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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

September, 1913.

The Month.

The Gospel and the Masses.

DURING this passing August the Bishop of Manchester has for the ninth time conducted his annual Mission on the sands of Blackpool. For the second time Bishop Kempthorne, last year of Hull, now of Lichfield, has done the same at Bridlington. One of the editors of this magazine has had the privilege of taking a share in the work both at Blackpool and at Bridlington. Blackpool is of course the larger place, and its crowds are a never-ceasing wonder, their numbers, their versatility, and their orderliness being more than remarkable. Here services are held on the sands twice daily at five different stands. Bridlington is content with one large stand. In each of these two great pleasure resorts there is no question but that the Bishops' Missions are appreciated. There is never a sign of disrespect or contempt. Crowds come to the services, and they come to stay. As the Missions draw to an end there are many indications that not only are the efforts appreciated, but that they are definitely helpful in bringing back many who have wandered, and in winning some for the faith of Christ. The old Gospel is not played out; whatever men may say and however great indifference and sin may become in our modern life, the simple preaching of Christ crucified and risen is as attractive and as powerful as ever in its contact with the masses of our people. The preaching of the Gospel is the best apologetic. Blackpool and Bridlington are proofs of this,

and they are splendid encouragements to a vigorous evangelistic campaign in the parishes of our land. If we preach Christ, we can be content to believe that with the power of prayer behind it our work will be owned and blessed. The future is as bright as the promises of God can make it. It is for us to enter upon it with the impulse of its glorious hope.

The Catholic League.

The Bishop of St. Albans deserves the warmest thanks of the whole Church for his bold and vigorous action in the matter of the so-called Catholic League. The whole story of this League, with its clandestine incursion into the Diocese of St. Albans and its unblushing Mariolatry, forms one of the saddest pages in the history of our modern Church. We are not disposed to attach too great an importance to it, but it does at least show that there are some members of the Church of England—we believe they can be but few—who do not understand the most elementary principles of loyalty. The Bishop has rendered extra and especial help by publishing the form arranged for the initiation service of the League. It is sometimes suggested that we are too fearful of the dangers of Romanism, and that there is no real peril to be afraid of. This League and the form which the Bishop has made public show that there is a body of men amongst us who are deterred neither by shame nor loyalty from bringing us back to the discredited and discarded superstitions of medieval Romanism. These men may be honest up to their lights, but if so, they are singularly unenlightened. Honesty would carry them into the Church of Rome. If it did, we should respect them. As it apparently does not, we can only take measures to prevent them from damaging the Church with whose real principles they are singularly out of harmony. Hence our pleasure at the Bishop of St. Albans action.

There is no need for panic. But the coming to light of this movement will surely help loyal Churchmen of every school of thought to realize that there must be no playing with our principles. The Catholic League will tend to bring together

Evangelicals and High Churchmen, who though they differ among themselves are loyal to the spirit of the Church of England, and so out of this evil good may come. The episode is the coming to the surface of a disease which the Church must cure for itself or succumb to before many decades are past.

A Revised Prayer-Book.

A revised Prayer-Book has been issued from the Press. It does not bear the name of the reviser, though it might perhaps be easy to guess it, but it does carry a guarded imprimatur from the Bishop of Oxford. We are inclined to regret its publication, and do definitely regret its tendency.

We regret its publication because we fear it will strengthen the section of the Church who are against all revision. They will say if this is revision, we will have none of it. We for our part are anxious that the Prayer-Book should be adapted to modern needs, that something of elasticity should be given to our form of worship, and we have ventured to differ from many of our friends who have told us that we may lose more than we gain by revision. If the final revision is approximate to this new book, our friends will be right and we shall be wrong, but we do not give up hope yet, and we do not intend to give up effort.

We regret its tendency. Two voices claim a right to be heard in any process of revision—the voice of the Liturgiologist and the voice of the twentieth century. We admit the right of both voices. We venture to submit a principle which we had hoped all could agree upon: the doctrinal balance of the present Prayer-Book ought not to be disturbed. The attempt at revision before us gives greater heed to the Liturgiologist than to the needs of to-day, and in doing so seriously disturbs the doctrinal balance. We cannot but agree, therefore, with the comment of the *Guardian*: "We cannot think that the authoritative revision, when it comes, will bear any close resemblance to it (viz., this attempt), for the simple reason that what is here suggested is much more than our English temperament would ever consent

to adopt at a single step." We would for ourselves omit the last phrase of the *Guardian* comment; we trust that English Churchmen as a whole will never consent to adopt such a revision. We notice that the *English Church Review* expects before long another compilation in which the Protestant interests will be represented. We hope the *Review* will be disappointed. We Evangelicals who are interested in revision are not out for a party advantage; we are out for a satisfactory revision on the present doctrinal basis. We are sorry that this attempt at revision is using the occasion to hark back in some particulars to medievalisms, which were laid aside three hundred years ago.

Mixed Marriages.

It is to be hoped that due attention is being paid by all English Protestants to the attitude of the Roman Church towards mixed marriages. Our contemporaries *Work and Witness* and *Evangelical Christendom* have made public the conditions on which that Church grants a dispensation for a mixed marriage. The dispensation is only granted on condition that the Protestant partner will undertake to interfere in no way whatever with the religious obligations of the Roman spouse, and will further allow any children that may be born of the marriage to be baptized and brought up in the Roman communion. Over against this attitude of passive helplessness on the part of the Protestant, the Roman partner undertakes to strive to the best of his or her ability for the conversion to Romanism of the non-Roman partner. It is obvious that no such undertaking could or should ever be entered into by any man or woman who has a shred of Protestant principle or conviction. Any Protestant man or woman entering into wedlock on such terms as these may either at once accept the inevitable and become Roman, or may certainly contemplate a family life that is wrecked and ruined from the very start.

"Father Ralph."

If any one thinks that the above is an unfair estimate of the influence of Rome on family life where the marriage is a "mixed one," let him read the tragic tale of that influence in families that are wholly Roman

as set forth in Mr. O'Donovan's novel *Father Ralph.* Not merely as a powerful story, but as a presentment of Roman Catholic religious life in Ireland in all its varied phases, the book is a document of primary importance. It is written by one who speaks from first-hand experience as a son himself of the Roman Church. The account of the various stages passed in preparation for the priesthood is tragic enough, but the point of pitiful horror and cruelty is reached in the narrative of Ralph's home-life in its gradual progress to absolute annihilation. And as the *Guardian* reviewer says, "Everyone who really knows Ireland knows that it is, every word of it, true." A Church which can enrich itself by domestic ruin in the fashion portrayed in this book is one that has departed far from primitive ideals. Those who have a leaning towards Roman ritual and doctrine will do well to study this graphic picture of the working of the inner life of that communion.

The Cinematograph.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the cinematograph show as at present conducted is fraught with manifold peril to the children and young people of our land. In the current number of the *Hibbert Journal* Canon Rawnsley discusses the moral aspect of the matter, while the Headmaster of Eton speaks from the side of education. One of Canon Rawnsley's indictments is the pandering to a depraved appetite for horrors which seems to be so widely prevalent. He gives various instances of the terrifying and distressing effects on little children who were present. He opposes vehemently, and, we think, rightly, the present practice of reproducing scenes from Bible history, including some of the most solemn and sacred moments of our Lord's life, in the form of living pictures. There is no doubt that powerful vested interests are concerned in the matter. It is said that some ten millions of pounds sterling in England alone are invested in these enterprises. This makes it all the more necessary that those who wish to check the harm which indiscriminate and unrestricted attendance at these shows may do to our little

ones should combine in their several localities to support such measures as have been taken by the magistrates at Liverpool, Middlesbrough, and Carlisle for the safeguarding and protecting of young children in this matter.

The Headmaster of Eton.

The cinematograph has been acclaimed as a new and potent instrument of education. The Headmaster of Eton deals faithfully and trenchantly with this point. It is utterly alien to that strenuousness and concentration which should be brought into play in any process which is to be called educational. "The influence," he says, "of the moving pictures is prejudicial to learning in exactly the same way as the reading of snippets of information in half-penny newspapers, only to a much greater degree." It is difficult to realize the confusion that must be produced in the child's mind by gazing constantly in a darkened theatre at rapidly changing pictures of every conceivable form of life all over the globe. It is indeed not only confusion that is produced, but unutterable weariness—possibly accompanied by the development of a new disease of the eye, already known to oculists as the moving-picture eye. It would appear, then, that the constant and indiscriminate use of the cinema is good neither for education nor for recreation; in fact, Dr. Lyttelton goes so far as to declare that in the case of the very young children unrestricted indulgence in it will result as a certain consequence in race suicide.

Truth New and Old.

In the poem of welcome which he wrote for the recent visit of the French President to London, Mr. Rudyard Kipling characterized the genius of France in the following line:

> "First to face the truth and last to leave old truths behind."

We quote the line, not to discuss its applicability as a summary of French life and character, but to suggest that it aptly portrays the ideal by which Evangelical thinkers and teachers

may well be animated at the present time. On the one hand let us be "first to face the truth." Let us have the "open" mind, which is quite a different thing from the merely shallow or impulsive mind. Let us be prepared to welcome new light from any quarter on Scripture or on Christian doctrine. But having welcomed it, let us then weigh and test and prove and discriminate, and in so doing let us be "last to leave old truths behind." The two attitudes of mind are not mutually antagonistic, but complementary. It is the man who has learned to value the earlier truth that has come to him, and who will therefore never lightly surrender it, who is most fitted to welcome and appreciate the truths that further life and experience may bring.

Good Manners.

Lord Rosebery's allusion, in his speech to the boys of the Guildford Grammar School, to the subject of good manners was a timely utterance, and has given rise to some discussion. In the course of it, a writer in the *Times* has put his finger on the really essential point when he says that the really well-mannered man is he who has learnt the great principle of detachment. He thinks of the other rather than of himself. If he speaks of his own concerns it is only so far as he thinks they may be of any real interest to the other. For the rest, he does not speak of his own affairs or concerns at all, but devotes himself entirely to those of the other; not in a spirit of artificiality or suffering boredom, but with a real and genuine interest. The man who can do that is not only a good speaker, but a good listener. He has caught the spirit of that genuine unselfishness which is the essence of true politeness. He knows something of "the heart at leisure from itself." He has also something of that Christlike spirit which believes that there is something good and pleasant in each and is determined to discover and evoke it. It is well for Christians to bear in mind how large a part gentle gracious courtesy should play in the truly Christian life, remembering, too, that in Christ alone its power and its secret are to be discovered and possessed.

The Church and the Poor.

A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

By W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D. B.Sc.

IX.

The Seventeenth Century.

BETWEEN the death of Queen Elizabeth and the beginning of the "Industrial Revolution," there stretches a period of about 150 years. It cannot be said, I think, that the Church (as a corporate body) took a prominent, or even an adequate, part in the relief of the poor during this period; though doubtless there were, as I shall show, individual leaders of the Church who, at various times, did take a deep and real interest in the welfare of the poor, and who gave liberally to their support.[1] If our task could be discharged by simply relating what the Church did for the relief of the poor during this age, then a very brief treatment of it might be sufficient. But those who have studied history know that any particular age can only be adequately explained by careful reference to the age which preceded it. Consequently the age of the "Industrial Revolution" (in which we may be said to be still living) cannot be understood without at least some conception of the conditions which existed in the age we are now considering.[2] It is, then, as being necessary to explain present conditions and present difficulties, that we must primarily study the measures which were taken on behalf of the poor during the seventeenth, and the first half of the eighteenth,

[1] The immense number of charities for the benefit of the poor founded by various individuals during the seventeenth century proves that the spirit of charity was then very much alive. A glance into the origin of existing parochial charities—to say nothing of the great number of those which have been lost—will prove how large a proportion of these date from this period.

[2] On this epoch as "a period of preparation" see Meredith, "Economic History of England," pp. 181 *et seq.* Also during this period, as I shall show, our present Poor Law became consolidated; the principles upon which, to some extent, it is still administered became fixed.

century. I say "primarily" because I do not wish my readers to think that a study of this particular age is in itself unfruitful; on the contrary, if we study it carefully, we may learn some extremely valuable lessons from it. This is especially true of the period covered by the reigns of James I. and Charles I.

These two reigns were, so far as our subject is concerned, extremely like the previous reign in one respect, and extremely unlike it in another. In them, as during the time of Elizabeth, we find that the care of the poor had largely passed into the hands of authorities which were only ecclesiastical so far as this, that the churchwardens of the parish were *ex officio* associated[1] in the administration of the Poor Law of that date. On the other hand, there was this great dissimilarity: the reign of Elizabeth was one of active *legislative* development, while during the reigns of James I. and Charles I., we find that it was rather an improved *administration* of the law than the making of any great changes in the law itself that was the chief object of the Central Authority.

The most important of all the Acts relating to the poor passed during the reign of Elizabeth was that of 1601,[2] which established the principle, "that property must be chargeable for the relief of poverty" and "that the security of the one is endangered by the extremity of the other."[3] It appears that it took some considerable time before the various provisions of this Act came into general operation. It is one thing for a Central Authority to order that machinery requisite for a variety of purposes shall be set up, and also for this Authority to give powers to Justices and other local authorities; it is another thing to set this machinery working satisfactorily in all the various parts of the kingdom,[4] especially when we remember how slow

[1] With the overseers.

[2] 43 Elizabeth, cap. 21. See Nicholls' "History of the Poor Law," vol. i., pp. 189 *et seq.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

[4] Nicholls states (p. 245) that "there were places in which no rate was made for twenty, thirty, and even forty years after the passing of this Act." He quotes from a pamphlet of 1622, which complains of there being parishes in which there had been no collection for the poor for seven years.

were the means of communication in those days compared with those we now possess.

Some of the most important provisions of this Act deal with the duties of overseers and with the powers entrusted to them. These officials were not appointed for the first time in 1601, but they were then first empowered to make and collect the rates requisite for carrying out their duties. They, together with the churchwardens of the parish, were henceforth[1] those actually responsible for seeing that the various provisions of the Poor Law were properly carried into effect. Here it will probably be well to remind ourselves of the actual ecclesiastical condition of England at this time. As Sir G. Nicholls says, "The great bulk of the people belonged to the Established Church, and they regarded it as an essential part of the government, parochial as well as general."[2] Hence, from a religious, as well as from an ecclesiastical, point of view, not only the churchwardens, but also the overseers would represent both the people and the Church in a way in which they do not any longer represent them. Not only those who administered the law, but also Parliament which made the law, may consequently be considered to have expressed the views generally held in the Church at that time as to the proper treatment of the poor.

As an example of this, and as an explanation of provisions which still exist in many parishes at the present time, we may notice an Act passed in the seventh year of James I.[3] This Act deals with the application of money given for the apprenticing of poor children. It states that much money has been given for this purpose, and that more is likely to be given, and its object is to encourage "other well-disposed people" to bestow "money to the same good and godly purposes";[4] therefore it enacts that "all money so given shall for ever continue to be used for such purposes only, and that corporations in cities and

[1] Until 1782, when "Gilbert's Act" restricted their duties to collecting the rate and accounting for it.

[2] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 221. [3] 7 James I., cap. 3.

[4] An instance of the truth that the Poor Law was originally intended to *supplement* private charity. See Leonard, "English Poor Relief," p. 137.

towns corporate, and in parishes and towns not corporate, the parson or vicar, together with the constables, churchwardens and overseers of the poor for the time being, 'shall have the nomination and placing of such apprentices and the finding and employment of all such moneys as are so given for the continual binding forth of such apprentices.'"[1] This Act, as I have already stated, shows, first, the exceedingly close co-operation of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities at that time; and, secondly, it reveals why to-day the vicar of an ancient parish is frequently a trustee (indeed, often chairman of the trustees) of charities for apprenticeship and other purposes.

Another Act of the same year is an additional proof of this co-operation. This Act[2] is "for the due execution of divers Laws and Statutes heretofore made against Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars, etc." It orders Houses of Correction to be provided in every county by a certain date, and if not provided by this date every justice of the county is to be fined £5; also a general search is to be made for undesirable persons, and "the constables and tithing men" are to give an account upon oath in writing and under the hand of the minister of every parish"[3] what disorderly persons they have apprehended. All this goes to prove not only how active, but, indeed, how efficient local organization was becoming.

We have now entered upon the period when the relations between the Crown and the people were such that Parliaments assembled only to be prorogued, and when it was practically impossible to pass legislative measures of any kind. Indeed, between 1610 and 1624 this seems actually to have been the case. When Parliament met in this latter year, the first Act[4] it passed was one for "erecting of Hospitals and Working-houses for the Poor." I mention this Act for this reason, because although the arrears of legislation must have been enormous, so keen apparently was public opinion at the time

[1] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 227.
[2] 7 James I., cap. 4. Its provisions deal mainly with administration.
[3] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 229.
[4] 21 James I., cap. 1. It makes perpetual 39 Elizabeth, cap. 5.

in regard to the poor, that the very first Act passed after fourteen years of silence had reference to a question connected with them.

