

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine and Review

CONDUCTED BY  
CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XXVIII.

(NEW SERIES. VOL. IX.)

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PUBLISHER,  
ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1914

# INDEX TO VOLUME XXVIII.

## SUBJECTS

	PAGE	PAGE	
ABRAHAM, A Short Study of the Character of, by Miss M. C. Malim	695	Giacomo Leopardi, by Miss Mary Bradford Whiting	210
Action of the Holy Spirit on the World, The, by the Rev. A. C. Downer, M.A., D.D.	929	God, The Mysteries of, by the Rev. W. A. Bathurst, M.A.	651
All Saints, 1914, by the Rev. E. A. Burroughs, M.A.	891	Gore's, Bishop, Open Letter, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.	487
Altered Decision, The, by the Rev. J. E. Gibberd	63	Hackett, John, by the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M.A.	429
Apocalypse, The, by the Rev. B. Herklots, M.A.	458	Holy Spirit, The, by the Rev. A. W. Greenup, Litt.D., D.D.	677
Apocrypha, The Doctrinal Teaching of the, by the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D.	841	Image of Gold and the Feet of Clay, The, by H. A. Dallas	115
Authority of Scripture in the Church, The, by Professor Beresford Pite, F.R.I.B.A.	728	Irish Romanism, Some Impressions of, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, M.A.	529
Berkeley, by the Rev. E. G. Pace, M.A., B.D.	53	Is the Existence of Pain reconcilable with a Divine Governor of the Universe? by the Rev. Francis St. John Thackeray, M.A., F.S.A.	353
Bishop Berkeley and the Bermudas, by the Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.D.	899	Jewish Family Customs, by Israel Cohen, B.A.	188
Books, Notices of, 76, 155, 230, 316, 390, 474, 551, 630, 710, 794, 868,	952	John Donne and Rennon, by Miss E. M. Spearing, M.A.	202
Brooke Foss Westcott, by Miss B. K. Rattey, S.Th.	361	Keswick and Foreign Missions, by the Rt. Rev. Handley C. G. Moule, D.D.	569
Caroline Divine and Catholicity, A, by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A.	345	"Life"—in the First Epistle of St. John, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D.	331
China, The Situation in, by the Ven. A. E. Moule, D.D.	439, 522	Missionary World, The, 71, 150, 221, 310, 384, 469, 544, 624, 704, 789, 858,	946
Church and the Poor, The, by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc.	28, 98, 175	Missions: Parochial and General, by the Rt. Rev. J. Denton Thompson, D.D.	509, 575, 663
Church of England and Episcopacy, The, A Reply to Canon A. J. Mason, by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, M.A.	823	Modern Christological Problems, by the Rev. F. R. M. Hitchcock, D.D.	88
Church Reform in Spain and Portugal, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A.	373	Monks and People at the Opening of the Sixteenth Century, by Albert Mitchell	940
Correspondence	620, 702, 864	Month, The 1, 81, 161, 241, 321, 401, 482, 561, 641, 721, 801,	881
Discussions	227	New Testament and Recent Research, Some Leading Ideas of the, by the Rev. M. Linton Smith, M.A., D.D.	168
East End and the East, The, by the Rev. C. H. Maxwell, M.A.	586	Old Book on Old Age, An, by the Rev. H. F. B. Compston, M.A.	538
Evangelical Churchmanship, What is? by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.	295	On Guard, by the Rev. Charles Courtenay, M.A.	125
Fallacy of the Seven Gifts, The, by the Rev. S. C. Lowry, M.A.	911	Oxford Nearly Fifty Years Ago, by an M.A. of Oxford	738
Famous Quotations from the Psalms, by J. Ewing	279	Paul, St., as a Man of Science, by the Rev. F. W. Orde Ward	285
First Struggle for Catholicity, The, by the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, M.A.	10	Planter's Padre, Impressions of a, by the Rev. W. A. Purton, B.A.	835
For 1914, by the Rev. A. J. Santer	70	Preparation of the Gentiles, The, by the Rev. M. Linton Smith, D.D.	851
Forty Years and Not Yet, by Charles Bailey	145	Psalms, Famous Quotations from the, by J. Ewing	279
"Fulfilled Among Us," by Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton	583	Publications of the Month 398, 478, 557, 638, 718, 800, 879,	954
Genesis, The First Chapter of, by E. Walter Maunder, F.R.A.S.	408	Rationalism, by the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A.	769
Genius of Jane Austen, The, by George Lowe	137	Record of the Several Religious Parties relative to Art, The, by the Rev. J. Warren, B.D.	811
German Christianity (?) and the Great War, by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc.	811		

	PAGE		PAGE
Resurrection Body of Our Lord, The, by the Rev. T. A. Gurney, M.A., LL.B.	266	Studies in Texts, by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A., 149, 220, 264, 389, 456, 520, 573, 700, 787, 866,	909
Reunion at Home and Abroad, by the Ven. A. E. Moule, D.D.	682	Sunday-School, The Future of the, by Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson, B.A.	607
Sacerdotal Idea, The, by the Rev. E. C. Derrick, M.A.	251	Sunday-School Organization, by Miss E. M. Highfield, S.Th.	44
St. Paul as a Man of Science, by the Rev. F. W. Orde Ward	285	Sunday-School Reform, by the Rev. Canon Morley Stevenson, M.A.	448
St. Peter, the Apostle of Hope, by the Rev. J. J. Caleb, B.A.	923	Textual Criticism of the Pentateuch, by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B.	744
Sanday's, Dr., Position, and Some of its Effects on the Anglican Communion, by the Rev. H. J. R. Marston, M.A.	501	Verification of the Spirit, The, by the Rev. Canon F. B. Macnutt, M.A.	597
Self-Knowledge, by the Rev. Walter R. Whately, M.A.	753	Verse: For the Table, by Albert Mitchell	782
Sermon of the Month	63	Voices from the Past: John Hackett, by the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild	429
Smith, Sydney; his Life and Humour, by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, M.A.	612	Voltaireanism, by the Rev. I. Gregory Smith, M.A., Hon. LL.D. (Edin.)	671
Some Leading Ideas of the New Testament and Recent Research, by the Rev. M. Linton Smith, M.A., D.D.	168	Westcott, Brook Fosse, by Miss B. K. Ratley, S.Th.	361
Spiritual Aspect of the Great War, The, by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, D.D.	783	What is Evangelical Churchmanship? by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.	295
		Who are the Poor? by the Rev. A. Smythe Palmer, D.D.	764

