans que personne songeât à les inquiéter. Leur rapport décide la tribu à émigrer : les guerriers partent au nombre de six cents, volent au passage l’éphod de Michée et le lévite qui officiait devant lui, surprennent Laîsh et changent son nom en celui de Dan. "Ils y dressèrent pour eux l’éphod, et Jonathan, fils de Gershom, fils de Moïse, lui et ses fils furent sacrificateurs pour les Danites jusqu’au jour de la captivité du pays." Dan se montra, dans ce poste périlleux d’avant-garde, ce qu’il avait été aux frontières de la Shéphélah, un des plus belliqueux qu’il y eût peut-être dans tout Israël.  

2 L’histoire de cette migration, qui est indiquée sommairement dans Josué xix. 47, se compose en son état actuel de deux récits entremêlés, dont on trouvera une restitution probable dans Budde, Die Bücher Richter und Samuelis, pp. 138-146. La présence d’un descendant de Moïse comme prêtre de ce sanctuaire local blessa le sentiment religieux de l’un de ces copistes ; il substitua le nom de Manassé à celui de Moïse (Juges xvii. 20), correction qui ne prévalut point.

defensible settlement. They sent out five emissaries, therefore, to look out for a new home. While these were passing through the mountains they called upon a certain Micah in the hill country of Ephraim and lodged there. Here they took counsel of a Levite whom Micah had made his priest, and in answer to the question, whether their journey would be prosperous, he told them to “Go in peace : before the Lord is the way wherein ye go.” Their search turned out successful, for they discovered near the sources of the Jordan the town of Laish, whose people, like the Zidonians, dwelt in security, fearing no trouble. On the report of the emissaries Dan decided to emigrate : the warriors set out to the number of 600, carried off with them the priest of Micah and his ephod, teraphim and graven image, and succeeded in capturing Laish, to which they gave the name of their tribe. “The children of Dan set up for themselves the graven image, and Jonathan the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until the day of the captivity of the land.”  

2 Some critics see in the history of this migration, which is given summarily in Joshua xix. 47, a blending of two accounts. Budde has attempted a reconstruction of the narrative. The presence of a descendant of Moses as priest in this local sanctuary probably offended the religious scruples of the copyist, who substituted Manasseh for Moses (Judges xviii. 30), but the correction was not generally accepted. [The Revised Version reads “Moses” where the authorized text (and the LXX. also) has “Manasseh.”—Tr.]  

The italics throughout are the reviewer’s.
The tribe of Dan displayed in this advanced post of peril the bravery it had shown on the frontiers of the Shephelah, and showed itself the most bellicose of the tribes of Israel.'

In the first instance the translator has entirely altered the author's meaning. The latter distinctly says that the history of the real feats of Samson was early lost, which we can well understand, and that all we know of him are his practical jokes played upon the Philistines. This is nothing less than an apparently deliberate falsification of Professor Maspero's statements:—

(2) The translator has inserted a phrase not in the original.
(3) The author's statement has been completely altered; in fact, it is no translation at all, but a sentence introduced without a shadow of authority.
(4) 'Les princes de Gaza' is entirely omitted and 'in honour of Dagon' inserted instead.
(5) Another sentence invented by the translator, instead of a correct rendering of the author's words.
(6) A mistranslation, for 'explorer un pays' and 'look out for a new home' are not one and the same thing by any means.
(7) Another falsifying of the author's words.
(8) A falsification of the original text.
(9) We will conclude here that the translator has made a slip and translated 'graven image' instead of 'Ephod' by mistake.
(10) 'Some learned critics' is not the equivalent of 'plusieurs savants.'
(11) The whole of note 2 has been so twisted round, that it is made to bear a meaning which is contrary to that of the author.

Here, then, we have in one page no less than eleven discrepancies. Of what value can a translation executed in such a manner possibly be? It is worse than useless; and it is unfair to both the author and the public. We have only to read a very little way in the Struggle of the Nations to see at once that the English translation can hardly be said to convey the meaning of the original at all, and however strongly we dissent from Maspero's Biblical criticism, we feel that a book put forth as a translation should at least be honest. We do not blame the S.P.C.K. if they thoroughly disapprove of some of the author's views; we do not see that
they can do otherwise consistently with their position. But why, then, did they publish a so-called translation of his book? there was no need for them to do so. Many years ago, when the writer of this article was a student in Paris, Maspero took up a very distinct line with regard to Biblical criticism; he made no secret of it, and he has never gone back from it. This fact makes it all the more a problem why the Society undertook the production of a work which, though absolutely invaluable, was, they knew, in one portion actually at variance with the fundamental object of their existence.

Granted that Maspero's history of Egypt and Assyria is splendid, and his last chapter with its critical notes wrong throughout, that one chapter alone should have caused them to stay their hand before undertaking to publish it. Having felt it incumbent upon them to produce an English edition, and feeling that Maspero's opinions upon certain points were not sufficiently orthodox to be reproduced with the cachet of the S.P.C.K. upon them, why did they not boldly say in the preface, 'This historical work is invaluable, therefore we issue a translation of it; but on questions of Biblical criticism we are throughout at variance with the author'? This would have been perfectly reasonable and justifiable, and to such a course no one would have objected. As it is, the Society has issued what they wish the public to believe is a translation of Les Premières Mêlées des Peuples, and which they, the editor and translator, must know is far from being what 'the writer wrote.' It is a grievous pity that a religious Society, and one so much respected as the S.P.C.K., has put itself in the painful and wholly unnecessary position of 'improving'—or shall we say Bowdlerising?—an author's text. The public confidence is shaken in it after an action of this kind—an action which we would fain believe savours more of a blunder than a crime; for, after all, the faults, innumerable as they are, running through the work, may be due quite as much to incompetence as wilfulness.

Chapters I. and II. are full of translator's errors; but Chapter VII. contains an immense number of apparently deliberate inaccuracies as well as blunders in translation, and some of them are very glaring. What weight can be given to a so-called translation which in one chapter numbers more than scores of discrepancies between itself and the original? However much we dissent from the author, we cannot but feel that the translator has no right to make alterations without one word of intimation to the reader, nor do we think that the
publishers should allow such a translation to go out with their sanction. We feel it to be a breach of faith to their subscribers and the public. It is with anxiety we look forward to the third volume of the *Histoire de l'Orient*, which, we understand, must perforce remain in the Society's hands, and it is not with an easy mind that we think of the probable accuracy of other translations put forth by the same house. We ought to feel that the S.P.C.K. is far above suspicion of any sort—in fact, that it is straightforward even to fastidiousness.

We will take a few pages at random from one chapter, so that the public may judge for themselves of the translation.

On page 675, line 2, the original runs thus: 'Comme les divinités de la Syrie il avait le caractère jaloux, farouche, sans pitié de qui l'offensait: on l'adorait en ses statues de bête, peut-être d'homme, que son esprit animait afin de prédire l'avenir, et on lui érigait aux endroits qu'il honorait de ses apparitions, des dolmens, des menhirs, des stèles semblables à celles des divinités cananéennes.' The translation gives this sentence a very different complexion: 'He is described as being a "jealous God," brooking no rival, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." We hear of His having been adored under the figure of a "calf," and of His Spirit inspiring His prophets as well as of the anointed stones which were dedicated in His honour.' This is not even a paraphrase, far less is it a bungling attempt to turn French into English; it is neither more nor less than deliberate alteration.

On line 15 'Les chroniqueurs essayèrent de combinaisons multiples pour ne pas rester en deçà du chiffre fatidique ou pour ne point le dépasser' becomes 'The Jewish chroniclers attempted by various combinations to prove that the sacred number of tribes was the correct one.' While in the last line 'The tribal organization had not reached its full development at the time of the sojourn in the desert' does duty for 'Le système flottait encore pendant le séjour au désert.'

In note 1 the entire part of a sentence, 'Pour ce caractère de Jahvéh,' is omitted. In Note 2 'On signale aussi celle du serpent (2 Rois xviii. 4)' is left out.

On page 679 'La tradition' is called 'the sacred writings,' and in line 14 'became their leader' is interpolated. The greater part of note 3 is omitted.

On page 680 there are three discrepancies.

On page 681 there are three discrepancies, including the omission of part of note 4.

On page 685, note 2 states that a certain episode 'repose, de l'aveu général, sur une tradition sans valeur;' this is rendered
as 'by some critics rejected as spurious.' Note 5 is entirely omitted.

Page 686 contains four discrepancies.

Page 692: 'une image en bois lamée d'or' is left out. Note 1 is omitted. Note 2 is omitted. Note 3 is so mutilated as to be hardly recognisable.

Page 706: 'elle renfermait deux pierres sur lesquelles on crut plus tard que la loi avait été gravée' is translated as 'contained the two tables of the Mosaic law.'

Page 712: 'La réalité fut moins brillante' is translated 'at any rate.' Note 2: 'le fait ne nous est connu que par,' &c., becomes 'the fact is known to us,' which gives the sentence an entirely different complexion. While notes 3 and 4 have been considerably altered to suit views other than those of Maspero.

On page 713 a whole phrase is left out, and the word 'hoplites' is omitted.

Page 714: 'La tradition' becomes 'the narrative.' Note 5 is altered, and the end of note 6 is omitted.

Page 730: 'Le dernier descendant d'Elie' is rendered 'a descendant;' while the following sentence is only one specimen, out of a great many, of the ingenious methods by which the sense of the author's opinions has been twisted: 'Grand par l'épée, il s'appuyait sur l'épée, et s'il avouait tenir sa couronne de Jahvéh, c'était à la façon dont les souverains de Thèbes ou de Ninive tenaient la leur d'Amon ou d'Assour, sans intermédiaire de prêtre'—'While David owed everything to the sword and trusted in it, he recognized at the same time that he had obtained his crown from Jahveh just as the sovereigns of Thebes and Nineveh saw in Ammon and Assur the source of their own royal authority.' 'Sur la rive gauche de Jourdain' is omitted. 'Le détail en fut vite oublié' is rendered 'the details are not given.' 'La garde philistine' is 'David's guard,' and 'les prisonniers' are 'Moabite captives.'

On page 734: 'et supprimé le mari dont l'existence gênait ses plaisirs' is translated 'and placing her husband in the forefront of the battle brought about his death.'

On page 750 note 1 is omitted, and 'la tradition sacerdotale' becomes 'the fact.'

On page 757 Maspero writes that 'le centre de gravité de l'Empire ... dépassa les noms du centre, dont un au moins, celui d'Héracléopolis, avait exercé une suprématie transitoire, puis il s'arrêta au Delta, et il oscilla de droite et de gauche,' which the translator expresses thus: 'The centre of government ... now gradually returned northwards, and passing over Heliopolis, which had exercised a transitory supremacy,
at length established itself in the Delta,' which makes non-
sense, as Maspero is particularly alluding to the transitory
rule of the Heracleopolitan monarchs. We never heard of
any royal supremacy being established at On!

Page 759 we read that 'le grand prêtre se levait le
matin à l'heure fixe, et dès ce moment il appartenait aux offices
de son état corps et âme.' Why has the translator finished
the sentence at 'heure fixe'? This is not the first time that,
without any apparent reason, sentences are omitted.

Page 772: 'Les Hébreux s'avouaient eux-mêmes leur
infériorité vis-à-vis de l'Egypte' is watered down to 'The
Hebrews themselves acknowledged some sort of dependency
upon Egypt.'

Page 779: 'Sa grand'mère, Maâkah, adorait un asherah
chez elle: il abattit l'émblème à coups de hache, le brûla
dans la vallée du Cédron, et destitua l'âeule du rang suprême
qu'elle occupait au harem depuis trois générations,' is trans-
lated 'His grandmother, Maachah, had made an abominable
image for an asherah; he cut it down and burnt it in the valley
of the Kidron and deposed her from the supremacy in the
royal household which she had held for three generations.'
The supremacy of a household is not in the very slightest degree
the same thing as the supremacy of a harim, and moreover
gives an entirely inaccurate sense to the sentence.

Page 780, note 1, reads 'chiffre traditionnel,' which is
altered to 'Bible figures.'

Page 785: 'Un personnage de cette envergure devait
être supérieur aux lois ordinaires de l'humanité: Elie vivant
fut ravi au ciel sur un char de feu. La tradition le veut ainsi
et l'on voit, par son exagération même, quelle impression
terrible le grand prophète avait laissée sur l'esprit de son
temps.' This passes, by skilful manipulation, into 'The sacred
writings go on to tell us that the prophet who had held such
close converse with the Deity was exempt from the ordinary
law of humanity and was carried to heaven in a chariot of fire.
The account that has come down to us shows the impression
of awe left by Elijah on the spirit of his age.'

The dispassionate reader must at once see under what
disadvantages the English edition of Les Premières Mêlées des
Peuples labours; for, laying aside the passages where ap-
parently deliberate alterations have been made, he will see,
besides, the unintentional blunders and inaccuracies which
occur in places where there is absolutely no reason for
touching the text, and where we feel sure that the publishers
cannot have had the slightest desire to do so.
We regret to see that terms of disparagement such as 'pretend' and 'imagined' are introduced gratuitously. They form no part of the text, and we would indicate to the reader that slight verbal discrepancies such as substituting 'narrative' or 'sacred writings' for 'la tradition' run throughout many pages of the book. 'Rédacteur' is invariably misunderstood—'a redactor' and 'the writer' of a MS. are two very different people. There are many more mistakes which we could point out, but these will probably be sufficient to put the reader on his guard.

It is with the profoundest regret that we are obliged to condemn *The Struggle of the Nations*, both as a translation *per se* and also on account of its unacknowledged but intentional inaccuracies. The Society, though meaning well, has blundered; and to many minds a blunder is worse than a crime.

M. Hachette et Cie, Professor Maspero's publishers, are not exempt from blame in the matter. Knowing, as they must have done, the nature of the work which they were bringing out, why did they negotiate for the English translation of it with a Society like the S.P.C.K., instead of with a first-class firm of publishers? Being well acquainted with Professor Maspero's views, we feel sure that he cannot himself have had a free hand in this matter, or he would never have selected a distinctly orthodox Society to be the channel by which his critical history of the past was to be known to English readers. It seems to us impossible that the manuscript or proof-sheets of the English edition can have been submitted to the learned author; for we feel convinced that he never for one moment would have sanctioned them. No plea of want of time or any such like excuse could justify either publisher or translator in such an omission—if such an omission there has been. The whole book, by its manifest carelessness, betrays haste, and it would have been far better to delay the publication of both editions than to have issued *The Struggle of the Nations*, which in its present form does not redound to the credit of either translator or publishers.

It is with the most unfeigned distress we find ourselves compelled to use such harsh language about this venerable society, to which the Church is indebted for so much valuable work. But the attempt to adapt Maspero's views to those which commend themselves to persons who cannot bring themselves into line with the Higher Critics was bound to end, and, indeed, deserved to end, in discomfiture and exposure.
SHORT NOTICES.

Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. By
H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (London: Longmans,
Green, and Co., 1897.)

Each fresh instalment of Dr. Liddon's works increases our sense of
the loss which the Church on earth sustained by his departure, and on
the present occasion we are also deeply conscious of the value of the
strong wisdom of the Warden of Keble, whose death is a serious blow
to the small company of Dr. Liddon's literary executors. There are,
happily, many persons who do not need to be told what Dr. Liddon's
explanatory analyses of Holy Scripture are like. Those who attended
his lectures when he was an Oxford professor, or who enjoyed the
informal classes which he used to hold on Sunday evening, or into
whose hands the analyses have already fallen, whether when privately
printed and circulated among his pupils or when published, as in the
case of the Epistle to the Romans, know full well how the clearness
and range of these terse comments opened an entirely new view of
the richness of St. Paul's language to all but a very small minority
of men. This is especially the case with this, the first of the Pastoral
Epistles. We may have thought that the little cluster of pastoral
remarks which St. Paul sent for the guidance of St. Timothy was but
a small bunch upon the sacred vine. But when Dr. Liddon presses
the words we see how fruitfully they yield what truly maketh glad
the heart of man. The main questions which arise almost all turn
on the authenticity of the Pastoral group. The external evidence
does not fall within the scope of an explanatory analysis, but the re-
jection of the Pastoral Epistles by some leading Gnostic teachers is
intimately bound up with the internal evidence of current forms of
false teaching, and on this last point Dr. Liddon has much to say (e.g.
on p. 40), for the passages which allude to the contemporary heretics
are numerous. Not less numerous, and even more important, are
those passages which justify the statements of the preface to the
Ordinal. As might be expected, Dr. Liddon is clear enough as to
the import of St. Paul's teaching on the Christian ministry (pp. 21-
23). We wish that his literary executors had printed as an introduc-
tory note to this analysis the learned essay on Holy Orders which was
prefixed to the second edition of Dr. Liddon's sermon on 'A Father in
Christ,' if only to atone for their mistake in omitting it from the volume
in which they inserted that sermon. We must pass by other leading
topics in the Pastoral group, such as the relation of the events recorded
to the history of St. Paul, the evidence for a second imprisonment, and
the special style of the group, because we desire to notice the chief
passages in the first Epistle of the group, upon which Dr. Liddon
has the fullest and most interesting remarks. The student who

1 Notes on the Study of St. Paul's Epistles. By the Rev. A. C. Head-
2 Clerical Life and Work, p. 288.
wishes to see how the ground is mapped out will do well to begin by consulting the summary analysis, which is placed in front of the explanatory portion. Then will come the perusal of the fine observations on the salutation of the Epistle (p. 2), the remarks on the proverbial sayings current in the Church (pp. 6, 23), and the different words employed to designate prayer (p. 10). The famous passage upon ‘the Childbearing’ is interpreted of ‘the ennobling blessing secured to all Christian women through Christ’s birth of a human Mother’ (p. 19); ‘the husband of one wife’ is taken to mean ‘having married, if at all, only once’ (pp. 24, 26-8); ‘a good degree’ is ‘an honourable step in the ministry of the Church, viz. the presbyterate’ (pp. 32, 34); the vexed question of the reading in 1 St. Tim. iii. 16 is not one which really affects the sense, for ‘the pre-existence of the subject of’ this early Christian hymn ‘lies in ἐφανερώθη. The New Testament knows of only One Being Who was manifested in human form, preached among the heathen, taken up in glory—the Only-begotten Son’ (pp. 37-8). No one, we trust, will omit to study the note on the grace which St. Timothy received, its nature and origin, and the attestation of its reality (pp. 47-8). The observations on the ecclesiastical order of widows (p. 55), and on slavery (pp. 70-72), are full of information concerning the early Church, but we regret that Uhlhorn 1 was not mentioned among the authors who may be consulted on the slavery of the ancient world. Naturally, upon παραβίασιν Dr. Liddon refers to St. Vincent, and quotes a fine passage from him in his note on the deposit of the faith (pp. 91-2). We may conclude with an earnest hope that many bishops will cause their ordination candidates and their young deacons to prepare this very masterly analysis, with its splendid notes, for a searching examination.