Throughout these two reigns, and especially during the long intervals which elapsed between the summoning of successive Parliaments, the Privy Council[1] became in effect the supreme administrative authority in all matters connected with the relief of the poor; and the various "Orders" which were issued by the Council at this time should be carefully studied, that is, if we are to understand how the poor were dealt with during this period.[2] These "Orders" were both local and general; they sometimes had reference to particular difficulties in particular districts; at other times they were general regulations applying to the whole kingdom. On the whole, these Orders in Council were wisely drawn up, and they show not only a knowledge of the needs of the poor at the time, but as a rule they meet these needs in a very satisfactory way. Some of the difficulties with which these Orders deal may be noticed: first, they frequently call the attention of the local authorities, the Justices of the Peace, etc., to the remissness with which they were administering the law, and they threaten punishment if it is not put into force. Secondly, they often issue temporary regulations in reference to the sale of corn at a cheap price in times of famine following bad harvests, and they also order that there shall be a supply of grain to the poor. Thirdly, they command that in times of scarcity the local authorities shall provide work for the workers.[3] In those days a bad harvest,

[1] "It seems . . . that the Crown claimed a sort of supplemental right of legislation to perfect and carry into effect what the spirit of existing laws might require . . . as well as . . . a sovereign power which sanctioned commands beyond the legal prerogative, for the sake of public safety" (Hallam's "Constitutional History," vol. i., p. 237).

[2] "On the Work of the Privy Council in regard to the Relief of the Poor." See Leonard, "English Poor Relief," chap. viii., "Parliament and the Privy Council."

[3] Leonard, *op. cit.* (p. 148), quotes as follows from an Order in Council: "This being the rule by wch both the woolgrower, the clothier and merchant must be governed. That whosoever had a part of the gaine in profitable times since his Matv happy raigne must now in the decay of Trade . . . beare a part of the publicke losses as may best conduce to the good of the publicke and the maintenance of the generall trade."

and especially two or three poor harvests in succession, meant a famine, because there was not then, as now, the means of procuring a supply of corn from other countries. In 1621 and 1622 there were two exceptionally bad harvests, which led to very serious disturbances in different parts of the country. Another matter upon which the Council uttered proclamations was upon the necessity of the country gentlemen dwelling at home upon their estates instead of living luxuriously in London about the Court. Two reasons were stated for this proclamation: (1) Because of "inconveniences which of necessity must ensue by the absence of those out of their countries upon whose care a great and principall part of the subordinate government of this realme doth depend"; (2) because the King "was perswaded that by this way of reviving the laudable and ancient housekeeping of this realme the poore and such as are most pinched in times of scarcity and want will be much releeved and comforted."[1]

We must now pass to the reign of Charles I. In this reign, as in the previous one, so far as the care of the poor is concerned, we find much more attention paid to the administration of the existing law than any effort to enact new laws. This is only what we might expect when we remember that during the greater part of this reign the action of Parliament as a legislative body was practically dormant. Three years after Charles came to the throne (in 1628) an Act[2] was passed dealing with parish apprentices and parish labour. The object of this Act was to prevent parish officers—churchwardens and overseers—binding children as apprentices except as a means and for the purpose of better relieving the poor. From this it seems as if some of these parish officers had been tempted "to use the poor-rates to establish manufactures with a view to profit by pauper labour."[3] Though it was only three years since he had ascended the throne, this was the third Parliament which Charles had summoned, and this was the last Act which this

[1] Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 146. [2] 3 Charles I., cap. 5.
[3] Nicholls' "History of the Poor Law," vol. i., p. 251.

particular Parliament passed. Upon its dissolution Charles tried the experiment of governing without any Parliament at all. But whatever other evils ensued, it cannot be said that the poor suffered in consequence of this decision. On the contrary, during the next few years their welfare seems to have been studied with more than ordinary solicitude. In 1630 the King issued a very important Commission "for putting in execution the laws relating to the poor."[1] Among the commissioners were Abbot, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and Laud, who, within three years, was to succeed him. The Commission went very thoroughly to work, different commissioners undertaking different districts. Immediately after the appointment of the Commission there was issued a very general "Book of Orders,"[2] or rather of "Orders" and "Directions." The "Orders" come first, and indicate what must be the method of administration; the "Directions" command that existing Statutes, such as those for the repression of begging, for binding of apprentices, and for the provision of work and of relief, shall be enforced. There can, I think, be no doubt that during the ten years which followed the issue of this Book of Orders[3] we find (for that period) an exceptionally thorough and, on the whole, wise administration of the laws relating to the poor. The experience is a proof of what a small but able and earnest body of men at the head of a widespread organization may do to make that organization thoroughly efficient. The real difficulty in connection with all schemes for the welfare of the poor, whether these refer to large or small areas, is generally

[1] Nicholls' "History of the Poor Law," vol. i., p. 252.

[2] See Leonard, *op. cit.*, pp. 158 *et seq.*; Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 254 *et seq.* Sir George Nicholls draws attention to the similarity between the objects of the Commissions of 1630 and those of 1834—"to prevent a lax or faulty action on the part of the local authorities, and to secure an effective administration of the law throughout the country."

[3] As an indication of the conception of the scope of the Poor Law at the time the title of this Book of Orders is interesting: "Orders and Directions, together with a Commission, for the better administration of Justice, and more perfect Information of his Majesty how and by whom the Law and Statutes tending to the Relief of the Poor, the well ordering and training up of Youth in Trades, and the Reformation of Disorders and disordered Persons are executed throughout the kingdom."

found to consist in maintaining the efficiency of those upon whom ultimately the actual work devolves. Scheme after scheme, each excellent in itself, has failed in various periods because there was wanting at the centre that administrative zeal which demanded efficient work at the extremities.

In dealing with this period Miss Leonard makes two statements which are extremely interesting:[1] first, she holds that "there are grounds for believing that never since the days of Charles I. have we had either so much provision of work for the able-bodied, or so complete a system of looking after the more needy classes when they were suffering from the effects of fire, pestilence, and famine." She also holds that "at this time the history of the poor is more distinctly connected than usual with the history of the nation as a whole." The second statement to which I refer is as follows: "The personal government of Charles I. has been more associated with the exaction of Ship Money than with attempts to enforce a system which has much in common with the socialistic schemes with which we are familiar on paper, yet these eleven years are remarkable for more continuous efforts to enforce socialistic measures than has been made by the central Government of any other great European country."[2]

I have found it somewhat difficult to estimate the amount of private charity given during the period with which we are dealing; but that in certain directions it was very considerable I think there can be no doubt. It seems to have been especially rich in the way of endowed charities of various kinds. For instance, about this time a large number of almshouses (commonly known as "hospitals") seem to have been founded in various parts of England.[3] These were maintained by private liberality, though some of them were controlled by municipal

[1] Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

[2] Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 164. Miss Leonard believes that "Abbot and Laud, Wentworth and Falkland, Dorchester and Wimbledon were the members of the Council most closely connected with this policy" [towards the poor].

[3] "Probably there were nearly as many of these in existence then as there are to-day, in spite of the fact that our population has increased sixfold" (Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 207).

and other public authorities. Then quite a number of pre-Reformation foundations had passed into the hands of the Corporations of various towns, and here and there we come across a pre-Reformation hospital which, having passed by purchase into private hands, had by its purchaser been returned to its original use or purpose.[1] Among donors of endowed charities for the poor we find four Archbishops of Canterbury—Grindal, Abbot, Laud, and Whitgift. One favourite method of giving charity was to provide sums of money for binding poor children as apprentices; Archbishop Laud gave money to apprentice ten poor boys at Reading. Another method of charity was to provide means whereby work might be given to the unemployed.[2] Of course a "workhouse" in those days was literally what its name signifies. Archbishop Abbot founded a workhouse at Guildford, and in many other places money was freely given for this purpose. Yet another method of charity was to lend money to young men to enable them to set up in business for themselves.[3] If we were to search into the origin and history of many existing charities and into the history of yet more which have either been diverted from their original purpose or unfortunately have been altogether lost, we should find that a very considerable portion of these dated from the first half of the seventeenth century. This is especially true of such charities as consisted in giving away small sums of money on particular Sundays or Feasts (generally after hearing a sermon), or in the distribution of loaves of bread. One point in estimating the condition of the poor at this time must not be forgotten, namely, that considering the sign or number of the population of England in those days, the proportion of such charities as I have named was very much greater than it is at the present time. We have only to think of the population of London and

[1] Miss Leonard gives several instances (*op. cit.*, p. 209).

[2] This seems to have been a method of helping the poor specially favoured in the first half of the sixteenth century.

[3] These sums were lent either interest free or at a low rate. From 6 to 12 per cent. was the ordinary rate for money lent in business at that time.

other towns in those days, and then to remember that very many of our existing charities were then available in order to see that this was so. Regarded from the legal point of view, a wide chasm to-day separates the merely poor from the pauper or person in aid of statutory relief. In the seventeenth century this chasm was far narrower.[1] We have only to investigate the distribution of corn in times of scarcity and of work when trade was bad to find out how difficult it is to determine how much of either was voluntary and how much was effected under legal compulsion.

The period of the Civil War was naturally one of very considerable social disorganization, though actually this was not nearly so great as might have been expected; that it was so comparatively small is a proof of the excellence of the local administration existing when the war broke out.[2] Had this been less perfect, the disorganization must have been far more serious. Undoubtedly the poor did suffer to a very considerable extent during the progress of the war.[3] People who had been accustomed to give considerable sums in charity were no longer able to do so. Funds which had been devoted to the poor now went to pay the expenses of the war—in fact, many of the gentry of the kingdom were practically ruined. The Justices of the Peace who had been responsible for the administration of the Poor Law were now engaged in raising troops for King or Parliament; and the overseers, instead of collecting rates for the support of the poor, were busy collecting money to pay the soldiers. As examples of the disorganization which ensued, the following instances may be cited: At Christ's Hospital in London there were in 1641 no less than 900 children; in 1647

[1] In those days "all classes were relieved because poor relief was originally part of a paternal system of government under which the rulers regarded the maintenance of the usual prosperity of every class as part of their duties" (Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 203).

[2] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 265, who quotes the "Memoirs of Colonel Ludlow."

[3] *E.g.*, from fluctuations in the price of wheat, which was 52s. a quarter in 1625, but rose to 76s. and 80s. in 1649; in 1653 it was 35s. 6d.; in 1659 it was 66s. 6d.

there were only 597 ; at St. Thomas's Hospital in 1641 more than 1,000 patients were relieved ; in 1647 the number had fallen to 682. From the former hospital there were serious complaints of the diminution of contributions for the support of the charity.[1] The laws relating to the poor were also badly administered because, as we have already noticed, those who were responsible for seeing to their administration were otherwise engaged. If this was the case, we need not be surprised that, even when charitable funds were available, these were sometimes corruptly applied.

One curious example of the straits to which local administrators were put from want of funds, and of a strange device to remedy this want, is afforded by a suggestion from the burgesses of Great Yarmouth. These suggested that the spoils of Norwich Cathedral might be used for the relief of the poor; they petitioned Parliament to "be pleased to grant vs such a part of the lead and other vseful materialls of that vast and altogether vseles Cathedrall in Norwich towards building of a works house to employ our almost sterued poore," etc.[2] It was the able-bodied poor, those out of work, who apparently suffered most severely from the effects of the war. Some effort does seem to have been made to supply the needs of the impotent and of the children, but there was no replenishing of the public "stocks"—*i.e.*, of raw material, which, before the war, were maintained by various local authorities, and by means of which those poor who were able to work could do something towards earning a a living. In fact, never again has this particular means of assisting the poor been used to the same extent as it was during the period preceding the Civil War.

I now turn to the reign of Charles II. In the year 1662 an Act was passed[3] which, from its far-reaching consequences upon the poor (some of which consequences exist at the present time),

[1] Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[2] Leonard, *op. cit.*, pp. 273, 274. "Part of the proceeds of Lichfield Cathedral seem actually to have been granted to the poor of Stafford" (*ibid.*, p. 274).

[3] 14 Charles II., cap. 12.

demands more than a passing notice. I refer to that known as the "Settlement Act," the cause of which was stated thus, that "by reason of some defects in the law, poor people are not restrained from going from one parish to another, and therefore do endeavour to settle themselves in those parishes where there is the best stock, the largest commons or waste to build cottages, and the most woods for them to burn and destroy; and when they have consumed it, then to another parish, and at last become rogues and vagabonds, to the great discouragement of of parishes to provide stocks, where it is liable to be devoured by strangers."[1] The Act provided that any person or persons coming to settle in a parish in any tenement under the value of ten pounds might be removed into the parish where they were "last legally settled." Such a law had long been in force against vagabonds and beggars, but this Act enormously widened its scope. The Act, so it is said, was carried through Parliament mainly by the aid of the members for London and Westminster, and its chief object was to prevent a continually increasing number of poor people settling in those cities. The actual consequences of the Act were probably not foreseen by the country members; had they been so it would not have been passed. As Sir George Nicholls truly says: "A fuller consideration of its provisions at the time might have shown . . . that to remove persons from a parish in order to prevent their becoming chargeable might end in practically restricting them through life to their place of birth, destroying the incentives to independent effort, and perpetuating a low state of civilization. We now know that such have, to a great extent, been the consequences of this measure, notwithstanding the frequent emendations which it has received."[2]

[1] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 280. On the Act of Settlement see "The English Poor Law System," by Aschrott and Preston-Thomas, pp. 9 *et seq.*, who write: "It is an uncontested and incontestable fact that this important Act, of which the consequences were so serious, was pushed through all the stages of legislation without affording either Parliament or public opinion time for discussion, merely because the representatives of London and a few wealthy landlords were desirous of lessening the burden of their own poor rates."

[2] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

Both the causes and the results of this Act still remain with us to a great extent at the present time. The greater part of the money raised for the maintenance of the poor is still raised parochially; hence it is still to the advantage of every "parish" to have as few poor to support as possible. If the charge for the poor had been a national instead of a parochial charge, no doubt every trace of the "Law of Settlement" would long ago have disappeared.[1] As it is, though very greatly modified, the law still remains; and the consequences are still perceptible in the tenacity with which many, especially of the agricultural, poor still cling to the parish in which they were born. Yet experience has taught us that, especially in times of bad trade, the mobility of labour is a condition at which we ought to aim. Labour should be able to follow trade, as trade will follow conditions most advantageous to its development and success. Cheapness of materials, facilities for transit, local demands, as well as a supply of suitable labour, all help to govern the choice of the situation of any particular trade. To do anything towards tying a man down to the place in which he was born is to hinder his efforts towards self-improvement. It discourages self-effort, the one thing above all others which those who seek the welfare of the poor would foster and increase.

At the time of which we are speaking there was evidently in the minds of those charitably disposed a strong feeling in favour of providing work for the poor at the cost of the community.[2] Sir Matthew Hale, the eminent Judge, published a work in which, besides advising that children shall be instructed in trade or work, he very strongly recommends that a sufficient number of workhouses shall be built in which a sufficient stock of

[1] It should be clearly understood that by the Settlement Act "the whole of the labouring classes throughout the country were subjected to a restriction which had previously been applied only to the idle and impotent" (Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 285).

[2] I know no more striking example of the difficulty with which the lessons of history are learnt and of the ease with which they are forgotten than the many demands to provide work for the poor at the public expense. Many of these demands have been made in quite recent times. *Cf.* Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws (1909), Part I., p. 87.

materials shall be provided, and where the poor shall be set to work. He gives two reasons for this: Firstly, that no man will have a need to beg or steal when he may get his living better by working; secondly, that "no man will be so hurtful to the public as to give to those who beg, and thereby to encourage them, when he is sure they may gain their living by working." He also states that "by this means the wealth of the nation will be increased, manufactures advanced, and everybody put into a capacity of eating his own bread." So firmly was the worthy judge convinced of the value of his ideas that he commends his plan as "a debt which we owe to our nature as men, a work highly necessary to us as Englishmen, and our first duty as Christians."[1]

I have given these long extracts because they reveal to us the ideas upon both political economy and Christian philanthropy of one of the best representatives of that age. But increased experience has taught us that, not only from the point of view of the political economist, but from that of the practical worker for the permanent welfare of the poor, Sir Matthew Hale's ideas are hopelessly wrong. The public provision of work leads to the theory of "the right to work," which by its consequences, wherever it has been tried, is now condemned by practically every real friend of the poor.