## AUTHORS

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Bailey, Charles	145	Highfield, Miss E. M., S.Th.	44	Purton, Rev. W. A., B.A.	835
Bathurst, Rev. W. A., M.A.	651	Hitchcock, Rev. F. R. M., D.D.	88	Ratley, Miss B. K., S.Th.	361
Blunt, Rev. A. W. F., M.A.	10	Hooton, Rev. W. S., B.D.	899	Santer, Rev. A. J.	70
Boughton, Rev. C. H. K., M.A.	529	Lees, Rev. Harrington C., M.A. - 149, 220, 264, 389, 456, 520, 573, 700, 787, 866,	909	Smith, Rev. I. Gregory, M.A., Hon. LL.D.	671
Barroughs, Rev. E. A.	891	Lowe, George	137	Smith, Rev. M. Linton, M.A., D.D.	168, 851
Caleb, Rev. J. J., B.A.	923	Lowry, Rev. S. C., M.A.	911	Sodor and Man, Bishop of	509, 575, 663
Carter, Rev. C. Sydney, M.A.	345	M.A. of Oxford	738	Spearing, Miss E. M., M.A.	202
Carus - Wilson, Mrs. Ashley, B.A.	607	Macnutt, Rev. Canon F. B., M.A.	597	Stevenson, Rev. Canon Morley, M.A.	448
Chadwick, Rev. W. E., D.D. 28, 98, 175, 783,	811	Malim, Miss M. C.	695	Streatfeild, Rev. G. S., M.A.	429
Cohen, Israel, B.A.	188	Marston, Rev. H. J., M.A.	501	Thackeray, Rev. Francis St. John, M.A.	353
Compston, Rev. H. F. B., M.A.	538	Maunder. E. Walter, F.R.A.S.	408	Thomas, Rev. W. H. Griffith, D.D.	295, 487
Courtenay, Rev. Chas., M.A.	125	Maxwell, Rev. C. H., M.A.	586	Thompson, Rt. Rev. J. Denton, D.D.	509, 575, 663
Dallas, H. A.	115	Mitchell, Albert	782, 940	Turton, Lt.-Col. W. H.	583
Dewick, Rev. E. C., M.A.	251	Moule, Rt. Rev. Handley, C.G., D.D.	569	Ward, Rev. F. W. Orde	285
Downer, Rev. A. C., M.A., D.D.	929	Moule, Ven. A. E., D.D. 439, 522,	682	Warren, Rev. J., B.D.	419
Drawbridge, Rev. C. L., M.A.	769	Oesterley, Rev. W. O. E., D.D.	841	Whately, Rev. Walter R., M.A.	753
Durham, Bishop of	569	Pace, Rev. E. G., M.A., B.D.	53	Whiting, Miss Mary Bradford	210
Ewing, J.	279	Palmer, Rev. A. Smythe, D.D.	764	Wiener, Harold M., M.A., LL.B.	744
Gibberd, Rev. J. E.	63	Pite, Beresford, F.R.I.B.A.	728	Wilson, Rev. H. A., M.A.	612, 823
Gilbert, Rev. T. W., B.D.	331	Pulvertaft, Rev. T. J., M.A.	373		
Greenup, Rev. A. W., D.D.	677				
Gurney, Rev. T. A., M.A., LL.B.	266				
Herklots, Rev. B., M.A.	458				

# THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1914.

## The Month.

**A Message  
for 1914.**

THE Editors of the CHURCHMAN wish to extend to all their readers the heartiest good wishes for the year 1914. They hope and pray that the year may be an auspicious one for the promotion of those great objects in ecclesiastical, academic, and social life, in the furtherance of which the CHURCHMAN attempts to take its part. It is sometimes customary for friends to send to friends a message in the hope that it may be a beacon-light to illumine the unknown waterways on which the barks of their respective lives will journey during the oncoming year. If we may be permitted to undertake this office for those friends—whether known or unknown to us personally—who form the circle of our readers, we would venture to suggest as a helpful, and in these days a very necessary, thought: “The joy of the Lord is your strength.” It is a message from Old Testament Scripture, but in the New Testament it is repeated and reaffirmed with deepening emphasis. It was with the prospect of cruel adversity lying before them that the Master bid His disciples “Rejoice and be exceeding glad.” It is St. Paul, who endured so much for Christ’s sake, who says: “Rejoice in the Lord always: again I will say, Rejoice.” It is St. Peter who repeats the Master’s word, perhaps as remembering it from His own lips, when he says: “On Whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable.”

