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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1913.

The Month.

The Winter's Work.

WITH October the pressure of the winter's work begins. The value of the work will depend, at least to some extent, upon the spirit in which it is taken up and carried through. If we work like beaten men, we court defeat. Setting our hands to the plough as if we were sure of the harvest, we have done something towards making the harvest sure. To realize the splendour of our opportunity is to take the first step towards its fruition. The winter's work in the ordinary parish—the visiting, the organizing, the preaching, the teaching, and all else that it involves—is a magnificent opportunity for bringing near to the people of our land that kingdom of God which shall, in the long run, mean the redemption of the world and the restitution of all things. The parochial system may, in part at least, have given place to the congregational, the old methods may have lost something of their novelty, the ordinary routine may seem to have become humdrum, the difficulties and disappointment of years of service may have weakened the grip and enfeebled the spring of some of us; but the fact still remains that highest amongst the factors that make for our national righteousness still stands the simple ordinary work of our parochial life. We whose task in life only allows us but a very small share in that aggressive work for God, venture to write this word of encouragement and appreciation to our brothers who are bearing the burden—nay, the

phrase is hardly the right one, hardly the one our brothers would wish to use—enjoying the responsibility and privilege of it.

The Outlook.

There is little need, however, to face the coming winter in pessimistic mood. There are difficulties and trials ahead for the Church at large. But history seems to suggest that critical times are best for the real life of a Church, and at any rate we can dare to believe that to-day's perplexities will become God's opportunities. The Welsh Church agitation, whatever its outcome, has at least drawn Churchmen together and braced us to new and vigorous effort. If the Bill goes through next year, and that is by no means certain, we must accept the situation in the right spirit, and we must see to it that the Church in Wales, impoverished and handicapped though it be, shall gain in spiritual effectiveness and in evangelistic zeal. For England the passage of the Bishoprics Act, for which we are profoundly grateful, ought to mean, and we believe it will mean, a fuller and more effective service in three great regions of the land. The vigorous action of the Bishop of St. Albans in the matter of the *soi-disant* Catholic League brings new hope to those who wish to see the Church cleansed from medieval and superstitious hindrances to real religion, and should by its very loyalty and courage inspire others in high places to stem the tide of Romish aggression. The passing of new temperance legislation for Scotland inspires the hope that England will not be much longer overlooked in this matter. The Mental Deficiency Act is another step in the right direction. Finally, in the imperial politics of the Church, the Swanwick Conference has not only brought its £100,000 to the coffers of the Church Missionary Society, but it has given us a new vision of things as they are and as under God they may be, if we will be but loyal to the spirit of the Master, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life. As we look round upon the happenings and the possibilities of to-day we may well go back to our work determined that for ourselves and for the whole Church it shall be fuller, wider, higher, more fully consecrated than it has ever been before.

Social Questions.

The mention of the Scottish Temperance Act and the Act dealing with the mentally deficient leads us to say a word about the attitude of the Church, and especially of Evangelicals, to social questions. It has never been true that the Evangelicals have been deaf to the pleadings of the social conscience. The mere mention of the Clapham Sect, of such men as the great Earl Shaftesbury, and of the support that Evangelicals have given to such societies as Dr. Barnardo's Homes and the Ragged School Union, is testimony to the contrary. But in one particular direction a special opportunity is open to us just now. The Report of the Poor Law Commission has almost become a forgotten document. It is true that it has inspired most of the social legislation of the last few years, but that social legislation has rather more largely concerned itself with creating new organizations to deal with particular departments of Poor Law administration, than with making the old really effective. In the main, the workhouse and outdoor relief stand where they did. In both there is much to be done. But people know very little about these somewhat intricate subjects. They therefore care very little; they allow Guardians' elections to be determined by a small minority of those entitled to vote, and often upon issues which are not only subsidiary to the main question, but in themselves utterly trivial; and when elections are over they allow the administration to proceed just as the Guardians, generally inadequately representative and often practically incapable, may happen to wish. May we venture to suggest to our Evangelical brethren of the laity that they discover for themselves the state of the case in their own neighbourhood and then proceed to such active interference as they may deem necessary. The care of the poor lay near to the heart of the great Apostle of the Gospel of the Atonement. It should lie near to the heart of Evangelicals. We believe that it does, only that they do not always show it. They do not show it because they do not know what their local workhouse is like, nor how the poor widow in her own home and among her children is being cared for. It is our business to know, to care, and to act.

Holiday Observations.

To those who spend their few weeks of vacation at one or other of our British watering-places, not the least interesting of the various forms of occupation is the general outlook on one's fellow holiday-makers. In their pursuits and recreations it is possible to read something of the tendencies of the age and the signs of the times. What has chiefly impressed the present writer is the change wrought in English middle-class life by the advent of the motor-car and the cycle-car. In former days, father, mother, children, came to a place and, with the exception of local excursions, stayed there. Now it is largely movement—constant coming and going. It was significant to hear from an accountant who had intimate acquaintance with the motor-car industry, that middle-class families are largely wont to cut down their establishments in order to keep a car. Fewer servants are kept, smaller houses occupied, families in many cases are limited, in others non-existent, in order that money and time may be set free for motor travel—for a life of constant movement and perpetual change.

Home Life and Church Life.

Whatever may be the positive advantages of all this, it can hardly be questioned that it is bound to strike a blow at home life, and especially at home life on its religious side. The opportunity for change and wider knowledge of one's own country, doubtless, is good in a measure. But the loss of that peace and repose which the word "home" has hitherto stood for is a heavy price to pay. The constant "week-end" motor holiday is bound to tell a tale not only on the statistics of church attendance, but on the inner religious life of those concerned. Week-end motoring holidays are presumably not church-going holidays; and even where church-going finds a place, the constant change and novelty are a poor substitute for the peace and quiet of worship at home. The present state of things has been not inaptly named a "motor-car and telephone civilization." It is an age of wonderful mechanical invention—in the air, on the land, beneath the sea. With no

wish to be unduly pessimistic, we cannot help feeling that many features of this mechanical age are of serious import both to church life and to home life, and we think clergy and teachers will do well to warn their people of the risks they, perhaps quite unwittingly, are running.

The Woman Movement.

At the forthcoming Church Congress we are glad to notice that the relations of man and woman in these perplexing days is to be considered. By the appointed speakers, and, we hope, by the whole Congress, it will be seriously considered. We have no intention here of involving ourselves in the vexed question of suffrage, but we do feel that there is serious danger of something in the nature of a sex war, a serious sex antagonism, arising among us. Wrong and wicked things are being said on both sides. Not only are men and women equally necessary for the maintenance of the race: they are equally responsible, in virtue of functions and capacities which they possess, for the real welfare of the social fabric. It will be a grievous pity if the suffrage controversy brings about the growing up of a generation which forgets the duty and opportunity of each sex in relation to the other. Therefore, in the interests not only of the social organism, but of real religion, we are glad to see the subject included in the Congress programme, and we hope that this ventilation of it upon a Church platform will serve to lift the whole controversy into a purer and more reasonable atmosphere.

Biblical Drama.

The question of the limits within which religious experience and emotion are fitting subjects for dramatic and spectacular treatment is too large a one for discussion in these Notes. But we are bound to express the greatest regret at the method in which—according to the report of the *Times* dramatic critic—the story of "Joseph and his Brethren" is being treated at His Majesty's Theatre. Many will be grieved and distressed that the sacred narrative should be made the subject of a dramatic spectacle at all. And even

those who would be prepared to welcome such representation if reverently and seriously treated can hardly fail to be repelled when they read that "an *ingénue* is provided to give Joseph his little 'love interest,'" and that "the chief baker, who was hanged, serves for 'comic relief.'" Apart from all other considerations, what an association is this treatment of the story to produce in the minds of those who witness it! When in private reading or public worship, the whole history, with its tragedy and pathos, is followed, what a jarring and alien note is struck by the recollection of the "comic relief" thus imported into the sacred narrative! Treatment such as this is a degradation of the Bible story.

Lord Haldane's Address.

One of the most striking events in recent international history has been the address given by Lord Haldane at Montreal. Our readers will be familiar with the outline, at any rate, of its main contentions. From one point of view it may be called a constructive essay towards the abolition of war and the prevalence of universal peace. The keyword was the German term *sittlichkeit*—customary or habitual morality. Lord Haldane pointed out how this sanction to good conduct grows up within the limits of any particular State. People do not act rightly merely from fear of the policeman and the magistrate, but in obedience to a general respect for what the feeling of the community at large approves. This purely moral factor is a stronger incentive to right action than any fear of legal penalty. May not this powerful factor operate not only within the limits of any nation or closely related group of nations, but in the international relations of the various peoples of the world? The ideal as sketched by Lord Haldane is lofty and inspiring. For ourselves we feel that the religion of Christ must be the most powerful agent in bringing this aspiration to pass. It well may be, as the fundamental principles of His Gospel are realized and obeyed, that a *sittlichkeit*, a moral habitude, will be developed powerful enough to insure universal peace.

The Bishop of Manchester's Letter.

It will be remembered that in the year 1908 a Sub-Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, which had been appointed to draw up an historical memorandum on the ornaments of the Church and its ministers, issued a Report which has become generally known as the Report of the Five Bishops. That Report was pretty severely handled at the time, and its mistakes and omissions pointed out by, among others, Mr. J. T. Tomlinson and Canon Nunn. Notwithstanding the fact that its conclusions had failed to stand the test of close and careful scrutiny, the Archbishop of Canterbury has been reported to have said that it was "unchallenged by any competent authority." In January last, however, the Bishop of Manchester sent to the Archbishop, in the form of an "Open Letter," a very effective criticism of the Report, challenging its main contention, which the Bishop summarized as follows: "I believe that I am correct in understanding the conclusion of that Report to mean that other vestments than the surplice and hood are lawful ornaments of the minister in ordinary parish churches, and, further, that it is specially contended that all ornaments of the minister for which authority can be found in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. are thus permissible, or at all events not excluded by law."

The Archbishop sent a brief acknowledgment in which he expressed the opinion that the question was one "of archæological rather than cogent practical importance," thus, in effect, dismissing all discussions upon the history and interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, though we might naturally suppose that the endeavour to ascertain the real meaning of the rubric was, in view of the existing conditions of the Church, one not only of cogent, but of very urgent practical importance.

The E.C.U. Rejoinder.

It was to be expected that the Bishop of Manchester would not be allowed to remain altogether unchallenged, and the English Church Union has now issued a pamphlet purporting to reply to his lordship's

contention. It is a curious document in many ways. When dealing with the Bishop's suggestion that the vestments were exchanged for the surplice during the service under the book of 1549, it adopts the argument that omission means prohibition, but repudiates it vehemently when the same argument is made use of by the Bishop. It contains some useful admissions, as, for example, that the Church does not provide a service for non-communicants, "the ideal being that those present should communicate." It contains some mistakes in point of fact—*e.g.*, in stating that there was a direction in the first Prayer-Book that in the Baptismal service the minister should make the sign of the cross with oil, there being no such direction in the book. In places, moreover, the Reply is scarcely ingenuous, for, to take one instance, it is stated that the rubrics of the Second Prayer-Book did not exclude non-communicants. There was, it is true, no rubric directing non-communicants to depart, but it is not irrelevant to point out that there was a lengthy exhortation in the service giving them this very direction in the clearest and most explicit terms. Again, the reply of the Bishops to the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, "We think fit that the rubric continue as it is" is given, but without any mention of the fact that after further consideration the Bishops did alter it very considerably.

The Ornaments Rubric.

But perhaps the most interesting part of the Reply is that which relates specifically to the meaning of the Ornaments Rubric. Having criticized the Bishop of Manchester's interpretation, the Reply proceeds to give us what, without undue affectation of modesty, it describes as "the *true* interpretation" (the italics are ours). It may be sufficient to say that the "true" interpretation is arrived at after interpolating certain words into the rubric, and inserting brackets before and after the words "by authority of Parliament," with the result that the rubric, thus altered, appears to require the minister to use or interpolate practically any ornament or ceremony which had ever been in use in the Church of England

up to the time of the Reformation. There is no reference whatever in the Reply to the fact that from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign to a time long after the rise of the Oxford Movement the surplice only, or surplice, hood, and scarf, formed the dress of ministration in parish churches, and that the vestments were never worn by anyone during that whole period. It will require something much more worthy of the name of argument than we find in this pamphlet to set aside this plain testimony of history.

The concluding paragraph of the Reply is curiously significant:

> "It may be noted that it is impossible to bring altar lights, or an altar cross, within the Rubric, if it is to be taken to refer only to such Ornaments as are referred to in the first book, either expressly or by necessary implication."

Exactly so; and hence we suppose the endeavour to find a meaning for it which will include them.

Lord Halifax and the Recognition of Anglican Orders.

By the Rev. ROBERT R. RESKER,
Vicar of Purley, and Rural Dean of Caterham, Surrey.

Leo XIII. and Anglican Orders. By Viscount Halifax.
The Life of Edward White Benson, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. By A. C. Benson.
The Life of Cardinal Vaughan. By J. C. Snead-Cox.
A Roman Diary. By the Rev. T. A. Lacey.

A FEW years ago I crossed the Channel in the same steamer as that in which Lord Halifax returned from one of his visits to Rome. Passing his lordship on the landing-stage, I happened to overhear the newspaper-boy from whom he had purchased some English newspapers, and to whom he had tendered—of course in ignorance—a lira, say to him: "This is Italian, sir." "Which thing," I said to myself, "in an allegory." What Lord Halifax did then, without intending it, was surely significant of what he has so long been attempting to do with deliberate purpose—viz., to introduce into England and the English Church what is distinctively Roman. Should Lord Halifax read this, I trust he will excuse this personal reminiscence, which doubtless has passed from his memory.

It is no exaggeration to say that reunion with Rome has been the burning passion of Lord Halifax's life. The record of his earnest attempts to secure the recognition of English Orders—as one step in the way of reunion, but a very important and far-reaching one—is sufficient proof of this. What he did to secure this result it is now possible to estimate fully, not only from his own recently published record, but also from the corroborative evidence supplied by the Lives of Archbishop Benson and Cardinal Vaughan, and by Mr. Lacey's "Roman Diary." On the one side we have the story of two whose position may be described as antagonistic to the effort—viz., Archbishop Benson and Cardinal Vaughan—and on the other side, of two of the active agents in the endeavour to accomplish the task—viz., Lord Halifax and the Rev. T. A. Lacey. Without going too

deeply into details, it is possible to give from these sources a connected account of the steps taken by Lord Halifax to accomplish the work on which he had set his mind.

It was an accidental meeting with the Abbé Portal in Madeira at the end of 1889 which first opened the way to discussion on the question of possible reunion between the English and Roman Churches. Lord Halifax kept up a correspondence with the Abbé, and afterwards had other meetings with him, and, apparently at the Abbé's suggestion, took Cardinal Vaughan into his confidence, but without much encouragement from him. In 1894 the Abbé published, under the soubriquet of "Fernand Dalbus," a pamphlet on English Orders, and afterwards visited England, both to bring to this country a favourable account of the Pope's attitude towards the question, and to judge for himself of the condition of the English Church. He visited certain churches, mostly of an advanced type, and certain Sisterhoods, and also the Church Missionary College at Islington. He also went to Cambridge and stayed one night with Bishop Creighton, and visited the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe. He was then taken by Lord Halifax to see the Archbishop of Canterbury at Addington. This was a purely unofficial visit. Lord Halifax observes in reference to this interview:

"The Archbishop was very reserved. It was obvious that he was afraid of being accused of receiving emissaries from Rome."[1]

In the Archbishop's "Life" we read that:

"One of those present said that the Archbishop's whole attitude was one of the greatest caution, and that he kept the conversation as general as possible, avoiding any dangerous discussions or compromising statements."

And his biographer adds that his

"view from the first seems to have been that an attempt was being made from Rome, working through the sincere and genuine enthusiasm of Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal, to compromise the official chief of the Anglican Church."[2]

The Abbé was summoned to Rome by the Pope, and Lord Halifax gives a deeply interesting account of his interview with

[1] "Leo XIII. and Anglican Orders," p. 100.
[2] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., p. 593.

Leo XIII., on whom the Abbé pressed the desirability of writing to the Archbishops—a suggestion which the Pope promised to consider. But two days later Cardinal Rampolla informed him that he (the Cardinal) would write an indirect letter to give to Lord Halifax, and also told him that the Abbé Duchesne would be charged to prepare a work on English Orders. The Cardinal said that if a favourable response was given to the indirect letter, a direct reply would be sent by the Pope to the English Archbishops.