As the years passed by Dr. Liddon confined his sermons more and more to the great dome which is for so many men chiefly associated with the memory of his voice. There are sixteen sermons, for example, in this volume, and only six of them were preached since 1870, and three of these were delivered in St. Paul’s. Many of the sixteen have been issued separately, and some appeared in the Oxford Lent courses of sermons arranged by Bishop Wilberforce. Two useful purposes, at least, are fulfilled by the collection. It adds another volume to the uniform set of Dr. Liddon’s printed works, and it also illustrates different periods of his style. The titles of the sermons will recall them to many who heard them, for it was one of Dr. Liddon’s special gifts to be able to select a title which included his subject and excluded all else. The Lent sermons preached at Oxford which appear in this volume are: ‘Christ’s Welcome to the Penitent’ (p. 1), ‘The Enduring Conflict of Christ with Undue

1 The Conflict of Christianity, pp. 131 ff.
Exaltation of Intellect' (p. 96), 'The Victor in the Times of Preparation' (p. 117), 'Personal Responsibility for the Gift of Revelation' (p. 138), 'Jonah' (p. 164), and 'Noah' (p. 243). The only 'University' sermon, and that preached at Cambridge, is 'Devotion to the Church of Christ' (p. 320). At St. Paul's there were four: 'Profit and Loss' (p. 75), preached at a special evening service in 1865; 'The One Salvation' (p. 267), on behalf of the Bishop of London's Fund in 1873; 'Teaching and Healing' (p. 304), before the International Medical Congress in 1881; and 'Religion and Arms' (p. 342), before the London Rifle Brigade in 1889—a sermon which will provide wholesome teaching for the growing companies of the Church Lads' Brigade. The other sermons, all preached in London, are: 'The Aim and Principles of Church Missions' (p. 26), on behalf of St. George's Mission in East London; 'Active Love a Criterion of Spiritual Life' (p. 52), for the Church Penitentiary Association; 'A Sister's Work' (p. 193), preached in substance at All Saints', Margaret Street; 'Christ and Education' (p. 220), at St. James's, Piccadilly; and 'Love and Knowledge' (p. 286), in the chapel of King's College. It is not necessary to say more of the quality of these sermons than that every one of them deserves to find a permanent place in the collected sermons of the great preacher. We think that it may be of interest to our readers to mention that the sermon on Noah, which appears in this volume, was once described by one who had heard all the great University preachers at Oxford for more than thirty years, as one of the greatest sermons that he had ever heard. We would fain drive home to preachers the precious lesson to be derived from the fact that Dr. Liddon's sermons were so well prepared as to be complete discourses. It is hardly ever possible, after reading a sermon of his, to ask why he omitted to notice this remarkable passage of Scripture, or why he failed to allude to that most pertinent historical illustration, for he placed in each part of his discourse what ought to be found there with the hand of a master, alike in the fields of Scripture and of general culture. The account of hospitals in the early Church (p. 210) is a fine instance of this finished work. When we compare the earlier with the later discourses we think that we are able to trace certain differences between them in this and other volumes of Dr. Liddon's sermons. The eloquence bursts out more spontaneously in the later sermons; in the earlier we find many a sentence which seems to suggest that a consummate artist has spared no pains to bring it to the highest exactitude and perfection. One is the flow of a grand stream, the other is the result of the sculptor's chisel; one is nature, the other is art. In his later discourses also we have often thought, and it is very likely that the point has been noticed by others, that Dr. Liddon allowed a certain triumphant freedom of play to his fine gifts of irony and humour, which he kept under more severe control, or which were, perhaps, less developed, in his earlier years, but which, in their maturity, resembled the tone of the passages in the Psalter which describe the idols of the heathen more than anything else with which we can compare them. The skill of division,
surely one of the greatest gifts of a preacher, naturally seems also to have developed by use, and makes the later sermons better models for preachers than the earlier ones. There is one more characteristic belonging to all Dr. Liddon's sermons which has often led us to commend them to young men. It is that they contain such valuable expositions of Holy Scripture. We are never tired of saying that he who possesses a complete edition of Dr. Liddon's sermons has within his reach one of the very finest commentaries on the most important passages of the Bible which can be obtained, alike for insight into the characters of the sacred history and the meaning of difficult portions of the text. For example, the sermon on 'Profit and Loss' (p. 75) is really a very full exposition of our Lord's words, 'What is a man profited? ' And the sermon on Jonah (p. 164) is, in fact, a commentary upon the history of Jonah.1 The present sermons confirm us in our opinions, and increase our gratitude to their revered author.


The most noticeable point in this clever book is Mr. Hutton's treatment of the supposed unorthodoxy of the Emperor Justinian. According to the opinion usually held, Justinian at the end of his life lapsed into the heresy of the Aphthartodocetics, published an edict declaring this notion to be orthodox, and deposed Eutychius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, for his resistance to the edict. This opinion was challenged by Mr. Hutton in an article published in the Guardian six years ago,2 and there has since been some controversy on the subject between himself and Professor Bury. In the Birkbeck Lectures of 1896, published 'with only a few verbal changes and corrections' (Preface, p. xiii) in the present work, Mr. Hutton adhered to and developed what he had previously said; and he has added an Appendix in reply to an article by Professor Bury, which appeared in the Guardian early in this year.3 In his careful discussion of this subject Mr. Hutton puts aside the testimony of Theophanes and Nicephorus, Glycas and Cedrenus, as being too late to be of value; that of Eustathius because of the general character of his Life of Eutychius, which he describes as 'full of manifest fables and inaccuracies,' and as 'a book which, when unsupported by other evidence,' cannot be accepted 'as a valid authority' (p. 214); and that of Evagrius because, valuable authority as he is, 'he is inaccurate in many points,' and is likely to have been

1 A striking parallel to the moral history of Jonah is related of the Rev. J. J. Enmegahbowk, an Indian clergyman, in The American Church Review for October 1885, p. 546.
2 Guardian, April 12, 1891.
3 Ibid. January 13, 1897.
'misinformed' in a matter of this kind (pp. 219-20). He contends that the letter of Nicetius of Trier, while it accuses Justinian of heresy, is inconsistent with a belief on the part of the writer that he was an Aphthartodocetic, since the charge is that the Emperor made our Lord to be 'mere man.' On the other hand, Mr. Hutton points out Justinian's long acquaintance with, and previous condemnation of, the Aphthartodocetic heresy, and the high estimation in which he continued to be held throughout the Church. The whole discussion, if not altogether convincing, is learned and temperate, and Mr. Hutton sums up his position in the following passage:

'In spite, then, of the consensus of historians, I plead for a re-opening of the question, and I still claim that we cannot state on purely historical grounds that Justinian became an Aphthartodocete. . . . I think it cannot be denied that the general judgment of later ages was that he was orthodox. I do not think the evidence for the prosecution is strong enough to obtain a conviction. . . . One possible explanation of the difficulty may be tentatively suggested. Aphthartodocetism in some of its aspects was not far removed from orthodox belief. While Julian of Halicarnassus affirmed that the Body of Christ was incorruptible, and from this his opponents drew the inference that the Humanity was unreal, his opponent Severus regarded the Body of Christ was incorruptible, and from this his opponents drew the inference that the Humanity was subject to corruption. Nicetius, ignorant as his letter would seem clearly to show that he was, would appeal to his 'honoured lord, the dear Justinian,' to remove the reproach which, after all, may never have been deserved. Be that as it may, I must be content to leave the question, as I believe, unsolved. I do not believe that we have yet full proof either way; but if that proof ever comes, I should be more surprised to find that it made certain the heresy than that it confirmed the orthodoxy of the greatest Greek theologian of the sixth century' (pp. 237-40).

In the Appendix Mr. Hutton quotes at length the passage from John, the Jacobite Bishop of Nikiusi, which Professor Bury cited in the article in the Guardian which we have mentioned. He expresses his opinion with regard to it thus:

'If I understand the passage aright, it asserts that Eutychius declared that our Lord's body before His crucifixion was incorruptible, and that Justinian held that "He was Man like as we are, and that the Holy Scriptures affirmed that He has suffered for us in His body." Surely this . . . is to state that Eutychius was an Aphthartodocete, and that Justinian was orthodox. The subject is confusing enough, but I can see no other meaning in the passage from John of Nikiu. . . . M. Zonberg has pointed out . . . that John does not seem to have a clear conception of the theological question, and that the writing of Mennas mentioned is apocryphal. Nor does the statement which he attributes to Justinian agree with the opinions of Julian of Halicarnassus. . . . John . . . himself a heretic . . . uses language which seems to show the Emperor to be orthodox' (pp. 308-9).
Though we doubt whether Mr. Hutton gives sufficient consideration to the statement of John, 'L'empereur inclinait vers l'opinion de Julien,' we agree with him as to the apparently confused state of mind indicated by that writer's language. On the point generally he has hardly made out a strong case for the orthodoxy of Justinian; but he has shown reason for hesitation in accepting the positive statements about his heresy which have been usual, and for some such tentative position as that for which he himself pleads.

We have called the point with which we have been dealing the most noticeable which the book contains. It must not be supposed that there is nothing else of interest. The whole work is fascinating and useful. There is much of theological value. The treatment of history is full of insight and power. The chapter on 'the art of the sixth century' is altogether delightful. Occasionally Mr. Hutton's love of clearness and epigram may, in our judgment, lead him unduly to sharpen a point, as in the language which he uses about the divisions between the East and the West before the year 519; but, as a rule, his judgment is well under control, and his language admirably calculated to convey a true idea of facts. The utility of the book is increased by the illustrations.

That the sixth century is worthy of close attention and separate treatment can hardly be denied. Mr. Hutton has well described some of its special features in his opening sentences:

'The sixth century is one of the great ages of the world's history. It is an age of great soldiers and great statesmen, of lawyers and historians, of missionaries and saints. It is an age of great events as well as of great men. It saw the ruin of the East Gothic power, the restoration of the Empire to almost its widest boundaries, the invasion and settlement of the Lombards, the foundation of the medieval Papacy, the beginnings of English Christianity' (p. 3).


This is a strong book. The four addresses which comprise the greater part of it were delivered in Worcester Cathedral in Lent 1896. At that time, as Mr. Carnegie mentions in his preface, Churchmen were awaiting with keen interest the introduction into Parliament of the Education Bill of that year, and he seized what seemed to be 'a favourable opportunity for discussing one or two of the deeper aspects of the questions to which' the Bill was 'relative, and for attempting to make a slight contribution to the theory of religious education' (Preface, p. v).

The addresses contain clear statements of valuable principles. Mr. Carnegie insists strongly that the true object of education, far from being the mere imparting of a certain amount of technical knowledge, is the development of capacity, and consequently the formation of character. If that is so, it is impossible for any system of
education which is without a religious element to do its work. And he mentions 'three chief reasons' because of which religion must be regarded as an 'absolutely essential element in any true system of education.'

1. We regard it as essential because religious truth and so-called secular truth have such important bearings on each other that it is impossible to study them apart without inflicting serious injury on both. Both religious knowledge and secular knowledge acquired under such conditions will be warped and one-sided and incomplete, for they will each lack the necessary service which the other supplies. Religious knowledge will be detached from the world of human speculation and experience and endeavour, in which it should ever seek to find its expression and application. Secular knowledge will be deprived of that background of the supernatural and the infinite on which alone its different parts can be viewed in their true perspective and combined in the unity of an intelligible whole.

2. We regard it as essential because any true system of education must include moral training as well as intellectual cultivation . . . and this end cannot be accomplished without the aid of religion . . .

3. We regard it as essential because religion has a value of its own apart from its application to the exigencies of temporal existence. Because that world of the supernatural and the eternal to whose threshold conscience brings us is the true home of man's highest self; and because, if he is to live his true life, and to accomplish the true destiny for which he was created, he must even here begin to breathe the atmosphere of that world, and sedulously to cultivate those habits and aspirations and modes of thought and feeling which are congenial to it' (pp. 60-63).

These lines of thought are developed with much robustness and force, and the consideration of them leads Mr. Carnegie, without formulating any detailed policy, to lay down two conditions as essential to any sound system of Christian education.

1. These two conditions are—

1. That religion shall be taught by religious teachers; by men and women who believe in what they teach, and who are trying to conform their lives to its claims.

2. That the religious truth which we shall make use of for educational purposes shall be un mutilated truth, and the religious knowledge we seek to impart, un mutilated knowledge' (p. 69).

We are disposed to regard the Introduction as in some respects the most important part of the book. Mr. Carnegie there points out that the question about religious education is only 'one aspect' of the 'much larger question' 'what part religion is to play in our civilized progress' (p. xiii), and he calls attention to some features of the present time which a good many Church people are content to ignore.

1. Religion has ceased to exercise any influence over the lives of large masses of our fellow-countrymen because they have ceased to regard it as practical or necessary' (pp. xxii-xxiii).

If those who adopt this attitude were merely the profligate and the careless, it would not be such a serious matter; their indifference could easily be explained on other grounds. But the case is far different:
among their ranks is to be found a great proportion of the industry and intelligence of our race; men who are foremost in every kind of enterprise; serious men and sober men, who have a settled purpose in life, and are capable of concentrating their energies on its accomplishment. Men, too, who maintain on the whole a high standard of rectitude; who often have a keen sense of honour; who are not lacking in sympathy and affection; good fathers, loyal citizens, successful men of business. These are the men who are moulding our civilization' (pp. xxiii-xxiv).

'The great majority of our fellow-countrymen have practically abandoned Christianity, because they believe they can accomplish the ends of life without its aid. It is our duty to bring home to them that they are mistaken. We believe that they are: we believe that Christianity is absolutely essential to happiness and progress and well-being; that society has no stability, and morality no security, apart from it. But it is no longer enough merely to believe this, nor even to express our belief in the form of practical endeavour. We must be able to show hard-headed men of the world that religion has for them a practical value of the most important kind; that any system of life which disregards it is essentially incomplete; that any morality which seeks to be independent of it is but living on the capital which it has provided, and is doomed to ultimate bankruptcy' (pp. xxv-xxvi).

Mr. Carnegie has, among others, three qualifications for the task he has undertaken in this book. He has honestly faced the existing state of things in England. He understands what education means. He has a true idea of the Christian Faith. It is the absence of one or more of these qualifications which lead to the unsatisfactory views about education generally and the place of religion in it which are common among Church people. This book is likely to be useful in promoting the growth of sounder opinions, and we cordially wish it may have a wide circulation.


This volume contains fourteen Sermons, the subjects of which are 'The Catholic Revival,' 'Sacerdotalism,' 'Ritualism,' 'Church and State,' 'The Church—One,' 'Holy,' 'Catholic,' 'Apostolic,' 'Continuity of the Church of England,' 'The Thirty-Nine Articles,' 'Unity of Christendom' (two sermons), 'The Papacy,' and 'The Holy Eastern Church.' They are marked by vigour of thought and expression, and are likely to have been useful in instructing the congregation to which they were addressed in the Catholic Faith. They may be helpful also to those who read them in their published form. They would, we think, have been more valuable for both purposes if the preacher had given them a less controversial tone.

There is a statement in the Sermon on 'The Continuity of the Church of England' which demands serious protest. Mr. Loxley there says—

'There cannot be two lawful Bishops in the same diocese, and, according to the acknowledged law of the universal Church, the Bishops who intrude into the dioceses of other Bishops have no jurisdiction—no power, that is, to exercise their episcopal functions—and their acts, and
the acts of their clergy, such as Absolution, are regarded as null and void: that means, if you were to go to Confession to a Roman Catholic priest here in Whitby, and he gave you Absolution, his Absolution would not hold good. So far then from its being safer to join the Roman Church, it is far safer to remain in communion with the old historic Church, which has the old Catholic line of Bishops, and which alone in this country represents Christ, or has the authority of Christ' (p. 113).