We ask our friends to dwell on this thought, because we believe that in these days it tends to be forgotten, and because we believe that our Christian life is thereby impoverished. We are all so busy, so grave, so occupied with problems, and so grimly intent on the solution of them, that we are inclined to lose the element of joy from life entirely. And yet joy is not an accident of the Christian life; it is, or should be, an essential element in it. The joy of Christ was one of the most characteristic features in His perfect and most lovely life. He rejoiced in God, He rejoiced in human friendship, He rejoiced in little children, He rejoiced in the glory and the beauty of the world around Him. It was not the joy of the light-hearted, superficial *dilettante*. He had indeed a cup to drink and a baptism to be baptized with. And yet He could rejoice. And if we would live His life, we must in this respect, too, make it our aim to enter into His spirit. It is sometimes said that good people are dull and uninteresting. So far as the charge has any truth, it is probably because of the negative character that has come to be stamped on their lives. They are perpetually saying "No" to something or other. We need more to-day of the Master's power of seeing things at their best. We need more of St. Paul's magnificent eclecticism: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

We have spoken of the element of negation that often enters into many worthy and pious lives. In this respect we would venture to address a "word of exhortation" to our fellow-members of the Evangelical school of thought. We are told from time to time by candid friends that we have so much been content to "be good, and let who will be clever," we have so much emphasized personal piety at the expense of mental culture, that we need not be taken into

Knowledge  
and Courage.

serious account in some of the issues of theological and ecclesiastical controversy. In this sphere of life, too, we have been content to say "No" in certain directions, and have had no positive message to give. Now, the trend of events in the Church of England is making it abundantly clear that we shall have to examine thoroughly our first principles as Evangelicals, and then either maintain them or abandon them. We must know *what* we believe and *why* we believe it, and then we must take our stand—we must stand fast in "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." If a crisis should come, we must not be blind to its significance, and so let our birthright go by default. Lord Haldane, in his recent address to the students at Edinburgh on "The Conduct of Life," speaking of certain mistakes and failures of which he was conscious in his own past life, said :

"The mistakes and failures would nearly always have been avoided, had I at the time been possessed of more real knowledge and of firmer decision and persistence. We all, or nearly all, get a fair number of chances in life. But we often do not know enough to be able to take them, and we still more often pass them by, unconscious that they exist. Get knowledge and get courage. And when you have come to a deliberate decision, then go ahead, and go ahead with grim and unshakable resolution to persist."

One of the problems which 1914 will present to us for solution is that of the Divinity Degrees in the Universities. Cambridge has now thrown her Divinity Degrees open to others than members of the Church of England. It is confidently expected that Oxford will do the same at no distant date, and many are hoping that Durham will follow the lead of the two older Universities. But when the opening of the Degrees is an accomplished fact, there will still remain further difficulties ahead. Is theology to be treated exactly as any other subject, so that the intellectual ability of the candidate to satisfy the examination tests is to be the sole condition of obtaining the Degrees? Or is anything in the nature of a profession of faith to be required? Is there to be any guarantee that the Bachelor of Divinity and the Doctor of

Divinity  
Degrees.

Divinity are professing Christians? Some people hold, and publicly declare, that once the limitation of the Degrees of the Church of England is removed, there is no alternative but to treat theology purely as a subject of examination, apart from any confession of faith whatever. This means, in effect, that Christianity must either be construed in terms of Anglican belief and practice, or it cannot be construed in any effective way at all. To put the alternative in this way, we hold, for our own part, to be one of the most appalling and monstrous propositions that even theological controversy has produced.

**Suggested Causes of Action.** Some are inclined to find a way out of the difficulty by requiring, in the case of Divinity candidates, a profession of Christian belief. They feel that in a distinct way Divinity Degrees do stand in a category separate from that of all other Degrees, and that they should be taken to signify, not only intellectual capacity, but personal conviction. Others are inclined to seek the solution along a different line. They maintain, on the one hand, that so far as the Universities are concerned which examine the candidates and confer the Degrees, the matter should be purely one of intellectual capacity, and that the test should be purely one of intellectual knowledge. But they hold, on the other hand, that the element of personal conviction should be present in the candidate, and that this should be secured by the presence of denominational colleges in connection with the Universities, the students of which colleges will naturally be assumed to be professing Christians. We do not quite see from this point of view what would become of a graduate of one of the ordinary colleges at one of the older Universities. He may be a professing Christian, but he does not belong to a distinctively theological institution. Others look for the solution in the founding of different theological faculties in each University—a Roman, an Anglican, and a Free Church Faculty. We trust ourselves that the holding of Divinity Degrees will not come to be totally dissociated from a profession of Christianity.

Bishop Weston has addressed an open letter, **Bishop of Zanzibar,** couched in terms always indignant, and sometimes scarcely respectful, to his much older and far more experienced brother Bishop, Dr. Jacob of St. Albans. The letter contains the elaboration of his charges against Bishop Jacob and a disquisition on Kikuyu. The first charge deals with the book called "Foundations," and complains that Mr. Streeter, who wrote the essay most open to objection in the book, was allowed *quietly* to cease to be the Bishop of St. Albans' Examining Chaplain. The essence of the charge lies in the word "quietly." The Bishop ought to have published Mr. Streeter's resignation on the house-tops. Now, we hold no brief for Mr. Streeter, or, indeed, for "Foundations." There is very much in the book from which we very seriously dissent, but we feel that fairness of treatment is due even to "Foundations," and upon examination of some of the charges which Bishop Weston brings against it we cannot but notice marked unfairness. The Bishop writes: "The book permits priests to believe and to teach, among other things equally heretical—we only quote specimens of his charges—

"(c) That Christ did not come into the world to die for us; but having come, He died because of the circumstances of the case.

"(e) That He did not found a Church, nor ordain Sacraments.