Upon this the Abbé hurried back to England to report to Lord Halifax. The latter at once wrote to Benson asking for an appointment, stating that he had "some very wonderful things" to tell him. The Archbishop was then staying at Dulverton, in Somersetshire, and so anxious was Lord Halifax to see him that he telegraphed that he would visit him the next day. To Benson's astonishment he was accompanied by the Abbé. The account of the interview, as given both in the Archbishop's "Life" and by Lord Halifax, is extremely interesting. The Abbé

"gave a full account of what had passed at Rome, and explained that the letter addressed to him by Cardinal Rampolla was an indirect step to make sure of the friendly dispositions of the heads of the English Church, and that, if the Archbishops could indirectly give him such assurance, direct overtures in the interests of reunion would be made by the Pope."[1]

"The Archbishop's attitude," writes Lord Halifax, "was not encouraging." Certainly it was one of caution. He himself said, "they were trying to make him commit himself, when the Pope had not committed himself"; that Rampolla's letter was "a nice letter, but very general," and that "it contained several expressions offensive to us, as that the Roman Church was our ancient mother and mistress, and 'the only centre of unity,'" adding that

"infallibility was not the only difficulty in the Pope's position, and the Pope's position not the only difficulty in the Roman doctrine";

and, further, that

"Portal had only seen one side of English Church life with Lord Halifax, and that the Pope could have no complete view of England before him."[2]

[1] "Leo XIII.," p. 123. [2] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., p. 600.

Although the Archbishop promised to consider whether he would write such a letter, Lord Halifax writes :

"At the moment it was a profound disappointment to the Abbé Portal and myself. To me it seemed, as it still seems, the throwing away of the greatest opportunity a man ever had, and quite inconsistent with the duty of one claiming to be the successor of St. Augustine."[1]

As no letter came from the Archbishop, Lord Halifax wrote to him on October 18, forwarding a summary drawn up by the Abbé and himself in French of what had passed, and urged :

"Will your Grace, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York, write me such a private letter as I can take to Rome? Your Grace may trust me. I know all the difficulties, and would say and do nothing which could, if it were made public to-morrow, compromise anyone but myself."[2]

He suggested the form which the Archbishop's letter should take, and enclosed a sketch of such a letter as the Pope himself might write to the Archbishops. But the most startling thing of all is his temerity in writing :

"Dante assigns the lowest place to those who, having a great opportunity, refuse to take it."

It is only right to say that he added :

"My dear Lord, forgive me for writing as I do. No one can be more conscious than I am of the amazing liberty I am taking, but the circumstances are so extraordinary that I cannot help it."[3]

To this Benson replied, after expressing his desire for unity, but stating that "this responsible position of mine binds me above all not to risk Truth for the sake of any policy of unity :"

"If I had known when you asked for that interview that M. Portal would accompany you, I would have pointed out that my position almost required that I should be informed beforehand of any grave matter which he had to lay before me."

And he proceeded to say that

"The Archbishop of Canterbury is not in a position to take a private and unofficial line with secret agents from great Powers. It is not our English method of procedure. It is not possible for me to say more upon that letter than that I also most deeply desire and pray that all the dissensions of Christendom might be ended, and rejoice that others long for it. But among its kindly lines that letter contains expressions totally inadmissible and inconsistent with the primitive model to which England appeals. But what is

[1] "Leo XIII.," pp. 125, 130, 131. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

most important is, that at this very time (before and since that interview) the head and representative of the Roman Catholic Church in England is officially declaring in a series of public utterances the absolute and uncompromising repudiation by the Papal See of the Orders of the Anglican Church."[1]

Lord Halifax replied that nothing could be further from his thoughts and intentions than to have treated his Grace without due consideration, and, after referring to his action and to the attitude of Cardinal Vaughan, expressed his conviction that the Archbishop's letter as it stands could only have the effect of closing the door to much that might have been productive of consequences inspiring the brightest hopes, and concluded by suggesting some modifications in the letter, and a conference with the Archbishop of York.

On October 27 the Archbishop wrote a general letter alternative to that of October 15, in which he said :

"The Church of England must always be desirous to stand in amicable relation to all other branches of the Catholic Church, so long as this can be done without any sacrifice on her part of Scriptural truth, or of the great principles for which she has contended in making her appeal to primitive antiquity, to the *quod semper* as well as the *quod ubique et ab omnibus*. It is her daily prayer, that 'all who profess and call themselves Christians should be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.'"[2]

He concluded by referring to the gain which unity would be in conflict with the powers of evil.

Lord Halifax was still dissatisfied, and after further correspondence visited the Archbishop at Addington, to urge on him the issue of an amended letter. After waiting apparently about a month, Lord Halifax again wrote earnestly requesting such a letter as he had drafted, and asking the Archbishop to trust him. On December 11 the Archbishop finally declined to modify the terms of his letter, and said :

"I really cannot accept it [*i.e.*, Lord Halifax's draft]. It omits safeguards which I had used. It inserts phrases which would compromise me extremely in England, and which do not represent my views. The effect is to alter the tone and animus of both the letters, entirely different as they are from one another."

---

[1] "Leo XIII.," p. 137 ; "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., pp. 604, 605.
[2] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., p. 607.

After alluding to the proposed inquiry as to the validity of English Orders, the letter proceeds:

"I must be pardoned for saying, what is only the part of friendship to say, that I am afraid that you have lived for years so exclusively with one set of thinkers, and entered so exclusively into the usages of one class of Churches, that you have not before you the state of religious feeling and authority in England with the completeness with which anyone attempting to adjust the relations between Churches ought to have—the phenomena of his own side clearly and minutely before him. And as to me, any action of mine in the matter of the relations is *ipso facto* public action. It is impossible for me to accept private assertions as to what is going on. It is equally impossible for me to adopt the part of a secret diplomatist among the counsels of the Church. Secret diplomacy is a recognized part of the machinery of the Church of Rome, and it is contrary to the genius and sense of the English Church."[1]

Lord Halifax then asked Mr. Athelstan Riley to see Cardinal Vaughan—who throughout was definitely opposed to recognition—and a memorandum of his interview is contained in Lord Halifax's book. He then once again wrote to the Archbishop asking what answer he should make if he should be asked at Rome what would be the attitude of the English Episcopate towards a step on the part of the Holy See suggesting a possible conference on the validity of English Orders, to which the Archbishop replied:

"I must say at once that it would be impossible for me to frame or approve any answer to a question which has not been asked. . . . Neither, I am afraid, can I give the most capable and trusted person leave to give to any probable supposed question replies in my behalf in any specified direction. This would be constituting a delegacy—almost appointing an ambassador—which I certainly should not think of doing, however great my confidence. Misunderstandings would ensue. But even if it were not so, no such plenipotentiary ought to exist when responsibility is so great as mine is."[2]

Meanwhile Lord Halifax delivered an address at Bristol on "Corporate Reunion," which he sent to various Bishops; and, armed with their acknowledgments of the paper, he went to Rome, and presented them, together with a *mémoire*, to the Pope. Afterwards he went to Florence, where he met the Archbishop. It is interesting to see what Benson's private views of

[1] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., p. 611. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 612.

Lord Halifax's persistent efforts to win him over were. Thus, on November 6, 1894, he writes in his diary:

"Halifax is like a solitary player of chess, and wants to make all the moves on the board himself on both sides."[1]

After the visit to Florence the Archbishop observes:

"Halifax does not seem to have done harm or compromised us, but to have made himself pleasant to them."[1]

Then followed the issue of the Pope's letter—*Ad Angelos*—addressed by "Leo XIII. to the English people who seek the Kingdom of Christ in the unity of the Faith." Of this letter Lord Halifax remarks that it was "on the lines he had suggested, but that it was not addressed to the Archbishops he attributed to the influence of Vaughan. He called on Benson at Florence to beg him to be "gracious about the letter," and started off to England the same evening "to do what he could with others in the same direction." The Archbishop remarks in his diary:

"Halifax very much agitated about the Pope's 'Encyclical to the English' . . . very anxious I should make an answer in the same spirit, and say nothing of difficulties—very determined in minimizing every Roman error, as if they were all matters of taste, pious opinion, or 'allow a large liberty, and say nothing about it now!'—as if it were a matter of which the English ever could think lightly. . . . As if the Reformation did not rest on principles far beyond all he talks about. But he is a most saintly man of heart."[2]

On reaching home the Archbishop, on April 29, 1895, wrote a letter to Lord Halifax, in which he defined his position in regard to reunion:

"With my whole soul I desire reunion. Disunion with Nonconformists, Foreign Reformers, Rome, Easterns, is the main and most miserable cause of delay in the Christianization of all men in Christian and heathen countries alike."[3]

He went on to say that he should regard the recognition of English Orders as a sign of Rome being in earnest, but "we do not sue to have them recognized," and, he added, that "secret and private correspondence would be certainly impossible."

Passing over the visit to Paris paid by Lord Halifax in the spring of 1896—a visit undertaken in order to meet various

[1] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., pp. 608, 614.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 615. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 617.

persons interested in reunion—we come to the appointment by the Pope, in March, 1906, of a Commission to consider all the evidence in regard to English Orders. It was not, however, a conference on which both sides would be represented, such as Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal desired; but was exclusively composed of Roman theologians, three of whom (foreigners) were known to be in sympathy with Anglican claims, and three (English), appointed by Cardinal Vaughan, on the other side. Two others were added afterwards, one on each side. But, on the invitation of one member of the commission (Mgr. Gasparri), and through the efforts of Abbé Portal, but without the approval of Archbishop Benson, the Rev. F. W. Puller and the Rev. T. A. Lacey went to Rome to give any information that might be required. The story of their efforts is well told in Mr. Lacey's "Roman Diary," and need not be repeated here; but it may be added that on their return to England, in June, 1896, Father Puller sought an interview with the Archbishop, which was granted; but the Archbishop wrote cautiously:

"I am sure that you realize that you come to me unofficially and simply by your own desire, and that I am not doing more than hearing anything that you may wish to say to me upon a matter of the highest importance and difficulty."[1]

Exigencies of space have led to the omission of the story of Mr. Gladstone's intervention in the controversy by the suggestion of Lord Halifax, who again indicated the lines which a letter from him should take—with a view of influencing the course of events in Rome. That letter was written and published in the London newspapers in May. On June 30, the Pope's Encyclical *Satis cognitum* was published in England, just a year after his former letter to the English people. It treated of the Unity of the Church, basing the claims of the Papacy on the teaching of our Lord, but claiming for the general Episcopate all that Rome considered had been given to St. Peter. A summary of the Bull was communicated to the Press by Cardinal Vaughan, which, however, omitted much that was afterwards

[1] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., p. 621.

found in the actual text. But, as the Cardinal said, the Pope's language would "dispel vague and hazy theories which are rich only in delusive hopes."[1]

The issue of the Encyclical was the prelude to the entire destruction of Lord Halifax's hopes and to the failure of his earnest efforts. It was followed in September by the issue of the Encyclical *Apostolicæ Curæ*. Notwithstanding the premonition of failure conveyed by the previous Bull, Lord Halifax writes:

"The foundations we had sought to lay, on which others might build and carry on the work for the reunion of Christendom, were not to be laid by us. The blow was as sudden as it was unexpected."[2]

The Bull declared that English Orders were

"entirely null and void, partly on the ground of previous Roman decisions, partly on the ground of defects of 'form' up to 1662, and also on the ground of defective intention on the part of the framers of the Prayer-Book."[3]

The Archbishop was in Ireland when the Encyclical was published, shortly before his death; and with the thought of the Bull in his mind, he noticed a motto at a meeting he attended, which bore the words describing the Church of Ireland as "Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, and Protestant," and said:

"There was not one of those words which could be spared. . . . If ever it was necessary, if ever we began to doubt whether it was necessary, to lay so much stress upon that last word, I think the events which have been occurring in the last few weeks, and the tone which has been adopted towards this primeval Church of Ireland and of England, are things which warn us that the word is not to be forgotten."[4]

The keen disappointment of Lord Halifax is seen in the attempts which he makes to put the blame for failure partly on the Cardinal and partly on the Archbishop. He writes:

"I say it with regret, the whole of Cardinal Vaughan's conduct . . . was unworthy of him, and it is no less painful to have to admit that what is true of Cardinal Vaughan is true in its degree of Archbishop Benson. . . . Few men have ever had so great an opportunity offered to them as the Archbishop; no man, I think, ever so completely threw it away."[5]

This, we venture to think, will not be the judgment of fair-minded members of the Church of England. His biography

[1] "Leo XIII.," p. 325. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 354.
[3] "Archbishop Benson's Life," vol. ii., p. 621.
[4] "Archbishop Benson in Ireland." [5] "Leo XIII.," p. 386.

shows that he was not a bitter antagonist of the Church of Rome; but he was not blind to its errors. And all through the persistent efforts of Lord Halifax to win him over to his side, he firmly maintained the position he took up from the first—that there could be no union with Rome at the expense of Truth. To charge him, as Lord Halifax does, with "hesitation" is only to conceal the chagrin which he felt at his failure to convince the Archbishop and to gain his support to efforts which, if successful, might have paved the way to a reconciliation with Rome (without any abatement of her claims or acknowledgment of her errors), and undone the work of the English Reformation.

The Church and the Poor.

A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

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

X.

The First Half of the Eighteenth Century.

THERE are two facts, both unhappy ones, which at the present time call for serious examination and equally serious thought. These are, first, the actual condition, economic and religious, of a great number of poor people in this country; and, secondly, the actual relationship of these people to what may be termed "organized Christianity"—the Church or "the Churches." Both the condition of these people and their relationship to the Church must be considered extremely unsatisfactory. Both are, of course, very largely the product of the past, and they have not come to be what they are in the course of the last fifty or even the last hundred years. Actually, they are by-products of that great movement which is usually and rightly known as the "Industrial Revolution," during which side by side with an immense growth of national wealth, there was an immense increase of poverty, and also of degradation and oppression of the poor. But these evils, which accompanied the Industrial Revolution, were not inevitable; there was no inherent necessity why they should have come to pass. Actually, they were to a great extent due partly to certain conditions existing when that Revolution first began; but much more to a want of wisdom in both Church and State during the first century of its progress.

In my last chapter I carried down our history to the death of William III., in 1702. The Industrial Revolution began some fifty years later. It is to this half-century, which covers the reign of Anne and the first two Georges, that the present chapter must be devoted. It was during this half-century that

conditions were permitted to develop which caused a large proportion of the evils of the period which succeeded it.

Nothing is more difficult than to sketch the characteristic features of any age in the compass of a few sentences. The attempt, from the inevitable complexity both of the circumstances and of the various forces at work, is almost bound to be misleading; yet it is essential, if our present subject is to be adequately studied, that there should be at least some clear idea of the general conditions in Church and State in the background.

At the opening of the eighteenth century the position of the English Church was undoubtedly strong; her life was vigorous and her zeal was at least considerable.[1] She was certainly popular in the nation, and both Romanism[2] and Nonconformity[3] were relatively far weaker than they had been for some time past. During the reign of Anne the Church's energy, spirituality, and earnestness were at least maintained. But as the century proceeded there came a rapid decline in every one of these qualities. The Church became more or less a tool of the State, and enthusiasm, indeed earnestness of any kind, rapidly died away. A period of lethargy succeeded a period of vigorous life; and by the middle of the eighteenth century the condition of the Church was in some respects as evil, if not indeed worse, than at any period in her history. The condition of the State offers an instructive parallel. At the death of Anne the country had been almost continuously at war, either within her own borders or with foreign Powers, for nearly a century. Hence, when Walpole came into office, his principle of *quieta non movere*, which he imposed upon the Church, was not unwelcome in the State.

It will be best for me first to notice what steps were taken

[1] "Never since her Reformation had the Church of England given so fair a promise of a useful and prosperous career as she did at the beginning of the eighteenth century. . . . Look at the Church's history in retrospect, as it is pictured by many writers of every school of thought, and a dark scene of melancholy failure presents itself" (Abbey and Overton, "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," p. 279).

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 152, 153. "Rome shared in the strange religious apathy which was dominant, not only in England, but on the Continent."