We are aware that there is a school of thought among ourselves which, grafting the Papal theory of jurisdiction upon Catholic principles, asserts that Absolutions which are irregularly given are absolutely invalid; and that some adherents of it contend that no Roman Catholic living in England has received a valid Absolution since the Reformation. The theology which underlies this view has dangers for English Churchmanship which are not always sufficiently recognized, and is as inconsistent with the true view of jurisdiction as it is lacking in acknowledgment of the fact that the exact effect produced by irregularities in Church organization or the administration of the Sacraments cannot be rightly considered without attention to the circumstances under which they took place. The whole subject is too complicated for us to enter into within the limits of a short notice, and the opinion against which we protest received a very complete refutation many years ago from the facts stated and arguments used in the course of Dr. Pusey's admirable treatise The Church of England leaves her Children free to whom to open their griefs.

Among the many passages in Mr. Loxley's sermons which we have read with much sympathy and appreciation we would instance two in which he emphasizes the truths that 'the unity of the Catholic Church'

'is by no means limited to the baptized here on earth, but takes in all the ten thousand times ten thousand who have finished their course and rest from their labours' (p. 63);

and that Christ Himself

'is always and everywhere the true Minister, the true Priest' (pp. 101–2).


This volume contains much interesting and useful matter about the Dies Irae. The author set himself to collect the versions of this great hymn, supposing that he would be able to publish the whole of them, with notes, in a large pamphlet. Research showed him the existence of a very large number of versions, and he has been compelled to abandon for the time his plan of publishing a complete collection. The present work contains lists of the versions with which he has been able to meet, an account of the history of the hymn, and painstaking comments and criticisms on the various translations. He hopes that in the future he may be able to supplement this volume by printing at length the whole collection which he has made, and appeals to those who are interested in the subject.
to help him to do so by becoming subscribers to this further publication. Those who remember that Mr. Warren helped in the compilation of the lists of translations of the *Dies Irae* in the *Dictionary of Hymnology*, edited by Mr. Julian, will anticipate that his work will be found to be thoroughly done, and a comparison of the lists in the *Dictionary* with those in this book shows that the latter are based upon still fuller materials than the former. There will certainly be reason for regret if he should be unable to publish his complete collection.

Mr. Warren accepts the usual opinion that the *Dies Irae* was composed by Thomas of Celano, and his book contains a brief account of Thomas and his writings. We have lately observed that no notice of the other hymns besides the *Dies Irae* is given in several works in which we might well expect to find it, and it has been a pleasure to us to find that Mr. Warren has not overlooked this point, and mentions a few details about the 'two Franciscan Sequences' which, together with the *Dies Irae*, are 'found in the *Index Sequentiarium* of Joachim Brander of St. Gall, 1507,' and were both 'printed by Daniel in the *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*.'


This little book consists of summarized accounts, with some quotations, of the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, the *Imitation of Christ*, Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*, *Paradise Lost*, Law's *Serious Call*, Baxter's *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, Young's *Night Thoughts*, and the *Christian Year*. The selection strikes us as rather oddly made, but there is no doubt about the sympathetic character of the author's treatment of the books which he has selected, and his volume may form a very useful introduction to the study and use of them. We hope that the inclusion of Law's *Serious Call* may do something to extend the knowledge of that really valuable devotional work.

There is rarely anything in Mr. Reid's thought or language to remind readers that he is a Presbyterian, and in a passage where this is implied he bears testimony to the practical usefulness of one part of the Church's system. In the last of the sketches he writes—

'The Christian Year is an attempt to link poetical ideas to the passing seasons, natural and religious. Some of these seasons have already, from the religious point of view, become familiar to us, and are more or less fully kept, as, for instance, Christmas and Easter. But the majority of the sacred anniversaries are still unrecognized and even forgotten. Not many ordinary Scotchmen remember that the Sunday which saw the riot in St. Giles' Cathedral, in Edinburgh, on account of the use of a certain liturgy, was the seventh after Trinity; and that the collect interrupted was the fine prayer beginning with the words "Lord of all power and might."... A Scotsman bred up in the National Church is disposed to ask, Of what practical use is this series of anniversaries? One valuable end at least is gained. The devout reader is carried every year through the gospel story, and reminded of the fundamental truths
of our Christian faith. . . . Surely, much may be gained from such an orderly course of worship and thought. Keble's poems in the Christian Year hang like ripe clusters on the boughs of the calendar. Journeying through the year with him, we find each Sunday adorned with some fitting verse and theme. The Lord's Day loses its dull indistinctness' (pp. 115-8).

There are occasional instances of awkward phraseology. The strangest of these is perhaps in the phrases 'among quaint advices to professional men' (p. 47) and 'regarding the Lord's Supper there are many fine advices' (p. 51).


It is a pleasure to notice that this very useful manual, the first edition of which was published in 1894, is the work of a layman. The author tells us himself that he 'has tried not to delve too deeply into the mazes of theological reasoning or philosophical thought, which but serve to confuse the average reader unskilled in the subtle and metaphysical reasoning of the schools, but to present the matter in such a way that it may be so clear as to be readily understood and appreciated by all, and so concise as to be interesting yet instructive' (Preface to first edition, p. xi).

In this attempt he has been eminently successful. The book gives us a clear, easily understood account of the Catholic Faith, of the main principles of Christian worship, of Ritual and Symbolism, and of the Church's Year. The Bishop of Milwaukee in his Introduction wisely says—

'We count his book as all the more valuable, written as it is for the help and guidance of his brother laymen, because so strictly his own, in conception, arrangement, and completion; and because his language is often so untechnical, his illustrations so close at hand, drawn from the ordinary run of practical life from day to day' (pp. vii-viii).

Yet we wish the author had submitted the proofs of the book to some one with fuller theological and historical knowledge than he himself possesses. There are a number of statements on points of detail to which, with little loss of shortness or clearness, greater accuracy could have been given. It is hardly right to speak of the final clauses of the Nicene Creed as having been 'added' 'at the Council of Constantinople, 381 A.D.' (p. 11), without any indication of the very great doubt which many competent authorities feel on that point. To speak of the 'very strong evidence' 'to support the claim that St. Paul' 'evangelized' (p. 18) Britain would not be possible to any one who had examined the original authorities which have been represented as supplying the testimony. It is not the case that the
Six Articles of the reign of Henry VIII. never went into effect’ (pp. 24-5). We do not know what is meant by the statement that the ‘validity’ of the ‘consecration’ of Cardinal Pole must hang or fall with that of Parker (p. 25). It is not accurate to say that the reign of James I. virtually ends the work of the Reformation’ (p. 26). It could not be seriously argued that ‘there is very little doubt that’ the Apostles’ Creed was composed in the first century’ (p. 64). It is not fair to say that ‘members of the Roman Communion must believe that nothing remains of’ the bread and wine in the Eucharist except the appearance only’ (p. 107), or to mention Cranmer as a believer in the Real Presence (p. 113) without any indication of the various changes his mind underwent on this subject. It is an unfortunate expression that Confirmation, as its meaning tells us, confirms the vows of the Christian made by him or made for him by his sponsors in Holy Baptism’ (p. 129). It is a mistake that the Church of Rome allows divorce (evidently meant to imply the possibility of remarriage) where there has been adultery (p. 156). In these and a few other points Mr. Knowles appears to us to have been misled by writers whose works he has used, and if he had shown his book before publication to some competent critic he might have saved it from being marked by these blemishes.

We have made these remarks, not in any spirit of hypercriticism, but because we like the manual so much, and think it so well fitted to do a most useful work, that we regret it should not be free from faults such as those we have mentioned.

Two odd misprints have caught our eyes—the spelling Gibbons for the name of the great historian (pp. 7-8) and St. Gregory Nyassa for that of the theologian of the fourth century (p. 249).

We should add that there is an excellent table of contents and a good index, and that the author is a member of the American Church.


This is a clear and careful account of the history of the Prayer Book. The writer brings out the chief points of importance in the various revisions which the Book has undergone, and puts his readers in a position to use it intelligently. We think that some of the clergy, as well as of the laity, will find Mr. Eland’s little treatise useful, and that, with a certain amount of supplementing, it may be of service to those who are preparing for examination for ordination.

There are a few points in which slight alterations would, in our judgment, be an improvement in the second edition which we hope the book will reach. Among these we may mention the following: The statement on p. 60 was apparently written in forgetfulness that the Prayer Book of 1549 ordered the Lord’s Prayer to be said with a loud voice.’ There is no notice on p. 63 of the special position
in which the Invocation of the Holy Spirit was placed in 1549, or on pp. 68-9 of the rubric directing the vestments of the priest at the Holy Communion in the same Book. On p. 142, while it is stated that the Creed submitted to the Council of Nicea by Eusebius of Caesarea declared 'the Godhead of Jesus Christ' 'in emphatic terms similar to those which ultimately were adopted by the Council,' the absence of the word ὅμοοντιον from that Creed is not mentioned. The change in the method of the use of the Quicunque vult, which was due to the revisers of 1661, is ignored on p. 148. And the phrase 'appropriated only by faith' on p. 166 might easily mislead.

We have been pleased to observe a clear statement of the true explanation of the word 'Collect.'

'The name is derived from the Church-Latin word collecta, which meant the assembly of worshippers gathered together to hear Mass. Hence in the old Sacramentaries we have the expression, oratio ad collectam, meaning "the prayer at the assembly"—a prayer offered at a particular church just before the congregation moved in procession to the so-called "station-church," at which the Mass was really to be celebrated. This expression is soon shortened to ad collectam, still meaning the prayer at the assembly; and so, by a very natural transition, the first prayer of the Mass, preceding the Epistle, came to be called the collecta, or "collect"' (p. 126).

Lectures on Ecclesiastical History delivered in Norwich Cathedral.

With Preface by the Very Reverend the Dean of Norwich.

(London : James Nisbet and Co., Limited, 1896.)

We have read with a great deal of sympathy the preface which the Dean of Norwich has written to these lectures. In it he describes the agreement among Churchmen as to the office of Cathedrals, and refers to parts of his own work at Norwich:

'Churchmen of all schools of thought are in the main agreed in expecting the mother church of each diocese to represent, adequately and completely, the standard to which devotional worship may attain. There the service of song reaches its highest expression. There the Psalter flows in praise, and has flowed in praise for centuries, with the regularity of the tides of the ocean. There the voices of holy and humble men of heart, belonging both to the East and West, are heard day by day, agelong in their language, yet interpreting the needs of the hour. There the Word of Life is read and expounded. There the Sacrament of Initiation and the Sacrament of Sustenance are administered. Thus Cathedral worship, devotional, continuous, and heaving with song, is the expression of the Church's praise. . . . Cathedrals have other functions to fulfil. . . . And, possibly, of all branches of sacred service recognized and encouraged by the Cathedrals of England, it may be questioned if there is one more important than that represented by the Nave Services for the people . . . . The lectures contained in this volume represent one section of a programme which is being wrought out in faith, in patience, in hope. They are historical, and therefore they are educational. The theme is ecclesiastical history, and it is treated in connection with the leaders of thought and of action who lived and laboured in the primitive or sub-apostolic period, and on through the succeeding centuries, closing with the epoch-marking era of St. Augustine' (Preface, pp. v–viii).
The lectures which the volume contains are by different authors, and are of very various degrees of merit. That on Clement of Alexandria, contributed by Dr. Chase, is brilliant, accurate, and learned. If here and there there are points that seem to have been missed, or matters we could have wished slightly differently treated, as when, in comparing Greek with Latin theology (pp. 279–280), the lecturer does not sufficiently allow for the inadequate character of Clement's doctrine of sin, we have found the perusal of the lecture a great pleasure, and we think it calculated to be of much usefulness. Mr. Brooke's treatment of Origen bears the marks of the indebtedness to the writings of Bishop Westcott which the author acknowledges; but it will be read with interest even by those well acquainted with what the Bishop has written on the same subject, and among its good points is that of clear and vivid statement. Mr. Brooke is full of enthusiasm for Origen and for the suggestiveness of his writings in their bearing on problems of modern thought; but he is not afraid also to recognize failings, as when he says—

'However wild some of his speculations may seem, he accepted the recognized creed on the authority of the Church; he deduced, as he thought, all his system from the teaching of Holy Scripture. He accepted the same authorities which we acknowledge. Enough has been said to show the extraordinary boldness and width of his thought. If there is much that we cannot accept, there is much to set us thinking, and thinking on the right lines' (p. 319).

Another valuable lecture is that by Professor Gwatkin on Eusebius of Caesarea. We cannot follow the lecturer in all he says, and he does not seem to us to have an adequate sense of the hold which the Church had on the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation in their essential characteristics before the fourth century. But the lecture is brilliant, sympathetic, full of historical sense, admirably calculated to stimulate thought. And we have read with great satisfaction two passages about St. Athanasius.

'On the main point, Athanasius was beyond all question right. Our Lord claimed to be in the very highest sense the Son of God; and by that claim the Gospel stands or falls' (p. 332).

'The work of the Nicene age was to show that God is not personal only but tripersonal, and that He is a Trinity of love, not a Being of abstract simplicity. The failure of Eusebius is that he could not see this, and it is the glory of Athanasius that he did see it; and this is why Eusebius is remembered as the man that hesitated in the day of battle, while Athanasius towers like a king of men above the wavering fathers at Nicæa' (p. 336).

Dr. Ince contributes a clear account of 'the life and times of St. Athanasius,' which lays stress on the most important features of that great father's life and work. It was well, perhaps, that he should mention that the Quicunque vult was not written by St. Athanasius; we wish he had abstained from or had differently worded the sentence in which he says—

'Athanasius is not responsible for the so-called damnatory clauses of the Creed, which have caused so much distress and perplexity to pious
minds; and it is doubtful whether he would have acquiesced in every expression of the exposition contained in the document' (p. 372).

There is a very able lecture on St. Ambrose by Bishop Barry; a careful account of Tertullian, evidently based on thoughtful study of his writings, by Mr. Schneider, the Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall; a useful description of the catacombs by Mr. Henry Gee; an excellent and sympathetic lecture on St. Jerome by Mr. Drury, the Principal of the Church Missionary College at Islington; 1 and a good and fair, if somewhat thin, description of the life and writings of St. Augustine by Dr. Moule. 2 When we have said that the lecture on 'the Apology of Aristides' is by Professor Robinson we need hardly add that it is interesting, accurate, and powerful, while the concluding paragraph shows that the lecturer was not unmindful of the practical services which such lectures can add to instruction.

'Two lessons stand out clearly for us of to-day as we read the old words of Aristides the philosopher of Athens. One is for the Christian student. He may learn that now as then the comparative study of religion proves Christianity to be supreme and final, because it alone has power to satisfy the needs which all other religions but reveal and deepen. The other is for the Christian man, whether learned or simple. He has it in his power—nay more, the solemn duty lies upon him—to give the highest, most convincing witness of the truth of the religion which he professes, in the quiet, unobtrusive, yet impressive and unquestionable testimony of a Christ-like life. This argument is never out of date. The point of attack in the battle for the Faith is perpetually shifting. The Apologetics of yesterday are not the Apologetics needed for to-day. But while there are human souls that feel their need of something to lift them out of their own failure and sin, so long will they look earnestly to the man whose life proclaims that he has found the secret of living. And as for ourselves we tremble at the responsibility thus thrown upon us, let us remember, for our strengthening and reassurance, that we do not stand alone, so that Christianity must stand or fall with us. The witness of individual lives is taken up and fulfilled and glorified in the corporate witness of the Catholic Church—that larger, steadier witness, reaching back into the past and forward into the future, before and after the short span of our momentary testimony, the perpetual embodiment and presentation to the world of the Life of Christ by the power of His Holy Spirit' (pp. 50-51).

The remaining lectures are less satisfactory. That by the Dean of Canterbury, entitled 'St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp,' and serving as a general introduction to the series, as well as being specially

1 Among some details which are open to criticism we may mention that Mr. Drury confuses the postponement of Baptism, which was common in the fourth century, with the error condemned in the Sixteenth Article (p. 451), thinks there are 'no sufficient data to decide' the 'question' about the 'perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord' (p. 460), and asserts dogmatically that 'Lerins sent forth its Patrick' (p. 468).

2 Dr. Moule does not seem to appreciate the reasons which led to the common postponement of Baptism in the fourth century (pp. 485-6), and we do not think he understands St. Augustine's teaching about the Church or the Eucharist (see, e.g., pp. 495-6, 501).
Short Notices.

concerned with those two fathers, is marred by much false rhetoric, and is lacking in appreciation either of the personal character or of the theology of St. Ignatius. Professor Stanley Leathes's lecture on 'the life and times of Irenaeus' scarcely reaches the high level at which we are accustomed to find any work from his pen. Dr. Kingsmill's treatment of 'the life and times of St. Chrysostom' is dull and feeble, and contains serious blunders. The lecture entitled 'Cyprian,' by Archdeacon Sinclair, and that on 'the life and times of Justin Martyr,' by Canon Meyrick, are very unsatisfactory. The only parts of the former which are of any value are the copious quotations from Archbishop Benson, Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, and Professor Schaff; and it is one of the signs of the lecturer's incompetence for the task which he undertook that he evidently in some important respects misunderstands those whom he quotes. We do not think the distinguished ecclesiastic who devoted his scanty leisure for the space of thirty years to the study of St. Cyprian would have approved of the unhistorical and mischievous statement that

'his influence for evil on Christendom, East and West, by introducing into the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ the hierarchical and sacerdotal principles from his heathen associations, and making them palatable by dressing them in Jewish form, has been absolutely beyond all calculation' (p. 140).

1 See p. iv of Mr. A. C. Benson's 'Prefatory Note' to the late Archbishop Benson's Cyprian: his Life, his Times, his Work.