"(g) That there is no authority in the Church beyond the corporate witness of the Saints, many of whom are now unknown, to the spiritual and moral value of the Christian religion."

Then, a little later on, he adds by way of comment :

"If Episcopacy, Sacraments, the Bible, and the Lord Christ Himself, are on the list of open questions, what is there left in the Deposit that we are here to hand on to Africans."

The Bishop of Zanzibar either misunderstands "Foundations" or he misrepresents it. We are loath to believe the latter, but the well-known scholarly attainments of the Bishop make the former difficult of acceptance. Possibly in the strenuous work of his missionary life his reading of "Foundations" was somewhat hurried. Surely the best way to meet the dangerous tendencies of the book is not to exaggerate its teaching, but

calmly and dispassionately to face its argument. Heresy-hunting is never a pleasant undertaking, but it becomes unpleasant indeed when the heretical tendencies are magnified.

The second charge is based on the Bishop of St. Albans' action in the matter of the "Catholic League" action, which we frankly confess won our intense gratitude. Here Bishop Weston complains of Bishop Jacob that "You publicly inhibited from ministering in your diocese a priest who had invoked our Lady, and the other Saints, in one of your churches, that you had delated him to his own Diocesan as an offender against Church Law and Catholic Truth, and had announced your refusal both of ordination and of jurisdiction to any who practice these Invocations." We have dealt so recently with the practice of Invocation in these pages that there is no need to do more now than quote one or two passages from the Bishop of Zanzibar's letter to show how far he has travelled :

"I can quite understand that some have never used this practice and some mistrust it. Our past history accounts for all this. I recognize that the *Ecclesia Anglicana* has excluded Invocation from her Divine office. But what I cannot understand is that any Bishop should oppose all and every use of it, much less seek to bring about its official condemnation. And when I add that the Bishops who are abroad have had no official intimation that our Deposit of Faith and Practice is to be reduced for us, you will understand how anxious I am, how worried, and how unhappy."

And again :

"And yet, my lord, you would, behind our backs, seek the complete condemnation of a practice so catholic, so beautiful, and so profoundly useful!"

The Bishop adds a note of exclamation at the end of the latter quotation. We are inclined to add several from rather another point of view.

The third section of the Bishop's letter is devoted **Kikuyu.** to the Conference of Protestant Missions at Kikuyu, British East Africa, held in June of last year. That Conference was a definite, though tentative, effort at a comity of Missions, so framed and arranged as best to make for closer unity in the

distant days to come. We have compared Bishop Weston's account of it with the very clear and straightforward report contained in Bishop Willis's letter to the *Record* on December 5, 1913. The two accounts do not tally. Bishop Willis was present. Bishop Weston, unfortunately, was not. We found the prejudiced eye in Bishop Weston's account of "Foundations"; maybe it exists here. However, the accounts are sufficiently in accord to enable us to understand Bishop Weston's plea. He holds a view of Episcopacy which Mr. Rawlinson—a Fellow of Keble College—finds himself compelled to repudiate in "Foundations," a view which quite obviously our Reformers did not hold. On the strength of this view he charges the Bishop of Mombasa and Uganda with heresy. He asserts that they are "seriously wrong in remaining in an Episcopal Ministry." Now, the comity of Missions tentatively arranged at Kikuyu is a large and complex matter, and we do not want to commit ourselves to all its details as yet. We gladly endorse its spirit and its general idea, and are prepared so far to stand by it. But to those who are impressed by Bishop Weston's letter we would venture to say that the Bishop appears to forget that the Bishop of Mombasa and Uganda are Bishops of the same Church as Bishop Cranmer and Bishop Cosin, a Church which is both Catholic and Protestant in the best sense of both words. Later on in his letter the Bishop writes: "If she (*Ecclesia Anglicana*) have need of us to catholicize the heathen world for Christ, I am at her service now as always. But if to protestantize the world, and modernize the Faith, by the works she officially undertakes, I, for my part, have no longer place or lot within her borders." We do not recognize the distinction. Bishop Weston's business is to win the heathen for Christ, and to build them up in the most holy Faith—a Faith alike Catholic in its condemnation of error and Protestant in its affirmations of truth. We cannot keep silence in this matter. Bishop Weston's party have no monopoly in the Deposit of the Faith. It is ours as much as his; we intend to retain it and hand it on, and to do so within the borders of the Church of England.

The  
 Communion  
 Service.

At the close of the Conference the two Bishops administered Holy Communion in the Scotch Church at Kikuyu, there being no English Church available, and admitted to Communion as many of the delegates as cared to present themselves. This was an act of occasional conformity, exhibiting much large-heartedness on the part of our Presbyterian brethren and others, who have principles as well as we. Bishop Cosin was a party to a similar act when he fraternized with the Huguenots in France in the seventeenth century. The circumstances of Kikuyu were exceptional, and although the Communion Service was doubtless extraordinary, it was a case in which two Bishops of the Church of England were enabled to welcome as guests, not as members, some of our brethren in the Church of Christ who are engaged in doing the chief business of the Church. We believe that moderate Churchmen generally, and without any reservations, ourselves amongst the number, will not only refuse to condemn the action of the two Bishops, but will cordially approve it. Here are the comments of the Bishop of Zanzibar: "If our position is so chaotic that a Bishop, consecrated for the very purpose of ordaining priests, may publicly communicate with a Church without Episcopacy, the whole purpose of our life and work is gone." We simply call attention to the last words, and quote again: "On the day that a Bishop can communicate with a Protestant minister deliberately and of set purpose, one of them is, it seems to me, bound in conscience to surrender the outward form which means so little to him, and yet so powerfully hinders the work of reunion." This quotation reminds us somewhat of the threat which the present Bishop of Oxford uttered at the Cambridge Church Congress, although it goes a step farther in its narrowness, and a great step, than the Bishop of Oxford did.