[3] See Dale's "History of English Congregationalism," chapters v. and viii.

by the State—which was then still practically the Church acting in a civic capacity—for the relief of the poor during the reign of Anne. In the first year of the reign we have an Act[1] against "truck," a form of oppression which still demands the watchful eye of the Legislature. The object of this Act was "to prevent the oppression of the labourers and workmen employed in the manufactures"; it orders that "all payments for work done by them shall be in lawful coin of the realm, and not by any commodities in lieu thereof." As Sir G. Nicholls says—and this is my reason for mentioning this Act—"this enactment proves that the welfare of the working classes was an object of solicitude to the legislature at that time."[2] In the following year an Act[3] was passed for apprenticing boys who, or whose parents, were chargeable to the parish, to the master or owner of any English ship until they were twenty-one years of age. In the same year we have an Act[4] for "erecting a Workhouse and for setting the Poor on work in the City of Worcester." This, from its provisions, was a very important Act, for it ordered that "the mayor and certain of the city authorities, with four persons to be annually chosen in each of the several parishes out of the ablest and discreetest inhabitants, shall be a corporation to continue for ever, under the designation of 'The Guardians of the Poor of the City of Worcester.'"[5] These Guardians are to relieve the poor of all the various parishes as if they were one parish; they may also contract with other parishes in the same county for receiving and setting their poor to work; they may provide all things necessary for this; they may compel beggars and idle people to come into the workhouse and set them to work there; also they may compel children found begging, or whose parents are chargeable, to do the same; and, then, when these children are fifteen years of age, they may bind them as apprentices.

Here we have something approaching the present-day work-

[1] 1 Anne, statute 2, cap. 22.
[2] Nicholls' "History of the Poor Law," i., p. 362.
[3] 2 and 3 Anne, cap. 6. [4] *Ibid.*, cap. 8.
[5] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

house, but with two great differences: First, the workhouse here described seems to have been arranged more for the purposes of police than as a means of relief; and, secondly, in this, as in all the original workhouses, work is provided with a view to profit—that is, in order to turn pauper labour to account. It is interesting to notice that already some misgivings of the effects of pauper labour upon free labour must have been felt, for in the thirtieth section of the Act it is provided that "no cloth or stuff, either woollen or linen, manufactured in the workhouse or houses of correction, shall be sold by retail within the City of Worcester or the liberties thereof."[1] Consequently, goods made in the workhouse must either be used there or sold at a distance. But it does not seem to have struck those who framed the Act that these pauper-made goods would displace those made by free labour just as surely in one place as in any other.

In the sixth year of Queen Anne a similar Act[2] was passed for Plymouth, but with one very striking addition, which is again indicative of the spirit of the age. This Act orders the appointment of "some pious, sober, and discreet person, well qualified for a schoolmaster, who shall in some convenient room within the workhouse read daily morning and evening prayers at certain hours, to be for that purpose fixed and stated to the poor people and others belonging to the said workhouse; and also shall, by catechizing and otherwise, every Saturday in the afternoon, and upon holy days, instruct the poor children and other poor persons belonging to the said house in the fundamental parts of the Protestant religion, according to the doctrine of the Church of England; and shall teach every the said poor children to read and write and cast accompts."[3]

In the tenth year of Queen Anne an Act[4] was passed for Norwich, constituting "a corporation under the name of Guardians of the Poor for the City of Norwich." In this, as in previous Acts, the chief object seems to have been to provide employment which would be remunerative; from which it must

[1] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 366.
[2] 6 Anne, cap. 46.
[3] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 367.
[4] 10 Anne, cap. 15.

have been assumed that employment could not be obtained by the poor themselves. Evidently the truth that this kind of employment penalized the best class of workmen for the sake of the worst class was not yet recognized, no more, indeed, than has the same truth been recognized by those who proclaim the doctrine of "the right to work" to-day. There is no other Act of this reign which seems to call for mention here.

I would now turn to what charity, apart from the State, was doing during this period. It was the time when the so-called "religious societies" flourished.[1] The history of these and their influence, especially as they inspired John Wesley[2] with the idea of the society which ultimately became so famous, should be studied; but it is only the philanthropic side of their activity that concerns us here. This was evidently extensive, for we are told that they visited the poor in their homes and relieved them; they fixed some of these in various trades; they were instrumental in setting prisoners free; and they assisted in establishing nearly one hundred Charity Schools in London, besides others in various parts of the country.[3] The Charity Schools,[4] in which poor children, besides being taught, were lodged, fed, and clothed, were, like the religious societies, a creation and peculiar feature of this age. It is not certain to which of them belongs the honour of being first established, but, largely owing to the help afforded them by the S.P.C.K.,[5] they multiplied rapidly. In 1704 there were fifty-four such schools in and around London, and 2,131 children were present at the first anniversary service. By 1712 the number of these schools had risen to 117 in London and Westminster, but, like everything else connected with religion, they suffered during the Georgian period.

Another movement at this time for the benefit of the poor was the erection of hospitals[6] in the present sense of the term, and many of the hospitals situated in our great towns date from this period. Yet another method of assisting the poor then in

[1] See Overton, "Life in the English Church" (1660–1714), pp. 207 *et seq.*
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 212. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 211. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 224 *et seq.*
[5] This was founded in 169$\frac{8}{9}$.
[6] Overton, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

vogue was by issuing "briefs" for collections on their behalf.[1] Taking all these various movements and methods into consideration, it must be admitted that during the opening years of the eighteenth century the spirit of Christian philanthropy was more than usually active. The work which was then done for the poor was actually the expression in practice of the very real and very considerable religious earnestness existing at that time.

With the death of Queen Anne we enter upon a very different phase of the Church's life. I will not here attempt to enter at length into the causes of the unhappy change which came over the religious spirit of the nation, and which, apart from a few brilliant exceptions—of individual men and women and in individual parishes—persisted for more than a hundred years. So far as it bears upon our present subject, I will deal with it in the next chapter. Perhaps the most peculiarly characteristic feature of the age was the remarkable absence of almost any form of self-sacrifice.[2] It may have been held that there was nothing specially to call for it; certainly among those in high places, both in Church and State, there were very few examples of it, and there were equally few exhortations towards it. In a very true sense the age was a "sordid" one.[3] During its course there was a large amount of material prosperity,[4] even if this was not generally diffused. Certainly the aggregate wealth of the nation largely increased, but at the same time, in another sphere, there was an even greater increase—one of moral and spiritual poverty.

There are few Acts of Parliament passed during the reign of George I. which claim attention here, though a study of those dealing with social matters throws much light on the condition of

[1] Overton, *op. cit.*, pp. 194 *et seq.* "Briefs" are really Royal Letters Patent for collections for special purposes.

[2] Which cannot exist apart from "enthusiasm." On the decline of missionary zeal, both home and foreign, see Abbey and Overton, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

[3] One of the worst features of the age was the widespread and often shameless seeking for preferment.

[4] Proofs of this will be given later.

the people at the time. More than one Act[1] was passed in the early years of the reign which was designed to prevent disorder. This evidently shows that a somewhat lawless spirit among the people was then prevalent. In 1718 an Act[2] was passed by which the property of persons deserting wives or children, whereby these became chargeable, was to be sold and the profit applied to their maintenance. Then, in 1720, a curious Act[3] was passed forbidding "the wearing and using of printed, painted, stained, and dyed calicoes in apparel, household stuff, furniture, and otherwise," because this "does manifestly tend to the great detriment of the woollen and silk manufactures, and to the excessive increase of the poor, and if not prevented may be the utter ruin and destruction of the said manufactures and of many thousands whose livelihoods do entirely depend thereupon." This is only one instance of much restrictive legislation, whose shortsightedness and folly have been amply proved by experience. Ostensibly, some of this legislation was in the interests of the poor, but actually the protection of the existing interests of the manufacturers were not forgotten. In 1720 we have an Act[4] which, because of its effect upon the spirit or temper, as well as upon the material welfare of the working classes (as detrimental to this), demands a more extended notice. The Act is entitled "For regulating Journeymen Tailors." I am going to quote from this Act because it so clearly reveals the point of view from which Parliament at that date—which we must remember was then entirely unrepresentative of the working classes—was inclined to approach any attempt on the part of these classes to improve their position. The Act states that "great numbers of journeymen tailors . . . and others who have served apprenticeships . . . have lately departed from their services without just cause and have entered into combinations to advance their wages to unreasonable prices and lessen their hours of work, which is of evil example." The Act then

[1] 1 George I., statute 2, cap. 5 (the "Riot Act," which is still in force); also 1 George I., cap. 11, and 6 George I., cap. 16.
[2] 5 George I., cap. 8.
[3] 7 George I., cap. 7.
[4] 7 George I., cap. 13.

declares that "all covenants or agreements between such persons for advancing their wages or for lessening their usual hours of work are illegal and void, and that every person offending therein is, on conviction, subjected to two months' imprisonment with hard labour." But the Act goes even farther than this: it prescribes the hours of work—from six in the morning until eight at night—and also the rate of wages, which from March 25 to June 24 are not to exceed two shillings a day, and for the rest of the year one shilling and eightpence.[1] It is the existence of such laws as this which explains the appalling conditions under which we find a large proportion of the working classes living for at least a century after this time. Such laws also go far to explain the attitude of these classes to the Church, which in those days was largely associated in their minds with the class represented in Parliament. This Act continued in force until 1768.

Two years later we have an Act[2] making general for the whole kingdom what had already been permitted in certain large towns—*i.e.*, that parishes might combine to erect workhouses and might "have the benefit of the labour of the poor." Also by this Act all persons declining to go into workhouses were no longer to be entitled to ask or receive relief from the churchwardens or overseers.[3] From this and other Acts passed during this period it is quite clear that the problem of the relief of the poor was constantly becoming a more and more difficult one. We can also see how, from a want of foresight in those responsible for making the laws, evils, which came to a head a century later, were gradually accumulating. The permission to erect workhouses—especially with a view to deriving profit from the labour of their inmates—was widely adopted. Within a very few years more than a hundred were erected. Here, certainly, the seeds of future evils were being sown. The workhouse was more and more used as

[1] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 10, 11.

[2] 9 George I., cap. 7. By this same Act (one of considerable importance) Justices were not to give relief without first communicating with the overseers. See Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 12 *et seq.*

[3] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 14.

a manufactory in which, at the cost of the Poor Rate, the worst class of people—the dearest of all forms of labour—was being employed, and every increase of this kind of labour was an additional burden upon the best class of workers, who ultimately paid the cost. Here is another example of the future being mortgaged for the present.

Two years before the death of George I. the principle of the Act relating to "Journeymen Tailors" was enlarged so as to prevent "unlawful combinations of workmen employed in the woollen manufactures," then apparently the chief existing industry, except, of course, agriculture. In this Act[1] we are told that "great numbers of weavers and others have lately entered into unlawful combinations to regulate the price of goods, to advance wages . . . and by force protected themselves and their wicked accomplices against law and justice." "All covenants and by-laws for regulating the prices of goods, or advancing wages, or lessening the hours of work, are and shall be illegal and void." Those who were guilty of contravening the provisions of this Act were very severely punished. We can easily see at what a disadvantage workmen were placed when it was absolutely illegal for them even to agree together and peaceably combine to obtain an increase of wages. Actually they were simply at the mercy of those who made the laws, and who did these represent? Certainly they did not in any sense of the word represent the working classes.

Because I want to make as clear as possible the causes of our own present so-called social difficulties, I am anxious, as far as I am able, to trace the origins and the developments of these. In the eighteenth century Parliament was in no sense of the word representative of the people. Towns like Manchester and Birmingham had no representatives; in Bath there were thirty-five voters. At the close of the eighteenth century, out of a population of 7,000,000 only 300,000 had votes. In the middle of the century Lord Lonsdale had nine "pocket" boroughs, the Duke of Norfolk had eleven, and the Duke of Newcastle could

[1] 13 George I., cap. 34. See Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 19 *et seq.*

practically nominate fifty members to the House of Commons.[1] Consequently there was legislation simply *for*[2] the people, but in no sense *by* the people. The working classes had no means of making their opinions heard, much less felt. The Church in its corporate capacity was in the same position. The Bishops in the House of Lords were the nominees of the Prime Minister, and, since Convocation was silenced in 1717, the voice of the Church, as a Church, was absolutely dumb. Then the stability of opinion in those days was far greater than at present, and consequently changes—whether in the nature of reforms or otherwise—were far less easily effected. In the earlier part of the eighteenth century the Whigs were almost continuously in office for forty-five years; and from 1769 to 1830 the Tories were almost as continuously in power. With both parties the landed interests, and especially those of the larger proprietors, were supreme.

The Acts of Parliament passed in the reign of George II., like those of the previous reign, are interesting chiefly for two reasons: First, as throwing light upon the actual social conditions prevailing at the time; and secondly, as indicating how those in authority thought that these conditions should be dealt with.

About the beginning of this reign there seems to have been formed a certain "charitable corporation for the relief of the industrious poor by assisting them with small sums upon pledges at legal interest." Sir George Nicholls thinks it probable that many worthy, if unwise, persons may have assisted in its formation. But eventually "it became worked for the benefit of a few designing men at the cost of their dupes and followers."[3] The number of sufferers must have been considerable for two Acts[4] of Parliament to be necessary for appointing (and amending) a Commission for taking and determining all claims made by the creditors of this (so-called) "charitable corporation," and for requiring its promoters to appear before the Commissioners

[1] Warner and Marten, "The Groundwork of British History," p. 480.
[2] Though not in the sense of *for* their benefit.
[3] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 23.
[4] 5 George II., cap. 31, and 6 George II., cap. 2.

of Bankruptcy. The very possibility of the formation of a society or company for this purpose, or rather of getting a number of people to form such a company, shows a strange ignorance of the true methods of assisting "the industrious poor." The last thing we should wish them to possess is any further inducement to borrow "small sums upon pledges," for this is to destroy provident habits among them.

The evil conditions under which many of the people must have been living are revealed by more than one further Act[1] against robbery and violence. That this prevalence of disorder was in part due to these evil conditions (themselves due in some measure to iniquitous class legislation), is proved by the fact that at least a measure of this disorder arose through bounties being paid upon the export of corn. This exportation of corn at a premium was clearly to the advantage solely of the landed proprietors, and tended to make the food of the people both scarce in quantity and high in price.[2]

In 1740 we have the Act[3] by which the Foundling Hospital was incorporated. By this Act the governors are authorized "to receive, maintain, and educate all or as many children as they shall think fit;" further, no churchwarden or overseer is to stop or molest any person bringing such children; also the governors are "authorized to employ the children in any sort of labour or manufacture, or to hire or let out the labour of such children, or to bind them as apprentices to any person willing to take them."[4] Here, again, we have an institution established (and a practice assisted) which is now recognized as actually increasing the evil which it was intended to diminish. Where no Poor Law exists there may be some excuse for the existence of foundling hospitals, but a Poor Law properly administered should provide for the really destitute, whether these be infants

[1] *E.g.*, 7 George II., cap. 21, and 11 George II., cap. 22.

[2] The winter of 1739-40 was exceptionally severe, and was followed by a very deficient harvest. Corn was sold in 1738 at 20s. 2d.; in 1740 it rose to 59s. The instability of prices, depending on the nature of the harvest at home, was in those days one of the great trials of the poor.

[3] 13 George II., cap. 29. [4] Nicholls, *op. cit.*, ii., p. 27.

or adults. To have the two working side by side is not only an extravagance, it is an incitement towards an evil which it is, in the true interests of society, to check as far as it possibly can.

Other Acts which are indicative of the evil social conditions existing, and of the inability of those in authority to check them by the right measures, are certain cruel Acts[1] against various forms of stealing; and where stealing is rife it will generally be found that such poverty as implies actual hunger is at least common. In 1741 it was enacted that persons found guilty of stealing sheep "shall suffer death, as in cases of felony, without benefit of clergy." In the following year this penalty was extended to those stealing "any bull, cow, ox, steer, bullock, heifer, calf, and lamb, as well as sheep." The well-known Vagrancy Act of 1744[2]—which is still the basis of the law on that evil—also indicates a state of things for which it was deemed necessary to take strong measures. Lastly, in 1747[3] the power of Justices of the Peace "to fix and determine the rate of wages" in all kinds of occupations was so far enlarged as to authorize them "to judge and determine whatever differences may arise between the employers and the employed, either with respect to wages or any other cause of complaint."

I have drawn attention to these various Acts—and their number might easily be enlarged—in order to show how generally the legislation of this period was in favour of a particular class—the class which was alone then represented in Parliament. Also I have shown that a very large proportion of this legislation was purely and simply repressive. There seem to have been very few attempts to remove the causes of the evils, which the very fact of the legislation itself shows were at least recognized. And, unfortunately, where we do find remedies proposed they are such as would tend to aggravate rather than cure the disease.

[1] 14 George II., cap. 6; 15 George II., cap. 27. Balleine, in the "History of the Evangelical Party," p. 10, states that at this time "there were 253 capital offences on the Statute Book."

[2] 17 George II., cap. 5. See Nicholls, *op. cit.*, ii., pp. 34 *et seq.*

[3] By 20 George II., cap. 19.