2 There is an even startling contrast between this passage and a paragraph in Archbishop Benson's Cyprian, p. 40, where the Archbishop says, 'Whence then did this form of Christian thought (i.e. St. Cyprian's doctrine of the Priesthood) originate? I see no proof, and to me it is incredible, that he or other Africans should have derived any such scheme, consciously or unconsciously, from Pagan constitutions, which appeared to them all in the light of a purely demoniacal and satanic system. Nor yet is it possible that they inherited them from any Judaizing forms of Christianity. For not only is sacerdotalism not one of the characteristics for which Judaizers are ever reprehended, but in fact the very essence of Judaism lay in looking back to the literal circumcision, the literal passover, the literal centralising of the Church upon Jerusalem. Towards Gentile Priests, towards Levites from the uncircumcision, they had no propension. Neither to heathenism nor to legalistic sects can we trace back the fruitful powerful theory now accepted in Africa.' We have no space to discuss the details of Archdeacon Sinclair's lecture; but we must mention the unfairness of quoting without giving the reference a passage written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist (De exhortatione castitatis, 7) as supplying 'the true counterpoise' to his 'direct sacerdotal claims on behalf of the Christian Ministry' (p. 133). In the context of the passage in question Tertullian's argument is that, since priests are forbidden to contract a second marriage after the death of a first wife, and since all Christians are priests, therefore second marriages are unlawful for all Christians. In Bishop Lightfoot's reference to this passage (Philippians, pp. 255-6), which Archdeacon Sinclair evidently has in view, the Montanistic character of the treatise and the general line of the argument contained in it were both pointed out.
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Canon Meyrick's lecture is not without one or two useful features; but most of it is as weak as it is controversial. When the lecturer says that the 'particulars of' his 'sketch' of a Christian Sunday in the time of St. Justin Martyr 'will be drawn in part from Justin's writings, in part from other sources' (p. 71), we can only suppose that his imagination is one of the 'other sources' referred to. He appears to us to have confused the Eucharist with the Agape, to have mixed up what is known about later times with the practice of the first half of the second century, and in his statement that the congregation went home 'for refreshment' between 'the Ante-lukan Service' and the 'Communion Service' to have introduced an assumption for which there is no evidence whatever.

We regret that such excellent work as characterizes the majority of these lectures should appear in the same volume with some that are not likely to serve any useful purpose.


The simplicity and clearness with which these sermons are expressed will be a surprise to some students of Dr. Hort's work. Underneath their clear expression lies much profound truth. They exhibit the spiritual power and intensity of their author; his insight into character and appreciation of human affection; his grip on the truths of the spiritual relation of the soul to God and the spiritual meaning of Holy Scripture; and a strong sense of the present working of God, the inner meaning of life, and the presence of the risen Lord in the lives of Christians. The first sermon, which is entitled 'The Anointing of the Spirit to Preach Freedom and Light,' has some special personal interest as being the first sermon preached by Dr. Hort in his parish of St. Ippolyts and Great Wymondley, in Hertfordshire, on his appointment as vicar in 1857. The following four sermons form an interesting series on Psalm lxvii. There is one sermon on the Parable of the Sower; then come three sermons on the Temptation of our Lord, one on 'God's love shown in Christ's death,' one on 'the lively hope proceeding from the Resurrection,' one on 'Andrew's discovery of the Christ to himself and Peter;' and the volume is completed by a set of twelve sermons on the spiritual lessons to be derived from the various books of the Bible. The whole of it is likely to prove valuable as suggestive of helpful spiritual truths, and as promoting the devotional use of Holy Scripture. It has a pathetic interest in its indications of the love for the teaching of the Bible which is shown to have marked the scholar who laboured so devotedly at the text of the New Testament. One specially useful part of it is in the practical lessons drawn from the Temptation of Christ; and we may quote from the third sermon of this series two passages which illustrate the preacher's pastoral care.

'This then, brethren, is the story of our Lord's Temptation. These
are the lessons which it reads us year by year when Lent returns and brings back to our thoughts those forty days in the wilderness. Now let us think what it has to say to us at this moment, on this last Sunday before the Confirmation.

'I am not speaking only to those who are themselves about to be confirmed. I am speaking to all. With many of you years and years have passed since you were confirmed: perhaps your present feeling is that you have got that over long ago, and that you have nothing more to do with it now. If so, none have greater need than you to be reminded of that almost forgotten day. The promises you made then were made for life. The gift of God's Spirit bestowed on you then was bestowed for life. If you find your present life unsatisfying, hopeless, weary, consider whether part at least of the reason may not be that you have thrown away the medicine for these ills which the recollection of your Confirmation might have supplied to you. Be thankful then now that it is brought freshly to your mind, and seize the opportunity for beginning once more the way of peace which you have long forsaken' (pp. 96-7).

'Confirmation must always have Lenten thoughts belonging to it. It can never be separated from the recollection and the dread of temptation; it speaks of sins to be repented and enemies to be renounced. But Lent itself is heathenish and not Christian, if it leads us for one moment to forget the coming Easter, if it drowns the hope of life in the fear of death. Much more should Confirmation, with all its solemnity, be a time of faith and hope' (p. 100).

If here and there we have noticed a sentence with which, for one reason or another, we cannot altogether agree, that does not prevent us from highly appreciating these simple, practical sermons, and thanking Dr. Hort's representatives for the publication of them. A brief 'Prefatory Note' by his son, Mr. Arthur Fenton Hort, directs attention to the 'deep and wide theology' which 'underlies them,' and 'the calm and trustful spirit that they reveal' (p. v).

The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era. First Series.


Mr. Adams has published the fruit of many years of Anglo-Saxon study at a suitable time, and his book will be welcomed both by historians and hagiologists. The inner lives of nearly all the most distinguished saints of the Anglo-Saxon age, and the circumstances of their time are described in interesting little biographical notices, to which reference is made easy by an alphabetical list of names, and which are embellished by some good illustrations. Among these are some of the more striking incidents of the period, such as St. Augustine's approach to Canterbury (frontispiece), Pope Gregory in the Slave Market (p. 6), Coifi's Profanation of the Heathen Temple (p. 75), King Oswald's Cross (p. 90), and St. Cuthbert's Vision (p. 304). Excellent cuts are also given of such places as Bamborough Castle (p. 106), Winchester Cathedral, the font (p. 151), the Saxon Church at Bradford-on-Avon (p. 158), the ruins of St. Augustine's at Canterbury (p. 267), Durham Cathedral (p. 342), and Lindisfarne (p. 365). Canon Carter's preface is somewhat marred by an inaccurate estimate of Dr. Bright's Chapters of Early English Church
History. He speaks truly enough of those ‘most graphic pictures of the Anglo-Saxon Church,’ but when he says that Dr. Bright’s ‘object did not extend to the details of the lives of the saints of that period, further than in illustrating the main points of the history’ (pref. p. iii), he does not allow sufficiently for the notes of Dr. Bright’s book, which fill as a rule half of each page, which are crammed with endless details, and are marvellous both for their interest and their accuracy. That it is not correct to hold Mr. Adams up as having the advantage in the matter of detail may be decisively demonstrated by examining his entertaining account of St. Cuthbert with the massive array of facts and references of authoritative historians. We do not know on what principle Mr. Adams has made his list. He includes an account of Rumwald, the child-saint, who only lived three days, and omits such men as Hygbald, who were great administrators of monastic affairs (p. 235). It may be fairly said that a comprehensive and typical selection of names has been made, and that the biographies are written in a popular style which will attract the general reader. It is, we suppose, for his information that stray notes are introduced, without very much uniformity as to their insertion, upon the Anglo-Saxon tribes (p. 3), the monastic hours (p. 96), Penda (p. 233), Monothelitism (p. 401), and miscellaneous subjects. Moberley (p. vii) and Lugabalia (p. 331) are misprints. A more serious mistake is that, after all his study, Mr. Adams should feel that ‘the miracles with which old writers loved to embellish their pages... as a rule, form no part of the lives of the saints;’ and so he regards them as an adventitious growth (p. vi). The truer and deeper view of these miraculous incidents surely is that these holy men were accustomed to trace the providential hand of God in the ordinary affairs of life, shaping their ends by personal intervention. It hardly becomes us, who habitually ignore the personal action of the Almighty, for example in relation to the weather, to cut out from the record of the old saints what was the heart and soul of their lives.


Mr. Abbott accepts what he calls a non-miraculous Christianity. The present volume is the non-critical, general, and constructive part of a work in which Mr. Abbott proposes to set forth the grounds for this paradoxical acceptance. A critical, detailed, and negative part is to appear after a while. It will be sufficient, therefore, at present to confine ourselves chiefy to general remarks on Mr. Abbott’s work, and to reserve our detailed criticisms for his second volume. Many of our readers may even think that a non-miraculous Christianity need not detain us at all, especially if they have read the passage of wonderful eloquence in which Mr. Gladstone has 

1 Dr. Bright’s *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 176, 214-6, 239-40, 289, 300 ff., 367, 373-4, 380 ff., 384-5, 397-8, 434, 437; 3rd edit. 1897. Mr. Plummer’s *Bede*, i. 442; ii. 444-5.
shown what the attempt to extrude the miraculous element from the Gospels really involves. But there are now many persons who are hoping in a vague way, and from various reasons, that a non-miraculous Christianity is true, and besides our duty towards them, so well discharged by Mr. Gladstone, we cannot be silent when we believe that a phantom is likely to delude many because it is commended in language which has hitherto borne an orthodox meaning. We must go further and express our conviction that when an orthodox preacher nowadays is speaking upon matters of the faith in terms which he believes to be unmistakable, he has to take into account the fact that there are those among the congregation who are transmuting his language according to their own ideas, using it as the drapery of a skeleton instead of as the clothing of a living organism, preserving the husk while they reject the kernel. When Mr. Abbott talks about 'worshipping God as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,' and 'accepting, in the fullest spiritual sense, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Atonement, and the Divinity of Christ' (pref. p. vii), the unwary reader may well be pardoned for failing to understand at first that these terms are used in new senses, as different from their historical meaning as light is from darkness. This will clearly be demonstrated, however, by the careful perusal of Mr. Abbott's remarks upon the conception of God (pp. 27-40), our Lord's baptism and temptation (pp. 170-1), His personality (pp. 259-65), and His sacrifice (p. 322). For a short and ready mode of arriving at the true value of Mr. Abbott's book, we should advise a reader to glance at the extraordinary suggestions about 'prayer and worship' (pp. 461-5), which are designed to improve upon the 'grave defects and disproportions' of the 'Anglican Prayer Book' (p. 466), and to annex appropriate passages of fine English prose writers to a series of readings from the Bible for family worship (pp. 468-9).

Mr. Abbott is apparently about to revise and correct his results by 'a renewed study of all the Gospels, and especially the fourth' (pref. p. v), before publishing the other part of his work. It is our sincere hope that by so doing he may be led to see that a non-miraculous Christianity is an incredible system of contradiction which is not Christianity at all. On p. 456 a figure is omitted in the footnote. It is quite consistent with Mr. Abbott's inconsistent Christ that 'an early utterance of Jesus' should be 'indicative of a sense of failure' (p. 181); and there is nothing in Mr. Abbott's view of Holy Scripture which prevents him from minimizing the most solemn utterances of St. Paul, who perhaps wrote a multitude of hasty letters 'in the course of his busy life as a missionary—whereas the authors of the Gospels—a very significant admission, by the way—'may be supposed to have written deliberately' (p. 231).

Eras of the Christian Church. Edited by John Fulton, D.D. LL.D.


Although this handsome book bears the well-known address of Messrs. Clark, it is plainly produced in America; and it is certainly turned out in a fashion of which no publisher anywhere need be ashamed. Paper, print, and binding are alike admirable, the paper perhaps especially so. In the matter of printing we note a curious variation of the art and mystery, as practised in America, from the time-honoured custom of the Caxtons of Europe to place a signature on the front page of every sheet. Here there seem to be no signatures of the sheets, but at the beginning of every chapter the number of the page is placed at the bottom. How that helps the folder we know not. We apologize for mentioning such a detail; but to say truth, the whole book carries us to America almost as vividly as to the Great Schism. It is undeniably a clever book. Though it does not pretend to any extensive use of original authorities, it uses the best secondary, especially Milman and Creighton, and the result is a volume which never allows you time to yawn—we had almost said to breathe—from the beginning to the end. It is indeed a matter of great rejoicing that our busy cousins over the Atlantic should learn the ecclesiastical history of old times. But if this is the way that it is to be done, we fear that we should choose for ourselves to read books of quieter style in some English university or rectory than go to study at Chicago and imbibe the annals of the Church in the form of successive up-to-date newspaper articles. We admire the cleverness of the Western process, and are most willing to give the author that praise which he awards to Pope Martin V. of answering perfectly to the American definition of 'smart.' But, after all, we doubt whether the best method of engaging interest in past history is to tell it in the fashion of the last news of the day.

We grant at once that the men of old time were men like ourselves, and that it is far better to make us realize them as living beside us than to leave them and the scenes they mixed in dead and lifeless in our hands. And if any part of Church history could be selected in which life should be preferred to dignity, it is that which it has fallen to Dr. Locke to treat; for the chief actors in his tale were only too human, and the most unscrupulous filibuster of the West might claim to possess more of the dignity of virtue than Pope John XXIII. Even so, the mere distance of time, the fact that these men, with all their vices and their schemes, are dead and gone, and the vastness of the scale upon which they enacted their wickednesses, might seem to demand more solemnity, so that the reader, besides realizing the facts, might receive some of the awe which they should inspire, and some impression of the spirit of an age which, though men are always men, yet is surely in many ways different from ours. But even such an age as that of the Great Schism contained characters better than those of its popes and kings, and great spiritual questions arose in it. Dr. Locke argues well that the recovery of Christianity from the degradations of such a time furnishes a testimony of its
Divine truth and power. But the argument would be only strengthened by the recognition of all the goodness, the simplicity, and earnestness, the power of thought and work, which proved an undercurrent in the religion of the time. It was not that Christianity revived after the tyranny was overpast, but that the religion which had been alive all through got rid of the incubus which had weighed it down.

Now, we cannot say that we find Dr. Locke as happy in describing the serious thoughts of that time, or its holy characters, as in depicting its worldly scenes and worldly men. It seems to us as if he could not depend upon his readers for so much attention and interest as should enable them to grasp a very serious subject, and could only hope to give them so much information as might enable them to say they had heard of it. We doubt much the sufficiency of his treatment of the Double Procession of the Holy Ghost (p. 285) to find for that doctrine a place in the reader's intellect. Nor can we think that mysticism would be made clear to the unlearned in the following fashion:

'It may be well to begin by defining what is meant by mystics and mysticism. It refers to a craving to get away from low and unspiritual levels, to break away from the formality and perfunctoriness of the average religious life—and it was perhaps never much lower or more perfunctory than in the fourteenth century—a desire to find a union with God which should be as real as the common relationships of daily life. It will be better understood by mentioning some historical characters to whom the word 'mystic' would apply: Gautama in India, Confucius in China, Fénelon in France, John Bunyan and John Wesley in England, the Fraticelli, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, the many divisions of the spiritual Franciscans. While these differed much in views, their teaching all partook of that quietism, that renunciation of the will, which characterizes mysticism in one or other of its forms (p. 288).

The determination to be popular or nothing provides us with a plentiful infusion of racy Americanisms. 'The King determined to down this gigantic spectre.' The Pope 'commenced dickering with Ladislas' (the reader who will look up 'dickering' in the New Oxford Dictionary will find that, though it has emigrated to America, it has an old European pedigree). 'The moment any reform questions were brought up the Pope's friends got the floor and talked them to death.' 'The council without Sigismund was like soup without salt.' 'The Pope's partisans would not hear to that.' 'The police were well organized, and before a riot could materialize peace and order were restored;' 'he argued that until France and England were reconciled, reform in the Church did not stand much of a show.' 'The Pope's chamberlains lifted up the Papal cassock and got the Pope's foot all ready to kiss; but the Greeks played they did not see it' (pp. 14, 145, 146, 164, 176, 281).

The Preface opens with an ill-omened quotation from Renan: 'When I read over what I have written the matter appears to me very poor, and I perceive that I have put in a multitude of things of which I am not certain.' Our author's experience agrees with
that of the Frenchman, and he admits that the absolute certainty of even the smallest item of the history seems doubtful. We do not wonder that M. Renan, that eminent novelist, should have been visited with a compunctious feeling that he had habitually assumed airs of certainty without reason. This is the nemesis of your graphic historian. He cannot march on without a pause or doubt making everything as real to the eye as if he had witnessed it, and yet have authority with him all the way. Details must be filled in by the imagination. It makes the story very pleasant, but it confounds history with the historical romance. And it is only those historians in whose text everything is vivid and the narrative unbroken by hesitations who need to make such unsparing admissions of uncertainty in their preface. We are bound to say that once Dr. Locke has unburdened himself of this confession of universal doubt in the first paragraph of his book we find nothing but assured confidence in the correctness of his whole story. Nor indeed, considering the public nature of most of the events, can we perceive any great cause for the expression of so great misgivings. It is chiefly when he levels spiritual phenomena to the manners and tone of a very earthly story that we think there would have been room for the expression of doubt and the sense of mystery even within the narrative itself. The sweeping condemnation of the monasticism of the period is not, in our judgment, true to the degree which is so positively claimed for it. And readers of the article upon St. Catherine of Siena which appeared in a recent number of this Review will not think the better of Dr. Locke's judgment for having adopted and even exaggerated the unworthy account which Dean Milman presents of that wonderful life.