The reign of Charles II. is remarkable for the attempts which were made during its course to "protect" certain trades in the interest of home industries with (it was stated) the object of benefiting the workers, though there is also evidence to prove that the interests of the landed gentry were not forgotten. I have no intention of entering upon a question much debated at the present time further than to point out that, among other projects tried in those days, efforts were made to prevent the importation of goods free of duty, "to the great detriment of the kingdom and the non-employment of the poor."[2]

There is little that calls for our notice during the short reign

[1] Quoted by Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 288, 289.
[2] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

of James II., except that it was already found necessary to amend the ill-considered "Law of Settlement," which, owing to its pressure upon the poor, was constantly being evaded. During this reign and that of William and Mary various attempts were made to prevent new-comers from being in a parish for forty days unknown to the authorities, and so obtaining a legal settlement. In one Act[1] it was ordered that every person upon coming into a parish must give a notice of this fact in writing to the overseers or churchwardens; and when this was found insufficient, it was ordered that the churchwarden or overseer was to read the notice of the person's or persons' arrival publicly on the next Lord's Day immediately after Divine Service. This was probably to afford all the parishioners an opportunity of demanding the ejectment of a newcomer "should their officers be remiss or over-indulgent."[2]

During the reign of William and Mary we meet with a difficulty which was, sooner or later, bound to arise in connection with the relief of the poor, considering who those were who bestowed it. This difficulty arose largely from the practically unlimited powers of churchwardens and overseers. An Act passed in 1691 draws attention to the fact that "these frequently upon frivolous pretences (but chiefly for their own private ends) give relief";[3] also that those who have obtained relief, "being entered into the collection bill, do become after that a great charge upon the parish, notwithstanding the occasion or pretence of their receiving collection (or relief) oftentimes ceases, by which means the rates of the poor are daily increased." It is then ordered that a book is to be kept in every parish in which the names of all persons "receiving collection" are to be registered. Then "yearly, in Easter week, or oftener if necessary, this book is to be produced to the parishioners in vestry, and the names of all persons receiving relief are to be called over, and the reasons for their receiving relief examined, and a new list is

[1] 3 William and Mary, cap. 11.
[2] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 324.
[3] Section 11 of 3 William and Mary, cap. 11.

to be made and entered of such persons as shall be thought fit to receive collection."

Here it is evidently quite clearly laid down that relief is a parochial charge, whose object is the welfare of the parishioners, towards which each, voluntarily or compulsorily, contributes. Its right application is the interest of all the parishioners; therefore it is their responsibility to see that this is effected. The relics of this old custom are found in hundreds of ancient parishes to-day, where at the Easter Vestry meeting an account of those charities which belong to the parish, and over which the Vicar and churchwardens have supervision, are produced for the inspection and ratification of the parishioners.

In my next article I hope to deal with the condition and relief of the poor in the first half of the eighteenth century—that is, up to the time of the first beginnings of the Industrial Revolution.

Leviticus and the Critics.

By the Rev. MARCUS JOHNSON, A.K.C.

II.

IT is a relief to turn from the dry bones of criticism to the living, breathing tissues of the written word of God, and to ask what messages this portion of it has for men to-day. An old book of old laws, whose interest and importance have long since evaporated, many would say. But this will not be the verdict of those who have carefully studied Leviticus; rather is their wonder aroused, their admiration called forth, and their belief in the book's genuineness and inspiration confirmed, for the illustrative or spiritual aspect of this book is far from being without its apologetic value. Powerful arguments are thus supplied in favour of the traditional view of authorship and date. The keynote of Leviticus is "holiness to Jehovah," and its central truth the great doctrine of expiation or substitution, whereby the forfeited life of innocent victims was accepted in place of that of sinful men. This was expressed in the Levitical axiom that "without shedding of blood there is no remission." It will not be forgotten that the author of that wonderful Epistle to the Hebrews (in great part an inspired comment on the principles of the Mosaic law) prominently emphasizes and interprets this axiom, and that it is in that book of the New Testament we read also that without holiness no man shall see the Lord (Heb. ix. 22, xii. 14). For this reason alone the importance and interest of Leviticus can never cease for the Christian world; but, looking more closely into the book, we are able to perceive many more points of instruction which have by no means lost their force to-day. The principles and ritual of the various sacrificial offerings and the great Day of Atonement; the law of the daily life, including the law of holiness; the Divinely appointed feasts; the Bread of the Presence and the penalty for blasphemy; the Sabbatic year and the Jubilee, all

have their antitypical, Christian, and some their still prophetic, teaching for the twentieth century after Christ.

Turning first to the Sacrificial Offerings, it is to be noted that in all the offerings in which blood was shed, and in the case of the goat for Azazel on the Day of Atonement, the offerer had to lay his hands on the head of the victim. That this was not merely significant of ownership, but of a transfer of something invisible—viz., of the sin of the offerer to the victim—seems evident from the fact that this was not done in the case of the bloodless offerings, which were equally the offerer's property. Rabbinical tradition, too, avers that the custom was to accompany this laying on of the hands by an actual confession of sin, of which the form has been preserved. The *burnt-offering*, which was completely consumed by fire—no part being eaten or remaining — taught, evidently, that for acceptable worship complete consecration is necessary, and pointed forward to that Coming One who was to be the perfect example of self-consecration to men. In the fact that a lamb was thus offered morning and evening, the fire never going out, we can see the ever-continued presentation of His unique offering in the heavenly place by man's great Representative and Mediator. The heathen idea latent in sacrificial offering was that man makes a feast for a god; the root idea in the Mosaic peace-offering is that God feasts pardoned man. In this feast the offerer, with all the members of his family, partook of the flesh of the victim at a joyous meal. "The sacrificial feast," it has been truly said, "at which man shall have fellowship with God is provided not by man for God, but by God for man, and is to be eaten, not in our house, but spiritually partaken in the presence of the invisible God" (Kellogg's "Leviticus," p. 92). When we reflect that that sentence is equally true of the Jewish peace-Offering and the Christian Eucharist, we see how typical was the peace-offering of the Christian feast and of all the soul's feeding upon the Lamb of God. Any flesh of the victim remaining until the third day was then to be burned, doubtless to prevent the least possible commencement of decomposition,

and, again, to be typical of the Holy One who should be suffered to see no corruption, but rise again on the third day. But two parts of sacrificial animals, even if not offered but consumed at home, might never be eaten, because both were regarded as especially God's—the fat as the best and the blood as the vehicle of life. This last must be drained away, even from an animal taken in hunting, and reverently covered with dust. The law of the *sin-offering* teaches to-day that God, the righteous Judge, distinguishes between sins. All sins were not equally heinous; some, indeed, were so grievous that the Mosaic law provided no offering for them—such were blasphemy, murder, adultery—the law thus leading men to think of the possibility of some better offering for sin than the blood of bulls and of goats yet to come. But for sins of ignorance or rashness, or for offences admitting of reparation, a sin-offering was specified by the law, and the central idea in the offering was expiation by blood presented to Jehovah. It is also most noticeable that whenever other sacrifices were offered, the sin-offering must be always presented first. How significant of the holiness of Him who will by no means clear the guilty, and of the primary necessity of forgiveness before any other transaction between man and God! The value of the offering was determined by the position of the sinner, and so merciful was the law in this particular that if a man could afford no victim at all he might bring an offering of fine meal, the support of one day, rather than not obtain forgiveness of his sins. No sacrificial meal was here. Anything remaining must be burnt without the camp, typical of that One Offering for sin which should be sacrificed outside the city of Jerusalem and cast forth beyond Israel's law and congregation. Because the sin-offering is mentioned late in Israel's history, and seldom referred to before the Exile, the Higher Criticism has decreed that this offering is of post-exilian origin. But apart from the danger of arguing from silence, the hardness of Israel's heart and their inability to understand the holiness of God, or even the constant customariness of the offering, would be sufficient to account for this. The root idea in the necessity

of the *guilt* or *trespass-offering* was that man, having by sin defrauded God of His proper due of service, is God's debtor. It should be particularly observed that this is the special kind of offering that Isaiah prophetically declared Christ should present when He should make His soul a trespass-offering for sin (Isa. liii. 10)—a distinct contradiction of modern Unitarian or Socinian teaching. Before leaving the subject of the sacrificial offerings, it is to be noted that the order in which they were commanded to be offered is in entire accord with that of the spiritual life: first, always, the sin-offering or expiation by shedding of blood, the means of justification; then the burnt-offering, typifying that entire self-dedication which is desired and determined on by one sensible of his forgiveness; next, the meal-offering, or the consecration of what the forgiven sinner *has*, no less than what he *is*; lastly, the peace offering typifying that feeding on Christ than which those who walk by faith can go no higher, and by which spiritual strength is received unto sanctification and full redemption. The origin of so truly spiritual an order is to be sought, surely, in a Divine and not merely a human, if priestly, source.

The ceremonies of the Day of Atonement, the critics insist, are of post-exilic origin. Yet what more natural occasion for the promulgation of this law could there be than that of Lev. xvi. 1, for its central requirement was that Aaron "came not at all times into the holy place within the veil," but once only in the year? The antitypical, Christian correspondence to this annual entrance of the high-priest into the Most Holy Place has been drawn out by the inspired author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 11, 12, 24, 26; x. 10). Called by the Rabbis יוֹמָא (the day) *par excellence*, it is still regarded by them as the day of days. Appointed to be observed in the Sabbatic month (the seventh), the Day of Atonement was closely connected with the most joyous of all the feasts, the Feast of Tabernacles, significant of the fact that only through the forgiveness of all sin can man perfectly rejoice with God. In regard to the ceremonies with the two goats, the sacrifice

here was probably doubled because one animal could not so well set forth the double aspect of both the means and the effect of reconciliation with God. While the death of the first goat emphasized the one great truth of expiation of sin by the shedding of innocent blood, the other being sent into the wilderness signified the entire removal of sin from a forgiven people. This would be the case whether עֲזָאזֵל (*Azazel*) signifies merely "removal," "dismissal," as in margin R.V. (Lev. xvi. 8), or is given as a proper name to the "accuser of the brethren" (Rev. xii. 10, 11).

Even that part of the Levitical law which concerns animals and things clean and unclean is not without its bearing on the law's origin. In the light of the investigations and discoveries of modern medical science, the most probable reasons for the distinctions of the Mosaic law between the clean and the unclean appear to be of a hygienic and sanitary character. Particularly it has been shown that in the ancient Hebrew dietary there was avoidance of all animals especially liable to parasitic disease (see Kellogg's "Leviticus," pp. 291, 292). Was such a law, then, which only of late years has been found to possess such striking correspondences with the laws of health, the invention of Jewish priests? Surely not. Even the Egyptian education of Moses is insufficient to account for such knowledge as he, if not Divinely inspired, must have had 3,000 years before his time. The Egyptians, too, far from holding contact with the dead produced defilement, considered the dead sacred. Nor were the dietary laws of the Hebrews the laws of Egypt.

The severity of the penal sanctions in chapter xx. 1-27 may be considered too great in modern times, but the objects no doubt were, first, to uphold the holiness and sovereignty of the Head of the Theocracy, and, secondly, to act as a sure deterrent. The penalty of death by stoning for blasphemy, *e.g.*, was necessary because public and private morality is founded on reverence for God. The consequence in France to-day of the abandonment of all national acknowledgment of God and proscribing of religious teaching in the schools has been

discovered to be that there is no foundation on which to build so necessary a moral instruction for children as obedience to parents. Is it not more likely that man has become too lax than that God was too severe? The Jew has always been known for the comparative purity of his social life; the state of modern society at home or abroad is on a far lower plane. The object of the present age is material well-being; the object which God has shown to be the end of government and life is holiness.

A paper on *Leviticus* would be incomplete without some reference to the Set Feasts of the Lord. A special word (חַגִּים) is applied to these, which number three—a word which, as is shown by its connection with the root חָגַג, meaning "to dance," indicates that these three, the Feasts of Unleavened Bread, of Pentecost, and of Tabernacles, were to be special seasons of joy. For the other three feasts the word מוֹעֲדִים ("appointed seasons") is employed. It has been asserted that the feasts of the Hebrews were merely natural festivals identical with the harvest rejoicings of other nations. But the entire series of Jewish feasts was based upon the weekly Sabbath, the sacred covenant number *seven* appearing everywhere in the whole system of sacred times. Nothing like such a series is found in any form of heathenism. The two Sabbatic ideas are rest and redemption; these, with varying emphasis, appear in the cycle of sacred seasons. In the *Feast of Unleavened Bread* the offering of the sheaf of first-fruits bore witness to the historic origin of the feast when Israel became God's first-born (Exod. iv. 22), the beginning of the harvest of the nations. But St. Paul has shown us that that festival looked not merely backward, but also forward to Christ in His resurrection, "the first-fruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. xv. 20). On the fiftieth day after the presentation of that wave-sheaf fell the *Feast of First-Fruits* or *Weeks* or *Pentecost*. A peculiar feature of this feast was the presentation of two wave-loaves of meal from the new corn, "for first-fruits unto the Lord"—typical, surely, of the conversion of those 3,000 from many lands, and so of the birth of the "Church of the first-

born," as a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures (Jas. i. 18), on the first Christian day of Pentecost. Five days after the Day of Atonement fell the last, and most joyous of all the set feasts, the *Feast of Tabernacles*. The antitype of this still waits, for, as the wave-sheaf at the commencement of harvest foreshadowed Christ risen from the dead, so the Feast of Tabernacles, coming at the conclusion of the year's harvest, looked forward to the completion of the harvest of humanity, when all who, being Christ's, were sown in the earth, shall rise from the dead at His coming; "the holy convocation" of the *eighth* day—always significant of a new era—typifying the new age of the future life and recompense for the toils and pains of earthly life for Christ. In the immediate precedence of this feast by the great day of national humiliation and repentance was doubtless predicted in type that turning to God of the Jews and their acceptance of Jesus of Nazareth as Messiah to which the Hebrew prophet Zechariah and the Christian Apostle St. Paul alike clearly point (Zech. xii. 10, xiii. 1; Rom. xi. 12, 15).

In these days of labour unrest and class division we should be well able to admire the wisdom which framed the laws in connection with the Sabbatic and Jubilee years—laws which removed from poverty much of its crushing and hopeless burden, while putting no premium on indolence or vice. Those notable years in the Mosaic law, and especially the Jubilee, falling as it did on an *eighth* year, bear witness to the future return of Israel to their own land (see Isa. xi. 11), and to a permanently blessed condition, not only for Israel, but for the whole redeemed people of God. Except for its appendix, *Leviticus* closes with mingled threats and promises to that people which still exists as an ethnological miracle in all lands, yet without a land of their own, known and marked, and, alas! too often persecuted and oppressed, and whose ancient country, so rich and fertile, and for centuries lying on one of the world's principal highways of commerce and travel, has yet remained comparatively unoccupied and untilled.

In view of the striking typical and predictive character of the whole Mosaic system of sacrifices, feasts, and seasons, it

remains to ask how, on the critical assumption, came this typical and prophetic element there? Allow a direct revelation of the law by God to Moses and all is at once understood; so much so that we can see that, God being what He is, and man what he is, and the plan of redemption necessary and determined on, God in the Levitical law could not have ordered otherwise than He did, even to the colour of the high-priest's garments. But on the supposition that this law was a fraudulent fabrication of post-exilic priests, whence did they obtain the necessary wisdom and foreknowledge of things to come, even of things that have not yet come to pass? That the God of truth could have chosen such means for communicating to the inner consciousness of the Israelitish race, and through them to all mankind, the fundamental principles of His great scheme of redemption it seems impossible to believe.

One argument for the traditional view remains—the testimony of our Lord to the Mosaic authorship of the law and the Divine revelation contained in it. It may have been no part of His work to decide questions of literary criticism, any more than those of natural science, but He certainly based His belief in the Mosaicity of the Pentateuch upon His Father's revelation inherent in it. Could our Lord have affirmed of a forgery, "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished" (Matt. v. 18)? Could a fabrication of fallible and fraudulent priests have been that "beginning from" which "He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 27)? Would He have placed, as on the critical theory He did, a man-made edict that he who cursed father and mother should be put to death—a law found only in the so-called priestly code (Exod. xxi. 17; Lev. xx. 9)—on a level with the Fifth Commandment, declaring the former precept of Moses a "commandment of God" which the Jews had made void by their tradition (Matt. xv. 3, 6)? It was Lev. xix. 18, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," with the signature of Jehovah, "I am the Lord," that Christ described as "a

second like unto it" (the first great commandment of the law) (Matt. xxii. 39). Was, then, the moral and spiritual progress of Israel so clear and so great that this summing up of the whole duty of man to man should have been evolved by cunning priests? Did God give the *first* great commandment to Moses and not the *second?* Did Christ falsely or mistakenly call this to the lawyer the *second—i.e.*, in the Mosaic law? The law of Leviticus was unquestionably in our Lord's view a revelation for Israel from God. But if Christ could not distinguish between a forgery of late date and His Father's word, how can we be sure He was qualified, as He claimed to be, to give men a perfect revelation of that Father, which was the great object of Christ's coming? No *kenosis* theory is of any use here. He who by His resurrection "was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness" (Rom. i. 4), could not have been deceived upon so vital a point.

Private Morals in Relation to Public Welfare.[1]

By ROBERT JONES, M.D., F.R.C.P. Lond.

Lecturer on Mental Diseases St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London, and Resident Physician to the Claybury Asylum, London.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."—Prov. xiv. 34.

"Strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts."—Zech. viii. 22.

"The Lord shall establish thee an holy people unto Himself, as He hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God."—Deut. xxviii. 9.

"And to make thee high above all nations which He hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour."—Deut. xxvi. 19.