It may be contended that we have no right to blame people for the results of a want of knowledge which they did not possess, that we ought not to condemn those who lived a hundred and fifty to two hundred years ago for being ignorant of sociological laws, and of the action of sociological forces which were not then discovered. This may be true; at the same time the causes of poverty, and consequently of disorder and crime, might have been far better known at that time than they apparently were, and they might have evoked a much more general sympathy than they seem to have done. When we compare the solicitude for the poor shown by the Church in the early ages of Christianity, and (if not always wisely) during the greater part of the Middle Ages, with the apparent callousness towards their condition and their needs during the eighteenth century, we cannot hold the Church of that age guiltless. It must, of course, be remembered that since 1717, when Convocation was silenced, the Church had no official means of voicing its collective opinion. Also, the general character of the Bishops during the century, the qualifications for which they were appointed, and the line of policy or conduct they were expected to pursue, were all such as precluded them from being in any way active in social reform. To maintain quietness, in fact to do as little as possible, was the chief demand made upon them by Walpole and the Ministers associated with his particular line of policy. It was, too, the age of pluralities, and pluralities inevitably meant a large amount of non-residence,[1] which in turn meant ignorance of the real condition of the poor, and so inability to improve that condition. For the sake of the poor, we saw that the earlier Stuart Kings demanded the residence of noblemen and squires upon their estates; the earlier Hanoverians did not demand even the residence of the clergy. Whatever may have been the causes of it, this is certain, that when the Industrial Revolution began, about the middle of the

[1] A Bishop of Llandaff was at the same time Rector of nine parishes in England and seven in Wales, while he himself resided in Westmorland (Balleine, *op. cit.*, p. 11).

century, the Church of England proved herself to be hopelessly unequal to meeting the demands which that great change in the economic and social conditions of life produced. From the results of a dereliction of her duty, which can only be called appalling, during the first eighty or even hundred years of the course of the Revolution, the Church is still suffering to-day. Individuals, both clergy and lay people, here and there did excellent work in their immediate neighbourhoods, but, as a whole, the Church ignored the true needs and the just claims of the poor. Consequently the Church alienated the poor, and from the effects of that alienation the Church has never entirely recovered. Undoubtedly the most difficult task before the Church at the present time—a task which has been bravely and widely undertaken—is to prove to the poor that she does care for them; that not only is she in sympathy with their legitimate aims, but that she is ready to do all in her power to further these.

In my next paper I shall deal with the opening years of the Industrial Revolution, but before doing so it may be well to state a few facts concerning the conditions which then existed, for, apart from some knowledge of these as a background to our picture, it will be impossible to understand what actually did take place.

Roughly speaking, the population of England and Wales in 1700 was 6,000,000, and in 1750 was 6,500,000;[1] but in 1801 it was nearly 9,000,000, in 1811 it was over 10,000,000, while in 1851 it was no less than 17,900,000. In other words, the rate of increase during the second half of the eighteenth century was five times as rapid as during the first half, while during the first half of the nineteenth century it was eighteen times as rapid as during the first half of the eighteenth

[1] There is some difference of opinion on this figure. Sir G. Nicholls places it at 7,000,000. See also Thorold Rogers, "The Economic Interpretation of History," pp. 55 *et seq.* Of the general increase of national prosperity during the first half of the eighteenth century there are abundant proofs. See Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 53 *et seq.*; also Meredith, "Economic History," pp. 231 *et seq.*

century. But this increase of population was not spread evenly over the entire country; it was largely confined to certain somewhat limited areas, especially to the coal and manufacturing districts of the North and the Midlands, and more especially to the large towns within these.[1] But trade increased even more rapidly than population. In 1700 it is calculated that the trade of the United Kingdom (imports and exports) worked out at £1 2s. 6d. per head; in 1750 it was £2 14s. per head; in 1800 it was £4 4s.; and in 1850 it was £6 10s. But this must not be held to imply that everybody became better off; on the contrary, with the increase of aggregate wealth we find a startling increase in the aggregate amount of poverty. The amount raised for the Poor Rate at the death of Queen Anne has been estimated at £950,000 a year; in 1776 it had risen to £1,500,000; in 1785 it was more than £2,000,000; in 1802 it was £4,000,000. Thus, while in a century, in round figures, the population had increased by half as much again, the amount raised for the Poor Rate had become quadrupled; or, to put it in another way, while at the beginning of the eighteenth century the cost of poor relief was about 4s. per head per annum of the population, at the end of the century it was nearly 9s. These figures show what an enormous increase in poverty had taken place; and when we pursue our investigation into the early years of the nineteenth century, we shall find an even greater increase.[2]

But probably by far the most fertile source of the various social evils which flourished during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the first two quarters of the nineteenth was an immense change which gradually took place in public opinion—a change which intimately affected every sphere of national life. Briefly, this change was the acceptance of the

[1] In 1760 probably not one of our largest manufacturing towns—Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield—contained more than 35,000 people; to-day the population of the smallest of these is ten times that amount. In 1750 Lancashire had 156 people to the square mile; in 1881 it contained 1,813 people to the square mile.

[2] In 1813 the cost of relief rose to £6,656,106, and in 1818 to £7,870,000.

doctrine of an almost unlimited individualism as the rule of conduct. It came to imply nothing less than the right of each individual to make the utmost of his opportunities, irrespective of the cost of his doing so to other people, especially of those poorer and weaker than himself. The growth and the consequences of the translation into practice of this doctrine—that generally known as *laissez-faire*—must be the subject of the next two chapters.

Canon Law.

By EDWARD F. EMMET, Esq.

CANON Law deals with matters of ecclesiastical dogma and discipline. It is obvious that as the corporate existence of the Church began to be recognized, the necessity of the regulation of her affairs upon some sort of a system must have been felt. We know that questions arose in the very early days of her history. In the Acts of the Apostles we read, for instance, of the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles being referred to the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Their decision, embodied in a formal letter to "the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia," may be regarded as the first example of Canon Law. There can be but little doubt that other questions were settled in a similar manner. These decisions would, of course, have no legal binding effect in the sense that there was any means of enforcing them, but it is probable that they were accepted by the general conscience of the Church. Situated as the Church was in the midst of paganism, problems of morality and discipline must have been of almost daily occurrence, and it is but natural that they should have been referred to some recognized authority. In course of time collections would begin to be made of the opinions and decisions of Apostles and elders to whom such questions were referred. Probably the earliest collection of any such Church rules is that contained in the "Didache," or "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which dates from the sub-Apostolic age, and in the second part of which are contained certain rules for worship and Church government. Other early collections are known as "The Apostolic Church Ordinances," "The Apostolic Canons," and "The Apostolic Constitutions" (an expansion of the "Didache"). The exact date of these various collections, and how far they are authentic, are matters of controversy, but it is only reasonable to suppose that some such collections would

be made for the guidance of the Church. Though they had no effect as positive law, they may be regarded as one of the sources of the later *Jus Canonicum.*

The other sources are the decrees of the Episcopal body assembled in Œcumenical Council, the decrees of local councils, and the opinions and decretals of individual Bishops. Though somewhat contrary to what might have been expected, it was not the Œcumenical Council from which the major part of ancient Canons emanated; it was from the local councils and isolated Bishops. Most of the old Canons would therefore originally only have been valid for certain localities. They subsequently became "Canon Law" because and only in so far as they were adopted elsewhere.

For some centuries no attempt was made in the West to compile an authoritative collection of Canons, or to draw up any uniform system. The earliest compilations were made in the East. The Canons of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) were accepted everywhere; and shortly afterwards, in 341, an authoritative collection was promulgated at the Council of Antioch. By the sixth century the Greek Canon Law had received what was practically its final form. It consisted of (1) the so-called "Apostolic Canons," (2) the Canons of about twelve Œcumenical Councils, and (3) a series of canonical letters of certain great Bishops. To these were added later twenty-two canons of the Second Council of Nicæa (A.D. 787).

As has been said, progress was much slower in the West. There were not even any local compilations until the fifth century, and it was not until the eighth or ninth century that any attempt was made at unification. Of the local collections, the most ancient is that of Africa, where there were two compilations—that known as the Hispana, and that of Dionysius Exiguus. The Roman Church itself was especially tenacious of its own local customs and traditions. These were based on usage and papal letters, called "Decretals," either addressed to various Bishops or written in answer to questions especially submitted. Towards the beginning of the sixth century, how-

ever, the collection of Dionysius Exiguus was adopted. This consisted of (1) the first fifty of the Apostolic Canons translated from the Greek, and (2) the papal Decretals. The second part naturally received additions from subsequent Decretals. It was this code of Canons which is stated to have been presented by Adrian I. to Charlemagne. It became known as the "Liber Canonum," and was received by nearly the whole of the Western Church. Though never officially adopted, it was recognized in England.

This was the only official collection in the Roman Church until the eleventh or twelfth century. It was, however, a collection without system or real unity. There was no grouping according to subjects. This was first attempted in the "False Decretals" of the ninth century which were issued in Spain by Isidore Mercator. These were never formally adopted, but they were widely accepted, and formed the model for subsequent collections, of which many followed, until the twelfth century. All these were then superseded by the famous Decretum of Gratian.

Gratian was a Benedictine monk and a native of Chiusi in Tuscany. His great work, which he called "Concordia Discordantium Canonum," was published at Bologna about 1148. It is not merely a collection of Canons, but a treatise also. It was thus all the more fitted to become, as it did, the standard book for teaching and practice for students of Ecclesiastical Law. It consists of three parts. The first deals with the sources of Canon Law and with ecclesiastical persons and offices; the second comprises a collection of "Causæ" (*i.e.*, cases for solution), which are subdivided into "Quæstiones" (*i.e.*, points solved in each case), with authorities bearing on each question; the third part is denoted by its title, "De Consecratione" (*i.e.*, the law on Church Ritual and Sacraments).

This great treatise never received official recognition so far as is known, but for all practical purposes it was accepted by the Church. It has sometimes been called the "Corpus Juris Canonici," but it is more correct to regard it as the basis of

what subsequently formed the body of Canon Law. On it were founded the subsequent collections of Decretals known as "Compilationes," issued by various Popes, the first of which was called the "Breviarium Extravagantium." The subjects of the five books into which this is divided are indicated by a well-known hexameter:

"Judex, judicium, clerus, connubia, crimen."

They may be shortly expressed in English as (1) ecclesiastical persons; (2) procedure; (3) rights, duties, and properties of clergy; (4) marriage; (5) penalties.

Pope Gregory IX. commissioned Raymond of Pennaforte to reduce this and four subsequent compilations, known respectively as "Tertia," "Secunda," "Quarta," and "Quinta," into one. The result was the first official code, issued about 1234, and known as the "Decretalia Gregorii Noni." A sixth book was added by Boniface VIII., and later still the decrees of Clement V., called the "Clementinæ," were admitted into the official code. The "Extravagantes" of John XXII., and those of some of the later Popes, known as the "Extravagantes Communes," were the only subsequent additions until the "Corpus Juris Canonici" was finally closed.

It remains to consider shortly the sources and contents of the English Ecclesiastical Law. This aspect of the subject has been much to the fore of late both in connection with political controversies and also in consequence of the publication by Mr. Arthur Ogle of a book on "The Canon Law in Medieval England." Shortly, the object of this book is to controvert the conclusions come to by the late Professor Maitland, who maintained, as against Dr. Stubbs, that the English Church before the Reformation accepted the Roman Canon Law in its entirety as absolutely binding, and overriding any English Ecclesiastical Law which might be opposed to it. Professor Maitland's results are used as an argument against the continuity of the English Church. It is maintained that the Church after the Reformation could not be the same as the Church before the

Reformation, as it recognized and was bound by an entirely different code of Ecclesiastical Law. Dr. Stubbs, whose claim to be an authority upon the subject was probably even greater than that of Professor Maitland, had previously held that the Roman Canon Law, as such, was never binding in the English Ecclesiastical Courts. Mr. Ogle's purpose is to prove that the Bishop was right, and that the Professor was wrong. It is not our purpose to go into the question, but if we may judge from the comments on the book of those who are entitled to speak with authority, it would seem that Mr. Ogle has clearly made out his case.

On the assumption that this is so, it is clear that there is no need, in considering the sources of the English Canon Law, to differentiate between such law before and after the Reformation. The sources may be stated to be threefold: (1) The general principles of the *jus commune ecclesiasticum;* (2) particular foreign constitutions received and adopted in England, either expressly or impliedly; and (3) constitutions and Canons of English Synods.

As to the general principles of the Common Ecclesiastical Law, these were undoubtedly adopted by the Church in England. They were, however, subject to many limitations where they came into conflict with any earlier English custom or rule, and the English Church never surrendered her right to repeal or vary any part of the law previously adopted. As to the second of the three sources mentioned above, there were many foreign constitutions current in England before the Reformation, and the fact that this was so is recognized by the Statute 25, Henry VIII., cap. 19 (on which the authority of Canon Law now depends), which enacted that a general review should be made of Canon Law, and that until such review all Canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial being then already made, and not repugnant to the law of the land or the King's prerogative, should still be used and executed. Any such foreign constitutions would be subject to repeal or variation in the same way as the general principles of the Roman Canon Law.

The third source is the only one which is English. This "National" Canon Law is composed of constitutions and Canons of English Synods. These constitutions are either provincial or legatine. The former are the decrees of the Provincial Synods held under the different Archbishops of Canterbury from Stephen Langton in the reign of Henry III. to Henry Chichele in the reign of Henry V. The legatine constitutions are papal decrees, formally enacted in National Synods held under Cardinals Otho and Othobon, two papal legates in the reign of Henry III. The great medieval authority for English Canon Law is Lyndwood's "Provinciale," wherein are collected the most important of the provincial and legatine Canons.

In addition to the Canon Law as it existed before the Reformation, there are the important post-Reformation Canons of 1603. Certain of these were altered in Convocation in 1866 and again in 1888; but, with these exceptions, they have remained unaltered to the present day, except in so far as they have been abrogated by civil legislation (*e.g.*, in testamentary and matrimonial matters) or have become obsolete by disuse. As is well known, these Canons were never confirmed by Parliament, and it has accordingly been held that they are not binding on the laity. They are, however, binding on the clergy so far as they have not been abrogated, and they would also be obligatory upon any laymen who have expressly or impliedly submitted themselves to their authority. Though the review of the Canon Law ordered by the Act of Henry VIII. previously mentioned was never taken, it is probable that the Canons of 1603 were intended to be enacted in pursuance of that Act. A large majority of them are in fact merely declaratory of the law then already existing. Those which partake of this nature are therefore binding on the whole Church unless they have since been repealed or have fallen into disuse. It would be of interest to examine the Canons, with a view to showing how far they merely adopted pre-Reformation Canons. It must, however, suffice to indicate shortly their subject-matter.

The first twelve treat of the Church of England, declaring

the King's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, and containing various anathemas against those who impugn such supremacy or the constitution or faith of the Established Church. The following eighteen Canons relate to "Divine Service and Administration of the Sacraments." They enjoin the proper celebration of Sundays and Holy Days, the use of the prescribed forms of service, and the reverent conduct of such services. Directions are given as to Holy Communion, its reception, and those to whom it is to be denied. The last of the Canons under this heading is a long statement declaratory of the lawful use of the cross in Baptism. The subjects of the next forty-six Canons are "Ministers, their Ordination, Function, and Charge." They contain minute rules on these matters, and the majority of them are still in force. The last of them (No. 76) may, however, serve as an example of the Canon Law being overridden by Statute Law. The Canon in question provides that "no man being admitted a deacon or minister" (which expressions have always been understood as including all those who have been ordained) "shall from thenceforth voluntarily relinquish the same nor afterwards use himself in the course of his life as a layman upon pain of excommunication." It is, however, now provided by the Clerical Disabilities Act, 1870, that any minister in the Church of England may execute a deed of relinquishment, and shall thereupon, after certain formalities, be discharged from all disabilities or restraints to which he was subject as a minister of that Church.

The close connection which formerly existed between the Church and education is indicated by the three Canons which follow, and which provide for the licensing of all schoolmasters by the Bishop (a preference being given to curates desirous to teach), and set out the duties of schoolmasters. "Things appertaining to Churches" is the heading of the next set of nine Canons. They order the provision of a Great Bible, the Book of Common Prayer, a font of stone, a Communion table, a pulpit, and chest for alms in every church, and bid churchwardens to see that churches and churchyards are kept in proper repair and order. They also deal with the periodical

survey of churches, and the making and preserving of a terrier of glebe lands and other Church property. Canons 89 to 91 relate to the choice of churchwardens or questmen, sidesmen, and parish clerks, the keeping of churchwardens' accounts, the duties of sidesmen, and the qualifications of parish clerks. One of such qualifications is that he shall be sufficient "for his competent skill in singing, if it may be"! It may be mentioned that it is provided that churchwardens are to be chosen by the joint consent of the minister and the parishioners; but if they cannot agree, then the minister shall choose one and the parishioners another; and that parish clerks are to be chosen by the minister.