'In these days of hypnotic experiences and when so much light has been thrown upon hysteria, much that appeared miraculous to her contemporaries appears very commonplace to us. She was a hysterical cataleptic subject, but by no means a weak-minded one, for her letters which are published show great vigour of intellect and much eloquence and force.'

He thinks that the works about St. Catherine founded on the life by her confessor, Raimondo, 'must be read with many grains of salt. It is a melancholy exhibit of what made a saint in those days, and to us moderns seems like the ac count of a lunatic rather than of a holy and very distinguished woman' (pp. 75, 76). Alas, if anything about St. Catherine be very commonplace, what term shall we apply to modern Christianity; and if that was what made a saint in those days, what makes a saint in Chicago? It is a pity that upon this subject Dr. Locke did not prefer the more recent authority of Bishop Creighton to that of Dean Milman. In the Bishop he possesses a guide as well versed in the history of a worldly time as if he were a smart American, yet capable of sympathy with spiritual enthusiasm. His epitaph on St. Catherine is more tender than Dr. Locke's. 'Canonized by Pius II, Catharine of Siena has a claim upon our reverence higher than that of a saint of the mediæval Church. A low-born maiden, without education or culture, she gave the
only possible expression in her age and generation to the aspiration
for national unity and for the restoration of ecclesiastical
purity.'

The attitude of our author towards the Church of Rome is inter-
esting and wholly devoid of bitterness. He seems to regard her as
a very important part of the Christian Church in which the spirit of
the religion is thoroughly alive, against which no man should speak
a harsh word, and which is destined some day, in spite of all that its
rulers can do, to fall into line with the mass of Christian com-
munities.

'Now was to commence the "Babylonish captivity" as Roman
Catholic historians designate the residence of the popes in Avignon, calling
it that because it lasted, like the captivity of the Jews, just seventy years.
Protestant historians often apply the word "Babylon" to Papal Rome,
which proves it to be a convenient word of cursing, the use of which
depends on your point of view' (p. 13). 'Martin V. certainly admitted
the power of the Council of Constance to decree matters of faith, for, in
his bull against the Hussites, he says, "Every heretic shall be required
to say whether he believes that what the holy Council of Constance,
representing the universal Church, has sanctioned and sanctions in
favorem fidel et salutis animarum is binding on all Christian believers,
and also that what that synod has condemned as contrary to the faith
must be held by all to deserve reprobation." This fact remains clear:
Martin V. adopted a decree which declares the judgments of the Pope to
be reformable, and Pius IX. adopted a decree which declares certain
judgments of the Pope in matters of faith and morals to be infallible and
irreformable. As Gladstone says, "One oracle contradicts another, and
no oracle which contradicts itself is infallible"' (p. 233).

'Many of the principles for which the reforming party contended in
these three Councils have become, the Vatican Council to the contrary
notwithstanding, the working principles of the modern Roman Church.
Popes no longer depose princes and absolve subjects from their allegi-
ance; cardinals can no longer hold a dozen sees and pocket their
revenues; heretics cannot be burnt or beheaded. The law of libel will
soon clap in prison an overzealous bishop who excommunicates and
indulgences, while still granted, are not now hawked about the country.
The same dogmas may be held by Leo XIII. as by Eugenius IV., but
they are often held only as a theory, not as possible to be put in practice;
and day by day, in spite of the constant cry of Rome that only by entire
submission to her can there be any union of the faithful, facts show that
the differences are being softened and the distances lessened' (p. 279).

The author has a good deal to say for this theory, and we doubt
not that the concessions of the Church which professes never to
concede anything are more observable in the new society of America
which is separated by the Atlantic from the scenes where almost
every relic of ancient times bears record that there the Papal
monarchy once ruled. In America there is not a crumbling building
to tell of mediæval times, and even the very memory of ancient per-
secutions belongs to the Anglican not the Roman Church.

The "era," which is here treated has a veritable unity of its own.
It opens with the last glimpse of the Papacy in its pride when Boni-

1 History of the Papacy, pp. 1-71.
face VIII. issued his insane claims. His audacity never was exceeded by emperor or high priest; but the time was too late for them. The papacy had pushed its dominion so far into the secular world that it had lost connexion with its religious base and become itself secular. And the earthly powers learnt to regard it as one of themselves; they doubted and then disbelieved its Divine sanction, and they inflicted on it the insults of coercion and war, and the still worse insult of using it as their tool. The migration to Avignon followed upon the defeat of the Papacy by Philip of France. And the long separation of the Popes from their proper seat led to the election of one Pope for the Italian seat and another for the French. The schism was a kind of testimony to a strength in the Papal idea, and a desire of man to be ruled, so great that it would even bear dividing, and that there was infallibility enough for two. But at the same time it was a testimony to the loss of faith in the sacredness of the office on the part of its own representatives. Popes and cardinals showed no fear of committing again and again the crime of high treason against that Divine monarchy the supreme sacredness of which among all earthly institutions they maintained at any cost of bloodshed. The cardinals who elected Urban VI. were either guilty of a sacrilegious farce in pretending to choose him only to save their own lives, or else they were guilty of the no less heinous crime of condemning an election which they knew to be perfectly valid, just because the object of their choice had disappointed them. This was the origin of the schism—like the wrath of Achilles which produced the woes of Troy. The great Councils which restored the Papal monarchy, under conditions which proved to be futile, wind up the era. And we think Dr. Locke might well have omitted the brief chapters which conclude his volume and take much from the symmetry of the design. They do not, as we have before hinted, furnish us with information of any depth or sufficiency upon the important subjects of which they treat. It is the conclusion of the great councils which 'closes the incident' to which his volume relates.


To criticize Mr. Pollard's book as a contribution to Egyptology would be as absurd as to review it as a literary work, for it is neither the one nor the other, though doubtless the author wished this offspring of his pen to serve the double purpose.

The Land of the Monuments is a curious and unhappy mixture of Murray and water, religious sentimentality, texts of Scripture, behindhand Egyptology, many blunders, and much bad English.

The book was published in the autumn of 1896, but from internal evidence the facts narrated bear the date 1892, as on p. 52 we read that Mr. Pollard's party witnessed the distribution of food by the grave of the late Khedive of Egypt, Thewfik Pasha, who died on January 7 of that year. It is most unfortunate that the author has not brought his book up to date, as much of the information is now actually inaccurate and therefore misleading. At p. 169 we
are told that 'Pyramid-building appears to have ceased with the Sixth Dynasty;' the discoveries of M. de Morgan made at Dahshûr during the last four years have proved incontrovertibly that Pyramid-building continued until the Twelfth Dynasty. Asyût, we are told, 'is the present terminus of the Cairo railway' (p. 188), a false and most misleading statement, as for some few years the railway has been gradually extending southwards from Asyût. When *The Land of the Monuments* was first published Abu Negga Hamâdî, 380 miles south of Cairo, was the terminus; and the line as far as Keneh, possibly as far as Luxor, will be open shortly. These are but two specimens of inaccuracy out of many others which may be easily found.

Mr. Pollard commits himself cheerfully to some marvellous blunders. That august body the Senate of London University would be somewhat amazed to hear that an exhibition of Dr. Petrie's 'finds' from Koptos had been held within their sacred precincts at Burlington House in August 1894. Yet such is practically what he tells us at p. 262. The exhibition was really held in University College, Gower Street, where Dr. Petrie, the 'finder,' holds the Edwards Chair of Egyptology. On p. 152 we read that 'the Serapeum is near to Mariette's house,' and that 'Serapeum was therefore the appellation of the tombs of the Apis bulls.' Now, the Serapeum was the exterior temple which surmounted the tombs of the Apis bulls; this temple has long since been destroyed, and at the present day very few remains of it can be seen. An avenue of sphinxes led up to it and two pylons stood before it; round it was the usual enclosure. It was distinguished from other Egyptian temples by having in one of its chambers an opening which led by an inclined passage to the rock below the desert; this gave access to the great sepulchral chambers wherein reposed the embalmed remains of the Apis bulls. Living, the Apis was worshipped in a magnificent temple at Memphis and lodged in an adjoining palace—the Apieum; dead, he was buried in excavated vaults at Saqqâra, called the Apis Mausoleum, and worshipped in a temple built over them, called the Serapeum. Like many another traveller in Egypt, Mr. Pollard has fallen into the trap of the 'sycamore fig' (p. 75, &c.) The tree is truly a fig, but it is a sycamore, or sycamine—not a sycamore, a tree which belongs to another family and does not bear figs.

As a member of the Council of Biblical Archaeology it might be supposed that Mr. Pollard would have had some knowledge of Greek, which would have saved him from this mistake, but perhaps spelling is not his *forte*, as we notice that he writes of a 'censor (sic) of burning incense' represented in the temple of Chousu (sic) (p. 324), a god of whom we have never heard. Perhaps the printers are responsible for these two errors of spelling, as well as for writing Dr. Petrie as 'Petri,' and Dr. Brugsch as 'Brusseli,' and 'nefern' for 'neferu.' Surely the publishers also have shown carelessness in sending out a book with a double number of pp. 129-144.

The author was indeed extremely fortunate if during his one visit to Egypt he saw 'burly lads' (p. 167) and a scarab rolling a ball of earth 'about the size of an ordinary billiard ball' (p. 342); the
reviewer, after a long residence in Egypt, has never seen a beetle's ball that approaches in the least such dimensions, and the only burly lads are not country children, but occasional horribly fat Jew boys in Cairo and Alexandria. Does Mr. Pollard really mean that in default of a north wind the dahabiyehs on the Nile are rowed? Surely he must know that rowing is only resorted to on the downward voyage. If the wind is contrary in going up stream the dahabiyehs are tracked or poled, or else tied up against the river bank. He is also charmingly unsophisticated when he writes rapturously of the natives, and particularly of the Bedawin Arabs at the Pyramids. At the best of times their one and only idea is how much bakshish they can squeeze out of their visitors, and the Pyramid Arabs have for long obtained an unenviable notoriety for their rapacity and their annoyance of tourists.

We learn (p. 79) that 'the ancient Egyptians worshipped one God, an Omnipotent Spirit'; this is a very wide statement, and one liable to mislead the class of readers who we imagine will use this book; but, unfortunately, the author, after stating this as a fact, proceeds to inform us that 'many other gods were recognized in later times' (p. 83); that 'the adoration of sacred animals was a peculiar feature of the Egyptian religion' (p. 86); and on p. 323, in direct contradiction of the first statement, we read that 'the Egyptians were worshippers of the host of heaven.' Which of these statements are we to regard as the true one? Moreover we did not know that devil-worship ever obtained in Egypt (p. 249).

It is a great pity that Mr. Pollard finds it necessary on all and every occasion to bring in texts of Scripture, some of them not always appropriate. Sentiment we approve of, but the nineteenth century is too old to put up with sentimentality, especially sentimentiality of a religious sort. Words fail the author to describe a sunset, which apparently affected them all to tears; only one young lady managed 'very appropriately to express her feelings on the occasion in the words of the hymn,' 'Thou who,' &c. (p. 197). The sight of the Lotus corniculatus growing by the desert track between Aswân and Shellal—a not very rare sight-causes our author to burst forth in the hackneyed lines, 'Full many a flower,' &c., and examples of this kind might easily be multiplied.

As a contribution to Egyptology we regret to say that Mr. Pollard's book is not only useless but misleading. Each year that passes sees some new discovery made, which is duly published, so that everyone can be now thoroughly au courant with the last 'finds' and the latest theories. To them, therefore, the Land of the Monuments is useless, but to those who are unable to keep themselves quite up to date it would be in many places, as we have already shown, misleading. For some time past a year has never closed without the publication of some useful and thoroughly up-to-date work, more or less popular, upon Egyptology, thus leaving no room for antiquated, and therefore erroneous, information. 'The diary in Egypt of a garrulous traveller can at best be but a copy of his guide book, watered down with his own reflections and minor observations, and padded out with snips
of history more or less accurate. This traveller’s diary does not add to our knowledge of Egypt by one new fact, nor does it contain one original observation. From the Preface we understand that Mr. Pollard was requested to publish this volume; he has done so, but it is a pity that it was not given to the public in the spring of 1892 instead of the autumn of 1896.


In our Number for July 1890 will be found a Short Notice of the first edition of this work, published in 1889. And although Mr. Vernon now tells us that this second edition is practically a new work, we do not find in it anything to alter the general opinion which we then formed.¹ For he also states that the general plan of the first edition has not been altered, although the translation and running commentary have been entirely rewritten. In our former notice we pointed out our objections to the extreme diffuseness of the running commentary and its necessary repetition, in effect, in the translation. We said: ‘Very frequently an equivalent of the sense of the portion of text about to be quoted and translated precedes the translation, and the translation which follows is practically the same thing over again.’ This remark still holds good; and when to this system of commentary a large increase in the number of notes is added, we have the result in the amplification of the two original volumes, of upwards of 400 pages each, into two of 579 and 654 pages respectively. Now, inasmuch as the Purgatorio contains but 4,755 verses, we still think that these ‘Readings’ run to an inordinate length. Nor can we avoid a feeling of relief when we reflect that we ourselves were not subjected to the system of studying each canto in fractional parts; which, initiated by Benvenuto and the other early commentators, has been adopted throughout by Mr. Vernon. Once more, we are also glad that in our own early studies of the Divina Commedia we were left to discover much for ourselves which we find here explained in full and frequently unnecessary detail. Benvenuto’s own reflections, moreover, which are frequently recorded, are very often the reverse of valuable or recondite. We are glad, therefore, that Mr. Vernon now gives greater prominence than before to the annotations of Francesco da Buti and Jacopo della Lana; also that he draws more fully upon that saddest but ablest of all ethical disquisitions, the De Consolatione Philosophiae of Boethius.² We could wish, however,

¹ As the present Notice proceeds upon different lines, we may refer our readers to this former one, to avoid repeating what we have said before.

² An excellent translation of this work into English prose and verse, by Mr. H. R. James, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, has recently been
that he had made more liberal use of the labours of the Platonist commentator Landino, full as they are of 'pensier contemplativi.' Mr. Vernon, however, earns our thanks for having brought into deserved prominence the *Bellezze della Divina Commedia* of Cesari and the *I sette Cerchi del Purgatorio di Dante* of Paolo Perez. The latter, in particular, is full of beautiful and appropriate reflections.

We feel that we can almost forgive everything in other respects which oppresses us as redundant in these volumes, when we study such of Mr. Vernon's notes as are philological. Here he has made the ground substantially his own. In researches into Dante's meaning, he is under enormous obligations to Scartazzini, and many readers will agree with us that he has been almost too lavish in his use of the excellent Concordance of Mr. Fay; but as an accomplished scholar not merely of the Italian language but of the Tuscan idiom and dialect, he has no need of indebtedness to anyone. With judicious recourse to the valuable *Gran Dizionario* of Signori Tommaso and Bellini, and the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, and his own intimate knowledge of Nannucci, he sets before us most admirable expositions of innumerable words and phrases, some archaic or obsolete, but many still in common use in Tuscany, and from his long residence in Florence as familiar to him as household words. Considerations of space prevent us from any detailed reference to these notes, but we may refer our readers to Mr. Vernon's spirited defence of himself against a critic who had censured him for translating 'Che si stavano all' ombra' by 'who were lying in the shade' (*Purg.* iv. 104). See his note *ad loc.* (i. 149). We must quote a characteristic passage from it. 'No Italian would ever use *stare* (by itself) for "to stand." He would say "starino piedi" or "starito." If one wanted to render "the woman was sitting, the man was standing," one could not say "La donna era seduta, l' uomo *stara*." It would only mean "was abiding." Suppose the case of a patient lying on a sofa, who on his doctor entering the room is about to stand up; the doctor would exclaim "*Stia! stia!*" i.e. "Remain lying down," or "remain as you were."' Mr. Vernon is equally emphatic in his objection to the rendering of 'dolce,' when applied by one man to another, by 'sweet.' Commenting on *Purg.* viii. 3, 'Lo di ch' han detto ai dolci amici addio,' he protests (i. 275) that the word 'sweet' is wholly inadmissible between two men. 'One can say "Such a man has a very sweet disposition," but not "My sweet friend," from one man to another.' Longfellow must, therefore, be in sad disgrace with him, as he renders 'Virgilio dolcissimo padre' in *Purg.* xxx. 50, by 'Virgilius, sweetest of all fathers.'

We pass on to notice a few passages in which we must differ from Mr. Vernon either in an adopted reading or in a translation. Since the publication of his first edition the Oxford *Dante* has appeared, and we think that in several instances he has been injudicious in following its text. Take, as the earliest of these, the reading 'òra' for published (Elliot Stock, 1897). We can strongly recommend it to English readers not familiar with crabbed Latin.
'ora'—'breeze' for 'hour'—in the first line of the passage Purg. i.

115-7:

'L' alba vinceva l' ora mattutina
Che fuggi innanzi, sì che di lontano
Conobbi il tremolar della marina.'