I HAVE written the following words, firstly, because we are faced to-day by vast and complex changes in our social organization in which the welfare of the individual as well as the welfare of communities are deeply concerned; secondly, because of my special experience in regard to the disastrous effects upon individual, and also upon the nation, of the loss of self-control, the of undue anxiety, of undesirable habits, of mental depression, of weak nerves, of idleness, of intemperance, and of indifference.

That these conditions exist no one will deny, for the State regulates and controls institutions recognized for their care and cure. Probably no one among my readers is without some painful experience of their reality, if not in his own family, then among friends and acquaintances. That they are widespread and deep is also well known, for they go to the heart of our life; some persons maintain that they are even on the increase, and that they are but necessary evils, and consequent upon the progress of civilization; for it has been ascertained that they tend to increase as man departs from the savage and semi-civilized state, and as he approaches to the highest plane in his mental development and evolution. We as doctors know their

[1] An address given in St. Andrew's Church, Leytonstone, Essex.

prevalence, and we also know the amount of moral treatment, the administration of cheerfulness, sympathy, and direction, apart from medicines, which our patients require to raise them when suffering from these conditions.

Only recently a young doctor informed me that some of his patients actually died when they became seriously ill because they had not the spirit, the pluck, or the mental vigour, to keep alive; a little strain or undue stress upon their feeble self-reliance, and they yield and give up the contest.

Some of these ailments are due, no doubt, to a weak inheritance—*i.e.*, to a structural defect caused by ill-assorted marriages, to an ill-regulated selection of a partner, possessing some family weakness which is visited upon the offspring; the children being unable to adapt themselves to the scheme of life proposed for them, and personally I feel that this aspect has hitherto not commanded from the Church the attention it deserves. On the other hand, many of these ailments and ills are brought about through our own personal neglect, partly from the want of a proper up-bringing, partly also from a neglect in later life of those prudential considerations which are characteristic of civilized man.

Many of these ills are due simply to a want of regard for ordinary moral laws, and from a desire for the immediate pleasures of the moment at the expense of future but more lasting happiness. There seems to be among everyone to-day a positive fight for pleasure, probably not the coarse and brutal delights of our forefathers, but the more exciting and sensuous pleasures of the moment.

Fortunately there is another aspect to the question, for there are some persons who are always ready to face responsibility; who, with a large spirit of human fellowship, look beyond their own wants, and, in the face of many difficulties, present an example of constant hopefulness and buoyancy, and who, fortified by a firm belief in the Divine Providence, are always ready to ease the burden of others and to inspire confidence in those around them. It is regrettable that their number is so

few, for probably at no period in the history of this country has such an example been more needed in our midst, to help individual development and try to bring about a larger, fuller, and better social organization.

For some time past the "masses" have been showing considerable discontent, and some who watch the spectacle are themselves struck by the attributed cause—viz., the apparently unfair division of this world's goods. I doubt if any country during the last century has made so much material progress as our own, and yet I doubt if extreme poverty has to any considerable extent abated. Although there has been a great increase in material wealth, it does not seem to have penetrated deeply among the industrial classes, because pity is but a short-lived passion, and suffering poverty remains as obtrusive as we have known it at any time during the last thirty years, and this in spite of the fact that the gates of political freedom are wider than ever before. In spite of better housing and better food, the bulk of wealth has fallen into the hands, not of those who toil and labour, but into the coffers of the undeserving, and often the unscrupulous. There seems to be a feeling that the masses of the people are not having their fair share of the rewards of industry, nor of their due proportion of the rest and comfort enjoyed by the idle rich. This is eloquently voiced in the form of prayer composed for a body of workgirls who were out on strike: "O God our Father, we, Thy children, humbly beseech Thee to grant that we may receive enough wages to clothe and feed our bodies, and just a little leisure, O Lord, to give our souls a chance to grow." One has only to look at the daily list of published wills in order to see the astonishing amount of wealth left after the death of quite ordinary people—people who are themselves at most the elect of chance. More especially is this the case among those who have been engaged in trade and commerce, which shows that the few have benefited at the expense of the many. The only exceptions to this accumulated wealth would seem to be the industrial classes themselves, and to these may be added Civil Servants and the professional classes,

who usually manage to die unencumbered, and most of whom leave to their dependents, beyond the memory of a good example, no personal or real estate, not even enough to defray the cost of their funeral expenses.

It is satisfactory, however, to be told by statisticians that parallel with material prosperity there has been some improvement in manners as well as in general sobriety. There has been, we are told, a steady diminution in drunkenness, and less intoxicating drink is consumed per head than has been the case for several years. Crime is showing a decline, not because there is a keener regard for the moral law, nor because there is less disposition to break the letter of the law, but because there is a conspiracy to evade its spirit, and because public opinion in regard to the moral law is more flabby, more indifferent, and less rigorous. Offences against the moral law are to-day more common than they have probably ever been before, and there is probably also less holy indignation at commercial dishonesty than there was in the days of our grandfathers; food is more adulterated, gambling is more widespread, deceit is more common, and the sins which debase and degrade the nation are more flaunted before the public gaze than ever before, and worse ones are barely hidden. Even the sacred obligation in regard to an "Englishman's word" is less binding, for men and masters appear alike to repudiate honourable agreements entered into in industrial contracts. The scorn shown in regard to the holiness of matrimony, the open depreciation of family life, the neglect of parenthood, disregard for the "cradle," as also the non-observance of the Sabbath Day, are signs of national indifference which must inevitably bring their own consequences. It shows a slackness on the part of the individual which calls for serious reform, and such heedless indifference to honest purpose, to straight dealing, towards duty, and to the laws of health, will inevitably impair the permanent and solid strength which has been our boast in the past, and which has hitherto characterized our native land.

Let us pause awhile in order to examine our terms, and to

ask, in the first place, What is the moral life? And what is life itself? We have lately been hearing much from men of science about "colloidal jelly"—that it is the basis of life, and that there is no real dividing line between living and non-living matter; that the most obvious sign of life is spontaneous movement, yet that non-living matter itself presents movement, owing to the physical and the chemical changes occurring in the surface tension of matter. All changes in living substances are thus brought about by chemical and physical forces, and it is asserted that life has originated by a process of evolution from non-living matter; and also that the biologist should now look to the chemist for the secret of life, which may yet be built up in the laboratory! This is a cry far in advance of the old doctrine of the earlier evolutionists, that "All life exists from previous life" —"Omne vivum e vivo." Knowledge is a ceaseless flux, and we have progressed far beyond the doctrine of Huxley, which dealt with the existence of complex living beings, for we now speak of the production of ultra-microscopic life from non-living substances, which we shall probably never be able to visualize physically, although we may have become convinced of its existence. What analogy can be more convincing of our belief in an all-powerful, all-knowing God, whose revelation in His Divine Son we as Christians rely upon as the basis of our faith, and whose immanence in all things is beyond our vision, although not beyond our faith.

Science, which is the systematized observation of matter, convinces us that scepticism, once more prevalent than it is to-day, is utterly impossible to the human mind.

It is permitted to man by our Church to use his own mind and to reflect philosophically, not only upon the great problems of Nature, but also upon the great realities of life and death which are ever present to us. To some of us, problems connected with these facts, and inferences drawn from them, although often baffling, are generally interesting, if not absorbing. In regard to scepticism, if the human mind does not construct for itself by conduct and thought a coherent faith or philosophy of

its own, it will be infested with irrational beliefs and with false superstitions. As has been wisely said, "The science which destroys all moral faith also destroys intellectual faith, and so ultimately destroys itself." There are many persons to-day who are sceptical about some truths of religion and some dogmas of theology, who are also sceptical about moral and intellectual ideas to which men attain by right thinking and right living, and upon which the whole structure of our civilization depends and has been based. Such a scepticism would deny the existence of a rational order in the universe, and so anarchy must result, which means tyranny, and tyranny means superstition, and this involves the destruction of all progress. Plutarch states: "I deem those men to have attained the perfection of human character who themselves unite with the power of managing public affairs the cultivation of philosophy. Such persons appear to me to possess two blessings of the highest order. On the one hand, they fulfil that part of general usefulness which belongs to a public capacity, while on the other they enjoy a life of calm and unruffled serenity which is the fruit of philosophical study." By this remark Plutarch implies that a life of action may be adorned by philosophy which adds grace and harmony to it, and so produces a far-reaching moral benefit to society.

We know that high ideals, separated from irrational pleasure and dissolute enjoyment, can direct conduct on lines which may reconstruct itself as well as reconstruct a degenerate environment; that lofty ideals can reorganize and rebuild the individual as well as the community. Such an aim is the whole purport of education, which is based upon implanting in the growing mind the feeling of self-respect, and therefore of self-reliance, as well as a regard for others and a reverence towards what is right. The first part of the teaching of the young is always in the direction of controlling the "will," which is now governed by feeling and sensation, and not as yet by the reason. The will in the young is therefore apt to be very impulsive. What the child desires to do is what he likes at the moment, and this

is equally true of grown-up persons who are deficient in self-control. Their wilfulness is, indeed, their weakness. It is at an early age—probably between two and five—that the moral sense begins to develop in children; for immediately the child begins to pass a judgment upon his own actions, self-knowledge and self-judgment are attained. When he begins to express a desire for approbation and praise, then he sets up for himself an ethical standard, and he is influenced by ideals of conduct, and thus the way is prepared for self-direction. These ideals are not inherited by children, but are the result of observation of those around them. These ideals are a part of the heritage of the race, and they are not transmitted to the child, but must be acquired afresh by each child, and to train a child to feel and recognize the higher motives of conduct is one of the most important parts of moral education. It is in this way that the young are successfully trained to resist the temptations to sensuous gratification, and to subordinate their own personal desire for the good of others.

I maintain that so long as children are of school age, in spite of many disagreements about educational methods, they are on the whole well cared for by the teachers. It is in the home where the scheme of example and instruction fails. The difficulty with young people comes, in the main, after they have left school, when there is an abrupt end to the teacher's influence, and when parental supervision, already much weakened through State interference, is of necessity relaxed. The youth, immediately he or she leaves school, becomes, in our large cities, a bread-winner of sorts, and contributes to the family support. As a young bread-winner he now not only feels, but demands, his or her own independence in the home circle. Among the educated classes this is not so; the sons, and of necessity the daughters, continue to regard the parents' authority up to and beyond the age of twenty-one. The period from school age to twenty-one or further, according to sex and circumstances, is generally referred to as that of adolescence, and is one of intense desire to obtain pleasure in some way or

another; it is impulsive, yet friendly—friendships even of the most intense kind being characteristic of this period, affections of the most violent character are common to it, and longings of the most ardent nature all tend to show its impetuosity as well as its irresponsibility, which the law to some extent favours. Its romance, its poetry, its idealism, its craving to get out of life all that is to be obtained, marks this period as one of the gravest, most perilous and dangerous, in the span of life. Its adequate guidance, protection, and supervision, therefore, command and claim our strongest attention. Compared with the periods of infancy and childhood, that between the ages of fifteen and twenty-one, although the most plastic and formative, is yet one which seems to receive the least consideration and control. This fact has been well pointed out by Mr. Charles Booth in his "Life and Labour in London," as well as by the Interdepartmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, and I most strongly urge attention to this on the part of our Church.

I think most of the social evils against which we have to combat are due to insufficient attention, I may almost say the neglect, of this period of life.

One of these evils, and possibly not the least, is

Intemperance.

There are still about 162,000 convictions annually for drunkenness, not a few of these being among women; and although less is now spent on the "National Drink Bill," yet 150 millions a year go in this way. While the country as a whole merits praise for the downward movement in convictions for drunkenness, the Metropolitan Police District presents an increase of convictions, which should urge those of us living in this area to renew our efforts against this sin, which, although not the worst if there be grades, is certainly the short-cut to all the other sins, and is one which leads to indifference towards all religious work, as well as to social and family irresponsibility and neglect.

The next of our moral evils is closely related to the one we have just considered, and is that of

Infant Mortality.

109 per 1,000 of all children born die during early infancy, and nearly a fifth of all deaths recorded are those of children under a year old. The sacredness of human life, and the helplessness of the human infant, should make a powerful appeal to the community, and should galvanize its conscience into strong action for the prevention of this waste—a most serious one from the view of commercial and military supremacy. Much has been done in some municipalities by the supply of pure milk to mothers, and by the help of health visitors, as also by the direction of religious people who have leisure and are willing to do district visiting among the poor in the neighbourhood of their own homes. Connected with the question of the care of children is the serious one of the

Diminishing Birth-Rate.

While the death-rate has been steadily diminishing in every European country, the birth-rate has shown an even greater decrease.

In France in 1907 there was such a drop in the birth-rate that it was actually below the death-rate, and the population of the country decreased during that year.

In our own country the same tendency to a diminishing birth-rate is actively in progress, for in 1910, the last year for which I have the statistics of the Registrar-General's Report, the birth-rate was the lowest since records have been kept. In 1874 the birth-rate was 36·3 births for every 1,000 living, but in 1910 it had fallen to 24·8 per 1,000. The diminution of births is mainly among the educated and cultured classes, but the condition is now spreading to the middle classes and to the best of the artisan class. It may also be noticed that the least prudential, the most wasteful, and the least fortunate of the people are free from this stigma of a diminishing birth-rate, and to thoughtful persons the prospect of the future is in consequence a gloomy forecast, as the coming population is being thus recruited from the least efficient of its members.

I can, as a physician, add here that it was shown by the census before the last one that the fertility of English wives was lower than that recorded in any European country except that of France.

One has to recognize that this question is connected with several economic problems, for the more careful men marry later in life, and the age of women at marriage has thus risen for some years past. Further, in spite of the frequent early marriages among workers of the casual labourer class, the marriage-rate in England and Wales has shown a diminution of 5 per cent. during the last twenty years, whilst, on the other hand, in the German Empire it has increased 13 per cent. The love of luxury, the migration from houses to hotels, the multiplication of "flats," and the fact that many women find a fuller and freer life in occupations or professions, all tend to influence the birth-rate; but it is certain also that the diminution is voluntary, which indicates a serious evasion of parental responsibility.

Most students of social conditions would agree that the marriage-vow to-day is less sacred than in the past, and one sees this not only in the reflection of life upon the stage, but also in the fact that 37,509 births are illegitimate, and decrees for dissolution of marriage, judicial separations, and orders by magistrates having the effect of decrees of judicial separation, have numbered yearly over 7,250 instances.

As related to morals, we may next consider

Pauperism

in its various aspects, and more particularly that section of it which is generally described as the opprobrium of our civilization —viz., the vast number of able-bodied persons, all of them well able to work, but who, having led immoral lives, or being persistent idlers, or having given way to intemperance and become useless, drift to the workhouse or into the casual ward. Even here it is difficult to get them to do the work regarded as compulsory. Rather than perform their allotted task, they indulge in bad language and resistive violence, doing damage to property or threatening those about them, with the result that they appear

before the different police-courts or quarter sessions, where they are repeatedly dealt with, but without any reformation. There are two million persons each year out of the total population in England and Wales (one in every eighteen) who have received parish relief, and one million who receive it all the year round, which is a higher ratio, in spite of our increased material prosperity, than was recorded ten years ago. It is also noteworthy that, in spite of a million old age pensioners, the Poor Law rate (apart from outdoor relief) has gone up, and that it amounts to-day to about 4s. 2d. per head of every individual in the estimated population. For London it is more than double this amount per head. Then, there are over 135,000 registered lunatics—one to about 250 of the population, and probably an equal number in a state of unstable equilibrium, who are on the borderland, ready to be precipitated into the class of the registered insane, much, possibly most, of whose insanity is due to a want of self-control caused by deficient early moral training. It is recognized that there are purely mental causes of insanity as well as physical. There are, for instance, the shocks from sudden bereavement, the worry of domestic unhappiness, of disappointment in love, and other forms of emotional stress ; even an ill-digested course of reading has been recognized as a cause of mental breakdown, and I have personally known the imagination to be morbidly kindled in the case of several young people who had wasted their leisure upon the cheap and exciting literature of the moment. In addition to the insane, we have a selection of anti-social persons who are repeatedly brought before the Justices for various offences against the law of the land. There were 167,695 persons convicted during 1910-11, the last year of which we have statistics, but the year 1908 recorded 68,116 indictable offences—the highest of any recorded year. Since then it is pleasing to find there has been a diminution. There is, further, a floating population of over 4,000 who are habitual criminals, actually at large and free to do their worst! Add to these an army of 40,000 vagrants, which in pressing times amounts to double this number, and some idea is given of the

social underworld and its great danger to the healthy community, much of which could have been avoided had those who constitute it only received half a chance in life.