Threats.

A custom is growing up in our modern controversy of using threats. Just a few of us who take serious objection to the reintroduction of the Mass vest-

ments threatened to leave the Church of England if they were legalized. The great majority of us felt at the time that the threat was unwise and unhelpful, and, indeed, it came from no responsible quarter. We ventured to deprecate the threat then, and we deprecate it just as strongly in the present case. The satisfactory solution of difficulties does not lie that way. Sometimes the comprehensiveness of the Church of England is strained to the uttermost. It seems as if such a period of strain has come upon us now. No man of principle, no school of thought with principles, can afford to listen to threats. It is a species of blackmail, from whichever side it comes. We do not intend to leave the Church of England, nor do we wish any others to leave it. We believe that the Bishop of Zanzibar, like the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa, is a man of the highest principle. Principles may be mistaken, and friendly controversy, conducted in a Christian spirit, will in the long run reveal the mistakes. But it is unbrotherly to threaten; it is also useless.

Since the foregoing paragraphs were written, **The C.M.S. and Kikuyu.** the General Committee of the C.M.S. have passed a resolution upon the subject, which we think of sufficient importance to be quoted, and with which we are in cordial agreement :

“The Committee understand that at the United Missionary Conference held at Kikuyu in June last there was no intention to take any steps involving alteration of the present ecclesiastical status of the Missions and nascent Churches in the field, but only such steps as the Missions concerned might rightly take with any necessary sanction upon the part of the Church authorities.

“Recognizing that there are certain issues involved which primarily concern the Church authorities, and which are not, at least at present, matters for consideration by this Committee, and without necessarily assenting to the details and the wording of the proposed scheme, the Committee wholeheartedly sympathize with the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda and their brethren in their desire for fuller co-operation and advance along the path-way towards such reunion as may eventually be according to God’s purpose.”



## The First Struggle for Catholicity.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. A. W. F. BLUNT, M.A.

*Vicar of Carrington, sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Exeter College, Oxford.*

THE Church of Christ is Catholic in at least two senses. In the first place, it declares that in Jesus Christ is to be found the absolute fulness of truth, in so far as man is capable to receive the revelation of God. No further theophany is necessary, for nothing further can be revealed to human comprehension. There may be, there must be, truths as to God's Being and Nature, as they are in themselves, which we do not know and never shall know under human conditions. But all that can be known by man with regard to God lies in the manifestation of the Incarnate Word of God ; and all truth that man can ever learn must be capable of being subsumed under that revelation. In the second place, the Church is Catholic in its purpose ; it is for all mankind. It has in charge the absolute fulness of God's grace, in so far as man is able to use it. No further outpouring is necessary, for nothing further can be given to human need. The complete perfection of God's love is beyond our powers of appreciation. But all that we can realize of that love has been shown to us by Jesus Christ, and is conveyed to us in experience by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

That is the Church's claim. The verification of that claim can only be made in history. The truth of the Church's message, the grace of the Church's mysteries, are proved to be really Catholic, only if they are found experimentally to be capable of answering all the various requirements of the various natures of men. The Church shows its Catholicity by being able to satisfy all that man asks, to assimilate and complete all the

<sup>1</sup> Based on a course of four lectures to the Nottingham Branch of the Church Reading Society.

aspects of truth that man anywhere sees, to assimilate and perfect all the qualities of character that man anywhere displays. Each individual, therefore, in his measure, and each nation in its measure, as they pass into the fold of Christianity, brings a new verification of that Catholicity. Each in turn brings the contribution of his or its own individuality to the building up of the Body of Christ ; and the Church still justifies its claim to be Catholic by its capacity to receive and use and consecrate these contributions. Each extension of the Church is a stage in the process by which the Church's Catholicity is developed. For every nation and every type of human mind has to be accommodated in a Church that is, in ideal and in design, the Body of the Perfect Man.

The first stage in this process is narrated for us in The New Testament. The Church began as a Jewish sect. The problem was whether, when the chance occurred, it would take it or not, whether it would be able to find room for the aspirations of the great Græco-Roman world outside the circle of Jewish nationalism, and yet at the same time to perpetuate the best elements which Judaism itself could bring to it. We already know the answer ; and only a summary recapitulation is needed of the struggle by which Christianity managed to slough off the nationalistic Judaism out of which it arose. That struggle had four stages, not clearly separated from one another, but still roughly distinguishable. In the first stage the Christian Church is, as has been said, a sect of Judaism. The Christians still observe the Mosaic law and frequent the Temple ;<sup>1</sup> they still cherish as a central belief the Messianic hope of the nation,<sup>2</sup> with this only difference, that they claim to know the coming Messiah's name. They do not attempt to be schismatic. They are tolerated, and even to some extent favoured, by the Pharisaic party<sup>3</sup> and the people in general,<sup>4</sup> a favour only increased<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 12.