Mr. Vernon, reading 'ora' in line 115, with Scartazzini and other Italian commentators followed by the Oxford Dante, and taking the word as equivalent to 'aura,' translates thus:—'The dawn was over-coming the breeze of early morning, which was retreating before it, so that (even) from afar I distinguished the shimmering of the sea.' He admits, however (i.35), that an overwhelming majority of commentators understand 'ora' to be the matin hour.' But he relies upon Cesari's remark that it is not easy to picture to oneself how the dawn can overcome the hour, nor how the hour can fly before the dawn; and upon the same commentator's conclusion that 'the dawn was driving before it that light breeze which is wont to spring up at the approach of the sun, and which imparts a tremor to the sea upon the coast line.' But to this we reply, in the first place, that the contraction 'ora' = 'aura' does not occur in any other passage of the Divina Commedia. And as to the supposed difficulty in regarding the dawn as overcoming the hour which flies before it, surely this is a most appropriate description of the gradual increase of light as the time of dawn advances. Compare the beautiful opening lines of Par. xxiii. in which Dante speaks of a bird which, sitting upon her younglings' nest through the night which hides all things from us, anticipates the time and yearns for the sun and the breaking of the dawn, that she may behold them again and set about the pleasing labour of finding them food. Moreover, Dante is not telling us the cause of the shimmering of the sea, but explaining how it came to pass that he

1 Scartazzini, no doubt, reads 'òre' in Purg. xxviii. 16, where Dante says that the birds in the Terrestrial Paradise

'con piena letizia l' òre prime
Cantando ricevieno intra le foglie,'

and Mr. Vernon here also follows him. Scartazzini cites, in support, from Petrarch, Sonnet 143:

'Parmi d' udirla, udendo i rami, e l' òre,
E le frondi, e gli augelli lagnarisi.'

But contrast with this a much more apposite passage in Ariosto (Orl. Fur. Canto xxv. st. 94):

'A salutar la nova luce
Pei verdi rami incominciar gli augelli.'

Be it also remembered that Dante in line 7 of Purg. xxviii. had particularized

'Un' aura dolce, senza mutamento
Avere in se.'

Will Mr. Vernon, and those who agree with him in reading 'l' òre' in line 16, explain (1) the sudden change in spelling from 'aura' to 'òre,' and (2) the mention of further 'breezes' immediately after that of the 'aura dolce,' which, we will concede to Mr. Vernon, may be supposed to be his favourite 'light breeze of early morning, blowing from the east'?
could distinguish it, viz., by reason of the brightening light. Mr. Vernon's quotation of \textit{En.} vii. 9, 'splendet tremulo sub \textit{lumine} [not 'tremulâ sub \textit{aurâ}'] pontus,' supports our view rather than his. We are glad to see that Mr. Fay does not admit 'ôra' or 'ôre' into his excellent Concordance. We will give one more instance only of a reading adopted by Mr. Vernon, against which we must protest, as we have done already in a Short Notice of the Oxford \textit{Dante}. We allude to the atrocious

'Guardaci ben; ben sem, ben sem Beatrice' (\textit{Purg.} xxx. 73),

where 'Guardaci' and each 'sem' are substituted for the almost universally adopted reading 'Guardami' and 'son.' Our apology for recurring to this subject is that since dealing with it on the occasion referred to, we have come across a passage in Ariosto's \textit{Altre Stanze}, stanza ii. lines 2 to 4, where, addressing his lady, he says

\textit{ho di voi} nel cuore \\
Real costumi, angelica favella, \\
Andar celeste, e star degno d'onore.'

It must strike everyone that, in this portrayal of her excellences, the poet had in his mind Dante's description of his Beatrice. The 'real costumi'—'queenly manners'—recall Dante's 'regalmente,' which, in \textit{Purg.} xxx. 70, he applies to Beatrice's attitude, and which, \textit{pace} Scartazzini, has nothing to do with the use of the plural number by a queen in speaking of herself. Beatrice, queenly in dignity, \textit{speaks} 'con angelica voce in sua favella' (\textit{Inf.} ii. 57). Ariosto's 'andar celeste' recalls Dante's 'mia celeste scorta' (\textit{Par.} xxi. 23), and 'star degno d'onore' his comparison of Beatrice to a 'donna onesta che permane Di sè secura' (\textit{Par.} xxvii. 31, 32). We are persuaded that neither poet regarded his lady as aping a sovereign's diction.

On the other hand, we must congratulate Mr. Vernon on refusing to be led away by Scartazzini and Dr. Moore in reading 'i Melenesi' for 'il Melanese' in \textit{Purg.} viii. 80. The speaker there, the Shade of Judge Nino Visconti of Gallura, is contrasting himself with his widow's second husband, the Milanese Visconti, not with the Milanese army.

We pass on to consider line 44 in \textit{Purg.} xxi., 'quel che il ciel da sè in sè riceve,' which Mr. Vernon renders 'what from itself Heaven receives into itself,' \textit{i.e.} what, having its origin in Heaven, is received back by heaven. By this, he says, is to be understood the soul, which came from God and goes back to Him when purified. No doubt, if this interpretation is correct, it makes excellent sense with what follows. But can 'quel che il ciel da sè in sè riceve' be construed as though the words ran thus: 'quel da sè che il ciel in sè riceve'? Is not the natural construction that which takes 'da sè in sè' with 'riceve'? and the meaning 'that which heaven by itself receives into itself'? \footnote{Cf. \textit{Purg.} xxvii. 135: 'Che qui la terra sol da sè produce.'}

\textit{Do we not unduly wrench the grammar in referring 'da sè' back to 'quel'? and, if not, does 'quel da sè' mean' that which is from
itself? One would expect 'quel di sè,' as in Purg. xxxii. 51, 'E quel di lei a lei lasciò legato.' Mr. Vernon has here followed Scartazzini and Dr. Moore; but the rendering which we suggest has the support of Benassuti and Fraticelli. It must not be forgotten that many commentators, Fraticelli among them, read the line thus: 'quel che il ciel in sè da sè riceve;' and if that be correct we think it impossible that 'da sè' can be taken apart from the verb.

A few more remarks and we will conclude. Mr. Vernon, in a note at vol. ii. p. 224 on the words 'ciò forniro,' in Purg. xxii. 6, says that 'only in Par. xi. 132 do we find our English signification of the word [fornire], to furnish, to provide.' But has he not forgotten Inf. xxiv. 58, 59, 'Leva' mi allor, mostrandomi fornito Meglio di lena'?

Our last reference shall be to Purg. xxiii. 43-5, where Dante says of the emaciated Shade of Forese:

'Mai non l'avrei riconosciuto al viso;
Ma nella voce sua mi fu palese
Ciò che l'aspetto in sè avea conquiso.'

We subjoin Mr. Vernon's translation:

'Never should I have recognized him by his face; but in his voice was made manifest to me that which his aspect had obliterated within itself.'

In rendering 'conquiso' (participle of 'conquidere') by 'obliterated' he follows Blanc, as did Scartazzini before him. The primary meaning of the word is 'conquered,' but we think 'obliterated' is fully warranted in this context. And we should not have alluded to the passage but that Blanc lays stress on the fact that this is the sole place in the Divina Commedia where 'conquiso' occurs. And Scartazzini, though he quotes instances of its use from Petrarch and Ariosto, fails to notice, as does Mr. Vernon, that it is used again by Dante himself in the Canzoniere.

Will Mr. Vernon, well read in Petrarch as he is, let us also remind him of that poet's imitation of Dante, Purg. xxxiii. 112-14?—

'Eufrates e Tigri
Veder mi parve uscir d' una fontana,
E quasi amici dipartirsi pigri.'

Compare Petrarch, sonnet 44, lines 7 and 8:

'E cercherassi 'l Sol là oltre ond' esce
D' un medesimo fonte Eufrate e Tigre.'

Both of them, of course, borrowed the allusion from 'un medesimo fonte,' viz. Boethius, Philos. Consol. lib. v. metr. 1, quoted by Mr. Vernon:

'Tigris et Euphrates uno se fonte resolvunt,
Et mox abjunctis dissociantur aquis.'

We now take leave of these volumes, with a full appreciation of the valuable matter which they contain, and in the hope, at no
distant date, of welcoming the appearance of Mr. Vernon’s promised ‘Readings’ on the Paradiso.


This book will meet with a ready welcome from every student of English Church History, because there is no other volume which contains so much of this kind in so compendious a form or at so reasonable a price. Theological students have long been looking for such a book. Moreover, a book which has the express commendation, in regard to plan and editing, of the present Bishop of Oxford, and which has passed under the eyes of Professor W. Bright and the late Archdeacon Perry, is bound to find acceptance with Churchmen. We learn from the Preface that it was not intended at first to include any documents belonging to the period before 1066, but that the editors gave way on this point, and have allowed the first fifty pages to be filled with a selection of such documents as seemed to be most important. We have, accordingly, among others, the proceedings of the Councils of Hertford, Hatfield, and Cloveshoo, and the Tithe Ordinance of Athelstan. Between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation (pp. 52-144) the chief documents included in the volume are the Constitutions of Clarendon, Magna Carta, and the Statutes of Mortmain, Provisors, and Praemunire. But the longest portion of the book, as was to be expected, has been given to documents belonging to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (pp. 145-670). Canons and Articles have been excluded, for the most part, as being easily accessible in other modern works. The source of each document is carefully given, the date is recorded on every page, there is a summary of each paragraph in the margin, and occasional notes are added at the foot of the page. There is no index, but the table of contents is very full. The only criticisms that we would offer upon this most helpful volume are: (1) Was it wise to give translations only, especially where the Latin or Norman-French is difficult to procure? (2) Was it advisable to give only the titles of the Canons of 1640 (as on p. 535), when even Cardwell has not given the full text of them?

A Forgotten Gospel: Lectures on Doctrine delivered in St. George’s Parish Church, Belfast. By Hugh Davis Murphy, D.D., Rector. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1896.)

These lectures upon Church doctrine were probably most useful in Belfast, but they have not the same value in England, because High Church principles are now so generally accepted among us, that English Churchmen would feel that Dr. Murphy’s teaching, although generally sound and good, left much to be desired both in depth and thoroughness. In a word, the standard of doctrine is not advanced enough for English Churchmen. For example, no Churchman could be satisfied with the lecture on Confirmation (First Series,
Lecture V.), and very few with that upon Holy Communion (Lecture VI.) ; for in neither case are we instructed as to the effects and benefits of these ordinances, and in the latter case the doctrine falls very far short of what may be called 'a Catholic standard.' Dr. Murphy is terribly afraid of calling any ordinance 'a sacrament' (except the two 'sacraments of the Gospel') even in a lesser sense, and his zeal upon this point leads him into saying, 'Confirmation does not fulfil the first condition, it has no outward and visible sign, like the water in Baptism and the bread and wine in the Eucharist. Matrimony does not fulfil a single condition of our Church's definition' (p. 125). He says the same thing of Ordination, viz. that it has no 'outward and visible sign,' but in neither case does he add 'ordained of God,' or we could understand him better. For our own part we dislike, as much as Dr. Murphy does, this continual talk among English Churchmen of a certain type about 'the Seven Sacraments' (p. 126); but we should not like to deny a sacramental character to Confirmation, Matrimony, and Holy Orders, and we acknowledge that the laying on of hands in the first and third Ordinance, as well as the joining of hands in the second, are truly 'outward and visible signs,' and in the case of Confirmation and Holy Orders these 'signs' are instruments 'of an inward and spiritual grace given unto' the recipients. Dr. Murphy does best when he is combating the ultra-protestantism of Presbyterians and other Dissenters upon subjects like Conversion and Assurance (Second Series, Lectures III. and IV.). When he treats of Extempore Prayer (First Series, Lecture III.), or of Fasting and Almsgiving (Second Series, Lectures I. and II.), he is able to put the teaching of the Church, or the duty to be enforced, in plain and practical terms, though at times he is apt to become too familiar and conversational in manner for the dignity of the pulpit. He is a strong advocate of Episcopacy upon its historical side, but whether he holds it to belong to the esse or only the bene esse of the Church we cannot tell from his lecture (First Series, Lecture II.). So, again, his conception of the Church as a visible society is admirable, but there is a defect in his representation of it as a supernatural organization; and in dealing with the Sin of Schism (Second Series, Lecture VI.), while he insists that the Church of Ireland, not the Roman Catholic body, has the lawful Irish succession (p. 304, comp. pp. 15-17), his whole attitude is applicable rather to the condition of religious bodies in the north of Ireland than to the position of the English Church. Dr. Murphy is well acquainted with Protestant and Evangelical literature, and has some knowledge of the Early Christian Fathers, and is often able to convict his hearers out of the mouth of those whom they admire most, while he appeals to history and the Scriptures. He says smart things now and again, and makes some clever home thrusts, but his views upon the Eucharistic sacrifice (p. 131) are weak, and, while he has some beautiful thoughts about the Communion of Saints (Second Series, Lecture V.), he hardly brings out the full relation of the departed to the living in the body of Christ. On the whole, we should say that these lectures would not be largely read by English Church-
men, unless they were put in a position of antagonism to those who hold extreme Protestant views, in which case they might find in them some useful answers to their objections to the teaching of the Church.

The Sanctuary of Suffering. By Eleanor Tee. With a Preface by the Rev. J. P. F. Davidson, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias', Earl's Court; President of the Guild of All Souls'. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

In spite of Mr. Davidson's sympathetic and appreciative preface we cannot but pronounce this book—reverent, thoughtful, and earnest though it be, both in purpose and character—to be very disappointing. Its title led us to suppose that it was a volume written for chronic invalids by one of themselves; but when we came to examine it carefully we felt that it would most probably prove to be tedious, if not tiresome, to those who were laid by with long sickness. Here and there we found chapters which would be really helpful—e.g. 'Sickness' (p. 219) and 'Poverty' (p. 236)—and, indeed, the latter part of the book is much to be preferred to the earlier portions, because it is more natural and practical, whereas the earlier chapters are devoted to the expansion of a doubtful theory about pain, suffering, and sacrifice, which is founded upon the Scotist view of the Incarnation, and we are not prepared to endorse this view. Mr. Davidson has dealt tenderly with the author's strong conviction that the Incarnation is independent of the Fall, and that Sacrifice has no necessary connexion with Sin, when he says—

'Such subjects as Pain, in its connection with the Fall, and in its aspects as independent of the Fall, and the Incarnation, viewed as a part of God's original Purpose, modified indeed in its character, but not necessitated by human Sin,—and other kindred points are touched with a sympathetic hand, so as to open up sources of spiritual consolation and devout thought, rather than to limit, by mere definition, what lies beyond our spiritual vision' (pp. ix, x).

We cannot take Evolution for granted, as the writer does, nor can we regard pain, before the Fall, as a beneficent power from God to enable man to work out his ideal, and, since the Fall, as punitive and remedial only, nor can we wholly separate suffering from sin. It is useless to speculate upon what might have been if there had been no Fall; and, in our judgment, to say, as our author does, 'that the foreknowledge of man's Fall involved a fore-provision of the remedy of that Fall' (p. 99) is practically to unsay all that has been said before respecting the Incarnation and the Sacrifice as independent of the Fall.

The following passage will show the general position of the writer upon this point of theology, viz. :-

'The Incarnation of God would, we cannot but feel, have been of the ordinance of God even if man had not 'fallen,' for by that means alone could man secure his perfect end—union with God. It must have been of the Divine Will, for without that God would not truly have given Himself to and for man; and, as "union (by sacrifice) is the term of
love,” God and man would not have been in perfect affinity and kinship. Incarnation meant to God the Immolation of Himself for the sake of this perfect affinity and kinship, whereby alone the chief object of His Creative Scheme of Love could realize complete bliss. There was to be oneness of life and being between Himself and the man created by Him for love, in which man should experience true bliss; and this could not be except by Self-Sacrifice and the acceptance of the Sacrifice. Therefore we feel that, irrespective of the Fall, suffering must always have been in the world’ (pp. 48, 49).

The writer gives due recognition to the place of the Sacraments in the Christian life, but it is regrettable that in regard to Holy Baptism no power or effect is attributed to the Resurrection; we ‘were baptized into His death’ (p. 138), but nothing is said about ‘newness of life,’ or new birth, through Christ’s Resurrection, nor do we remember to have read anything in this book about the Resurrection; and in regard to Holy Communion ‘the Altar of Sacrifice’ is dwelt upon to the exclusion of any idea of our being made partakers thereby of the risen and glorified life of Jesus. This is surely a great loss; for a theology in which the Resurrection of Christ is not a prominent feature, since it is the very foundation of ‘the endless life’ (pp. 147–57), is wholly inadequate for Christians; yet it is absent from Part v. of this book, where we should expect to find it. It is of no use to exalt the Sacrament of the Altar (pp. 158–78), as the connecting power between the Incarnation and ourselves, and overlook that which makes the blessed Sacrament a living power in us.

As we have said, the practical part of the book, which begins with ‘Things New and Old’ (p. 209), is much the most helpful, because the most natural; and it is a relief to get rid of the reiteration of the Scotist theory, which leads to mere speculation about what might have been, and finds but little support in Holy Scripture. Throughout the book one finds passages of great beauty and intense religious feeling, together with illustrations from Art and Science and Literature which delight the reader, and show how widely our author has read and studied; but one experiences also a sense of exaggeration continually, and regrets the superabundance of words, the lack of logical order, and the enormous length of the sentences. Unfortunately the writer has taken certain parts of Lux Mundi for her theological standpoint, and has not perceived the whole tendency of that teaching, because she has not grasped ‘the proportion of the faith.’ The text, too, is marred by an absurd error in the frequent use of the ‘via dolorosa’ (pp. 175, 176, 190, 218, &c.) as if it were always an ablative case.

On the Use of Science to Christians. By Emma Marie Caillard.
(London: Nisbet and Co., 1897.)