The Canons which follow (Nos. 92 to 138) relate to the Ecclesiastical Courts, their procedure and officers. They are divided into six different headings: (1) The courts belonging to the Archbishop's jurisdiction; (2) those belonging to the jurisdiction of Bishops and Archdeacons, and the proceedings in them; (3) Judges ecclesiastical and their Surrogates; (4) Proctors; (5) Registrars; (6) Apparitors. The greater number of these are now archaic. The subject-matters of some, especially those relating to probate and divorce, have been removed from the cognizance of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Others, such as those relating to presentments by churchwardens and ministers, have practically fallen into disuse. Probably the only one of the Canons relating to the Ecclesiastical Courts which is now of any great importance is No. 99, which forbids marriage within the prohibited degrees. Of interest in another manner is the Canon No. 133, which enjoins that Proctors are not to be clamorous in court, but that they "refrain from loud speech and behave themselves quietly and modestly." Now that solicitors are allowed to practise in the Ecclesiastical Courts, Proctors are no more.

The three Canons 139 to 141 contain anathemas against those who impugn the authority of the sacred Synod (*i.e.*, Convocation), and the last authorizes the Bishop or Archbishop to declare a benefice vacant by reason of the beneficed priest becoming disqualified from holding the preferment.

A Defence of Evening Communion.[1]

THAT Evening Communion was the practice of the Apostles and of the Church of the first century and a half there is absolute certainty. Professor Cheetham, who is one of the most learned and impartial writers that could be found, says that in the Apostolic Age Holy Communion was at the time of the evening meal—the Greek δεῖπνος, the Latin *cæna*. Baronius, the Roman Catholic historian, admits this in his narrative of the year 34, chapter lxi. From the nature of the case, when Christianity was an illicit religion, it was necessary that the peculiar rite of Christian Communion must have been celebrated in such a way as to attract the least possible attention. St. Paul's "breaking of bread" in the Troad, related in Acts xx. 7, 8, was after nightfall, and the service was not over at midnight. The heathen calumnies mentioned by Justin Martyr ("Dialogue with Trypho," chapter x.) show that the meeting of Christians took place after nightfall; and the same custom earned them the epithets of "latebrosa et lucifuga natio" (a people that sought darkness and shunned the light), which Minutius Felix ("Octavius," c. 8) tells us were bestowed upon them. Origen, too, tells Celsus (1. 3, page 5) that it was to avoid the death with which they were threatened that Christians commonly held their meetings in secrecy and darkness. And still in the third century, when Morning Communion had also been introduced, we find Tertullian, Cyprian, and others speaking of "Convocations nocturnal," "nightly gatherings," and of "sacrificium matutinum et vespertinum" (the morning and evening sacrifice) (Tertullian, "Ad Uxorem," ii. 4; "De Coronâ Milet," c. 3). In the latter passage Tertullian implies that Christians communicated at the evening meal, as well as in assemblies before dawn. Cyprian refers to some who in the morning sacrifice used water only in the chalice, lest the odour of wine should betray them to their heathen

[1] Authorities consulted and quoted: "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities"; "Holy Communion"; Canon Meyrick in "A Protestant Dictionary."

neighbours, and warns such not to salve their conscience with the reflection that they complied with Christ's command in offering the mixed chalice when they came together for the evening meal.

Apart from the Forged Decretals, the first distinct reference to any special morning hour is in a letter of Sidonius Apollinaris, who died in 489, who says that priests held service at the third hour, which is 9 a.m. As late as the twelfth century, on ordinary days Mass was said at the sixth hour, which is twelve o'clock (Honorius of Autun, "Gemma animæ," 1. c. 3). On fast-days, and on Wednesday and Friday throughout the year, Mass was celebrated at the ninth hour, or three o'clock in the afternoon.

Midnight Communions continued to be celebrated on Christmas Eve, and the Eve of the Epiphany, Easter Eve, the Eve of Whitsunday, and four times a year on the Saturdays of the Ember weeks. On Maundy Thursday the practice of a distinct Evening Communion was maintained.

The practice of the First Century, and partly of the Second, is enough for all theological argument on the subject. Evening Communion continued till the Emperor Trajan's jealousy of club-meetings compelled the Christians of the second century to transfer the Lord's Supper, and for a time the social meal also, to the forenoon. It was not any objection to Evening Communion, as such, which produced this change of practice, but the pressure of Imperial Law enforced by secular and pagan magistrates through fear of conspiracies being hatched at evening meetings.

How is it possible to condemn a practice followed by all the Apostles and several generations of their converts—a practice ordered by St. Paul in all the Churches which he established, and which he refrained from altering, even when some great evils showed themselves as a seeming consequence of it—a practice which was not changed on any religious or ecclesiastical motive, but simply because the law of the land required it? Evening Communions, though less frequent, continued to beyond the time of Tertullian and Cyprian, and are mentioned by

them without condemnation. Staley, in "The Catholic Religion," puts forward the kind of argument with which we are now familiar, which has not a shadow of foundation. "The rapidity," he says, "with which the change was accomplished, and its universal acceptance, lead to the conclusion that it was made on the authority of the Apostles themselves." But Canon Meyrick well observes that no Apostle was living when the change was made; and that it was the compulsion of the Imperial Law which caused the rapid alteration.

"The Congregation in Church" pronounces Evening Communion to be a strange, irreverent, and possibly sacrilegious custom. This would be to condemn all the Apostles and their succeeding generations as irreverent and sacrilegious.

"The Ritual Reason Why" uses the same kind of absolutely baseless argument as Staley. It has the boldness to assert that early and fasting celebrations were commanded by St. Paul among the other things which he set in order when he came. The truth is the exact contrary. He settles the question of Evening and Fasting Communion in the 11th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, and says it is the rest, other things beyond those he has mentioned, which he will set in order when he comes.

About thirty years ago the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury issued a very important and interesting letter on the subject of Evening Communion. They pointed out that from about the third century, Communion in the morning had been the rule, but they also recognized the facts of the first century and a half. They said that at the Reformation the Church of England had recovered her full liberty in all such matters; that there were reasons for Morning Communion; but that where, from the nature of the population, it was difficult for a number of parishioners to attend in the morning, and the opportunity of communicating in the evening would be a distinct advantage to them, that opportunity ought not to be denied.

The Church of England has, in fact, as it has been pointed out by Canon Meyrick, laid down no rule about the time at

which Holy Communion should be celebrated. It is clear that the Prayer-Book expected that it would take place after Morning Prayer; but it is left to the discretion of the ministers. Neither Early Communion nor Evening Communion probably occurred to the minds of the reformers of the sixteenth century; the latter had been unknown, except on exceptional days, for so many centuries, that they did not think of it: nor indeed, until about fifty years ago, were there any services known which we should describe as evening—evensong took place in the afternoon. At the time of the Reformation, also, the population was so small and the occupation so leisurely, that there was no difficulty in attending the midday or morning celebration. Had there been any need at that time for Evening Communion there can be no doubt that the Reformers, in accordance with their principles, would have adverted to the practice of our Lord, the Apostles, and the first century and a half.

As a matter of fact, Evening Communion was revived in the Church of England after the lapse of so many centuries by Dr. Hook, the High-Church Vicar of Leeds, as an accommodation for his vast working population. As long as he was vicar, every Saint's day there was an Evening Communion for their benefit.

It was only on account of the recrudescence of the belief in the Real Corporal Presence of Christ in the Elements, in the train of the results of the Oxford Movement, that objections were made to this practice. An accompaniment of this materialistic belief was the dogma that the Communion could only be taken fasting, because ordinary food must not meet the actual Body and Blood of Christ in the digestive organs of the recipient. Such a view is unknown to the Church of England, which declares that the Body and Blood of Christ are taken after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby they are received is faith; which deliberately also cut out every direction about fasting reception, and laid down purely spiritual conditions. Its view is well put by Bishop Jeremy Taylor: "That the Lord's Supper is sacredly and with reverence to be received is taught

us by the Apostles: but whether this reverence ought to be expressed by taking it fasting or not fasting, the Apostles left the Churches to their choice."

Fasting Communion cannot be shown to have become the general custom before the fourth and following centuries; and the reason of it was the heaviness of the one great meal of the day. The kind of fasting Communion at that date was a totally different thing from the fasting Communion ordered by the Papal Church, and urged by the Ritualistic party, which dates only from the thirteenth century. The rule laid down by Thomas Aquinas, A.D. 1270, which is binding on the members of the Papal Church, is that no meat or drink must have passed the lips since the previous midnight, in order that the stomach may be empty of food when Christ enters it. But in the Early Church anyone was considered to be fasting who communicated before the midday dinner. The order of meals was this: In the early hours a light refection or breakfast, called *jentaculum*, was taken; about midday came the dinner, called *prandium*; and in the evening the supper, called *cæna*. Until a person had eaten his prandium he was said to be *impransus*, and was regarded as fasting. There is no distinction to be drawn between such a Communicant and a Communicant of the English Church, who approaches the Lord's Table three or four hours after a moderate breakfast, at which, since the recent introduction of coffee and tea, no intoxicant is taken, and which is always of moderate proportions. What we should aim at is such a state of body as will not interfere with the sober devotion of the soul. To some persons there is a certain devotional attraction in the early hour, and the absence of food. To most there is greater help to devotion in quiet family prayers, a moderate breakfast, and an hour's public worship in the Church, with the well-known confessions, prayers, hymns, and lessons.

It is sometimes objected that by the time of an Evening Communion the recipients will have had the principal meal of the day, and will be tired with the experiences of the hours which have passed since the morning. But Evening Communion

exists largely for the sake of the working people. Working people have their chief meal soon after midday, and the effect of it will have passed away long before the evening. Such an argument does not apply to labourers, servants, or shopkeepers. Where a congregation consists largely of these classes, then an Evening Communion cannot be considered on such grounds undesirable. Early Morning Communions, and those at midday, are impossible for the large class of domestic servants to attend.

The practice of our Lord, the Apostles, and the Church of the first century and a half would alone be enough to justify this custom completely and abundantly. We are additionally fortified when we consider that the main objection to it is founded on the materialistic superstition introduced into the Western Church by Paschasius in the ninth century, and into the reformed Church of England by Robert Isaac Wilberforce about fifty years ago, as to the Corporal Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. It was to purify the Church from such dogmas that the Reformers devoted their energies: to arguments drawn from such sources no attention whatever need be paid. If ancient English canons are quoted, a disuser of even forty years is sufficient in Canonical Law to abrogate them, much more a disuser of three hundred and fifty. There is a certain force in the consideration that it is undesirable to give offence to the weak brother; but the offence is so unreasonable that it is wise and right quietly, unostentatiously, and uncontroversially, to maintain the true position. In this, and in many other kindred matters, the Christian minister has no right to subject himself to the bondage of adverse opinion. It is his duty as well as his privilege to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made him free.

St. Paul and the Modern Note in Missions.

By the Rev. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.

I RECENTLY presided at a Missionary Meeting held under the auspices of the C.M.S.

The meeting was addressed by two speakers—one a clergyman, the other a lady missionary. Both came from the field of work in India; both were young, and extremely intelligent as well as indisputably earnest and devoted. The lady speaker described the method of teaching the natives of India—at least, in the locality where she worked—and frankly averred that it was common to take some point of Indian belief and use it as furnishing, wherever possible, a starting-point for Christian teaching. She illustrated this method by saying that the incarnation of Krishna, which his devotees eagerly look for, might be taken as a way of introducing the doctrine of the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord.

The clerical speaker followed with an earnest plea for Educational Missions. He emphatically declared that sympathy with the educational wants of India is, when wisely manifested by missionaries of the Gospel, a powerful stimulus to interest native hearers in the truths of the Christian Revelation.

In short, the two addresses were penetrated by the modern note, and dyed deep with the modern colour. Scarcely conscious, perhaps, of the atmosphere which they had so deeply inhaled, these representatives of the younger missionary method and temper revealed, most clearly, that many of the notions, once accepted without question, and in vogue in every missionary circle, have been profoundly modified. Wholly as I sympathize with the modern mind in every sphere, and believe that only by it can any situation ever be saved from rust and decay, I felt constrained to utter a gentle warning to my hearers and to the accomplished speakers. I said in effect that there might be a danger, against which we ought to guard, lest those distinctions between "the truth as it is in Jesus" and all forms

of Oriental speculation should be overlooked. I urged that there might be a danger, too, that to-day the West may become Orientalized, not less real than the danger that the East may become Occidentalized.

In talking over the matter, subsequently, with one of the two missionaries, I found that the classical instance on which such speakers depend is that of St. Paul in the Areopagus. I am free to confess that in that glorious instance they find a most abundant justification for going a long way along the path on which they have travelled so far and so freely. Whether the Apostle will support them in every step is properly open to debate. But the appeal is good, and, therefore, to understand that greatest of all Christian apologias becomes very important. That no one who only reads the Authorized Version of St. Paul's speech on the Hill of Ares can properly understand it, I am positive. I am positive, too, that in order to understand that speech, we must dismiss the mischievous notion that the Apostle made a mistake in speaking there as he did, and was inevitably, if not justly, punished by the most signal failure in his career. That he spoke then, as Stier and Alford maintain, under the full and distinctive inspiration of the "Spirit of Jesus," I hold to be incontrovertible. With these views, and under the impulse of that interesting incident which I have briefly narrated, I have ventured to re-translate the great speech in the Areopagus, and now offer it to the attention of the Christian reader, in the hope that it may assist to some clearer ideas of what is due to those natural feelings and views of religion to which St. Paul paid such just and noble homage in the great discourse.

St. Paul in the Areopagus (Acts xvii.).

And Paul having been placed in the middle of Areopagus, said: "Men of Athens, I see on all hands that you revere the unseen Powers in no common degree. For, as I passed along and reviewed the objects of your worship, I even found an altar, on which had been inscribed (the words), 'to God unknown.'

Him, therefore, Whom you worship without knowing it, do I announce to you. That God, Who made the world and all things which are in it, being from its origin Lord of heaven and earth, does not inhabit temples made by hand; nor is He tended by the hands of men, as though in need of someone else; for He it is Who is ever giving to all life and breath and all things. He, too, made out of one element every nation of men to inhabit the entire surface of the earth, marking out for them allotted periods of time, and the limits of their habitation; that so they might seek for God, if they would but feel after and find Him, though He is originally no long way off from each one of us; for in Him we live, and move, and are essentially; as even some of your favourite poets have said, 'for we are also His offspring.' We, then, being originally God's offspring, ought not to think that the Divine is similar to carving in gold or silver or stone, the product of man's art and imagination. Those times of ignorance, however, God has overlooked; but now He announces to men that all in all places should repent, having regard to the fact that He has appointed a day in which He proposes to judge the inhabited world in righteousness, in a Person, Whom He marked out by raising Him from among the dead, and thus furnishing proof-positive to all."

Goethe and Lavater.

By the Rev. C. FIELD.

TO anyone interested in the currents of thought on the Continent in the eighteenth century the friendship between Lavater and Goethe presents a deeply interesting object of study. For the Swiss and the German were embodiments of the two chief opposing tendencies of their time, Pietism and the Illumination (*aufklärung*). Pietism, under the lead of Spener and Franke, had liberated men from ecclesiastical trammels, and set the individual face to face with his Creator. The "Illumination" may be described as the mental ferment of new ideas which was agitating all men of intellect in Germany and France, and which was to produce, among other things, the Romantic movement in literature and the French Revolution.

Lavater was a pietest to the core, and also an ardent proselytizer. His bold appeal to the Jew Mendelssohn to weigh the evidences for Christianity was an instance of this. Like most others, Lavater felt the great fascination of Goethe, and at an early stage in their acquaintance wrote: "Goethe read many passages to me from his papers, or rather poured them forth in all the ardour of their first composition. His scenes are full of the most truthful human nature. He is an unequalled genius; he excels in whatever he undertakes."