<sup>2</sup> In Acts xxiii. 6 St. Paul makes the perfectly honest and legitimate point that he is called in question "touching the hope." Cf. also Acts xxviii. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Acts v. 34, xxiii. 9, vi. 7, xv. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Acts ii. 47, v. 13, and the number of conversions is further evidence.

by the occasional attacks which the unpopular Sadducees make upon them.<sup>1</sup>

In the second stage, the Church is still Jewish at the centre, but it allows its circumference to be extended by the admission of Gentile adherents. This development, prepared by the work of St. Stephen, Philip the Deacon, St. Peter, and the unknown Hellenists who preached at Antioch (Acts xi. 20), was brought into unavoidable prominence by the work of St. Paul; and the decree of Acts xv. marks the point at which the duality within the Church receives official recognition. By that decree the Gentile Christians were altogether absolved from the necessity of submitting to circumcision and of obeying the whole law of Moses.<sup>2</sup> But no exemption from this law was granted to Jewish Christians.<sup>3</sup> The issue between Faith and the Law was not settled. It might still be maintained that circumcised was a superior form to uncircumcised Christianity; and no rules were laid down as to the social relations between Jews and Gentiles in the Christian Church.

This stage could obviously only be temporary.<sup>4</sup> Compromises of all sorts would have to be made. Probably a Jewish Christian anywhere would for a time continue to attend the Jewish synagogue. So, too, the Gentiles are exhorted by St. Paul not to offend the consciences of their weaker brethren. It is even possible that for a time Jewish and Gentile Christians

<sup>1</sup> Acts iv. 1, v. 17.

<sup>2</sup> For a luminous discussion of the terms and text of the decree *cf.* Professor Kirsopp Lake's "Earlier Epistles of St. Paul," chap. ii. and Appendix. My general indebtedness to this masterly book must be apparent to all who have read it.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xv. 19; and in xv. 21 it is obviously anticipated that Judaism was to be recognized as a religion which might proselytize and yet continue in a friendly relation to Christianity.

<sup>4</sup> We cannot say how far the Christian leaders expected it to last. Obviously their aim was to hold the two parties together, and to keep the peace between them. Partly, perhaps, they trusted to time, and hoped the question would settle itself in practice without the need for downright legislation; this, indeed, is what happened. Partly, however, they did not even yet, with the exception of St. Paul, grasp the essential principle at stake. And St. Paul was probably glad to accept any compromise which would allow him to go on with his work. Neither he nor the other Apostles wished for a schism. And if he could continue his mission, the chances were that time would be on his side.

might be to some extent organized separately, in places where there were enough of both to make a coherent body for each.<sup>1</sup> But as time went on, if there was to be any Church life at all, one side would have to accommodate itself to the other. And, since the decree of Acts xv. had categorically stated that Gentile Christians need not be circumcised, it was obvious that any accommodation must come from the Jewish side. Therein, indeed, lay the real importance of that decree. It did not settle the principle, but it permitted the practice which in process of time would settle the principle for itself by sheer usage. At Jerusalem, indeed, the Church became, under St. James's leadership, increasingly Jewish.<sup>2</sup> Even after the Roman attack on Palestine had driven the Christians to Pella and elsewhere, they apparently still adhered to their Jewish practices.<sup>3</sup> But the suppression of the rebellion of Bar-Cochab in A.D. 132 was followed by the foundation of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem, and by the issue of Hadrian's edict forbidding all Jews to enter the new city upon pain of death, but making an exception in favour of those who declared their severance from Judaism by renouncing its distinctive observances. So far as we can discover, the majority of the Christians in Palestine accepted the favour, and the Church of Aelia came into existence as a Gentile community with a Gentile, named Marcus, as its Bishop. On the other hand, those Christians who refused to abjure the Mosaic Law remained in Pella and other places, isolated from connection with the Catholic Church, and probably infuriated with the Christians of Aelia, who would seem to them a church of renegades. In consequence, by isolation and reaction, they soon drifted into heresy and eventually faded into obscurity. But, while such was the course of events in Palestine, or at least in Judæa, in the Dispersion there was a gradual

<sup>1</sup> This is undoubtedly the case at Antioch (Gal. ii. 12 *et seq.*), where it is clear that Gentile and Jewish Christians ate at separate tables, possibly in separate buildings. And *cf.* K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. iii., for the arguments that 2 Thessalonians is addressed to the Jewish section of the Church at Thessalonica, as if it had a distinct existence apart from the Gentile section.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xxi. 20. For St. James *cf.* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Hegesippus is our authority for this fact.

*rapprochement* of Jewish and Gentile Christians (and we must note that one of the most significant features of this stage is the gradual ousting of Jerusalem, for all purposes of practical influence, from its premier position in Christendom, in favour of Gentile Churches like Antioch, and, later, Ephesus and Rome). This *rapprochement* was due partly to the force of circumstances (*e.g.*, the growing preponderance of the Gentile element in the Churches), to the pressure of the Gentile environment, and to the practical necessities of Church life in the cities of the Dispersion. But, of course, it was immensely stimulated by the tradition of St. Paul's teaching.<sup>1</sup> And, when he vanishes from the scene, his work, so far as the Dispersion is concerned, is done. His later years seem to have been comparatively immune from any violent antagonisms on the part of Judaizing teachers among the Gentile Christians.<sup>2</sup> And we find in none of the other New Testament literature any trace of real opposition to his main tenets.<sup>3</sup> The Christian Churches of the Dispersion are by now

<sup>1</sup> Or rather, St. Paul's fuller teaching, as found, *e.g.*, in Gal. iv. 21 *et seq.* For it is clear that he was at times disposed to qualify such an uncompromising rejection of Mosaism (*cf.* the brilliant discussion of this point in Harnack's "Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels," chap. ii. A). His position was ambiguous; but its ambiguity was possible only then, because the traditions of the Jewish Dispersion, in which Jews had for centuries associated with Gentiles, and found means of evading the Jewish Law to do so, were still living. The time came soon, when national feeling was so inflamed by national misfortune that Judaism once more shut itself up in its shell of exclusiveness, and the Jew became an irreconcilable alien in all lands. And St. Paul's position was exactly what was needed to safeguard the good elements of Judaism until they had mixed so thoroughly with the Gentile elements that their superficial connection with Jewish observance could safely be dropped—*i.e.*, until the spirit of Judaism had so soaked into Christianity that the letter of Judaism was no longer needed.