For the last ten years there has been a steady increase of crime, and this in spite of the greater tendency to be lenient with first offenders, and the disposition to treat with greater consideration those guilty of the slighter offences. Fear is expressed that this increase is due to a relaxation of public sentiment in regard to the criminal. There is reason to think that the reprobation of crime and resentment against the criminal are diminishing on the part of the public, as well as on the part of those in high official authority, and this social "flabbiness" must be detrimental to the primary function of civilization—viz., that of safeguarding persons in the State as well as their property. Mr. Justice Scrutton is reported in the *Times* of October 19, 1912, to have said, when on the Midland Circuit, that well-meaning reformers had now made prisons so comfortable that people who could not get work, or did not want to work, preferred to go to prison rather than to the workhouse. In towns the favourite way of getting into prison for such offenders was to break the plate-glass window of an innocent tradesman; in the counties it was to pick out an unoffending farmer, and to set fire to his haystack. The tendency of sympathizing with the criminal, and of making it appear "that nothing matters," is a certain danger to the public welfare. The cheap Press also has done much to encourage public sympathy for the convict by devoting a disproportionate amount of space to crime records, especially when the crime may have been an ingenious or a daring one, or when the spoils are described to have been extensive. Such printed reports tend to elevate the criminal to the level of a hero, who has come to champion the revolt of the poor against the rich, or who has only expressed courageous discontent with the unequal distribution of wealth.

I will not speak in detail of

Gambling.

It has many forms, and perhaps as enthralling as any is that in respect to stocks and shares. It is a spirit which is destroying our manly games, and is speading even to young people and children. It is the first step in the ruin of many a promising career, and a painful letter was recently (October 21) read at a meeting of the Police Court Mission at Wanstead, which instanced the destructive consequences of gambling to an otherwise promising career. Many persons in responsible positions know to their cost, and to that of their dependents, the measure of this evil.

The Breaking of Agreements

is another moral blot, and we have all read accounts of this in the labour strikes which occurred in the summer of 1911 and the spring of 1912. Possibly the employers are no better than the employed, which only shows its wide toleration, and this in spite of the help afforded by the Government through the appointment of the Industrial Council. In the days of Aristotle's "Politics" the State was looked upon as made *by* the individual, whose duty towards it was recognized and established. To-day the reverse seems to be the case: the State is made *for* the individual, and the altruistic spirit of patriotism is apparently a feeble one. The fact that "Territorial" practice has been relegated by some to Sunday target shooting points to a feeble patriotism, as well as to the small regard now felt for Sunday observances. You probably hear enough from this pulpit as to the purely pleasure-seeking spirit now prevalent on the Sabbath, so that I shall not further comment on this subject.

What is the remedy for this serious condition of things in our midst? I believe the whole secret of this to be in the life of the home, and no better example for reform can be quoted than the home at Nazareth, with its parental control and filial piety. I know that the clergy, by example in their own homes as well as by precept in their public life, are doing all that in

them is to encourage this view of a pure and simple home-life, as also to control what is evil and to encourage what is good. We are told by some Socialist leaders, who are themselves earnestly devoted to the welfare of humanity, that the millennium is at hand for the masses, and so far as they advocate purity in the home I am with them; but they go farther, and prophesy from industrial changes alone signs of better things. They state there is already evidence from general economic directions of the birth of a new order of things which is to emerge out of a violent and general revolution. They see in this revolution that all masters of industry are to be abolished, that the concentration of capitalist enterprise is to cease, and that the twentieth century is to control its own undertakings. This is only one aspect. What about encouraging the moral virtues, those which relate to self in particular—viz., temperance and courage—not to mention justice and benevolence, which is our duty towards others? Much is often said about the value of moral education as against religious. We know that the code of morality is a varying one, whilst the religious basis is permanent. Ideals taught by Christianity — those that encourage patience, purity, and charity, those that kindle high ideals of self-negation—are always applicable, but morality is an unstable factor. There are moralists to-day who hold very diverse views about human duty. Some consider that the holding of property is theft, others that the traditional relation between the sexes is wrong, and that the marriage tie should be relaxed for a freer relationship, and there are some who hold that killing, from the political standpoint, is no murder, if it be desired to remove a King or his Minister. If we are to rely on morality, there is no religious sanction to enforce it; and although the ethical end may vary according to whether it be the greatest happiness to the greatest number, or obedience to the revealed will of God, or the realization of an ideal human self, or the perfection of social integration, we shall find morality in itself, however helpful it may be as an example and a creed, to be insufficient, and that religious influences, a faith in God and obedience to

His will, are necessary for our teaching. Moral education, we know, can help us greatly. It helps us to realize, for one thing, that

Idleness

is the source of much lawlessness, is the opportunity for temptations of all kinds, and is itself the cause of ill-health. "Nerves" are the prerogative of the idle or the rich, or of both, whereas it is rarely known among the labouring classes. These have no time for "nerves." Industry of one kind or another is enforced upon them if they are to earn good wages, or, in their own language, to "take good money." Dr. Watts knew the danger of idleness, and preached and sang against it. Ruskin says that only by labour can thought be made healthy, and only by thought can labour be made happy. An American recently said that the greatest difference between his nationality and ours was that the American is always "going to business," and the Englishman always "going home." Lord Roberts urged that all boys and men should work hard, that boys should be taught to be fearless, truthful, and honest, that they should be independent, yet obedient and respectful to authority, self-reliant, considerate and courteous to all, and should always aim at being clean in mind and body. Such a creed needs no annotation and no supplementing, if it is based upon the example of the life of Christ.

We know the value in the social life of "straight talks," of Church settlements, of girls' clubs, Sunday-schools, and the various agencies which make for social betterment, and they need our support. All encouragement and every help must also be given to games, which in moderation help to instil moral qualities into boys. They know that for success in games they must keep their bodies fit and well, that they must be fair and manly, self-restraint and self-denial must be exercised, so that the *side*, not the person, may gain. Games teach boys to overcome difficulties; they must accept defeat, and do so with generosity and cheerfulness, and victory need not be proclaimed with boastfulness and pride. These good qualities in boys are

encouraged by the Scout movement and the Boys' Brigade, which latter is an item in the disciplinary teaching of most of the Churches. The boys in their spare time are drilled like the men, and, like them, are given uniforms, although only toy rifles or leaping-poles are used as weapons. The boys are appealed to like men are, and are also trusted. Needless to state, they respond to the confidence placed in them. In this treatment is to be found the key to the control of self, to the spirit of patriotism, and to the abolition of the loafer.

> "Who is the happy Warrior? Who is he
> That every man in arms should wish to be?
>
> "——It is the generous spirit, who, when brought
> Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
> Upon the plan that pleased his childish thought;
> Whose high endeavours are an inward light
> That makes the path before him always bright:
> Who with a natural instinct to discern
> What knowledge can perform, is diligent to learn;
> Abides by this resolve, and stops not there,
> But makes his moral being his prime care."

It is not boys alone who are to become the pillars of the home. Girls have even a greater part to play in this; and it is astonishing that youthful parents manage to bring up their children at all, considering the mothers suddenly find themselves engaged in a business of which they had no previous experience, and in regard to which they had no knowledge and could find no guide in persons or books. We have too long neglected that highest responsibility of life—viz., the duty of parenthood.

Parenthood is the strongest and deepest instinct in animals, and from one's own experience of the nursery it is a passion with children, who prefer to play with a doll before any other amusement. Parenthood is the sacred trust for the life that is to come, and girls after school age should be more systematically encouraged to care for and guard others, to feel a pleasure in the things of home, and not to look upon amusements as the main object of life. Too many girls are irresponsible butterflies or sheltered pets, and they are kept away from the realities of life, and certainly from ideas connected with parenthood. Parenthood

is the germ of everything that is good in human nature, and the German Emperor when he circumscribed the life of woman within the quadrangle of the four K's (Kirche, Küche, Kinder, Kleider—translated into the four C's: Church, Cooking, Child, Clothes) indicated the way to a high standard of morality. I know that some women resent that this path should be mapped out for them, and many interpret it as a command from the other sex to show submission to authority, to be absorbed only with housewifely duties, and to suffer perpetual self-sacrifice in the family interests; but the health of the community as well as its happiness is in woman's hands. They already exercise an imperious influence on the æsthetic side of life; theirs, also, on the best side is the direction and control of human conduct. A woman herself has said: "To elevate and to maintain a high standard of morality, to secure for children their full share of health, efficiency, and happiness, to utilize all the knowledge, economic, scientific, and social, now at our disposal for the rearing of healthy children, to cultivate without enervating, and to further refine the æsthetic qualities which make for physical, intellectual, and moral progress—these represent in general terms the influential, exacting, and responsible duties entrusted to the women of our land."

I venture to think that if each of us, men and women alike, realized how much depends upon private morals, upon the exercise of self-control as well as of self-sacrifice, upon the cultivation of a pure and simple home life, then the public welfare would be correspondingly advanced, and such can never be realized, except, as Browning says in the epilogue to "Asolando," by—

> "One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward,
> Never doubted clouds would break,
> Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
> Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
> Sleep to wake."

Hints from the Pew.

By Miss MAY JUST.

IN the course of my life I have heard, I suppose, somewhere between two and three thousand sermons, good, bad, and indifferent. One does not go through such an experience without forming some general impressions on the subject of preaching, and I want to beg the indulgence of those to whom I have so often listened in silent respect, while I allow myself for once a few criticisms, and help them to hear themselves as I hear them from my obscure place among the congregation.

We all realize, as Christians, the supreme importance, and the practical difficulty, of being good. So I rate most highly of all those sermons which aim directly at making me good, or at all events help me to realize the possibility of becoming better than I am.

This is the chief thing that we in the pews ask from the preacher. We want something to raise our lives, continually dragged down by the influence of sense. We want food for the spirit, starved often in the midst of material abundance. Everything else is comparatively unimportant. I believe it is not merely the isolated mystic who feels this want, it is the average person, especially the average young person; and the young matter most. I was almost startled a few days ago when a young girl whom I had always looked upon as altogether conventional remarked to me: "It is a pity our vicar somehow gives one the impression of being worldly. It is as though he went through the service merely as a formal duty, and one does not like to feel that." Yes; in spite of our own often sordid and frivolous lives, we of the laity have a high ideal for our clergy. We expect them to be spiritual.

Yet one feels it is a most difficult thing to ask of a man, that he should keep the flame of his own inner life always so clear and bright that he can at any time rekindle the drooping light of ours. Perhaps only the few are really capable of this.

But if all have not the mystical insight which is inspiration, surely all can be sincere. And sincerity is the one indispensable quality. We like to feel that the sermon is a true expression of the preacher's best thoughts, the outcome of his own experiences. A string of set phrases or of stereotyped religious expressions has no real meaning for us. We might as well be listening to a discourse in Basque or Flemish. Better, perhaps, for then no touch of irritation would interfere with its soothing soporific effect.

Next to the purely spiritual sermon, the sermon which helps me to be good, I enjoy the sermon which teaches me useful facts of any kind, and so aims at making me wise or learned. The facts may be of any order—ethics, psychology, philology, history—so long as they bear more or less directly on Divine things. In this class I should place a very charming and simple history of the English Bible, which I was privileged to hear one day lately, and some (though not all) missionary sermons.

I believe many of the clergy would be surprised and horrified did they know what utter ignorance sometimes prevails nowadays of the old Bible stories, of Church ordinances and traditions, and even of the life of our Lord Himself, among young people of the wealthier middle classes, brought up to live for games, pleasures, and a good time generally. Healthy and happy-looking for the most part, and faultlessly dressed, they are brought occasionally to church, as a sop to social prejudices. During the sermon their thoughts are far away; still, an occasional story, well told, might win their attention. Yet one feels how powerless is pulpit teaching, or indeed any sort of teaching at all, in the face of a home atmosphere of indifference and materialism.

It must chance sometimes that a preacher is conscious of feeling neither sufficiently spiritual to influence us to holiness, nor learned and original enough to make religion interesting on the intellectual side. Personally, I cannot see why in such a case he should not frankly present to us the work of some more competent divine. People will not sit down to read old sermons

to themselves, even those of famous preachers, but they might listen with interest occasionally to productions of this sort, suitably chosen, and well delivered in church, with a few words of introduction. And it would be more honest than the manufactured article occasionally met with.

After all, however, this is but a *pis aller*. A sermon depends for its real force on the personality of the preacher.

But if a sermon is always welcome which teaches some new fact, or which throws any fresh light on the problems of life, there is, on the other hand, nothing more annoying than an assumption of learning where the reality is absent. Had I had a companion, we should probably have merely shared a smile the day that a particularly superficial preacher referred to himself as "We Thinkers." Chancing to be alone, I am afraid I was weak enough to feel irritated. Then there was the would-be scientific cleric, who, wishing to direct our thoughts at Easter-time to the beautiful weather, began amid dramatic flourishes: "Day by day, at this delightful season, our little planet of Earth, bounding along on its orbit, is drawing nearer and nearer to the great source of light and heat, the Sun; and as we approach more closely to the splendid luminary, we feel its grateful warmth kindling new life," etc.

I knew this preacher pretty well in private. He was a frank and modest young fellow enough, of the open-air type, and not overburdened with education. It is a mystery to me that he should have held it necessary to pose in the pulpit as a philosopher and a scientist.

We do not require a clergyman to be an expert in natural science; should he by a happy chance combine two types of mind usually rather incompatible, we may, I think, trust such a man to use his rare talents to advantage. But pseudo-science in the pulpit is odious. Let us have truth at all costs, though it be the truth of honest ignorance. There is really no absolute need to drag in the Solar System, and perhaps it is more useful on the whole to reason of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.

Another orator, of an equally florid type, and a good deal more self-confident, betrayed his own confusion of thought one day by a sermon in which he laboured to demonstrate at some length that the force of gravitation and the Mosaic injunction to refrain from stealing were equally "laws," and therefore to be placed in exactly the same category.

Most mischievous of all, perhaps, in the hands of the incompetent, are such themes as miracles, historical criticism, etc.—subjects which seem often to have a fatal attraction for them. We come out of church with a vague impression that not only are we all drifting rudderless on a shoreless sea, but also that the pilot in charge of our boat is doing his best to swamp it.

No one can be an authority on every subject, and I think that a man would generally do better to leave on one side those things in which he does not see quite clearly himself—unless, indeed, as happens occasionally, he is great enough and simple enough to understand his own limitations, and, perhaps, even to use them as an intellectual stimulus for his congregation.

I remember once hearing a very original sermon on love. "In most cases," said the preacher, "we find that the stronger and more concentrated anything is, the purer it is also. As, for instance, in the case of light. But with love the converse is true. That love which is most free from alloy is the love which is general, the type of love which we call charity. As love attaches itself to smaller groups, and again to particular persons, it grows more powerful, and at the same time less pure. I have not yet been able to solve this puzzle." I cannot solve it either, but the observation opened up for me a fresh vein of thought.

Still, I suppose it is only the few who care for psychological problems, while we are all of us glad to have any simple directions for the everyday duties of life.

But if an assumption of learning jars on one, still more so does an assumption of esoteric sanctity. When a man's attitude is that of the Christian, striving, through difficulties and with varying success, after an ideal to which he can never attain, he appeals to my respect and sympathy, and to my own experience.

I feel that here is one who knows what the struggle is, and can help me in it. But Sir Oracle, pronouncing from a platform of infallibility, whether personal or official, simply awakens my suspicion and dislike; and the more glibly and authoritatively he speaks, the more strongly I incline to suspect him.

After all, it is the man behind the words that really matters. It is the Christ, mirrored, however imperfectly, in His followers Who draws us now, as He has drawn the world through two thousand years. Englishmen are rarely orators, and deep feeling will sometimes make them almost dumb; but halting and broken phrases are often most eloquent of all. Each human being has his own individual life story, and it seems to me that, with prayer and careful preparation, almost any man should be able to utter some few truths which he has proved in his own spiritual development, and which may be of use for helping others through theirs.

We all get so much into the way of regarding the sermon as a mere part of a routine, that I believe a preacher would sometimes almost be surprised to know that among his ordinary respectable-looking Sunday congregation were any souls craving a word of guidance in the hour of difficulty, or perhaps even despair. Yet this may happen often; I know it happens sometimes. Tragedy is all around now just as much as in the days of old, though nowadays we screen it decently and try to ignore it. The sick and the sad still crave the healing touch of Christ.

I remember going one day to church in a mood of some perplexity, doubting, as one does so often, where duty really lay, in the conflict between one's own claim for fuller development and the denial of self for the sake of others. The sermon was on the Collect for the First Sunday after Epiphany, and the preacher began: "It is needless to waste much time over the first half of this Collect; we all know pretty well what our duty is; the difficulty is to do it." At the moment I envied him his simple outlook, but then again I felt chilled and discouraged at so superficial a philosophy offered in the name of the Church.

Some preachers make constant references to passing events. Presumably this is supposed to be "up to date," and to attract a congregation. But it seems to me altogether a mistake. We are weak creatures, and largely dependent on associations. To God the things that are God's. Let the church be a holy place. When we meet there, let us feel that we are really coming apart out of the world's life, that we can cast behind us every thought that is sordid and soiling to the soul. At the time of the "Crippen case" I heard the chase of the murderer used as an illustration in a sermon. It struck me as horrible.

One occasionally hears sermons so utterly unsuitable to the occasion that one can only marvel at any human being's having so little of the sympathetic instinct. I remember one such instance in a little district church in a poor neighbourhood. There were present, besides myself, the preacher's showy wife at the harmonium and equally showy groom in one of the back pews, seven or eight choir-boys, doubtless paid for their attendance, and about three old women with the professional devoutness of church-cleaners. Besides these officials, one saw half a dozen rather old and shabby-looking rustics, drawn to the service apparently by an agelong habit that had developed into instinct.