Admiring Goethe's genius, Lavater made a strong effort to win him over to his own simple type of Christianity—"the type untampered with, the naked star," undimmed by philosophic fogs. Goethe, whose mind was rapidly tending in the direction of Spinozism or a sort of Christianized Pantheism, resented this, though at first Lavater's zeal caused no breach in their friendship. In his autobiography (Book XIV.) Goethe writes: "The idea which Lavater had conceived was so closely in union with the image of Christ which was impressed upon his mind that he was unable to imagine how anyone could live and

breathe without being a Christian. He absolutely tormented Mendelssohn, myself, and others. He wished us to be Christians, and Christians after his manner, or that we should convince him of the truth of our creeds. This ardent proselytism irritated me. It was in direct opposition to the religious toleration which I had been accustomed to profess. Lavater's importunities served only to confirm me in my own opinions, which is generally the case with all whose conversion is attempted in vain. At length, however, he pressed me with the terrible dilemma that I must either be a Christian or an Atheist; and I then declared if he would not leave me in the enjoyment of the Christian faith which I had formed for myself I should not have much hesitation in deciding for what he termed Atheism."

In 1774 Lavater was ordered to go to Ems by his medical adviser. Goethe accompanied him, and has drawn a graphic portrait of his outward appearance at the time: "His mild and benevolent expression of countenance, his sonorous German accent and honest Swiss dialect—in short, every peculiarity by which he was characterized, produced the most agreeable impression on his auditors. The attitude of his body, which was somewhat bent, by diminishing the ascendancy of his presence, placed him in some degree on a level with those about him. Vanity and arrogance he opposed by calmness and address. At the moment when he seemed to be on the point of yielding to an opponent he would bring suddenly forth some great view like a diamond shield, and yet knew how to temper the light which flashed from it so agreeably that men of this kind generally felt themselves instructed and, at least while in his presence, convinced.

"He was sympathizing, ingenious, and witty, and loved the same qualities in others, provided they observed the bounds which his own delicacy prescribed. If one ventured beyond these, he used to pat him on the shoulder and call the offender to order with a true-hearted 'Behave, now!' One became virginal by his side in order not to scandalize him by too free speech.

"To me Lavater's visit proved highly important and instructive. It imparted a new impulse to my love for the fine arts, and inspired me with new activity of mind. The objects which then absorbed my time and attention were too numerous to admit of this influence taking an immediate effect; but I felt the utmost impatience to renew the discussion of the important points of which we had treated in our correspondence. I therefore resolved to accompany Lavater to Ems, whither he was about to proceed; and I hoped, during the journey, shut up in a carriage and secure against interruption, to be enabled freely to enter on the discussion of the questions which most interested me."

Further on Goethe draws an amusing picture of himself seated between Basedow the Educationalist and Lavater at a table d'hôte at Coblentz. The latter was explaining the Apocalypse to a country clergyman, and the former endeavouring to convince an obstinate dancing-master that baptism was useless. Goethe summed up the situation in the well-known lines:

"Propheten rechts, Propheten links,
Das Welt-kind in der Mitte."

Although Goethe repelled Lavater's open attempt to convert him to orthodox Christianity, the latter had some religious influence on his mind, as appears from a passage in a letter he wrote to Lavater in August, 1775: "God will be gracious to me, brother; I am for a while pious again, delight in the Lord, and sing Him psalms whose echo you ought to hear soon. I wish you were with me, for then I have good company."

In 1779 Goethe visited Zürich and stayed some time with Lavater. In his immediate neighbourhood the poet felt his personal charm more than ever, and wrote in enthusiastic terms to Frau von Stein: "It is difficult to describe this man's excellence; when one's impression of him has been weakened by absence, one finds oneself all the more astonished in his presence. He is the best, greatest, wisest, most lovable of all mortals and immortals whom I know. . . . We are happy in and with Lavater; it is like a moral tonic to be near a man who

lives and moves in an atmosphere of domestic affection. It has made me realize in what sort of moral torpor we usually live, and how my heart, which is not naturally dry and cold, has become stiff and frozen." To Knebel Goethe wrote: "Lavater is and remains a unique personage, to whom one has to be quite close in order to appreciate him. Such truthfulness, faith, love, patience, strength, wisdom, goodness, industry, thoroughness, versatility, calm, is not to be found in Israel nor among the heathen."

But in spite of these high encomiums, when personal intercourse was replaced by correspondence, the radical difference in the two friends' ways of thinking become more and more obvious. Lavater was in the habit of sending his works to Goethe, who, while praising certain portions, made it plain that his own point of view was diametrically opposed to that of his friend. In 1781, on Lavater's sending his "Letters to youths," Goethe wrote: "Never have I been so pleased with, and admired your presentment of Christ so much as in these letters. To see you enthusiastically grasp your crystal goblet, fill it to the brim with red and frothing wine, and then drink it eagerly down is an elevating sight! I gladly allow you this joy as you would be wretched without it. Considering the natural longing to idealize an individual, together with the impossibility of being satisfied by an individual, it is a great thing that a figure survives from ancient times to whom you can ascribe everything, and in Him mirror and worship yourself. But I must protest against your robbing all the thousand varieties of feathered fowl under heaven of their plumes, as if they were not their own, to deck your Bird of Paradise with them exclusively; this must necessarily seem intolerable to those who, like myself, are disciples of the truth revealed to each man through mankind, and who, as sons of God, worship Him in ourselves and in all His children. I know well that you cannot change in the matter, and that your motives are good. But since you so persistently preach your faith and doctrine, I must persist in pointing you to ours —the iron-grained steadfast rock of Humanity, which you and a

whole Christendom may bespatter with your waves, but can neither engulf nor unsettle from its foundations."

Here Goethe frankly assumes the standpoint of humanism in opposition to Lavater, whose picture of Christ he regards as a projection from his own imagination. When Lavater, in 1782, sent him his work entitled "Pontius Pilatus," Goethe wrote on the subject to Frau von Stein: "When one of us poets dresses up a hero in a patchwork of our own proclivities and peculiarities, and calls him Werther, Egmont, Tasso, or what you like, it is all right; the public ranks it according to the merits of the author's genius, and the story rests on its own basis. Our friend Lavater fancies this method of dramatization, so to speak, and dresses up his Christ in a similar patchwork. But when he makes Humanity's birth and death, Alpha and Omega, salvation and safety depend upon Him, it seems to me tasteless and intolerable. . . . When a great man has a dark corner in him, then it is very dark. The story of Christ has turned his head, so that he cannot think sanely."

On August 9, 1782, Goethe wrote to Lavater himself: "You hold the Gospel as it stands for Divine truth. An audible voice from heaven would not convince me that water burns, and that fire extinguishes, that a Virgin can bear a child, and that a corpse can rise again; rather would I reckon this a blasphemy against God and His revelation in Nature. You find nothing more beautiful than the Gospel; I find thousands of writings of God-gifted men, ancient and modern, just as beautiful and useful and indispensable to mankind. Dear brother, believe me, that I am just as earnest in my faith as you in yours; must I not, then, maintain precisely the opposite of what your book 'Pilatus' contains, and demands our unconditional assent to, with bigoted intolerance. Forgive me these hard words. Did it not lead to further misunderstanding, I might say the intolerance is not in you, it is in your book. The Lavater who walks among men and converses with authors is the most tolerant and mild of beings. Lavater as the fanatical propagandist of an intolerant religion—what are we to call him?

"Forgive me, I speak without bitterness. Your 'Pilatus' is intolerant from beginning to end, and you intended it to be so. Often you make the demand: 'Who can—who dare (speak as He did)?' Whereupon in reading an involuntary 'I' has often risen to my lips. Believe me, I have often wished to discuss your book with you in detail, and have written much about it, but could not send it, for when will one man understand another? It is impossible to be so opposed in opinions without coming into collision. I confess to you that if I were a teacher of my religion you would perhaps have better reason to charge me with intolerance than I you."

Lavater returned a mild reply to this letter: "I believe myself to be open-minded and strong to hear anything, because I am most anxious to mend my defects. Everyone knows that my whole manner of life, at any rate, is the opposite of intolerant. Yes, I venture to assert that among all German authors none is more tolerant and appreciative of good where he can find it than myself. I find many things besides the Gospel beautiful, but nothing *so* beautiful as the Gospel which judges me a thousand times more sternly than my friend Goethe."

To this Goethe replied (October 4, 1782): "Your exposition in your letter of your inner scheme of religion was very welcome to me. We shall soon arrive at a mutual understanding on this point, and leave each other in peace. Nature deserves our gratitude for having stored up in every creature so much *vis medicatrix*, that, whenever it receives an injury, it can immediately commence to patch itself up again; and what are the thousandfold forms of religion but so many examples of this *vis medicatrix*. My plaster doesn't suit you, and yours doesn't suit me. In Our Father's dispensary are many recipes. So I have nothing to answer nor refute in your letter, but much to say on the other side. We ought some day to set out our two respective confessions of faith in two parallel columns, and enter into some bond of peace and neutrality on the subject."

But the theological gulf between Goethe and Lavater was too wide to admit of any such compromise. Goethe was

approaching the time of his visit to Rome and Venice, when he was probably more estranged from orthodox Christianity than at any other period, as appears from certain of the "Venetian epigrams." The correspondence between the two friends became rarer, and in 1783 altogether ceased. In 1786 Lavater paid a visit to Weimar, and stayed a night with Goethe, but their intercourse was distant in manner and restrained. He wrote to his friend Spalding: "I found Goethe older, colder, firmer, more reserved, more practical." Goethe on his side wrote to Frau von Stein: "Lavater stayed with me. No really friendly nor intimate word passed between us, and I have done with love and hate as far as he is concerned."

But, in spite of this assertion of indifference, Goethe's later references to Lavater in letters and conversations were not devoid of considerable bitterness. To Jacobi he wrote about him: "He has been spying here in Weimar, but our decided heathenism frightened him away"; and in the "Xenien" many of his sharpest epigrams are levelled at him—*e.g.*:

> "Pity that Nature made only one man out of thee,
> For there was material enough for a worthy man and a scoundrel."

When Goethe visited Zürich in 1797 he carefully avoided Lavater, and on one occasion, when he saw the latter approaching down an avenue, deliberately stepped aside and let him go by.

In old age Goethe's judgment of his former friend became milder. In one of the conversations reported by Eckermann he said: "Lavater was a really good man, but subject to strong delusions. He did not wish to deal with Truth whole and unadulterated; he deceived himself and others." Of another conversation Eckermann reports: "Goethe spoke about Lavater, and said much in praise of his character. He also related details of their early intimate friendship, and how they had often at that time slept in the same bed." "It is lamentable," he added, "that a weak mysticism so soon set bounds to the flight of his genius."

The friendship of Goethe's mother with Lavater, on the other hand, continued unbroken till her death. The following

letter, written on the death of her daughter Cornelia, testifies her warm regard for the Zurich pastor:

"FRANKFORT, *June* 23, 1777.

"'He giveth strength to the weary, and to them that have no might He increaseth strength.' What He promises He certainly performs. We are new and living witnesses of this, who have just laid in the grave our only daughter Cornelia. Her death was like a bolt out of a clear sky—entirely unexpected. Oh, dear Lavater! The poor mother had much to bear. My husband was sick all the winter; the sudden slamming of a door startled him, and I had to be the first to announce to him his daughter's death, whom he loved above all besides.

"My heart was crushed, but the thought 'Shall there be evil in the city and the Lord hath not done it?' kept me from entire collapse. Without a rock-like faith in God—on God Who counts our hairs and knows the sparrows, Who slumbers not, nor sleeps, Who goes not on journeys, Who knows the thought of my heart before it is present, Who hears me without my having to cut myself with knives and lancets, Who, in a word, is Love—without faith in Him it would be impossible to hold out. St. Paul says, 'All trials are grievous when they come'—but it is one thing to feel this, and another to murmur at God's providence, and to be like those who have no hope. But we who know that immortality dwells beyond the grave, and that our brief life is hurrying to its close, we should kiss the hand that smites us, and say, although with many tears, 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the Name of the Lord.'

"Dear son, your letter has done me much good. You say you are vexed with yourself that you cannot comfort me. But let me tell you it was like balm to me to have your whole warm, sympathetic, friendly heart laid open before me. When I see only a line of your writing all those happy moments recur to my mind when we sat together at one table, when you were under my roof, and used to come to my room at nine o'clock in

the evening. Although I saw you such a short time I knew at once on which round of the lofty ladder, on which my sons stand, to set you. When you departed I wept for a whole day. All this comes back to my memory when I see your handwriting upon an envelope.

"Forgive me, dear son, for writing this sort of stuff. It is now one of my favourite occupations to write to those friends who are so near to my heart and share its joys and sorrows. I live in this great town as in a wilderness. Of my relations, there is only Frau Fahlmer who understands me, and she is unfortunately in Dusseldorf.

"Now, my dear friend, good-bye. Greet your dear wife, Pfenninger, Frau Schulthess, Lenz, and all good souls from me. I have had two touching letters from my dear son Schlosser.[1] He suffers like a Christian and a man and believes on God. May the Almighty bless you and your belongings, and preserve your affection for me. Mine will last till death, and beyond—so says, and will keep it,

"Your true mother,

"AJA."

[1] Husband of Goethe's sister Cornelia.

SERMON OF THE MONTH.

The Turning-Point.

By J. E. GIBBERD.

Neh. i. 9: "Turn and keep My commandments."
Lam. v. 21: "Turn us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned."
Acts xi. 21: "A great number believed and turned to the Lord."

WE have now seen how sin passes from a latent defect of the fabric of our nature to a troublesome agent in the deterioration of our character. We have seen, that is, that the knowledge of God which Christ has turned like a searchlight on the world has altered the unknown poverty of heart and character into known poverty, and thus brought into play a strenuous sense of evil and of obligation to aim and aspire after the higher type of life of which Christ is the standard rule and measure.

We have seen how known sin, in conduct or condition, provokes deep sorrow in any heart that is well adjusted towards the Father of spirits who, by His love, sent His Son to redeem us Such grief is worthy and far better than horny unconcern and lifeless inaction.

Our passage from the barren and unresponsive heart to the newborn spirit that is happy in God is made by a turn of the most distinct kind.

By the roadside an untenanted house long stood looking bald, dearth-like, inanimate. To-day blinds and curtains are up, windows are clean, the whole building looks inhabited, and says by its signs that the stir and life of a family is within its walls. The look of life indicates the fact of life. Interest is quickened. A knock at the door would be answered. It is turned from an empty house to a tenanted house. If within it there is a living soul that once had no bright, fervent care about God, and now trusts Him, and loves Him, and feels His presence, there is the larger turn from the empty soul to the soul that is a

Divine dwelling-place. One who turned unto the Lord recorded that after it "God was not afar off: He was my Father, and Christ my Elder Brother." Another said: "Fear of God was gone. I saw He was the greatest Friend one can have." A greater change could hardly be conceived than this inward change.

There is no new and improved word for a change of heart that is as old as the human race. No word is better than the old word "converted." The Latins put "cum" or "con" before a word to intensify it. The prefix gives "cum-ulative" force to the root "vert," which means "turn." So conversion is the most intense and thorough turning. The old heart becomes new; the former man becomes a new man; the soul that always doubled back upon itself to please itself, and never got that way out of grovelling, sets its face away from self to God to please God. The comfortless, unspirited, boneless character becomes new in its content, its feeling, its appearance, its powers, its expression. "Old things pass away; all things become new."

We are concerned now with the turning-point. If a worldly life on a low level, low enough for the swamps to be unable to drain themselves, be in possession—if a spiritual life on a high level, whence there is fall enough to carry off all the drainage, is to be in possession—it is manifest some drastic change must occur. If a heart full of temporal aims and objects is to be turned into a heart full of eternal purposes, it is clear there must be a turning-point. If the centre-seat of the heart has been held by self, and the character has been commanded thence into servile and pitiful poverty of plan and poverty of filling in, and henceforth the centre-seat of the same heart is to be held by Christ, and the whole plan and filling in is to be enlarged and enhanced, it is unquestionable there must be an inward end of one reign and beginning of a new reign. The subtle revolt of the heart against God, and removal of the heart from God, of which the sinner against his own soul is unconscious; the latent bent of thought and feeling and will away from God, and from all heroic and self-sacrificing duty, from all the nobler

phases and outgrowths of character by which the sin-smoked heart is unwittingly stifled; the delicate, fancy, affected poise of inward life that bows the Heavenly King out as an inconvenient caller, and wears politely the insignia of utter worldliness under a delusion that the observance of religious forms is religion—all these inferior types of soul have to be regenerated by the operation of the Divine Spirit who enters like a wind and changes the breath. A life that is unworthy from centre to circumference—that is, sin in its very composition—has to be converted into a life of different substance—that is, godly in its very composition. "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out."