Some months ago the attention of our readers was called to Miss Caillard’s remarkable book Progressive Revelation. We now welcome a little book of ninety-five pages, by the same writer, on the benefit which Christians may gain from Science—this last word being used
to mean physical science. It is not an attempt to reconcile Faith and Science. It is still more emphatically not an attempt at the impossible task of constructing the Christian religion out of scientific data. Such an attempt would disparage revelation, which would be superfluous if science could discover all that is revealed in Christ. The Creed is not a short cut to the goal which science would reach with arduous endeavour. But Miss Caillard (herself an ardent believer in the Christian Revelation and in Him who is revealed) addresses her fellow-Christians in the hope of showing them what new and invigorating light is thrown on the old Faith by modern scientific thought.

It is, no doubt, most dangerous to identify Christianity with this or that form of science or philosophy, just as it is most dangerous to identify it with this or that form of polity. The polity, the theory may pass away, but 'the word of the Lord endureth for ever.' But it is one thing to say, for instance, that the Gospel is an antedated Hegelianism, and quite another to say that Hegel throws new light on the Gospel. Each age, as it comes to contemplate the Gospel, brings with it certain political, scientific, metaphysical prepossessions, which cause it to regard the one Gospel from a point of view which is not precisely that of other ages. It is not to be expected, then, or desired, that minds influenced by modern views of physics, biology, geology should regard the Christian revelation precisely in the same way in which the same revelation was regarded before the birth of these sciences.

It is possible to think that these sciences contradict the Faith; it is possible to think that they are identical with the Faith; it is possible to establish faith and science in air-tight compartments of the mind, so that neither should touch or influence the other. Miss Caillard attempts a nobler work—to show in what way scientific progress can be borrowed as Egyptian spoil to decorate the faith of God's Israel.

She works out, then, with much skill and much reverence, such theses as these: that the modern conception of the Unity of Nature corroborates the revealed truth of the Unity of God; that the consistency of natural laws argues a methodical steadfastness in the Creator, which harmonizes with the Christian doctrine of submissive yet co-operative prayer; that the 'close connexion between mind and body,' which are yet not identical, finds a guarantee in the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the flesh; that the conception of the world as not merely made, but 'made to make itself,' brings into clear light the constant presence of God with His creation. We appreciate very highly a chapter in which she employs the abundant pain in the world to show that 'happiness per se is not the end of creation,' but that perfection is (p. 35). Nature tells us that sacrifice is the principle of progress; Revelation tells us that this is the case because God is love, and is manifested in the sacrifice of His Son. And we cordially agree with her that the Apostle's words, 'We walk by faith, not by sight,' do not mean 'We walk by faith, not by reason.'
There are, of course, passages on which, if we had space, we should wish to offer some criticism; but on the whole we commend this little book, which is written in a very lucid style, to those (and they are many) who hold the Faith, yet fear it can be held only on the sufferance of science. Such timid faith is apt to break down into a chaotic agnosticism. Miss Caillard proves that science is neither the rival nor the enemy of faith, but its valuable servant.


A hope which we recently expressed in these pages has been fulfilled by the appearance of the second series of Dr. Fraser’s Gifford Lectures; but we own to a slight feeling of disappointment. The second series seems to us rather less lucid, and rather more encumbered by repetition, than the first—partly, perhaps, because of a natural weariness on the part of the lecturer; partly because, whereas the first series was mainly negative, the second essays the harder task of construction. But if his argument sometimes strays beyond the limits of logical cogency it is wise to remember that the fundamental thesis of the writer is that other faculties besides the logical have a rightful place in the structure of a truly human philosophy; and that such a philosophy is, by the nature of the case, necessarily imperfect, because it is the work of an intelligence neither tied to verse-readings, according to Mr. Spencer, nor identical with omniscience, according to Hegel (pp. 121 ff., 269).

The earlier pages of this volume resume the Moral Foundation of Theism (p. 8 ff.) No science—no thought at all—is possible except on the assumption that the universe is a realm of order. But may not this order be purely mechanical and unmoral? It may be answered that order is itself necessarily moral, because order is an expression of Truth, and Truth is a moral as well as an intellectual conception. A sounder answer may be found in the moral constitution of man. If he is moral it is because he finds himself standing in the presence of a moral Power. If he says, ‘I ought,’ his conscience echoes a Voice which says, ‘Thou oughtest.’ But there is still a difficulty. The Power which says ‘Thou oughtest’ might itself remain unmoral: morality might express what God commands and not what God is. It seems no answer to this theory to say that it plunges the thinker into the most hopeless confusion; for moral agnosticism might be miserable yet true (p. 21). But we are convinced, with Dr. Fraser, that faith in a final moral Principle is as elementary and fundamental as faith in a final intellectual Principle. If it is impossible for man to believe in a universe which is a chaos, it is no less practically impossible to believe in a universe which is a fraud. And if the Power at the root of the universe is an unmoral Power, how could there arise among its effects moral and responsible man?

Dr. Fraser, then, does not hesitate to accept the testimony of

1 *Church Quarterly Review, January 1897.*
conscience to a perfectly moral First Cause. The meaning of the universe 'is finally revealed... in the voice of conscience, with its sense of eternally underlying righteousness alone. Is not this the conception of the Whole which—I do not say by strict logical necessity of the understanding I must take—but which I ought to take?' (p. 11). We find some sagacious remarks (p. 15) on Kant's refutation of logical proofs of God, which is interpreted (we think rightly) to mean not that God is unknowable, but that there is need of a faculty other than the logical by which to know Him. There are also good remarks (p. 65) on the Argument from Design—an argument which has greatly ceased to convince when it is concerned with details of adaptation, but is as forcible as ever when it appeals to the orderliness of the universe as a whole.

Passing reluctantly by these points we come to the chapters in which Dr. Fraser recognizes, and takes great pains to solve, some of the difficulties in the way of Theistic Philosophy, reminding us that if there are difficulties on the theistic side, we do not escape from difficulties still more serious when we try to think out the universe without Theism. He considers specially the four difficulties of Evil, Progress, Miracles, and Death.

(1) If the world be the work of omnipotent Goodness, whence comes it the evident occurrence of things which are as they ought not to have been? (p. 142 ff.) Dr. Fraser rejects the theory of the purely negative character of evil, because evil is practically felt to be a real power (p. 165). Whence comes it? If from God, then His holiness is assailed. If from an evil deity, then the ultimate truth of the universe is dual confusion, not unity and order. But conscience testifies that man has received a faculty of self-determination, or, in a sense, creation, by which he can originate a course of action. Does the entrusting to him of such a power indicate imperfect goodness or imperfect wisdom in the Creator? Dr. Fraser rejects (p. 185) Leibniz's optimism, which assumes that evil is permitted as the necessary occasion for greater good; for evil still remains evil, whatever use may be made of it, unless evil is, after all, only an imperfect form of good. But he points out that such originative power is the only means by which real moral goodness on the part of men could be produced. If man were a mere machine, bound to turn out virtuous actions to order, he would be a thing and not a person; and it may well be more divine to create persons who, being free to choose between good and evil, are free to be voluntarily good, than to create things which cannot be morally good at all (p. 184).

Evil, then, is due to the misuse of a faculty given that we may be voluntarily good. But is not evil too prevalent for human self-determination to be the sole cause of it? We regret that Dr. Fraser gives some countenance to the theory that part of the evil may have been originated by men in some pre-existent state (pp. 190, 281). Such a theory seems to us baseless, and inconsistent with the function of memory in amending character, and perhaps to involve the grotesque supposition that a person might, in successive incarna-
tions, be repeatedly regenerated in Baptism. Moreover it does not really solve the difficulty, but only puts it back a stage. We wish Dr. Fraser had shown how consistent with reason is the Christian doctrine that other creatures besides man, with wider spheres than his, have received the like originative power and have misused it. It were well if those who lightly deny the personality of Satan would consider that such a denial either throws the whole responsibility of the world's misery on man, or else casts on God the blame of making a world which is, as we see it, in many respects very evil.

(2) With such a view of evil the problem of Progress offers little difficulty (p. 192 ff.) Progress implies, indeed, the imperfection of the universe as it is; but if it is consistent with Theism to conceive of God as allowing originative wills which can and do choose evil, the world is confessedly not perfect, and may progress towards perfection. Thus too we can account for the fact that progress is 'not like a Roman road, which goes straight to its goal; it is rather like a winding river, frequently forced to turn backward' (p. 208).

(3) A similar account can be given of Miracles (p. 216 ff.) They imply a certain imperfection in the working of the universe, which needs to be occasionally supplemented. But if the universe contains persons as well as things, and those persons have the power of bringing into existence that which ought not to have been, may there not be reason why these abnormal forces should sometimes need to be rectified by unusual action on God's part? And if miracles are, after all, found to form a part, not yet comprehended, of the ordinary course of nature, this would only show that God provides in nature a cure for the evil which He allows to intrude itself into nature. With Leibniz Dr. Fraser holds that 'when God works miracles He does it not in order to supply the wants of nature, but those of grace' (p. 236).

(4) With respect to Death, and man's possible survival, Dr. Fraser preserves a philosophical reticence (p. 240 ff.) The case is so unique that little can be learned from analogy. He disallows the Platonic notion of an indissoluble soul surviving in a disembodied state the decay of the flesh; but maintains that, as on other grounds we have a reasonable faith in a perfect First Cause, we may trust Him in this case also not to suffer us to be confounded.

The characteristic which we value most highly in Dr. Fraser's philosophy is that he boldly claims a place in it for other than the sensitive and the logical faculties. As a philosophy must aim at satisfying the whole man, so the whole man must take part in the construction of it. In his system the testimony of the conscience and the freedom of the will are not set aside as perplexing things for which a precarious place must be found at the end of a study of natural causation. They take their place as prime elements of self-consciousness, mysterious indeed, but not more mysterious than other truths, and demanding their place among the solid foundations, and not among the insecure pinnacles, of human thought. There is thus a mystery left which logic cannot solve, but in which man can live. The conclusion is, in a sense, agnostic, for 'we
know' only 'in part;' but it finds room for faith by which we have communion with the Perfect.


The writings of the Dean of Canterbury are becoming increasingly like the fatal gift of Æolus to Ulysses. Given a subject, there pours from his ready pen such a turmoil of quotation, motto, illustration, anecdote, bedizened platitude, vituperation, shrieking and pomposity, that we are inclined to think that the four winds loosed from their prison would be more peaceful company. It is sad to see such eminent gifts of language and memory and enthusiasm rendered distasteful, and almost useless, by the lack of discipline, and by an unbounded egotism. The chief purpose of this book seems to be to show that the traditional Puritan and Protestant conception of the Bible as the one infallible guide to truth, literally and verbally inspired, or rather dictated, by the Holy Ghost, is altogether impossible. It is pointed out that this conception is false to history, and to what we know of God's dealings with men (cc. i.-iii.) ; that we must recognise the human element in Scripture; the progressive and partial morality of the Old Testament (cc. iv., v.); the varying degrees of spirituality in the different books of the canon (viii. &c.); the danger of quoting isolated texts from any part of Scripture, as if they were in themselves conclusive as to doctrine or morals (xvi. &c.) There is, of course, nothing new in all this; but had it been set forth quietly, reverently, and in a Catholic spirit, with that power of making a subject interesting and popular which the Dean undoubtedly possesses, the result would have been a useful book, and a real help towards removing vulgar misconceptions of revelation. But as it is the book is marred by fundamental defects. We would draw attention especially to Chapter xiii., which gives the key to the writer's principles, or lack of principles. This chapter is entitled 'The Bible not the only Source from which we can learn of God.' The other sources it mentions are these—History, Biography, Nature, and Conscience. Where is the teaching of the Church? We look in vain for any adequate conception of it in this chapter or elsewhere. All that we are left with is a number of vague and rhetorical generalities about the guidance of the Holy Ghost, which apparently is to be looked for just as much in the utterances of gifted individuals as in the judgment of the Universal Church. For, on the one hand, Luther is quoted with approval because he, 'relying on the promised guidance of the Spirit of God, "sought for the Canon in the Canon"' (though it is admitted that his judgment about St. James and the Apocalypse was wrong) (p. 28). On the other hand, we are warned against considering even the decisions of Ecumenical Councils as infallible (p. 33). The writer's attitude towards Catholic interpretations is illustrated by one of his customary tilts at what he calls 'the deadly system of auricular confession' (pp. 211-13).
The simple fact is that the Dean's position is—

'Wandering between two worlds, one dead,
The other powerless to be born.'

He cannot be a thoroughgoing Protestant—he is too learned and too honest for that. And he will not be a Catholic. Consequently he is thrown back upon merely natural and human canons of interpretation, and practically makes no difference in principle between the voice of God as it is heard in the gradual development of human experience and research, and as it speaks in the Universal Church, a voice which, in spite of many surface variations in tone, is yet in its essence one and unchanging and supernatural. Consequently we cannot be surprised that Dean Farrar has nothing but condemnation for the mystical interpretation of Scripture (c. iv.); that he lightly brushes away with a few words the solemn question of our Lord's infallibility (pp. 127-8); that he treats in a most cavalier manner some of the miracles of the Old Testament—e.g., the speech of Balaam's ass becomes 'the language of a warm imagination' (p. 228); the standing still of the sun and moon a mere poetical expression of the providence of God in the battle of Bethhoron; while to get rid of the miracle of Jonah he is reduced partly to discredit and partly to misunderstand the words of our Lord in St. Matthew xii. (p. 240).

Upon the whole, the chief value of this book is that it will be found a storehouse of quotations and anecdotes bearing upon the Bible and the opinions of men concerning it.


This book contains twelve sermons, well printed in large type, with wide margins and rough edges, also a handsome title-page in red and black. Six of the sermons are an incomplete course on the Beatitudes, preached in St. Paul's; the rest are on various subjects. Most of the twelve have a controversial flavour; indeed, the second is on 'The Duty and Spirit of Controversy.' We gather that the author regards himself as having a mission to warn against the errors of the Roman Church, and whatever tends in that direction, under which head he evidently classes the Oxford Movement, or, as he calls it, 'the crusade of Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey' (p. 40). The sermons display undoubted power of language and illustration, and a certain earnestness. But unfortunately they also show their author as a man of singular narrowness of mind. On some subjects he seems quite incapable of even trying to understand the opposite position, to say nothing of being fair to it. And his style of controversy is peculiarly irritating, for while he condemns unreservedly, and with an air of having said absolutely the last word on very great and solemn subjects, he indulges in gratuitous and somewhat feline expressions of affection for those whose convictions he condemns. The spirit of his controversy with those whom he calls 'our beloved
brethren of the Roman persuasion' is well seen in the first sermon, on Unity. In this he apologizes for Independents, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, even Unitarians, but for Roman Catholics he has no allowance to make. All he can say is that they 'represent three disastrous ideas' (p. 14). Similarly, throughout the book he treats his hearers, in the threadbare and familiar style of the Protestant lecturer, to harrowing descriptions of St. Bartholomew's Day, the Marian martyrs, and select tit-bits from Roman casuists. We do not think this style of controversy does the least good to any one, unless it be to those attacked. Roman controversy in these days demands not only protestations of charity, but that realization of charity which consists in being fair to your opponent. And, above all, it demands a real knowledge of Catholic truth, and a loyalty to it. How far the Archdeacon of London is qualified in these ways we will leave the reader to judge by laying before him a few examples. The Archdeacon thus apologizes for Presbyterianism. They 'represent the principle of the original identity of presbyters and bishops. That brings them very near indeed to ourselves' (p. 15). The Introduction to the Ordinal seems strangely to ignore this 'principle.' And we presume it is to further emphasize this nearness (or is it a holiday reminiscence?) that the Archdeacon says in another sermon, 'When we sit or kneel around the Lord's Board' (p. 102). Again he gives us as a definition of the Eucharist that it is 'a renewal of the Covenant by the symbolical participation in the heavenly feast opened to us by the complete, finished, and never-to-be-repeated Sacrifice of the Cross' (p. 104). Consequently 'the fanciful view of the Schoolmen, that it is an extension of the Incarnation, finds no support in the New Testament, in the Primitive Church, or in the Book of Common Prayer' (ibid.). We fear that the Archdeacon has never grasped the full meaning of the Incarnation itself. He sees no alternative between the heresy of the Capharnaites and a Zwinglian, or at most a Calvinistic, view of the Eucharist, such as his own. Otherwise he would scarcely quote St. John vi. 63 as conclusive against the belief he is attacking. He takes no pains even to be accurate. He says, 'The persons who hold this view lay stress on every allusion to the Incarnation, not on the Death and Passion. They pray that they may perpetually perceive in themselves the fruits of their participation' (p. 105). We suppose he is alluding to the words of the well-known Collect, 'Deus, qui nobis sub Sacramento mirabilis,' &c. He has apparently never read it, so he may be comforted to know that the last word is 'redemption' and not 'participation.' And with monstrous effrontery he tells his hearers that 'it is on account of this unscriptural view that some insist on fasting Communion' (ib.). Fasting Communion, then, is a mere corollary of a 'fanciful view of the Schoolmen'!

We go on to look for a moment at the Archdeacon's view on the Eucharistic Sacrifice. He says:

'There is nothing in the whole New Testament about Christ pleading His sacrifice in Heaven.' It amounts to a mistake, a direct contradiction of the Article of the Creed, 'He sitteth at the right hand of God.' . . .
The Sacrifice is in eternal activity only in the same sense that any other event or act of His life is an eternal activity; if we take up such language, we must say that He is perpetually born, perpetually teaching in the Temple, ... perpetually supping with the Pharisee,' &c., &c.