The sermon was on the love of riches. "Look, my brethren," cried the preacher, "at your great heaps of gold, at all these shining jewels! Why are you so much attached to them? You cannot carry them away when you die!" etc.

I thought of my own slender earnings, and the few forgotten trinkets in a drawer at home, and conscience upheld my conviction that none of these were likely to block my way to heaven. I glanced at the old women's pinched faces and rusty clothes. Did the preacher suspect any hidden hoards in stockings? Or could it be that the groom's princely salary. . . . It would have been really funny if it had not been sad.

My next instance was sad only.

In a great ward of one of our large hospitals all the patients who were able to do so had gathered for a week-night service.

Many joined in the prayers and hymns; all heard them respectfully.

Then to the Church came her golden opportunity. These poor people, practical heathens many of them, victims of our pitiless modern industrial system, for once in their hard, hurrying lives, had an interval of peace, and had come of their own accord to listen for a message from God. They fastened hungry eyes on the preacher, looking for some small crumbs of consolation or encouragement.

They received a stone—an academic essay on Evolution.

I have never in my life felt so utterly ashamed for my Church, or so sad for the cause of Christ.

Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of such people pass through our hospitals every year. Surely at our hands God will require their souls.

And now, though hesitatingly, and with deference, I would mention the sermons I have heard regarding the Holy Communion.

There are some preachers who can so delicately play upon the strings of the heart as to make it impossible for one to turn away from the Table of Christ. There are others who insist continually on the duty of attendance, with a contrary effect. Speaking for myself, I do not believe that our Lord can greatly care for guests who accept His hospitality grudgingly or of necessity, and experience has led me to conclude any kind of compulsion in these things to be deadening to the soul. Nothing so surely drives ardent young spirits into covert or open rebellion against the Church, as the conviction that her most sacred mysteries are forms kept up out of self-interest and stupidity. They are apt to conclude in haste that religion itself is a mere wretched, despicable sham.

But there is another reason why we should not be urged too often to come to Holy Communion. Each celebration generally means a collection; and in poor places each collection is of importance. Do not let the least suspicion of any sordid object defile the ideal of the sacred Feast.

The mention of collections brings to me my last point—the begging sermon.

It is painful to hear a sensitive man, a gentleman, and perhaps a scholar, appealing in public for money. I am ashamed when I think that our wealthy congregations, with handsome clothes on their backs and luxuries of every kind in their homes, should require Christ's ministers to humble themselves in this way before they will spare some single contemptible little coin towards His cause. Are we indeed Christians, or is the whole thing a farce?

There is perhaps just one excuse for us. Some of us have an uneasy suspicion that the whole system of Church finance needs readjustment, and that by helping to bolster up the present state of things we are delaying the adoption of any comprehensive and business-like scheme. We are a nation of shopkeepers, and like to feel sure that our money is being laid out to the best advantage; we are a just people, and require things to be quite fairly arranged all round.

I believe the more the clergy beg, the more they may. We get used to it, and become indifferent. And it is demoralizing both for them and for us. No; the more excellent way is never to beg if you can help it; but when you must, let your congregation see that you are in a false position, and make them feel ashamed of it. Personally, I should much like to see a voluntary church rate, levied for the common good.

In conclusion, I would beg my spiritual pastors to believe that I have criticized them and their work in no carping spirit. I recall with gladness and gratitude many useful lessons learnt from sermons, many impulses to good that they have given me; one or two sermons that have even made landmarks in my life—simple discourses, which, coming from the hearts of the speakers, reached my own. But I need not write about these. If no true service is ever lost, they are chronicled elsewhere.

The Scene of the Church Congress.

By M. ADELINE COOKE.

THIS year's Church Congress has been fixed to take place in what is, in many respects, a remarkable town. That it differs widely in appearance and surroundings from most populous centres is apparent directly the visitor arrives at the principal railway station, for instead of being, as are so many stations, in the dirtiest and most undesirable portion of the town, at Southampton the wide flood of water lies alongside, sweeps indeed to the very boundary of the busy rail in the most delightful manner, and emerging from the station we are confronted with gleaming tides bearing stately ships and white-sailed boats, and the line of a curving coast whereby stand the ancient walls which in olden days defended Southampton—and sometimes none too successfully—against the dreaded onslaughts of Frenchmen and Spaniards.

The story of Southampton, even from its earliest beginnings in Roman and Saxon times, is more military than ecclesiastical, and perhaps in some ways that is only to be expected when the character of the town as the port for passage and transit from Normandy to England is duly considered. Monarchs frequently visited it, but their minds were usually too occupied in marshalling and embarking armies to fight on the fair lands of France to concern themselves greatly about religious foundations.

Another reason is no doubt to be found in the constant raids by the watchful foe, and the tales of fire and sword which mark much of the town's history. Southampton, indeed, formed far too tempting a bait for the denizens of the land just across the water for the inhabitants to care overmuch to increase the temptation to burn and plunder by building stately abbeys and enriching churches. Speed, indeed, narrates that the Church of St. Mary was "demolished in the sixteenth century because its spire was too good a landmark for the French."

Southampton folk would seem to have been, as they probably still are, of a somewhat utilitarian spirit, for the Court Leet Book of 1550 contains an order "to cart away so much of the rubbish of St. Mary's Church as would be required to make the highway from Bargate and all East Street down to the turning to the chantry." It is also declared that a certain chantry chapel of St. Michael's Church was let as a dwelling-house and became in time a barber's shop. This old church, the most ancient in Southampton, saw terrible doings in the fourteenth century, when a fleet of marauding galleys got access to the town on Sunday morning when folk were at Mass, and were rudely disturbed by the foreigners falling upon them, and fire and sword painted that quiet Sabbath in flame and blood. St. Michael's is a church which must greatly attract visitors to the Congress who care for the history of centuries told in stone. It shows many different styles, and the beautiful font, at least, would be worth going to see, for it is one of the five celebrated black fonts in Hampshire, wonderfully carved and full of detail. The church stands open all day long, and contains, besides a fifteenth-century brass eagle lectern, a sixteenth-century canopied monument to Lord Chief Justice Lyster, which now stands in the nave, and the piscinas which show the presence of vanished chapels. The shell of the church with its Saxon tower is very old indeed, and all is carefully and reverently ordered. About its position there is something most quaint and even foreign in appearance. It stands in the centre of a little square quite remote from the busy traffic of the town, although within a stone's throw of it; and nearly opposite rises the splendidly timbered, gabled, and carved Tudor House built by Henry Huttoft, a mayor of Southampton, and, so local tradition asserts, visited by King Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn. Just by its side, beneath its shadow, lies Blue Anchor Lane, running steeply down to the Norman walls, the quaint building known as King John's Palace, and the sparkling blue water. It is one of the quaintest bits of old Southampton, a picture of the original town which must needs interest and charm, and the timbered house itself, built on stonework of the fifteenth

century, is well worth a visit if only to see the fine hall with the carved minstrels' gallery, panelled rooms, picturesque stair, and quaint casements. St. Mary's Church will most probably be the scene of Congress services. It is the principal church of Southampton, and was rebuilt by Street in 1878 as a memorial to Bishop Wilberforce. Much of the internal decoration is very beautiful, and the baptistery is a striking feature. The name of St. Denys, now practically a suburb of the town, recalls the Priory which has vanished long since ; but in the church of Holy-Rood, with its splendid fourteenth-century tower standing in Southampton's principal street, may be seen some fine old black stalls which appear to have come from the monastery, together with a brass lectern which represents an eagle, more like a dragon, trampling on a serpent. To this Priory Edward III. gave the Hospital, or lazar-house, of St. Mary Magdalene, but so frequent and so bitter were the contentions over the nomination of the wardens and other matters that by the fifteenth century it ceased to exist. The town, however, contains much of the Maison Dieu, or Hospital of St. Julian, which is mostly known as God's House. Gervase le Riche and burgesses of the town founded it in the twelfth century in connection, so it is supposed, with the Canterbury pilgrimages. The chapel, which has been extensively restored, is often called the French Church, and was granted by Queen Elizabeth as a place of worship for Huguenot refugees residing in the town ; and it is worthy of note that this Queen also left fields at Oxford wherewith to build almshouses for four women and four men. It is a very peaceful scene nowadays, yet even St. Julian's was damaged by French raiders, and the ivied tower which practically adjoins the buildings may have been built as an additional defence.

And those who delight in traditional history must know that the shore was the scene of King Canute's rebuke to the flattering courtiers who would fain have persuaded the monarch that he was more than mortal. There is, indeed, a fragment of an old building in Porter's Lane which legend, at least, declares to have been his palace.

There are other churches in Southampton, naturally. The names come speedily to the mind, though space forbids more detail; yet it is interesting to note that the great painter Millais was baptized at All Saints' Church, while if we cross the river by the floating bridge we can visit the Jesus Chapel on Pear Tree Green, and remember that it was the first to be consecrated after the Reformation. Nor must we forget that Isaac Watts was born in the town, and that his grand hymn, "O God, our help in ages past," was originally sung in a Southampton meeting-house.

It is impossible to walk through the streets of Southampton without feeling that we are greeted by much history of the English race, and at least some few events which have marked the story of our country.

From the quay first set sail the *Mayflower*, laden with those greatly daring ancestors of ours, the Pilgrim Fathers, seeking a new home in a strange land. Underneath the old West Gate and Tower, standing so quaintly near the original place of embarkation, the West Quay, England's archers marched to cross the sea and fight the battles of Crècy and Agincourt. The old wool-house, although converted to quite different purposes, speaks forcibly of Southampton's position in the commerce of a day that is dead; the fourteenth-century arcading of the town walls is deemed unique; King John's palace tells of the monarch who brought much shame on England, and contains a treasure-chest of Philip II. The principal street is spanned by the Bargate which confronts the twentieth century with medieval architecture; the huge docks and wharves where leviathans of the ocean lie at anchor, liners call, and all the busy commerce of an important seaport proceeds, must have a place in our time and our thoughts, or we should scarcely be true Imperialists at one with the achievements and glories of our country, and quietly ready to shoulder her responsibilities as well as take part in her triumphs.

"The Religion of a Gentleman."[1]

By the Rev. I. GREGORY SMITH, LL.D.

THIS quaint title, "The Religion of a Gentleman," reminds one of the saying of Charles II. that the Roman Catholic is the religion for a gentleman. But the book itself has nothing in common with the flippant epigram; indeed, so far as it touches the controversy with Rome, it is distinctly anti-papal. It was intended, the author (a high dignitary of the Church of England and Ireland just after the Revolution of 1689) tells us, to be, like Leslie's "Short Method with a Deist," "a short and easy draught [*sic*] of Christianity and of the reasons of it, as every man may read without tediousness and understand without difficulty." It is an appeal to common sense—such an appeal as an able lawyer makes, a clear, concise statement—in fact, "a draft." Nowadays it would be "The Religion of the Man in the Street." Though "many things have happened," to borrow Disraeli's phrase, since 1697, a little attention to its pages will not be thrown away.

It is curious the fascination which the eighteenth century has for some readers. Just as there are ardent lovers of travel who prefer a stroll through Warwickshire lanes to climbing snow-peaks far away, so some persons are more interested in a period not long ago past than in days more glaringly contrasted with our own. Is it laziness, naturally averse to what requires more effort of the imagination? Is it the sympathy of a nearer kinship?

Dull and prosaic the eighteenth century seems if one thinks of the stormy sunset which closed the day. The progress which it can boast in the acquisition of knowledge seems slow if measured against the gigantic strides, almost as swift as thought, which mark the triumphal march of physical science since then;

[1] By the Most Rev. Edward Synge, D.D., Archbishop of Tuam. At the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1800. The book was first published in 1697. A fifth edition in 1726 was reprinted 1830.

very slow, though sure, the gradual amelioration, so far as material comfort goes, in the lives of the poor. Yet all the time the seed sleeping under the sod was ripening for the harvest. The English character, in spite of limitations not few nor inconsiderable, was consolidating silently and secretly the sturdy energies needed for the practical duties of life. It was—

"The torrent's smoothness, ere it dash below."

Some of the characteristics of the time are well expressed in Mr. Whittuck's "The Good Man of the Eighteenth Century."[1] Taking Addison, Fielding, etc., in England, Voltaire and Rousseau—the sneerer and the idealist—with others, on the Continent, to show the sort of goodness aimed at, he analyzes his subject with philosophic discernment.

"The Religion of a Gentleman" illustrates the same thing from a contemporary standpoint. Though on a lower level devotionally than Taylor's "Holy Living," or "The Whole Duty of Man," it is a fair sample of serious thought in England during the Georgian period. Perhaps the phlegmatic temperament which the earliest representatives of the Hanoverian dynasty brought with them to England set the fashion. Tone of thought often percolates into the national life through the influences of the Court.

The bane of the literature, the art, the religion of the time was the dread of enthusiasm. "Pas trop de zéle!" It was not a mere lack of enthusiasm; it was a positive aversion to anything that looked like it, a distrust of everything except hard "common sense." Pope's exquisite versification lent a charm to shallow platitudes; Addison's easy, graceful way of enunciating commonplace truths made what is commonplace delightful. But even in their loftiest flights they and their imitators skimmed the surface; they did not try to probe the heights, the depths of life and character. Gray is, perhaps, the best of our poets in the interval between Pope and Byron. But Gray is painfully conventional. Matthew Arnold, in Ward's "English Poets," is

[1] G. Allen and Sons.

far too lenient to him. The naturalness of Goldsmith is exceptional after Johnson's pomposity and the magniloquence of Gibbon.

And yet, though enthusiasm was the *bête noire* of the age, an emotional sensitivenesss was rated highly—in women. The ideal woman overflowed with "sensibility." It is the old story of the swing of the pendulum—

"Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurrit."

The author of "The Religion of a Gentleman" is carefully orthodox; but he seems, like Milton, to diverge on the mystery of the Trinity (p. 102), and fails to grasp the reality of the Incarnation (p. 106). As a rule he avoids abstruse questions (p. 47), and is tolerant of difference in opinion when the mistake is free from fault morally (p. 671). It is noticeable that he speaks (p. 170) of prayer addressed to the Holy Spirit as a practice that has need to be justified. The authority of Holy Scripture, the older (p. 51) Testament included, is paramount, provided always that it is in accord "with reason." He takes Holy Scripture literally, but he admits that the early chapters of Genesis (p. 115) may be an allegory. Anticipating the very words of an Oxford Professor in "Essays and Reviews," he says that "the New Testament is to be interpreted in the same way as any other book." "The end and design of the Gospel," he declares emphatically, "is virtue" (p. 156); but with him, as with the men of his day generally, "virtue" is not self-sacrifice. "To love others," he writes (p. 196) "as much as we do ourselves is impossible and unreasonable." This is not the spirit of the "Imitatio"—"Though he slay me, yet will I love him"; it is the demand of the disciples of the Christ in their novitiate: "What shall *we* have?"

The Archbishop's practical sense shows itself in what he says on questions of casuistry—for instance, on the plea of conscience as an excuse for law-breaking (p. 63), on oaths (p. 164), against Sabbatarianism (p. 225). It is characteristic of the eighteenth century that he appreciates the excellence of

virtuous heathen. He maintains the traditional distinction between "positive" and "moral" precepts. He seems, in his psychology, to confuse "soul" and "spirit" (p. 113), a confusion not peculiar to him nor to his contemporaries.

Religious thought was chilled and cramped by dread of enthusiasm. People seemed to forget that the original meaning of the word points to something divine. Our insular reserve and reticence drew back instinctively from any sort of display, and sheltered themselves in conventionality. What is called "natural religion" was easier to understand and to practise than the glimpses which Revelation gives of a world supernatural. The mind accustomed to explain everything to itself could not breathe in a rarer atmosphere. Cowper complained that, though Paul gave the text, Plato, Epictetus, and Tully were the staple of the sermon. It was obvious for Butler, contending with Deists, to lay stress on the principles which they acknowledged. But "natural religion" by itself is merely guesswork; it cannot reveal God except very partially. Only when illuminated by the rays which dawned on the mystery of pain in Christianity has Nature a tale to tell of Divine power and love; without that she is the Sphinx of the desert. The warning cry of Wesley and Whitfield was wanted to awaken a sense of something higher than a refined Paganism, and to lead men to a personal Saviour. Of course, there were exceptions—what rule has them not?—but, speaking generally, the tone of English religion in the eighteenth century was beyond question secular.

This fear of trying to soar too high dragged down the ethical aspirations of the eighteenth century. Like the philosophers of ancient Hellas, the moralist made self the beginning and the end of being virtuous. In "Sandford and Merton," a book typical in its way of the didactic tone then prevalent, Mr. Barlow proses away on the advantages of being good, of the harms sure to come sooner or later from vice. What you can get for yourself by being good, and how much you will lose by behaving badly, is the burden of the song. Self is the centre of gravitation, the goal as well as the starting-point. If the root of the tree is selfishness, what must the fruit be?