<sup>2</sup> Philippians and Colossians show mere echoes of the struggle. In the Pastorals (if they are by St. Paul), it is not Judaistic doctrine but mere Jewish trifling that is denounced.

<sup>3</sup> The First Epistle of St. Peter shows no sign of distinction between Jew and Gentile, and its dogmatic teaching is similar to St. Paul's. The Epistle of St. James (even if it is not from a much earlier date) is much more a polemic against the antinomianism which might falsely be deduced from Paulinism than a polemic against St. Paul himself. Jude and 2 Peter are free from any hint of the necessity of circumcision, or of the view that the observance of Mosaic Law is a superior method of life. Hebrews is steeped in Pauline feeling, and hints not obscurely that Judaism is to be renounced (viii. 13, xiii. 13). The Apocalypse may possibly be taken to exhibit a covert depreciation of St. Paul in its exaltation of the Twelve Apostles, and

overwhelmingly Gentile. An occasional Christian may remain a Jew, but the tendency to an absolute renunciation of Judaism and the Gentilizing of the Christian Church has triumphed.

In the third stage, therefore, we may say that the Church as a whole becomes predominantly Gentile, without, however, violently ridding itself of its few Jewish adherents. In the fourth stage, Judaistic Christianity comes to an end within the Church, and outside it subsides into heresies, mainly local and of small influence. Ignatius<sup>1</sup> roundly asserts that to use the Name of Jesus Christ and yet observe Jewish customs is absurd, or virtually a confession that we have not received grace. And Justin Martyr<sup>2</sup> tells us that in his time there were some Christian Jews whose Christianity was orthodox, and who did not proselytize among Gentile Christians; these he was personally prepared to admit to be Christians, though he says that many Christians would have nothing to do with them; but he also notices the existence of Christian Jews who deny the Virgin Birth of Christ. In fact, Judaistic Christianity had now become severed from the Catholic Church, and Ebionites and Elxaites were acknowledged heretics. None of the Ebionite communities was received into the Oriental patriarchates. The Church has by now emerged as a Catholic body, where Judaism and Gentilism are alike merged in the system of Catholic Christianity.

Such in broad outline was the course of the struggle between Jew and Gentile in the Christian Church. We must now attempt to appreciate the underlying spirit of the whole controversy, and the nature and value of the Jewish elements which were incorporated into the Church system that arose out of the struggle. And, in thus trying to estimate the debt of Christianity

---

is thoroughly Jewish in language and ideas; and yet its Christology is Pauline, and though it gives a certain precedence to the Jewish Christians (the 144,000), yet the Gentile Christians (the multitude of every nation and people and kindred and tongue) are redeemed not by any obedience to the Jewish Law, but simply by the blood of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> "Ad Magnes." x. Other Ignatian references are given in Hort's "Judaistic Christianity," lect. x.

<sup>2</sup> "Trypho," chaps. xlvii., xlviii.

to Judaism, we shall do well at the outset to clear the discussion of all the superficialities that are too often allowed to obscure the true issue. We need not concern ourselves with a history of Pharisaism, in the popular sense, within the Christian Church. The historical Jewish Pharisees were mainly characterized (1) by a high sense of obedience to written rules, (2) by a pedantic formalism that flowered into insincerity. Popular cant has forgotten their conscientiousness, and uses the term "Pharisee" as synonymous with hypocrite. In such a sense there are and have always been Pharisaic Christians. But such Pharisaism is not in any special way a Jewish heirloom. It is endemic in all religions, and is due to two universal causes: firstly, every religion, even the lowest, recommends a standard of life or belief which is above the average of the society in which it exists; and in every society there will be some people below the average who cannot rise to the standard of the religion, and therefore tend to ease the strain by finding satisfaction in mere external conformity. Secondly, every religious society is apt to suffer by success. It wins many adherents, and its membership tends to become adulterated. No doubt one religion may be more apt to breed Pharisees than another. A religion with a definite and stringent moral code is harder to practise than one with a laxer standard, and the difficulty generates evasion among the weaker members. But these would not generally profess conformity to the religion at all, if it were not for its material attractions. Thus the breeding of Pharisees eventually results as much from the circumstances of the society as from the character of the religion.

Again, we need not here inquire how far the Christian system is indebted in any of its externals to Jewish examples. It is possibly correct to say that the Christian type of hierarchical organization was originally borrowed from the Jewish synagogue, and to establish a connection between the Christian Sacraments and various Jewish rites. But these facts are not more than superficial. If the Church was to be a society at all, it was bound to have some kind of official organization, and it was

likely to borrow the framework from that system with which at the outset it was best acquainted, and from which it was historically an offshoot. Similarly, if Christianity was to be a religion at all, it was bound to provide some kind of rites and sacrifices for those who professed it. However the Christian rites originated, their spirit is a development of religious notions and an attempt to satisfy religious needs that are universal to humanity, and not specially characteristic of Judaism.