"Repent." The cry of the prophets was "Repent." The behest of the Lord was "Repent." The Lord's echo in Apostles was "Repent." "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke xiii. 3). Godly sorrow for sin, whether sin in action or sin in condition, issues properly in renouncing sin of thought, word, and deed. Sin is so reprehensible, it should be hateful. We are without excuse, having Christ's revelation of God, if we curl our lives round ourselves and our worldly concerns, and do despite to God's Spirit in the reluctance of our hearts to obey His inward monitions. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8). This is no made-up warning from a conceit of religiousness. It is the true interpretation of the currents of our own spirits. Our own hearts attest its truth. Godless lives are failures. Judged by any honest criterion, they fall short of ordinary honour. "Repent and be converted." The turn cannot be too real, too intense, too sure. God has the first claim on us. God's claim is transcendent. The majesty of His law is violated. His truth is neglected, and His gift of His Son is put aside as an inconsiderable and negligible trifle. "Repent and be converted." Let it be whole-hearted. Let it be soul-full. Let it carry a new turn of the stream of life. The little stream of our individuality has to flow into the greater stream of God's life, and mix with it till it is, not lost, but absorbed. Turn out of the small channel of self; turn into the greater channel of God. Christ calls.

Christ leads. Christ bids. Repent and be converted. Find the turning-point. Be sorry at heart till it be found. Tread not the path of sloth or false conceit. Tread not the uncertain path of treacherous furrows. Seek the right way, paved with truth, leading to eternal life.

"Father of all, to Thee
Our contrite hearts we raise,
Unstrung by sin and pain,
Long voiceless in Thy praise.
Breathe Thou the silent chords along,
Until they tremble into song."

Concerning the momentous importance of the turning-point of life being reached, one thing has to be said which embraces all other persuasions. Its vital importance is expressed in the atoning sufferings of our Saviour Jesus Christ. God's sense of the deadliness of sin could have no stronger witness than the gift of His Son to redeem us. Christ's sense of the necessity of release could have no greater attestation than His willingness to be the sacrifice for sin. For while Christ's sacrifice provides us with the means of reconciliation to God, it also reflects God's thought of sin, and the measure Christ took of its enmity to God.

Now much careful thought and inquiry have been applied in our own day to this change that is called "Conversion." The inquiry has been made as an inquiry into the growth of plants would be made. Actual testimony from the best available sources has been acquired and carefully compared. The results of such inquiry are too valuable to overlook.

In the first place, it is shown that every girl and boy should earnestly seek to have a godly foundation laid by the age of fourteen, and on no account to allow it to be postponed when sixteen to eighteen years of age is reached. There are many who find the blessed change in later years, but very few find it with as much facility who leave it till a less impressionable age. Besides, if the turning-point is pushed forward into later life, there are fewer years in which to reap the holy advantages of a godly course. You do not choose old boughs for planting out

to get young trees. The earlier you stock your grounds with saplings, the longer do you expect to enjoy the fruits. Let Christ have all young hearts, that He may impress Himself on them.

In the next place, there are two lessons from experience.

One lesson is, that in a great many persons conversion simply came to them. This does not mean that it came mystically on those who had no previous teaching, no earnest training, no regard for religion—in fine, no preparation. It came as seeds come up that have long lain buried in the ground too deep to sprout, but ready to sprout if the plough should bring them nearer the air. It came as close affection and sweet alliance sometimes comes to those who were boy and girl together and meet afresh in later years. God's seed springs up from depths of the heart and blossoms. Decision is formed by a steady growth. It is well known that some who have grown up under religious shelter have found their turning-point by beginning to take some work for others. The happy day that *fixed* their choice was when they began to teach the Bible-story to a class of children; or when they began to offer a word of consolation to the feeble and the dying; or when they first made a brave stand for righteousness in a hailstorm of bad influences.

It speaks volumes for the value of public worship and Christian exercises, of daily prayer and reading of the Bible, of efforts to do good, and of every arrow of life aimed at the target of piety, that these preparations often bear gracious results, which come without any paroxysm or drastic crisis—come as healing often comes, even as the sun climbs from its rising low in the east to its noonday zenith—smoothly, naturally, unostentatiously. It says to all, Put yourselves in the way of Christ, so that even as He passes by His spell may catch you in God's spell. Let no one demur to a soul's awakening because it has been modest and apparently spontaneous. God is in the still small voice and the soft summer shower, in the noiseless growth of the babe, in the gentle expansions of the faculties. So that

the awakening comes, so that the turning-point be reached, so that the high choice be settled, it is not for us to say how God's Spirit shall do His work. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

But though the turning-point is sometimes reached without effort the duty remains, wherever it is not reached, to strain all the activity and ardour of the soul after it. A writer tells of a music-teacher who says to his pupils, "Just keep on trying, and some day you will find yourself playing." "The agonizing to enter in may often be the only way to the new insight, and a definite cause in bringing it about."

> "Perhaps the longing to be so
> Helps make the soul immortal."

So "strive to enter in at the strait gate, for narrow is the way that leadeth unto life." It may be that one has to strive to apprehend God's forgiveness of sin. Perhaps the need of forgiveness has not been observed in all its urgency, and the meaning of Christ's sacrifice has not dawned on the soul. The mind must be bent on knowing the truth about sin and salvation. Perhaps there has been a vein of fatalism poisoning the springs of energy, and suggesting that one has to be what he is, or that if God means to save one He will do it. So resolute aim and endeavour have been kept at bay. And the soul needs arousing —even a shaking, to awaken it. Perhaps the effort has been made, but made with too much agitation, and anxiety, and loud pleading, like an attempt to take the kingdom of heaven by force. And it may be that, instead of so much striving to acquire better feeling, what is needed is to cease from assault and take to self-surrender. "I give myself to Christ," may express as sound an act of faith as, "I will strive to find Christ." Still one may not rest on a lounge of indifference—one may not let his will drift—one may not take his chance. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve."

Whatever be the turning-point of a soul's course—whether

it be an awakening that comes without striving, whether it be the comfort of forgiveness easing the sense of sin and guilt, whether it come with a service that implies Christian feeling, whether it seem a reconciliation after estrangement, whether it occur in self-surrender, whether it result from set and steady determination, whether it arise as a distinct act of God in the soul aiding a helpless child—the particular type of experience is less of moment than the experience itself. Beyond the turning-point lies the whole province of a life in peaceful union with God. Beyond the turning-point lies the entire usefulness of a Christian life in all its branches. Beyond the turning-point lies the triumphant assurance of glory, honour, and immortality. Beyond the turning-point lies the fellowship with Christ, through His Spirit, which is the fulness of life and the active evidence of eternal life. Turn ye; turn ye: why will ye die? Perchance there is a toll-gate between your present situation and the turn to God and heaven. Refuse not to pay the toll. Reach the right turning at all costs.

In the life of Duncan Matheson there is the story of a young man who was "awakened at a meeting and began to inquire the way of life." Days and nights passed, but he found no rest for his soul. One evening Duncan took him aside, and said, "Now, are you willing to have this awful business settled? Christ is willing; are you?" The young man said he was. They prayed together, and as they prayed light and peace dawned, and the young man "started to his feet in a tumult of joy and praise." How often do anxious souls stop sorrowing on the bank of the road, short of the turning-point, but so near it, because they will not shed the pride that keeps them from acknowledging their anxiety to one who will pray with them and lend them a hand on the way to God! Let none of us stop short. Make sure of the turning-point. It is the way to make sure of the way of life.

Loneliness.

WOULD'ST know the secret of thy lonely way,
O solitary soul? Dost wonder why
Thou find'st no solace for thine aching heart
In all the world calls Friendship?
Yes, 'tis true,
The cisterns of man's Love for man run dry
Right soon. True Friendship costs. Its question is,
What can I suffer for the Friend I love?
How much, and not how little, can I bear
To ease his shoulder of life's weight of woe?
Expect not then great wealth of human Love,
But pluck this tender flower with reverent hand,
A choice exotic from an alien soil,
Whose Home is God.
You find it not on earth?
O thrice-blest lonely soul! Bound by a cord
Of strong compulsion to the Fount of Love.
Others may dally by the stainèd stream
Of human Love; may even rest content
To quaff its waters from the banks of Time.
But thou, blest soul, canst never find thy peace
But at the Fount of Love—with God Himself.
Thy longing is thy solemn cry for God
And God alone can give thy longing—Home.

S. H. C.

The Missionary World.

THE winter's work in the various missionary centres will be in full progress when these notes are issued from the press. Several of the autumn farewell meetings will have been held, and others will be impending. The annual output of the Church at home into the mission field will be delimited; friends at home will be facing the fast-approaching parting, workers abroad will be awaiting such reinforcements as are available for them with expectancy and hope. Behind each outgoing missionary lies more or less background of vocation, of testing, of commitment, of preparation, and of careful location to a post assigned in view of every capacity and possibility. Year by year the processes of selection, location, and equipment, are receiving fuller attention, and there is already evidence that careful and well-considered action brings proportionate results in the mission field. The tendency on every hand, in Europe and in America, and in all advices received from abroad, is to increase rather than to lessen care.

* * * * *

It has not yet been discovered that a parallel work waits to be undertaken at the Home Base. There is still in vogue, for the most part, strangely inadequate practice as to the selection of workers for office (except in the case of a few important central appointments), strangely inadequate conception of the real issues which should govern the nomination to missionary committees, strangely vague preparation—if any—for those sent out to deputational or organizing work, strangely little perception of the need for that delicate adjustment of temperaments and dispositions which does so much to facilitate associated work, strangely little manifestation of that far-sightedness and larger policy which is beginning to govern preparation for work on the foreign side. There is scope here for broad and deep thinking. There will be immediate advance at the Home Base when the high principles which govern selection, preparation, and location for the foreign field are applied to home-workers, and when the

vocation held to be essential in the one is sedulously sought for in the other.

* * * * *

The C.M.S. "Swanwick Conference" is still bearing fruit, not only in the completion of the sum asked for to adjust the Society's finances, and in wide and deep devotion and sacrifice among its friends, and in the Day of Prayer being widely observed on September 21, but also in a clear expression of a spirit of love and fellowship between the missionary organizations. The *C.M. Review* for September quotes with evident feeling some sentences penned by Bishop Montgomery, and in *China's Millions* for the same month there is an editorial note charged with the deepest and sincerest sympathy. In past days the C.M.S. owed much to inspiration received through the China Inland Mission; it is pleasant to have this fresh evidence of the warmth and reality of the present fellowship. In this connection every friend of missions is drawn towards the London Missionary Society at this time. With a past full of heroic devotion—some of the greatest missionary leaders have been L.M.S. men—and a future of unbounded responsibility and promise, the Society is in the present faced with severe financial problems. A large group of the directors and friends of the Society are meeting at Swanwick from September 29 to October 2 to face the situation quietly in the presence of God. By past mercies given in a like need to a sister Society, there comes a call to us to surround this gathering with faith and prayer.

* * * * *

The long term of preparation with which the Wesleyan Missionary Society has been closing its first century is nearly over, and the Centenary Celebration will be celebrated all the world over in the first week of this month. We can cordially echo the words in the leading article in the current issue of the *Foreign Field:* "It fires the imagination and quickens the pulse to think of the Methodist family in all the world coming before God on that day [Sunday, October 5] in an unbroken fellow-

ship of thanksgiving and in a great and holy act of consecration." We wish our brethren a future for the world which is greater even than their past. "So shall we," continues the article in the *Foreign Field*, "pass out of the old and through the gates of a new century of missionary service, pledged, by the grace of God, to make it, in faith, and zeal, and courageous service, not less, but greater, than the past has been."

* * * * *

The laying of the foundation-stone of the much-needed extension of the Church Missionary House on September 5 by the Kabaka of Uganda has been so widely reported in the secular and religious Press that there is no need to chronicle its details here. It is one of those vivid incidents which stand out as high lights in the missionary landscape, and quickly catch the eye. Those to whom the whole situation was most charged with meaning were the senior men and women who had prayed and worked for Uganda through the long and chequered course of its mission, striving for the welfare of the country on the very spot where the young Christian African ruler laid a foundation-stone for a Society who had itself laid the surest foundation on which rests the future welfare of his realm.

* * * * *

Many still remember with thankfulness and almost with wonder the Student Volunteer Conference in Liverpool, 1896. Directly after it was over, the young chairman, the Rev. Donald Fraser, set sail for work in the South African colleges, and thence, as a missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland, went to work in the Livingstonia Mission. From time to time we have heard of him, especially at the time of the Rev. Charles Inwood's remarkable visit to the Christian congregations of the Mission. Now, as a fruit of this recent furlough, Mr. Fraser has given us a record of his fourteen years' work in Central Africa, and the book fulfils all the expectations formed by those who sat under its author's presidency in 1896. "Winning a Primitive People" (Seeley, Service, 5s.) is full of human charm and interest, simple, virile,

humorous. It goes to the heart of things African, and leaves a deep impression of the reality and power of the message which the missionary bears. Young people, and those who know little of missionary policy, will read the book eagerly. It has at the same time many lessons for the serious student of missions, and even the ethnologist will not be wise if he brushes it aside. It is an excellent example of a type of missionary book of which we have but few, and could scarcely have too many.

* * * * *

Some who have access to many missionary magazines and but scanty time in which to read them may like to have the titles of a few selected articles underlined. In the *C.M. Review* the thoughtful paper on "Karma and the Problem of Unmerited Suffering," by the Rev. J. Paul S. R. Gibson, of Trinity College, Kandy, should not be missed. *The Bible in the World*, amidst much else of interest, has a novel article by Sir George Grierson, with musical illustrations, on "Tell-Tale Tones." "Mental and Moral Characteristics of the Sea Dyaks of Borneo," are dealt with at some length in the S.P.G. *Mission Field* by the Rev. Edwin Groves. The B.M.S. *Herald* publishes an address on Mohammedanism, by the Rev. C. E. Wilson, called "The Most Formidable Problem of the Church of Christ," and a paper on "Women's Work in China," by Miss Shekleton. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field* contains a freely illustrated article on the work of the Blind School at Hankow. The L.M.S. *Chronicle* has a striking comparison between the Church in Madagascar in 1863 and to-day, and an account of educational work in two centres in the island in the last fifty years. *China's Millions*, under the title "Among the Tribes of Hunan," prints lengthy extracts from Consul Archibald Rose's recent report on an official visit to the territories occupied by the Yao and Miao tribes.

* * * * *

Those who have long known the central working of the C.M.S. cannot allow the names of the Rev. B. Baring-Gould and

the Rev. G. B. Durrant to pass off the official list of secretaries without a word of sustained gratitude and fervent Godspeed. There are hundreds in the mission field who in long years have grasped the brotherly hand so readily held out to them, and hundreds, both at home and abroad, who owe missionary inspiration and guidance to words from voice and pen. Such links can never be broken. They extend into regions beyond space and time. G.

Notices of Books.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST. By Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 10s. 6d.

A new book on the Person of Christ is always welcome. The problem of His personality is so many-sided that even the dullest and least intelligent writer is apt to stumble on something new and suggestive. So many books have been written, and so many new aspects of the problem have arisen, that sometimes a new book, even when written by the wisest and best, runs the risk of obscuring the issue. Professor Mackintosh is a scholar of the highest repute, he writes in simple and nervous English, he is markedly suggestive in the treatment of his subject, and, best of all, he writes with conspicuous clarity. As he tells us in his preface, he not only attempts to set before us his own opinions, but he tries to provide a competent guide to the best recent discussion both here and in Germany. We do not think he fails.

He makes one further point in the preface: it is a defence of the dogmatic and the metaphysical in the sphere of religion. The business of dogmatic is not to supersede faith, but to "fix in lucid conceptual forms the whole rich truth of which faith is sure." Further, the revelation of God in Christ raises speculative problems. Hence the presence in theology of metaphysic; but it is the metaphysic of faith, never moving beyond the sphere of conscience. Dr. Mackintosh is loyal to his preface as he writes his book. There is much of dogma in it, not a little of metaphysic, but when it is finished we feel it is true to say of it that it makes for the more confirmation of the faith.

The first 280 pages of the book are devoted to a careful study of the Person of Christ as it is set before us by the writers of the New Testament and in all the controversies of the early and the later Church. Little need be said of this summary of the history of doctrine. It is full and sufficient, it is fairly and evenly balanced, it is clear and intelligible. Professor Mackintosh has done afresh what has been often done before, but rarely if ever has it been done so fully and so clearly in so few pages.

In the latter half of the book an attempt is made to reconstruct the doctrine of Christ. Dr. Mackintosh begins by showing that there is a real problem—a problem which is not solved by the definition of Chalcedon.