True, vice is folly, or, as Plato would say, downright insanity. To calculate the harmful consequences of wrongdoing is a subsidiary motive for resisting the temptation. But the tendency of eighteenth-century morality was to make this lower motive unduly prominent. Instead of being a self-sacrifice regulated by prudence, virtue was a balancing of loss and gain, a calculation of self-interest. This may save a man from doing what is wrong; but, as Aristotle taught long ago, to do virtuous actions is not the same thing as to be virtuous. To love what is right for its own sake, come what may, is virtue. Even if the advantage to be gained is far off in the remote future, though this may call for a greater exercise of patience and self-control, the motive is mercenary, the prompter is self. "Other-worldliness," as Coleridge called it, is in its essence very near to what is called worldliness. The teachers of the eighteenth century used both freely in their exhortations. "We can procure no considerable benefit or [*sic*] advantage from it"—*i.e.*, from pride (*Spectator*, No. 257).

A great deal is taken for granted in "The Religion of a Gentleman"—more, far more, than would be taken for granted nowadays. It starts with a large assumption on the very first page—"All men have agreed that there is a God, and that religion shall reward with future happiness." Later on the author says: "Reason demonstrates"—a very strong word—"the being of a God." Mysticism, as was to be expected, there is none; for instance, in what is said about the Holy Communion.

One thought there is—it runs through the book from end to end—sufficient by itself to commend "The Religion of a Gentleman," whatever else may be wanting—there to seekers after the truth. For it reminds them that the message of Christianity is practice, not theory—that while much shall remain obscure, uncertain to the end, thus far at least the message is clear and unmistakable.[1] They shall know who do.

[1] *Cf.* Dr. Johnson's prayer: "In this world, where is much to be done, little to be known."

The Missionary World.

THE outward expression of the spiritual movement initiated at the C.M.S. Conference at Swanwick is so far all that could be desired. Inquiry in the central office elicits the fact that up to August 10 the special offerings were well over £93,000. The outlook is full of hope, though the certainty of "a strong permanent advance" still depends on the extent to which those who have responded to the call of God seek the grace of continuance. The situation is simply and adequately stated in an editorial note in the *C.M. Review:*

"'Swanwick' and 'July 8' are only the beginning. They are God's call to the Society, heard and recognized as a precious token of Divine love, to extend the knowledge of the everlasting Gospel. That the call may be answered, we need all of us an increase of faith, a revival of spiritual life, a truer spirit of stewardship, a more Christlike simplicity of living, and such a deliberate limitation of personal expenditure as may release more of the resources with which God has put us individually in trust for His own direct service."

The August *Gleaner*—which, by the way, is again this year the popular report of the Society—contains also a personal letter from the Honorary Secretary of the C.M.S., full of inspiring suggestion, and breathing a spirit of humility and of hope.

* * * * *

The question of "The Sacredness of Money," an address on which is printed in the *C.M.S. Gazette*, is still deeply exercising many minds, and it is being realized by many that simplicity of aim is an essential basis of simplicity of life. Meantime the *Bible in the World* furnishes a beautiful illustration of real giving in South Rhodesia, where the native Christians connected with the mission of the Dutch Reformed Church in Mashonaland have had special annual collections for the B.F.B.S. for many years, even through times of distressing poverty and famine:

"One man, for instance, brought a couple of sugar-canes from his early garden; another the only pumpkin left in his garden by hungry thieves. Others brought green mealie-cobs and wild water-melons. A few women who had nothing left in the granary took a little grain out of the scanty store

remaining in their pots. . . . A number of people gave what they earned by one day's labour in the mission-garden. Several sold bundles of wood, so as not to come empty-handed on Bible Sunday. One man actually put in the collection-plate—or, rather, basket—a large auger, which he had used to bore holes while he was building his house, but which he could now dispense with and sell for the benefit of the Lord's work."

On another page we find some striking instances of "exchange and barter," the actual things—strange and worthless in our eyes, it may be, but priceless to their owners—which men have given up to get some portion of the Word of God. In Timbuktu a colporteur bartered six Arabic Gospels for leather amulets, and a tribesman brought a beautifully embroidered hat and gave it in exchange for an Arabic Bible. An Abyssinian chief gave the weapon hanging at his side for a copy of the Scriptures. In the Solomon Islands Gospels were sold, the natives paying for them in food, fish, strings of teeth, etc. In South-West China the aboriginal tribes-people paid for their Gospels with hemp-cloth, fruit, eggs, and pine-chips. Even in Europe a soldier, having no money, gave his watch in exchange for a Russian New Testament; and in other parts of the Continent a can of buttermilk, three *kilos* of lentils, and a small sack of nuts, were given in exchange for copies of the Word of God.

* * * * *

The "findings" of the Continuation Committee Conferences held under Dr. Mott's chairmanship in India, China, and Japan last winter have been published in three small pamphlets, which are of unique value to missionary leaders. They focus the experience of the missionary body upon all the great problems of their work. They give an interdenominational and international summary of expert opinion, and provide evidence of a kind never available before. For years to come these pamphlets will probably be a final court of appeal. They supplement, and in some senses surpass, the Reports of the World Missionary Conference. On every question of missionary policy they furnish an unfailing guide. It goes without saying that they should be familiar to members of missionary committees, but

they also have uses for all who care for the wider and deeper aspects of missionary work.

* * * * *

Whilst China is struggling through many political disturbances towards light and liberty, it is significant that the students of the land are being widely touched by the message of the Gospel. The *Student World* (New York) contains a record of the remarkable fruitfulness of the evangelistic meetings held by Dr. Mott and Mr. Eddy in over a dozen centres, and of the striking collaboration of the Chinese authorities. The *C.M. Review* contains a short account by Bishop Price of the meetings in Foochow, where Mr. Eddy and Professor Robertson were the leaders. In both there is an earnest plea for continued intercession that the men and women whose hearts have been touched may be gathered into the Kingdom of God. This would mean salvation for China.

* * * * *

The S.P.G. *Mission Field* has two articles which offer new fields for missionary interest. One is on a Medical Mission in Malacca, among Mohammedan women. We know too little of Malaya as a mission field. The other, by the Bishop of Chota Nagpur, gives a most interesting account of a coal-mining district in Bengal, and of the work carried on amongst Europeans and Anglo-Indians there. A considerable number of Indian Christians are employed in various capacities, but the majority of the miners are unevangelized Santals or Bauris. Those who have done evangelistic and pastoral work in British mining districts will realize the difficulty and the possibility of the situation.

* * * * *

A sentence in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*, written by a missionary at Wusueh, China, is suggestive at a time when so many missionaries are about to leave the homeland, and so many friends are glad to provide them with some token of remembrance. He urges that the dangers of mental stagnation on the mission field needs an antidote in the form of stimulating and

thought-provoking literature. "Would that a few of our wealthy laymen in England had the foresight thus to enlarge our mental horizon by sending out the *London Quarterly* or the *Constructive Review*." We re-echo his plea, though possibly the *International Review of Missions* or *The East and the West* would be the papers of our choice. Private letters recently received from a number of missionaries show how greatly such literature is appreciated by those who are closely pressed with detailed work. A good book is a welcome present, but a review which comes freshly quarter by quarter means even more in the mission field.

* * * * *

We Anglicans are slowly awaking to the importance of Sunday-School work in the Church at home; in diocese after diocese steps are being taken to introduce better methods. In the mission field our Nonconformist brethren, who have long led in Sunday-Schools at home, are far ahead of us also. The great World Sunday-School Conference, held at Zurich in July, has revealed the enormous possibilities of Sunday-School work. The attention of missionary leaders should be turned in this direction forthwith. The L.M.S. *Chronicle* for August contains an illuminating paper called "The Children of India: An Opportunity and a Call," by Miss Emily Huntley, who was one of a commission sent out by the British Sunday-School Union to visit typical centres of work in India. The article will be found full of practical wisdom by home organizers and missionaries alike.

* * * * *

An article on the beginning of missions in Arabia, in the August number of the *Evangelisches Missions-Magazin*, published by the Basle Missionary Society, gives a new idea of the possibilities of that little-known land to those who are familiar only with British Missions. The names of Henry Martin, of General Haig, of Bishop French, and of Ion Keith Falconer bind us for ever to Arabia, but we hear little of the work which is now year by year gaining ground in that land. The Scottish

Mission in Sheikh Othman is well established, though Sana, the capital of Yemen, has not yet been reached. The Danish Mission has extended its work from Aden to Hodeida. The American Mission, founded in 1891, has six stations, with more than thirty missionaries of both sexes, including doctors. Two large hospitals have been established, and others are soon to be opened. School work is only beginning, and the obstacles are many ; baptisms as yet are few. But the confidence of the people has been gained and Christian influence is becoming widespread. The situation is full of hope, yet, as the writer of this interesting survey points out, no one can speak of Arabia without thinking of Mecca, from which annually at least 70,000 pilgrims, many of them Moslem subjects of Christian Powers, go back to strengthen the consciousness of the great brotherhood of Islam in their own homes. When some Christian mission has a firm foothold in Mecca, then indeed a strategic centre of the first importance will have been gained. Those who have unoccupied mission fields specially on their hearts will do well to make this article the basis of their intercessions.

* * * * *

Leaders of mission study circles will find good material in the textbooks provided for their use this autumn. For advanced work, "The Spirit of Japan," by the Rev. G. H. Moule, is being issued ; for elementary adult circles, "The Kingdom in the Pacific," by a son of the well-known hero of the New Hebrides, will be found of thrilling interest. It is "good method" to lead circles already familiar with the fields of Anglican missions to find the same glow of missionary inspiration and the same missionary principles in regions where other organizations are at work. The heroism of South Sea missionaries, foreign and native, will kindle many hearts. It is deeply important this winter that the mission study circle should not only maintain but develop its place in the life of the Church. The newness of the method is passing, but its value is being more clearly established every day. In the wide area touched by the C.M.S. Swanwick Conference, no means will prove more

fruitful in the garnering of results. It is worth while to spend time in order to secure the organization of well-worked, ably-led study circles in every parish.

* * * * *

The United Council of Missionary Education does not care for adults only. A delightful set of "Talks on Japan" for use in children's mission study circles has also been published. In addition, a book of vivid stories, intended to be told, not read, to such boys as scouts—"Camp-Fire Yarns"—has been issued, with notes to aid the story-teller in his task. Gradually we are being equipped with excellent material for our work. It lies with us to use it with proper power behind. Someone has said that a rifle-ball in motion effects more than a cannon-ball lying on the ground. G.

Discussions.

[*The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the* CHURCHMAN. *The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions"* must *reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.*]

"TITHES AND THE POOR."

(*The "Churchman," August,* 1913, *p.* 636.)

I AM much obliged to Mr. Price for his letter in last month's CHURCHMAN. I certainly should have added a footnote calling attention to the fact that the authority for the so-called "Canones Ælfrici" is somewhat uncertain. Two questions are involved: First, this particular authority; second, even apart from it, how far some portion of the tithe was regarded in England in the early Middle Ages as the heritage of the poor. Both questions are too large for full discussion here. I am quite prepared to admit that Lord Selborne has adduced sufficient evidence to show that these "Canones Ælfrici" must be received at least with caution. At the same time I do not think that the second question would then necessarily be answered in the negative. Hatch (in "The Growth of Church Institutions," pp. 114, 115) writes: "It would be improbable, even if no positive evidence on the point existed, that our own country, which followed closely in most other respects the

movements and practices of the Churches of the Continent, should have differed from them in respect of the apportionment of tithes. But the positive evidence is clear. The authority of the enactments may be disputable, but they are at least witnesses to a current belief or tendency; and it can hardly be denied that whatever evidence exists in our own country for the payment of tithes at all in pre-Norman times exists also for their appropriation, not to the clergy only, but also to the poor."[1] To this I would add the following from Ratzinger, "Armenpflege," p. 266: "Ich bin der Ansicht, dass die karolingische Gesetzgebung allerdings schon unter Egbert oder bald nach ihm durch Alcuin oder andere in Frankenreiche ansässige Briten in England Eingang gefunden habe und beobachtet wurde. Wenigstens findet sich im neunten und zehnten Jahrhundert das karolingische System der Armenpflege auch in England durchgeführt."

Some of my readers will remember Dante, Par. xii. 93, where there occur the words "decimas quæ sunt pauperum Dei"; also St. Thomas ii. 2, Q. 87, A. 3: "In nova lege decimæ dantur clericis, non solum propter sui sustentationem, sed etiam ut ex eis subvenient pauperibus."

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

Notices of Books.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH. By H. B. Swete, D.D. London: *Macmillan, Ltd.* Price 8s. 6d. net.

Dr. Swete gave us some years ago a valuable book on "The Holy Spirit in the New Testament." He now follows up his earlier work by publishing a further instalment of the history of the doctrine of the Spirit, carrying us from the close of the Canon down to the eighth century. Professor Swete, with the careful fidelity to detail which marks the best Cambridge scholarship, examines all the more important patristic writings, extracts the references to the doctrine of the Spirit, and with a shrewd comment or a connecting link of history weaves them all into an illuminating and interesting whole. He regards the Arian controversy as the natural division of his period. "To the pre-Arian age the question of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son does not become acute." Arius seems to have been loyal to his logic, and to have made the Holy Spirit a creature. But the Person of the Son dominated the field of controversy for fifty years, and it was only then that the Church was compelled to defend the divinity of the Spirit. That defence was whole-hearted and adequate.

In the pre-Arian period Dr. Swete devotes chapters to the sub-apostolic period, to the Greek Apologists, the Gnostics, the Montanists, to Irenæus, to

[1] By 15 Richard II., cap. 15, it is enacted that "if a parish church is appropriated" the "diocesan shall ordain a convenient sum of money to be distributed yearly of the fruits and profits of the same to the poor parishioners in aid of their living and sustenance for ever."

the Monarchians, to the Churches of North Africa and Alexandria. With Montanism Dr. Swete expresses considerable sympathy, as, indeed, we should expect. Speaking of Tertullian, he writes: "The emphasis which he laid upon the work of the Paraclete in the living Church deserves the warm gratitude of all who recognize that neither an orthodox creed nor an unbroken succession can satisfy without the stirring of a supernatural life." Of Montanism itself he writes: "On the whole, the movement which the sect created was beneficial, especially perhaps in the West, where tradition and convention were apt to exercise too great a control." Alas, that it should still be true that tradition and convention still strive to maintain that control, to the detriment of spiritual religion!

In the next section of the book the Arian and post-Arian history is dealt with, chapters being devoted in turn to the Arian controversy, to Eusebius of Cæsarea and Cyril of Jerusalem, to Athanasius, to the Cappadocians, and then in chapters, of less detail and wider purview, to the centuries which elapse before the life of Gregory the Great. The last and shortest section, but by no means the least valuable, summarizes the doctrine of the Spirit under its various heads, and the book closes with brief appendices on the Didache and the Odes of Solomon. There are excellent indices—a matter of considerable importance in a book which will have value not only as the history of a doctrine, but as a book of reference for both students and preachers.

ST. PAUL AND JUSTIFICATION. By the Rev. F. B. Westcott, D.D. London: *Macmillan.* Price 6s. net.

Two questions arise in any discussion of St. Paul's theology: What precisely did he mean to convey to his readers by his phraseology? and How far are his arguments convincing to us? Upon the latter question Dr. Westcott has only a little to say, and he says it at the end on p. 394: "As one reads the familiar words of an Epistle like Romans again and again and again, it comes ever more home to one that, though he writes in Greek and cites the Greek Old Testament, he is really at bottom a Hebrew. A great gulf separates his whole method from that with which we became familiarized in the days when our minds were given to the lucid writers of Hellas. It is when he is definitely arguing that he carries his readers least with him. Of their kind, no doubt, his arguments are very excellent; but it happens not to be the kind in which we ourselves have been trained. Therefore we love him best when he leaves all logical processes far behind, and discarding 'reason' as such, surrenders himself entirely to a species of intuition. It is in his dithyrambic vein, when the tide of inspiration is flowing strong and free, that he is for modern minds the most convincing."

But the latter question cannot be touched until the former has been answered, and the former postulates careful and grammatical study of the Pauline text. To this Dr. Westcott devotes his strength. His book is an exposition of the doctrinal teaching of Galatians and Romans. Of the numerous earlier workers in this field the author admits his debt most to Lightfoot and Sanday and Headlam, but his own work is on a different pattern to theirs. It is in the form of an essay, and throughout is very readable. Like Sanday and Headlam, he gives a paraphrase of the passage with which he is dealing, and adds exposition and comment. The whole is

the result of much careful reading and teaching, and certainly ought to receive a place beside the standard commentaries on the shelves of every theological student who desires to master St. Paul's greatest theme. Where so much has been already written, it is difficult to add anything altogether new; but Dr. Westcott has not slavishly followed any earlier teacher, and the careful reader of his book will constantly find new renderings and fresh suggestions which will be both welcome and profitable. It is not easy to know how best to illustrate the character of the book, but we will notice some passages which struck us in our reading.