In contrast to this solemn trifling we turn to the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'Jesus, made an high-priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.' Has the Archdeacon ever tried seriously to take in what these words mean? Would he be content to treat the mediatorial Sovereignty of Christ in the same way that he does the Priesthood?

Once more, the Archdeacon deliberately ignores the existence of a form of private and direct absolution in the Prayer Book. Indeed, he practically condemns such an absolution by saying, 'In God's teaching there is no ground . . . for insisting that his (the priest's) voice, legitimately pardoning our sins, is to be heard as that of Christ Himself, who said to the palsied man, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee"' (p. 156). And we are not surprised to find the Archdeacon in a complete Protestant fog as to the meaning of 'penance.' 'And as for satisfaction imposed by a priest, our Church teaches that "the offering of Christ once made is that perfect satisfaction,"' &c. (p. 158). The Archdeacon's attacks on Catholic practices may remind us of the proverbial old lady sweeping out the Atlantic with a besom. There is undoubtedly a humorous side to them; but to our minds the sad side is more prominent. That one who is a member of the Chapter of St. Paul's should show himself so obtrusively blind to the meaning of the most solemn act of worship of the Christian Church is bad enough. But to endeavour to make light of, to misrepresent and discourage the precious privilege so sorely needed by a sin-laden world, of receiving a personal absolution for sin confessed to God in the presence of His priest, seems to us little less than a crime.


We welcome the appearance of this excellent little book. It is an attempt by a well-known and successful headmaster to raise the standard of religious teaching in secondary schools. Such an attempt is sorely needed. The average religious instruction given in the higher schools of this country is utterly inadequate. Boys and girls—the children of Christian, and in most cases of Church, parents—are going out to the universities, to the professions, to the higher stations of public and social life, with less knowledge of the Bible and less appreciation of its claim and meaning than many a child in our National schools. Mr. Bell does not ignore this fact, nor its causes. He speaks of the 'haziness' or unsettled belief of many of the teachers (pp. 13–15), of the absence of any right scheme of religious teaching, or worthy conception of the end of such teaching.
And he complains, rightly, of the entirely inadequate standard often set up by examiners in religious knowledge (pp. 18-21). Consequently, even the very short time which a school time-table assigns to 'Divinity' is often spent merely in dry details of Scripture history, 'got up' from some manual; or if the subject be the Greek Testament, teachers 'who know or like Greek better than Divinity' find 'a convenient neutral ground in the "ecbatic and telic" senses of ἐνα or the peculiar uses of ἐν' (p. 81).

But Mr. Bell does not despair of improvement; and he is clearly of opinion that, even in the limited time usually assigned to this subject, much may be done if only the aim and method are right. So in this little book he first sets before the teacher clearly, reverently, even solemnly, what is the object of all religious teaching: 'The ultimate aim of the Christian teacher is to lead his pupils to the Father through Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, that they may grow up in the love of God and man' (pp. 1-2). Again: 'The Christian teacher looks on Jesus Christ as the centre of the history of religion; all that goes before converges to Him, all that comes after radiates from Him' (p. 25). He then suggests leading principles by which to interpret the Old and New Testaments, and gives concise and most carefully thought-out schemes of subjects. He also deals with some of the modern difficulties with regard to the Bible, especially with the Higher Criticism. Lastly, he gives a scheme of instruction on Christian Evidences (chap. vi.) which, he tells us, was actually given to a sixth form in 1891 and 1893. Throughout Mr. Bell is reverent, broad-minded, and inspiring, and shows wide reading and a love of the Bible. We cannot, however, follow him altogether in his treatment of the Higher Criticism. He is a moderate adherent of this system, though we are pleased to see that he practically rejects the 'Kenosis' theory (p. 126). It is perfectly true that the teacher ought to know something of the questions raised by the Higher Criticism; it is also true that he need not be tied to a hard and mechanical theory of inspiration; but we do not see the wisdom of suggesting, even to advanced and inquiring scholars, that, e.g., there are 'doubts (or even definite conclusions) respecting the traditional date and authorship of the book of Daniel' (p. 48). For ourselves we cannot see that such 'doubts' or 'conclusions' can stand either with reverence or logic. But, at any rate, we think that those using this book would do well to confine themselves to the constructive part, and we should be much surprised if they found any need to support a wavering faith by the suicidal methods of the Higher Criticism. Holy Scripture interpreted as Mr. Bell would have teachers interpret it is its own best apologist. He will be a wise teacher, moreover, who does not try to explain everything, but is willing to leave some difficulties unsolved. With this reservation we cordially recommend this book to teachers, and especially to examiners. The latter have much to answer for. As Mr. Bell more than once points out, they are practically responsible for the style of religious instruction given in our schools; though, indeed, 'character and principle, piety, reverence, and the love of...
righteousness, may not be expressible in written answers nor calculable in marks' (p. 60). Yet, when examiners learn to set papers which endeavour to draw out knowledge of the religious and moral teaching of the Bible, the teachers themselves will have to endeavour to impart this, and therefore to learn it.


This can hardly be called a posthumous work, for six of its seven chapters had appeared during the author's lifetime in the pages of magazines. And yet there is a pathetic interest attaching to it. The author, a scholar of singularly attractive though hidden personality, was a remarkably progressive thinker. And death stayed his hand before it could, perhaps, be clearly seen, as in the case of this book, so in his own, in what conclusion he would rest. Gaston de Latour, like Marius the Epicurean, as Mr. Shadwell tells us in his tasteful little preface, is 'the history of the spiritual development of a refined and cultivated mind' (p. vi). But in both the interest is by no means confined to the central figure. The setting is exquisitely painted. Indeed, the pictures of contemporaries are, if anything, more vivid than that of the hero. In Marius the scenery belonged to the golden autumn of Imperial Rome, and was enriched by portraits of Marcus Aurelius, Lucian, and others. In Gaston de Latour Mr. Pater has described a past which seems in some respects further away from us than Rome of the Antonines, France of the sixteenth century, and he introduces the figures of Pierre de Ronsard, lay-prior, poet, and amourist, Montaigne, and Bruno the Dominican pantheist. In Marius the progress of thought, or perhaps, to speak more correctly, of sympathy, is from a refined Paganism to Christianity. Here we see traditional Christianity brought face to face with neo-Paganism, aesthetic and intellectual. It is probable that the story would have ended in a return to the old faith, but the battle is scarcely beginning when the fragment ends. Gaston himself is introduced, in the first chapter, as a youth of noble family in the district of La Beauce, passing his early years in seclusion and a narrow circle of inherited traditions. He chooses the priestly calling, and receives the tonsure at the age of sixteen from the Bishop of Chartres, whose household he joins. Next we see him startled and awakened by the love-poetry of Ronsard, then learning suspense of judgment from Montaigne, and lastly confronted by the daring idealism of Bruno. There is nothing new, of course, in all this. It is a story of the inner life which repeats itself under different conditions in every age. But Mr. Pater had begun to tell it again in his most graceful and suggestive manner. His style, in spite of affectation and fastidiousness, is always an agreeable change from the commonplace. He appreciated language enough to take real pains with it; and though his writing is lacking in strength and persuasiveness, it is always sympathetic, tender, and thoughtful, with a suggestive undertone of the pathos of
human life, 'the sense of tears in mortal things.' Perhaps Mr. Pater is at his best in describing with delicate allusiveness the ceremonies and sanctities of the Catholic Church. What could be more felicitous than this 'appreciation' of the Office for the Ninth Hour?

'It was like a stream of water crossing unexpectedly a dusty way—Mirabilia testimonii tua!' In psalm and antiphon, inexhaustibly fresh, the soul seemed to be taking refuge, at that undevout hour, from the sordid languor and the mean business of men's lives, in contemplation of the unaltering vigour of the Divine righteousness, which had still those who sought it, not only watchful in the night, but alert in the drowsy afternoon' (pp. 11-12).

Christianity, no doubt, would have won back Gaston de Latour after his spiritual wanderings, not only by its inherent beauty, but by its essential sympathy with human nature and the results of human experience, its true 'humanism.' Anima naturaliter Christiana is a truth which seems to have increasingly appealed to Mr. Pater in his later years. We are thankful that it was so. And yet we could wish to see in his writings some deeper sense of the severity of Christianity: its doctrine of sin, its keen contrast between nature and grace, its insistence on 'righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.' Sin seems to have presented itself to him rather as something monstrous and ugly, or something which introduces unpleasantness and pain into the world, than as an offence against a personal God. And so there is a subtle danger, even in his most Christian thought—a danger by no means imaginary in these days—of a merely aesthetic appreciation of Christianity, without any deep submission of the will. We are far from laying to the charge of Mr. Pater's memory that he would have had the least sympathy with ritualism divorced from morals. We rejoice in his remarkable witness, somewhat one-sided though it may be. But the modern danger we speak of compels us to remember that while God in revelation appears 'in perfect beauty,' it is the beauty of righteousness: 'from His right hand went a fiery law.'


This book is the first instalment of a series, to consist of ten volumes, written by various American scholars, among whom we recognize some well-known and honoured names. The publishers in their advertisement describe the series as being 'popular monographs giving, so to speak, a bird's-eye view of the most important epochs in the life of the Church,' and suggest the hope that these may promote the cause of Christian unity.

Dr. Vincent's work deals with the development of the idea of Papal rule from Leo IX. to Boniface VIII.; while the first chapter gives a short sketch of the course of Papal history in earlier times. It will be seen that this volume covers one of the most deeply important and most fascinating portions of Church history. It is a period of the strain and conflict of Titanic forces, resulting in con-
trasts and paradoxes at once splendid, grotesque, and bewildering. The most intense belief in the truth of the Christian revelation and the reality of Christ's kingdom upon earth exists side by side with manifestations of the most barbaric and unregenerate human nature. Above all it was the age of idealists—Hildebrand, Barbarossa, the earlier Schoolmen. The vigour of the young Western nations had not yet been damped by failure nor diverted into the exclusive pursuit of material interests. Hildebrand is a phenomenon we can never contemplate without admiration, scarcely without awe and terror. He represents the rare, almost unique, combination of a lofty and all-embracing idealism, a courage, intellectual and moral, to carry out in every detail what faith and imagination had suggested, and the opportunity of doing it on the largest scale.

Consequently it is no easy task to write the history of this time. The historian must first be interpreter rather than judge. And for this he must be in thorough sympathy with his subject. He must take a wide and generous view of human nature. Above all, he must endeavour to put away personal feeling in interpreting religious beliefs and ideals. We cannot say that Dr. Vincent, though he endeavours to be fair, possesses those qualifications. He is out of sympathy with his period; and he has not even made it interesting. His book shows considerable reading and some ability. He has certainly traced the history of Papal claims, shown the mistakes on which they seem to be based, and the causes which led to their downfall. But still the general effect is dull and disappointing. He unconsciously belittles all that is great in his period. He cannot forget that he himself, professor in the Union Theological Seminary, detests alike the Hildebrandine idea of the Church and the Catholic conception of authority. He does not seem to be able to enter into the unearthly depths of religious feeling which underlie not only the movements of the Preaching Friars, but even such strange aberrations as the Flagellants. No doubt he has been fettered somewhat by his limited purpose, 'to make all personalities and all historical details tributary to the main theme' (xii.), but we can scarcely forgive him for telling us no more, e.g., of Thomas Aquinas than just his name. He repeats the wearisome platitude, 'The essence of monasticism was selfish—the effort of the individual to secure his own salvation by repudiating all the duties and responsibilities of life.' That a man might become a monk with the primary purpose of the glory of God, and as the response to a supernatural vocation, Dr. Vincent, in common with most Protestants, cannot understand. And his general tone is illustrated by such passages as this criticism of Hildebrand's famous dying words: "'I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity." Did he believe it? It is not for us to say. There is no delusion like moral delusion. If he was sincere, we can only pray to be delivered from the righteousness which Hildebrand loved' (p. 116). Or, again, let us take this crude and commonplace conclusion about Abélard:

"He met the fate which always attends the inroad of thought and learning into the snug retreats of fixed belief and accepted tradition."

VOL. XLIV.—NO. LXXXVIII.
His disaster was due, largely, to his own unrestrained passion and arrogance; but he carries with him the sympathy of all open-eyed and fair-minded men by his courage in the fight against a bloated ecclesiastical conservatism, and a lethargic submission to authority in matters of faith' (p. 206).

We are not always sure of Dr. Vincent's accuracy in details. For example, it is misleading to say 'William [the Conqueror] refused the profession of obedience to Rome' (p. 102). What he refused was to do homage for his kingdom to the Pope as feudal lord. Again, Charlemagne was crowned Emperor at Rome on Christmas Day, 800, and not in November (p. 10). And speaking of Manichæism (p. 303), he says: 'From one of its leaders, Paul of Samosata, the system acquired the name of Paulicianism.' Probably the name was taken from St. Paul; and besides, the expression 'Paul of Samosata' has been so appropriated by historians to the earlier heretic that it is a pity to use it of quite a different person.

Without wishing to condemn altogether Dr. Vincent's book, we cannot praise it, nor recommend it as a real contribution to the history of the Middle Ages. There is still much need for careful, sympathetic work at this complicated and little-understood period. The historian need not himself be either a Romanist, or even a Catholic, to understand and interpret it. Witness such brilliant monographs as Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire,* or Storr's *Bernard of Clairvaux.* But he must at least be slow to deliver judgment on motives and characters; and he must endeavour, in the weighty words of the Bishop of Oxford, at the conclusion of his *Constitutional History,* 'to base his arguments on nothing less sacred than that highest justice which is found in the deepest sympathy with erring and straying men.'

*Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1897.* Being a Statistical Book of Reference for Facts relating to the Clergy and the Church; with a fuller Index of Facts relating to the Parishes and Benefices of England and Wales and Ireland, and to the Charges, Missions, &c., of Scotland and of the Colonies, and of Europe, North Africa, and the Mediterranean, than any ever yet given to the Public. Twenty-ninth issue. (London: Horace Cox, 1897.)

We have been at pains to set out in full what we find on the title-page of this most admirable work in order that our readers may see at a glance what a vast repertory of invaluable information on matters clerical this volume of 2,075 pages places at their disposal. The Editor says: 'The writing of the Preface to this work does not become a lighter matter as years go on.' If it be not a 'light matter' for him, he certainly has the knack of making it both light and bright to his readers. We have not known for years a more sparkling bit of light reading than the Prefaces to *Crockford.* After reading them and noting the curious *tit-bits* of correspondence with which he regales us, we feel tempted to define the clergy as 'the class that makes inadmissible demands.' It never seems to occur to
them, if we may judge from these specimens, to ask themselves on what lines and with what laborious care this colossal work has been built up, and whether their requests to have this or that or the other inserted under their names will mar the symmetry of the system and the usefulness of the Directory. No! if the Editor is compelled to decline they give him a piece of what they are pleased to call their 'mind.' They hector him, and bully him, and half threaten him. But even an editor is, presumably, a vertebrate animal, and even a worm will turn. Of the extent to which these attempts to force an entry into the Directory are carried, some idea may be formed from the fact disclosed to us in this Preface, 'that the matter rejected far exceeds that which is used'!

But the interest of the Preface is not confined to stories, however amusing, of captious and silly correspondents. It deals—and deals, we venture to think, very soundly—with matters which very gravely affect the best interests of the clergy and of the Church at large. Take, for example, the following remarks on the Resolution lately carried by Mr. Round in the House of Commons on the grievous injustice done to the beneficed clergy in the matter of poor-rates, which in their case, and in their case alone, are levied, not on their estimated rental, but on their incomes:

'The attitude of Sir Michael Hicks Beach in his remarks on the Resolution are not what might have been expected from him. He promised an inquiry by a Royal Commission. It might have been thought that a Government which owes so much to the clergy might have been ready to take immediate measures for their relief without waiting for a Royal Commission. . . . It is to be hoped that the subject will not be allowed to drop, but that Mr. Round and others who have promoted the Resolution will not desist from their determination to relieve the clergy till they have succeeded in passing into law a short and practical Act of Parliament which will give effect to their intention' (p. vi).

We should like to have quoted copiously the paragraphs in which the Editor indulges in severe, but, as we think, most legitimate criticisms on Parish Councils, but our space is limited. So we can only give a sentence or two: 'A moribund Government felt that they had done nothing, and to save their credit must, if possible, do something. So out of the depths of their inner consciousness they evolved the Parish Councils Bill' (p. xv).

And yet again:

'In one point my friendly critic was strictly correct. He says the reason of my strictures on Parish Councils is not difficult to guess. Certainly it is not; for it lies on the surface, and is sufficiently obvious. It is the dislike which is shared with me by men of education and intelligence generally for the transfer of important public interests from those who formerly cared for them efficiently to a body of men who have now more than proved their incompetence and incapacity to deal with them' (p. xvi).

There are also some admirable remarks on the Education Bill and on Church Statistics, and on the lamentable decrease of clerical
incomes and increase of outgoings. On this last head the following is a case in point:

'A characteristic example of the way in which nominally high clerical incomes sink into nothing before outgoings has been furnished by a beneficed clergyman in the county of Dorset. His total income for a period of five years, including rent of the vicarage, which he is allowed to let, was 1,868l. os. 11d. After paying for assistant clergy, making repairs to vicarage, and meeting other inevitable deductions, the net income left to himself was 21l. 6s. 8d., or an average of 4l. 5s. 4d. a year' (p. iv).

And yet people are to be found who pooh-pooh the crippled means of the clergy!
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