The doctrine of the two natures of Christ has to face a serious dilemma—the Scylla of a duplex personality, and the Charybdis of an impersonal Manhood. In the view of our author the Fathers tended to lose sight of the Manhood of Jesus. In order, therefore, to arrive at a true view we must go beyond Chalcedon back to the New Testament, where the unity of Person and the true Manhood are clearly realities. The next two chapters are, in consequence of this, devoted to a study of the historic Christ as presented in the New Testament, with special reference to the relationship between His Person and His work. Professor Mackintosh quotes Luther and Athanasius to illustrate the line he takes. Luther: "Christ is not called Christ because He has two natures. What does that signify to me? He bears this glorious and consoling name because of the office and the work He has undertaken." Athanasius "sees Christ's power, through His works, to be incomparable with that of men, and comes to learn that He alone among men is God the Word." The work illumines the Person, suggests this book, but it equally recognizes that the Person explains the work. We cannot drop the problem of the Person of Christ because, at least in practical issue, the nature of His work is clear.

In the chapters that follow we have Christ set before us as the object of saving truth, as the exalted and glorious Lord, as perfect Man, as Very God. These are the immediate certainties of the believing mind, and of none of these has Professor Mackintosh any doubt. Of the last he writes:

"Let men perceive that in Christ there stands before them One who in spiritual reality—that is, in will and character—is identical with God Himself, that in Him we have to do with nothing less than the Eternal, and at once it becomes plain that revelation can go no further. In other words, the dimensions of this revelation form the differential feature of Christianity. . . .

"Herein is love, writes St. John—not that we love God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son. And the message broke the world's hard heart. . . . Thus it is religion, not theology, which has the deepest stake in the divinity of Christ. Let men be persuaded that it after all is a metaphor only, an overwrought symbol, the adoring hyperbole of which must be quietly confessed in the sane mood of reflection, and the high appeal which has long moved them will be impoverished beyond remedy. The glory of God's love will fade into dimmer hues. There will remain problems no word but this can solve, and needs which no lesser gift can satisfy."

Thus writes a scholar who has surveyed the world's thinking, and who has faced the problem unafraid. They are inspiring and hopeful words, and though he has not solved all the problems, he has shown that the humble believer need not be afraid of the best scholarship—nay, that he can welcome it as a helper and a friend.

Next he turns from these facts to the transcendent problems that lie behind them, and in a footnote of exceptional value he saves us from losing our faith in the quagmire of speculation:

"They are real problems, and theology will always try to solve them by reasoned thought, but we are much more sure of our facts than of our theories. While the fact of Christ's oneness with God is certain for faith, interpretations of this oneness will vary to the end. But every form of interpretation presupposes the initial impression of His transcendence."

The modern mind all too easily tends to give up or deny the facts which it cannot fully explain. Theories may have to go in view of facts, but facts can never legitimately be made to yield to theories. This said, Dr. Mackintosh deals in turn with the Christian idea of Incarnation and some of its difficulties, the pre-existence of Christ, His self-limitation or kenosis, His development as an Incarnate Person, His place in the Trinity. Here we are much more in the region of speculation, and all his readers will not agree with the writer. In dealing with the question of the kenosis, Dr. Mackintosh points out that for the completely Christian view of Christ four postulates are necessary: (1) Christ is now Divine; (2) His Divinity, like all Divinity, is eternal; (3) His life on earth was unequivocally human; (4) we cannot predicate of Him two consciousnesses or two wills. In view of these we must suppose a kenosis. We quite agree: we believe that St. Paul said what he meant when he wrote ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν; we believe that Christ's emptying of Himself was willing and loving, in accordance with His will, and the product of His love. But we are not quite sure that we should have stated the third postulate as Professor Mackintosh writes it. Christ's life on earth was human, but it was also Divine, and in the relationship of those two statements lies the problem of the kenosis. Of course, Professor Mackintosh means (3) to be taken in the light of (1) and (2), but it would be as well to say so. With regard to (4), there are two questions still awaiting answer: Is Dr. Sanday's theory of the conscious and subconscious to be entirely ruled out? Is it impossible to conceive of a human will always and voluntarily subjecting itself to a Divine will, without a breach of the idea of personality? In a valuable additional note Professor Mackintosh deals with Dr. Sanday; but although it may be generally agreed there are flaws in Dr. Sanday's argument, is it not possible that some modification of it may some day stand the test of examination?

In an appendix Dr. Mackintosh deals with the question of the Virgin birth. He defends the doctrine, but not on *a priori* grounds nor with all the usual arguments. Indeed, he most wisely points out the dangers of some of them.

It is a good book and a reverent book, and Professor Mackintosh has helped us to a surer grasp of our faith and to a better understanding of its problems. He would be the last to say that he had solved them. Now we see through a mirror, in a riddle, then face to face. But we can see, and see the better for this book. We thank the author, and take courage to go on.

F. S. Guy Warman.

Eternal Life: A Study of its Implications and Applications. By Baron Friedrich von Hügel. *T. and T. Clark.* Price 8s. net.

This book is the outgrown article upon the above subject for Hastings' "Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics." It considers its theme in relation to the main religious and philosophical systems of ancient and modern times; the contributions of Buddhism and other Eastern religions, of Judaism, of the great Greek thinkers, of Christianity, and of post-Christian thinkers like Plotinus, Augustine, and "Dionysius the Areopagite," are passed in review; Thomas Aquinas and Eckhart stand for the Middle Ages, and Spinoza and Kant for the threshold of the modern world; of contemporary thought,

Fichte, Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Schopenhauer, with their followers, are considered. The relations of the evolutionary categories of to-day, of the social unrest, and of institutional religion, as typified by the Roman Communion, to the central idea, are carefully discussed.

It will be seen at once from the above survey that the book is a rich feast to the philosophically-minded, and a severe mental discipline to the unphilosophical. That discipline is not lessened by a certain obscurity of style; in eight lines the two following phrases occur, the "ever occasional yet intense, diffuse yet over-concentrated, one-sided yet magnificently spiritual writings," and "the clear and elegant, over-immanentary yet here sympathetic and mostly very just Professor" (p. 262). But despite difficulty of subject, obscurity of style, and, we may add, careless proof-reading, the book is well worth the pains it demands. The writer is a student of philosophy, but the philosophical interest is always subordinated to the religious; "Philosophy ends, surely, with certain *desiderata* and possibilities, which religion meets, exceeds, traverses, restates; and religion is a circle of experience, possessed of its own character, contents, and conditions which, as man's first and last and deepest experience, will indeed greatly exceed philosophy in richness, but fall short of it in direct clearness and detailed articulation." And the philosophical systems as they are passed in review are judged and criticized, as they succeed or fail in taking into account the data of experience, and especially religious experience. Certain features of the book seem of outstanding merit; the writer's insistence on both the ethical *and* the eschatological sides of our Lord's teaching, as mutually complementary, is needed in the light of the many attempts to interpret Him in the light of only one or other of them; his analysis of the causes of the alienation of modern social movements from organized religion is as subtle as his outlook on the future is hopeful; and his candid but discriminating criticism of the Roman Church from within (for the writer is a devout Roman Catholic) will give many who stand without it a truer conception of the strength and weakness of that great Communion. Altogether, the book is one to read with the closest attention, and one that is worthy of the great theme with which it deals.

M. LINTON SMITH.

ST. PAUL AND HIS COMPANIONS. By Basil Redlich, M.A. London: *Macmillan, Ltd.* Price 5s. net.

This is really a study of St. Paul's life from the point of view of his friendships, and although Mr. Redlich is sometimes a little too imaginative and fanciful, it is a book worth reading. He accepts, and does not argue about, the Pauline authorship of the Epistles and the South Galatian theory. The Acts is a biography of St. Paul. The Acts of Peter, of Stephen, of Philip, are but an introduction to the coming of Saul: "They are an anticipation of Saul." "The importance of Philip's work has been overestimated." Presently Saul comes and serves his apprenticeship. It began on the Damascus road, and lasted until he started on his first missionary journey. The episode between St. Peter and St. Paul took place before he started on that journey, and led to, or at any rate helped, the rupture over St. Mark. Mr. Redlich is quite sure about the reason for St. Mark's going back. He returned (1) because he was unwilling to accept St. Paul as the

new leader; (2) he was opposed to the liberal tendency of St. Paul's theology. St. Mark became a liberal later on, because he added a phrase, "for all the nations," to Isa. lvi. 7 (LXX), "My house shall be called a house of prayer." That addition shows that he made atonement for his early narrowness. Barnabas was "unauthoritatively" deprived of the superior position. "Forgetful of his subordinate position, Saul had publicly rebuked St. Peter just as he now publicly parted from St. Barnabas after a sharp contention." "St. Barnabas deserved more respect than was shown him by St. Paul: mere gratitude demanded it." "The headstrong enthusiasm of Saul overstepped the limits of self-control." All this is interesting and suggestive, but we fail to find the ground for it in the New Testament.

We must not go into detail over the rest. It is crisply written, and it carries us about through the wonderful story of St. Paul's life in a way that will not only attract, but will help. There are abundant appendices, not least valuable among them a dictionary of biography, containing short "Lives" of all St. Paul's companions and all the people whom he mentions. The appendix on the journeys of Timothy and Titus in connection with the various problems of 2 Corinthians deserves approving mention.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Rogers has already written a book on the principles of parish work In the last chapter of it he told us: "It is not merely the standard of efficiency that needs to be raised to the level of other professions; the whole conception of pastoral theology needs to be lifted to a higher plane. To elaborate this idea would require the writing of another book." The other book lies before us. It is the work of a scholar and an acute observer. It is full of suggestiveness, and there is much of helpfulness. But we fail to see how it raises the whole conception of pastoral theology. There is plenty of machinery, plenty of theorizing, plenty of organization. But the book lacks life and force and spiritual power. Mr. Rogers seems to regard a parish pretty much in the same way as a chemist regards his laboratory, and not always with the same eye to the ultimate end. The best pastoral theology is learnt in the parish, and although Mr. Rogers has seen and observed the details of many parishes, we doubt if he has quite caught the spirit with which the parish priest, the curate of souls, faces his responsibility. It is not his fault. The lecturer on pastoral theology is bound to become mechanical and theoretical unless he is living in touch with the work. Books of this kind should be written by the vicars of our biggest and best parishes, and, alas! they have little time in which to write them. Meanwhile we read Mr. Rogers' book, take advantage of his guidance, and only sometimes use the words which he puts upon the lips of one whom he condemns: "I agree with you in theory, but in practice I should do just the opposite." Sometimes, in common honesty we are bound to add, we cannot even agree in theory. But about theories we shall dispute to the end. Practice helps to unite.

FATHER RALPH. By Gerald O'Donovan. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 6s.

This is a story of Irish seminary life. Father Ralph is trained for the Roman priesthood at Bunnahone and at Maynooth. He then begins his

work as a parochial clergyman at the place of his early training, Bunnahone. Finally, his experiences drive him from the Church, and no one will wonder at it, for Father Ralph is in earnest. It is a powerful book, and presents a terrible picture. We can only express the hope that the picture is grossly exaggerated. If it is not, Rome must be in parlous straits, and Ireland will find that Home Rule means a rule infinitely worse than the worst Dublin Castle régime.

MACMILLAN'S SHILLING THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

THE CANDLE OF THE LORD—AND NINE OTHER SERMONS. Bishop Phillips Brooks.
SIXTEEN VILLAGE SERMONS. Dean Church.
DISCIPLINE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. Dean Church.
SERMONS ON THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE. Rev. Professor Hort.
PERSONALITY, HUMAN AND DIVINE. Rev. Dr. Illingworth.
DIVINE IMMANENCE. Rev. Dr. Illingworth.
VILLAGE SERMONS. Charles Kingsley.
GOOD NEWS OF GOD. TWENTY SERMONS. Charles Kingsley.
THE FAITH OF A CHRISTIAN. Rev. Bernard Lucas.
THE FAITH AND MODERN THOUGHT. Rev. William Temple.
THE GOSPEL OF THE RESURRECTION. Bishop Westcott.
"PRO CHRISTO ET ECCLESIA."
SEEKERS AFTER GOD. Archdeacon Farrar.
ETERNAL HOPE. Archdeacon Farrar.
ECCE HOMO. Sir John Seeley.

London. Price 1s. each net.

Macmillans have many times won the gratitude of the reading public, and not least of the reading public with small means. But never have they so thoroughly deserved our thanks as now. Without any sacrifice of paper, print, or binding—indeed, quite to the contrary—they have issued some considerable number of well-known and exceedingly valuable theological works. These volumes are not simply cloth-bound sixpenny editions. The print runs right across the page, and is taken from similar founts to those used for the first editions. This new library is a noteworthy achievement, and well deserves the success it will doubtless secure.

THE MASTER: LIFE AND TEACHINGS. By J. Todd Ferrier. *Lund, Humphries and Co.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

A most imposing-looking book, and within its covers a mad form of mysticism which makes extraordinary assertions and claims. We are told that the life of Christ in the Gospels is a sad misrepresentation, and that the Pauline Epistles are a tissue of mistaken ideas concerning Christ's Person and work. In fact, the New Testament writers have led the world astray from Christ. But the writer proposes to set things right by removing the cloud of ignorance and darkness and revealing the true Christ. He professes to have been enabled to recover the "long-lost vision" by means of a series of "visions, illuminations, and momentous realizations." We have tried to read the collection of phantasies, allegories, inconsistencies, and repetitions with patience. We admire their ingenuity. We do not doubt the writer's

sincerity, but we are bound to say we prefer the sober record of Gospel history as a better-attested and truer representation of the Divine Master.

THE WEAKER VESSEL. By E. F. Benson. London: *Heinemann and Co.* Price 6s.

This is a novel, and normally this magazine is not concerned to notice novels. Not that a good novel is out of place in a theological library, but that there are other and more serious things to do. But this book by much that is in it merits a notice here and a wide circle of readers outside. It is the story of a husband and wife, and the husband, not the wife, is the weaker vessel, and very weak indeed. Eleanor is by no means a perfect woman, but she understands how to forgive and how to help. Mrs. Ramsden is the Martha of the book, and shows how hard and unintelligent a good woman can be. Harry Whittaker is a writer of plays, but he is a drunkard and worse. Eleanor stands by him, helps him, and forgives him to the last, and her love wins its reward. The book puts a new point of view to those who are interested in the various efforts which are being made to solve the marriage problem to-day.

RETREATS FOR THE SOUL. By Sir H. S. Lunn. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 1s. and 2s.

Sir Henry Lunn published a little while ago a valuable little book called "The Love of Jesus." This is a companion volume. The writer has been impressed with the need of going, with others, "into a desert place apart." He is a Methodist, and he has been into retreat at Swanwick. So he writes a book on the subject, borrowing good things whence he can. His book contains a few introductory chapters, then some litanies for retreats composed by himself on the model of our Litany (how our Nonconformist brethren are learning to love our Prayer-Book!), then some selections from Bishop Andrewes' "Preces Privatæ," then a plain guide to meditation from a Mirfield manual; then, in turn, selections from the "De Imitatione," Scupoli's "The Spiritual Combat," and Brother Lawrence's "Practice of the Presence of God." A selection of sacred poetry brings the book to a close. A useful and valuable devotional help. It must be used as an alpenstock, not as a crutch, or it will fail of its purpose.

Received: THE WORD OF GOD, AND THE USE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR; OR, HATH GOD DECEIVED THE NATIONS? By John Abbey. London: *R. J. James.* Price 1s. net. An argument in proof of the contention that the wine of the Gospels was not intoxicating. THE DIVINE AUTHORITY AND PERPETUAL OBLIGATION OF THE LORD'S DAY. By Daniel Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta. London: *Chas. J. Thynne.* Price 1s. net. The third edition of a series of sermons opportunely issued at this time. SIMPLE LESSONS ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD. By the Rev. H. A. Lester, M.A., and Eveline Jennings. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net. A set of Sunday-school lessons for children between eight and ten years of age. SUNDAY-SCHOOLS AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Sermons and addresses by Bishops and others. Edited by Rev. H. A. Lester. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net. MY CLIMBS IN THE ALPS AND CAUCASUS. By A. F. Mummery. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 1s. net. REULLERA. By Rev. Dr. Isaac Gregory Smith. London: *Mr. Elkin Mathews.* Price 1s. net. HARVEST THOUGHTS FOR PREACHERS AND PEOPLE. By Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d. THE GREAT MESSAGE. 114th Annual Report R.T.S. London: 62, St. Paul's Churchyard. A LONG LIFE'S JOURNEY, with Some I Met by the Way. By Rev. Canon Owen W. Davy, M.A. London: *Simpkin, Marshall and Co., Ltd.* THE ROMANCE OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY. By Charles R. Gibson, F.R.S.E. London: *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price 5s. An excellent gift-book for a boy; as interesting as any story-book.