On the crucial question of the meaning of δικαιοῦν, he says (p. 7): It "does not mean to 'make righteous' in the sense of 'right doing,' or even . . . to 'account as right doing,' but simply to 'set right.'" δίκαιος, in St. Paul, has two senses. "Sometimes it means the condition of one who is righteous (in the sense of right doing); sometimes (and this is the technical usage) the condition of one who is 'right'—that is, right with God."

Gal. iii. 19, 20 is known as a *crux* of interpreters. On pp. 61-63 we find: "To what end then served the Law? It was an addition made for transgression's sake, till such time as the seed should come, for whom the Promise is: appointed in the presence of angels by the hand of an intermediary. Now God is one: and the very idea of one excludes an intermediary." "There appears to be an antithesis between the 'mediate' character of the Mosaic covenant and the wholly 'immediate' nature of the Abrahamic Promise." On p. 166 we were glad to read: "A 'righteousness of God' I take to mean a way whereby a man may attain to 'right'-ness with God, by God's own plan and appointment. It has nothing to do with conduct: it deals with *status* only: but *status*, where God is concerned, is for man the very first of all considerations. God's own righteousness, in the ethical sense, has nothing to do with the matter."

In connection with ἱλαστήριον, Dr. Westcott says, on p. 178: "We must not close our eyes to the solemn fact that Christ Himself proclaimed a virtue in His Death, and that all His followers, as many as ever taught in early days, likewise proclaimed this thing. Though blood in the ancient world . . . was taken as the seat of life: yet blood that is shed stands for death—stands for life laid down for others. As Dr. Sanday very justly observes, the idea of sacrifice is a 'central conception' of New Testament religion. Though we may not see its meaning, we 'must not explain it away': nor regard it as 'mere metaphor.' To all this I say 'Amen' with all my heart and soul."

We are not now surprised to read (p. 217): "Some modern thinkers tell us that . . . by slow yet sure degrees . . . the race will attain to a state of moral perfection. But Christians . . . are very sure that things are somehow wrong, and that it is not to racial evolution we must direct our gaze to save us, but to moral regeneration, acting upon the individual."

Another difficult passage is Rom. viii. 10, and after a long discussion we have this helpful paraphrase: "And if Christ be in you: for all the body is dead because it is sinful: yet the *Spirit* (which is Christ) is a source of Life *because you are at peace with God.*" To be quit of guilt is a necessary foundation for the Spirit's further work.

It would have been a pleasure to give many other quotations; but it is our hope that the citations already made will induce many both within and without the ranks of professed theological students to study Dr. Westcott's book for themselves. C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

THE ROMANCE OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. By the Rev. W. H. Saulez. London: *Longmans*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

If a chorus of approval proves anything, it proves that this book has considerable merit. Its reliability should be guaranteed by its author's credentials as Syriac and Chaldee Prizeman at Trinity College, Dublin. Its interest is apparent to the most casual reader. Its object is not to teach Hebrew, but to show convincingly that Hebrew is a language that ought to be learnt, and to give a taste of the rich banquet that is provided for the Hebrew reader. Those who are struggling with the difficulties of grammar will find here an inspiration to persevere. Those who must still be content with English will find much light thrown upon their English text by the numerous passages selected by the author, in which an added point or an increased vividness is given by study of a Hebrew root, or tense, or conjunction, or even an accent. The book will certainly occupy a prominent place among Helps to the Study of the Bible, and we would heartily commend it.

JUDGES AND RUTH. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. By G. A. Cooke, D.D. *Cambridge University Press*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

We are particularly impressed by the notes in this new addition to the Cambridge Bible series in the Revised Version. They are excellent in their combination of careful scholarship with a clean-cut simplicity and fresh suggestiveness. We cannot say that the author in the Introductions is convincing in his estimates of the date of either book. No one doubts that Judges is a compilation from various sources, but we think that the alleged traces of the influence of the "Priestly" school on the Introduction (chaps. i. 1–ii. 5) and Appendices (chaps. xvii.–xxi.) are too slight to warrant the relegation of these portions to the fifth century.

In the case of Ruth, the author admits that "on the whole the style is classical," that "the author . . . is evidently describing a life with which he was familiar," that "the scene and characters which fill it are unmistakenly true to life," and yet he proceeds to regard the book as an idealized picture seen through the "twilight of fancy" by a writer in the century following Nehemiah! This does not appeal to us as sound and convincing criticism. However, though we can by no means endorse all the critical conclusions of the book, we are sensible of its value and commend it.

SYNTHETIC STUDIES IN SCRIPTURE. By W. Shaw Caldecott. *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. 6d.

Whether these short essays will help much towards "a return to the more conservative interpretation of the Bible," we have our doubts, for some of the theories put forward are by no means "conservative." It may be conservatism to regard the book of Job as written by Moses in Midian; it may be modified conservatism to attribute Hebrews to the dual authorship of St. Paul and St. Luke; but it is radicalism to argue for the Thursday of

Holy Week as the day of our Lord's Crucifixion. Still, from a study of the sacred text so reverent and minute as that of the author we expect something more than theories as unsubstantial as the binding of his book. Our expectation is satisfied with much that is helpful and suggestive, and we acknowledge the debt.

THE ROYAL PROGRESS OF OUR LORD. By the Ven. Archdeacon E. B. Trotter. *Ouseley*. Pp. 322.

The Royal Progress is the last journey to Jerusalem, as narrated in St. Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14. The book begins with an essay on the criticism of the Gospels, in which the author maintains that this section of St. Luke is a unity, not merely a collection of incidents for which there was no place in the Marcan framework; and, moreover, that while there is in it some topical arrangement, there is also much more chronology than is commonly supposed. Whether the reader agrees with these conclusions or not, he will find the rest of the book very helpful. It is expository, and the exposition is also practical and devotional. The text is broken up into short sections, any noteworthy words are commented on, and then comes the exposition. We have been struck by the number of apposite quotations, and by the way in which light is constantly shed upon modern problems. There are full indices.

THE WORD AND THE WORLD. Pastoral Studies for the Modern Preacher. By Canon Wakeford. London: *Longmans*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

First delivered as a course at King's College, London. The Bishop of Lincoln writes in his Introduction: "It is because these pages are so full of life and criticism and experience, and compel reflection upon great subjects, that I wish for them a wide circulation." They are not a treatise on Pastoral Theology in the ordinary sense of advice on preaching, visiting, and the like, but rather an inquiry into conditions of success and failure in all these. A parochial clergyman would find them stimulating, though he would probably disagree here and there. At the end is an appendix giving a number of replies from anonymous workers to these questions: What is the strongest ordinary motive disposing people to religious denomination? What most hinders the reception of spiritual truth? In any case of conversion that has come to your notice, what has been the cause or apparent occasion?

CATHOLICISM AND LIFE. By the Rev. C. H. SHARPE. London: *Longmans*. 1913. Price 4s. 6d. net.

This book, despite some good and true things in it, appears to us to be radically unsound. "Catholicism," in the author's view, seems to be little more than a rigid Episcopalianism. The word "Catholic" is narrowed till it becomes practically synonymous with a kind of sectarianism that is the antithesis of "universal." Yet the pressing need of the moment is not a Catholicism so interpreted, but a Catholicism so broadened and deepened as to contain within its borders every genuine form of Christian belief, whether Episcopalian or non-Episcopalian. The author's attitude to modern thought is sufficiently indicated by the fact that he interprets the earlier chapters of Genesis as literal and plain history. The Primacy of Peter, and therefore of the Pope, is assumed; the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin is accepted, more or less; and auricular confession is taught. Now,

this is not the teaching of the Church of England, as the Articles clearly imply. All these things we regret, the more so because there is a great deal in the book with which we may, and do, heartily sympathize. We wonder whether Mr. Sharpe has read the late Dr. Fairbairn's volume, "Catholicism, Anglican and Roman"? If not, we would venture, with all respect, to commend it to his notice.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHRIST. ("Preachers of To-Day" Theological Library, edited by J. Stuart Holden, M.A.) By the Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, M.A., Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside. London: *Robert Scott.* 1913. Price 3s. 6d. net.

"What is the nature and ground of the demand that Jesus Christ makes on human lives?" Such is the insistent question that Canon Masterman faces, as it faces every thoughtful student to-day. And this volume of sermons is an attempt to answer that question. He remarks, and truly, that this challenge of Christ is working as a revolutionary force in modern life. On the nature of the answer given will ultimately depend the whole future of mankind. Slowly but surely the great ethnic religions of the world are being sapped by the impact of modern thought; slowly but surely those religions are losing their efficacy, despite vigorous efforts to galvanize their systems into new life. The religion of Jesus Christ is the only religion now in the world which fully responds to human needs. It is no longer a struggle between various competing creeds, of which Christianity is one; but a struggle between Christ and anti-Christ. Briefly, but not ineffectually, Canon Masterman indicates the nature of this titanic struggle; and his book, though somewhat slight and superficial in treatment (as, indeed, it was bound to be, from the nature of the case), puts fairly and forcibly before us what the "challenge" implies, and indicates some, at least, of the answers that so imperious a challenge demands. It is certainly worth reading.

PENNELL OF BANNU. By A. L. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1s.

An admirable account of one of the most remarkable men of this generation. The value of the pamphlet is increased by the inclusion of General Scott-Moncrieff's paper on Dr. Pennell, first published in *Blackwood's Magazine* for July, 1912.

WHAT LIFE MEANS TO ME. By Dr. W. T. Grenfell. London: *James Nisbet,* Berners Street. Price 2s. net.

Those who have read Dr. Grenfell's other books, "Down North on the Labrador," and "The Adventure of Life," will welcome this little volume, which is in some measure autobiographical. It is delightfully unconventional, and perhaps not always quite orthodox; but, then, it is penned by a layman—a plain man who confesses that our Lord's remarks about the man who put his hand to the plough and looked back did him more good than all the books of the Christian Evidence Society! "Life to me," he says, "is a school in which to learn how best to serve, a school in which we may be taught how best to employ and develop our special talents for service here and, I believe, hereafter." Just the kind of stimulating book to put into the hands of a young man starting out in life.

THOUGHTS IN HIS PRESENCE: MEDITATIONS UPON THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. Wilfred M. Hopkins. London: *Robert Scott*, Paternoster Row. Price 2s. net.

Canon Barnes-Lawrence, who contributes a Preface to this little volume, truly says that "the writer's method is not in any way controversial, but devotional. His pages . . . breathe a spirit of devotion to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and his one aim is the teaching and refreshment of His people." Most suitable for readings at a weekday service, or for putting into the hands of communicants. It is happily entirely free from the extravagances which frequently spoil works of this class. We hope Mr. Hopkins will be encouraged to try his hand again as a devotional writer.

ARTHUR T. PIERSON: A BIOGRAPHY. London: *James Nisbet*, Berners Street. Price 6s. net.

This memoir of one whose praise is in all the churches will be welcomed by many. He had a remarkable career. Descended from a Church of England clergyman, he was converted at a Methodist revival, was trained for the ministry in a Presbyterian college, his first charge was a Congregational Church, while the most important work of his life was his Pastorate of Spurgeon's Baptist Tabernacle. When he passed away he was connected, as his biographer says, with no human organization. As a champion of the Bible he has had few equals in modern times. To him it was a living book, and he had a wonderful way of making it live in his lectures, many of which have been widely circulated.

THREE MEN ON A CHINESE HOUSE-BOAT. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1s. 6d.

This little book, most attractively got up, has not a dull page. Bishop Cassels truly says in his Preface: "It is full of interest and fun." Most suitable as a Sunday-school prize, especially now that our eyes are so expectantly turned to the Celestial Empire.

THE INEVITABLE CHRIST. By F. B. Macnutt. *Robert Scott.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

Canon Macnutt's contribution to the "Preachers of To-Day" library will by no means disgrace this excellent series. The sermons contain abundant illustration of the change which is becoming apparent in modern preaching, which addresses itself to the needs of the present rather than to a contemplation of the glories of the past. The preacher has tried to diagnose the conditions and ills of modern life, and, in language to which he hopes men will listen, he has proclaimed the remedy. And the remedy is the Cross. A fresh presentation does not in any way affect the essential message; and no matter where the preacher finds us (or we find him), from all positions we are summoned to turn and behold Jesus Christ and Him "lifted up." Sermons such as these can do nothing but good, and we are glad that cathedral congregations receive such truly "evangelical" teaching.

THE WAITING LIFE. By Hubert Foston. *Clarke.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This is a devotional meditation on the first psalm, worked out in an unusual but not unattractive manner. Dr. Foston discovers an elaborate tracery of interlaced parallelism, which is indicated and expounded piece by piece. The author appreciates beforehand that some may think the exposition

rather fanciful, and perhaps scarcely legitimate; but he has prepared it with evident care and earnest thought, and with the reverent spirit of one who loves His Bible and the God who inspired it. In any case, the teaching of the book is helpful and refreshing in an age which is in danger of forgetting the secrets of a life of waiting.

Received: AT HIS TABLE. By Constance Coote. London: *Marshall Bros., Ltd.* A little manual for Holy Communion. THE ACTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By Arthur T. Pierson, D.D. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. A reprint of Dr. Pierson's well-known work. THE KINGDOM IN THE PACIFIC. By Frank H. L. Paton. London: *Church Missionary Society.* Price 1s. net. COUNSELS FOR DAILY LIFE. By Cecil F. J. Bourke. Price 1s. net. A FIFTH GOSPEL. By Rev. W. H. Veales. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d. net. The Fifth Gospel is that according to St. Paul. LAWS AGAINST NONCONFORMITY. By T. Bennett, LL.D. Grimsby: *Roberts and Jackson.* Price 1s. net. Is anything gained by a book of this kind? Nonconformity had its own way in England for a little while once under the Commonwealth. Is it proud of it? Why, then, publish a book on the sins of the State and the Church? DARKNESS OR LIGHT. By Robert KEABLE. London: *U.M.C.A.* BIBLICAL PEOPLES RECOGNIZED IN MODERN NATIONS. By M. T. Glasgow and Dalbeattie: *Fraser, Asher and Co., Ltd.* Very far-fetched and fantastic. "REMEMBERING THE DAYS OF OLD." By the Right Rev. the Dean of Westminster. London: *Oxford University Press.* Price 6d. net. THE TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS. By Rev. Arthur C. Headlam. London: *Spottiswoode and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net. A new edition of Dr. Headlam's vigorous pamphlet. CHOOSING A BOY'S CAREER. By Henry C. Devine. London: *Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net. A useful little book; but it is the choice of a career, not a vocation. HALF-AND-HALF TRAGEDY. By Ascott P. Hope. London: *Adam and Charles Black.* A collection of stories for boys and others. AMBASSADORS IN BONDS. By F. A. Simpson. London: *John Murray.* Price 6d. net. A plea for freedom of thought. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST TO NON-CHRISTIAN RACES. By Charles H. Robinson. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. A new edition of a most valuable book. TEN YEARS IN SOUTH LONDON. By Rev. M. Hay. London: *J. and J. Bennett, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. DIVINE TRANSCENDENCE. By J. R. Illingworth, M.A., D.D. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 6d. TALKS ON JAPAN. London: *Church Missionary Society.* Price 6d. net. HOLDING UP THE STANDARD. By Jessie Louisa Mylne. London: *Marshall Bros., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. net. A BUILDER OF SHIPS. By Charles M. Sheldon. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* A story of the type for which Mr. Sheldon is famed. SION COLLEGE AND LIBRARY. By E. H. Pearce, M.A. Cambridge: *University Press.* Price 9s. net. An excellent piece of work, of real interest to all who have had any contact with Sion College. WHAT'S THE GOOD OF RELIGION? By A. Herbert Gray, M.A. London: *Student Christian Movement.* A valuable little pamphlet. THE BIBLE REMEMBRANCER. RUTH THE MOABITESS AND OTHER BIBLE READINGS. By Henry Moorhouse. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. BISHOP RIDLEY ON THE LORD'S SUPPER. By the Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D. Price 2s. net. A new edition. THE PATHWAY OF VICTORY. By Robert B. Girdlestone, M.A. London: *Chas. J. Thynne.* Price 6d. net. OUR WONDERFUL FAITH. By Edward W. Osborne, D.D. Price 1s. 6d. net. THE TWO HUTS. By Rev. J. M. Neale, D.D. Price 6d. THE LAITY AND CHURCH COUNCILS. By H. D. Acland. Price 3d. SUNDAY READINGS FOR CHILDREN. By J. M. Neale, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d. net. THE HOLY LAND OF THE HINDUS. By Rev. Robert Lee Lacey. Price 3s. 6d. net. THE NEARNESS OF OUR LORD'S RETURN. By Rev. R. W. B. Moore. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. net. FELICITY IN FRANCE. By Constance Elizabeth Maud. Price 1s. net. IN KEDAR'S TENTS. By H. Seton Merriman. Price 7d. net. ROB ROY. By Sir Walter Scott. Price 6d. net. LEAVES FROM AN INSPECTOR'S LOG-BOOK. By John Kerr, LL.D. SIMON DALE. By Anthony Hope. Price 7d. net. THROUGH FINLAND IN CARTS. By Mrs. Alec Tweedie. Price 1s. net. THE PALADIN. By H. A. Vachell. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 7d. net.