These observations having been made, we can now turn to the question which is our real concern—viz., how far the spirit of Christianity has preserved any of the spirit of Judaism; how far Christianity has perpetuated principles which can be traced to its spiritual inheritance from the Jewish Church; how far, in other words, Christianity has been able to keep a ground of appeal to the Jewish type of mind. To understand and answer this question, we must clearly recognize that the struggle, of which we have sketched the history, was a struggle between two competing types of human mind. It was more than a conflict between Nationalism and Universalism. Judaism was under no intrinsic necessity to be exclusively nationalistic. No doubt the general, as distinct from the highest, tendencies of Jewish religious feeling were best represented by the Pharisees, and the Pharisees tended to set up an ideal of bigotry and exclusiveness.<sup>1</sup> But occasional signs of a more liberal view are not wholly absent in popular Jewish literature.<sup>2</sup> And the highest teaching of the evangelical prophets had repudiated the crudely nationalistic idea; whilst the Judaism of the Dispersion had to some extent managed to accommodate the uncircumcised within the circumference of its membership, even if it only admitted them into the

<sup>1</sup> Their view is well represented in 2 Esdras vi. 55: "O Lord, Thou hast said that for our sakes Thou didst make the world. As for the other nations, which also come of Adam, Thou hast said that they are nothing, and are like unto spittle, and Thou hast likened the abundance of them unto a drop that falleth from a vessel."

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, Pss. Sol. xvii. 38: "The Messiah shall have mercy upon all the nations that come before Him in fear." Apoc. Bar. i. 4: "I will scatter this people among the Gentiles, that they may do good to the Gentiles."

outer ring of that circle.<sup>1</sup> The real issue in the early Church was not merely whether Christianity was to be externally a religion for the Jews only or for the whole world, but whether it was to appeal only to the Jewish type of mind and aspiration or to other types as well. It is the question that repeatedly occurs whenever Christianity comes into touch with new sections of the human race. Can it find a means of responding to their special kind of spiritual needs and ideas, or is it unable to discover a point of contact with them?

This question, as it first came up in Church history, took the form of a controversy between the Jewish and the "Greek" types of temperament. The issue might have been framed crudely as follows: "Is Christianity a religion for those who want a code of rules to obey, for the disciplinarian, or is it for the mystics, for those who want a new power of life by which to live? Is the Christian God the transcendent Law-giver, or the Immanent Life-giver?" Of course, the distinction between disciplinarian and mystic is not absolute, for mystics are often among the strictest conformists to set rules. Nor is it even quite just as between Jews and Greeks. There were Jews who had more than a tinge of mysticism in their composition,<sup>2</sup> and there were Greeks who lived by fixed formulae of conduct—*e.g.*, the Stoics. But, broadly speaking, and taking the average type of each side, it is not far wrong to say that the Jew was naturally disposed to a legalistic, the Greek to a mystical, view of the function of religion. And the main factors in the controversy are perhaps capable of being classified under three heads: (1) The question between Ethics and Sacraments; (2) the question between future and present; (3) the question between institutional and mystical.

1. The Jew thought of religion in terms of law, righteousness, and moral conduct. He grounded his belief upon the idea that God was a God of righteousness—*i.e.*, a God of a certain

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the very interesting discussion of the tendencies to liberalism among the Dispersed Jews, in K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Psalm cxxxix. is in the language of the purest mysticism. And the conception of the Shechinah made real and vivid the thought of God as dwelling presently in the midst of His people.

ethical character. His Will, therefore, was that man should live a certain kind of life. But, to be obeyed, this Will must be expressed for man in set terms. The Law was this expression; it embodied the rules which God wished man to obey, and these rules covered the whole of man's life. The natural result was the growth of a system of casuistry—viz., the tradition of the scribes, which was a practical commentary on the Mosaic Law. It had its good and its bad points. It was strongly ethical<sup>1</sup> and allowed no action of life to fall outside its purview, and it emphasized the duty and value of obedience and discipline. But it tended to encourage a legalistic morality,<sup>2</sup> to place shackles on the free action of the human spirit, and to foster the notion that man could by his works earn merit in the sight of God.

On the other hand, the Greek thought of religion in terms of spirit, mystery, and a presently realized life with God. For him, therefore, Sacraments were the centre of religion. He based his belief upon the human desire, innate and instinctive, for a higher power of life, for a communion with the Divine, wherein the invisible world was realized and all mysteries and all knowledge could be learnt. The mysteries and the Oriental cults professed to place man in this relation, and to produce in their devotees an ecstatic rapture, in which man became the vehicle of Divinity. This type of religion is indeed only called Greek by a misuse of language; for the Eleusinian mysteries seem undoubtedly sprung from Eastern Orphism, and the Bacchic cult was as Oriental as the later cult of Mithra. The mystery-religions are importations into genuine Hellenism. But by the time of St. Paul, Hellenism had become inextricably confused with these Oriental cults,

<sup>1</sup> The golden rule in its negative form was attributed to Rabbi Hillel; and another Rabbi is quoted as having said: "Be not as slaves that minister to the Lord with a view to receive recompense, but be as slaves that minister to the Lord without a view to receive recompense; and let the fear of heaven be upon you." The Sermon on the Mount is in much of its substance the lineal descendant of the best Jewish moral teaching, which was based on the conception of Divine righteousness that had grown up under the influence of Prophets, Psalms, and Law.

<sup>2</sup> The legalistic tendency should not be exaggerated. The Prophets and Psalms were still a force in the national religion. But the Law was the predominant force.

which had acclimatized themselves in the Græco-Roman world. The resulting compound is generally called Hellenistic ; and it was this type of religion which was competing with Judaism for the possession of the Christian Church. The merits of this type are the merits of Sacramentalism—*i.e.*, the emphasis on the ideas of communion with God, of eternal life as a present possession, of spiritual realities as the ultimate objects of religious aspiration ; its defects are that it encourages a depreciation of external conduct, that it lays a disproportionate stress on excitement,<sup>1</sup> and that, in its less violent forms, it is compatible with a selfish quietism. The only mystery-religion which had any clear ethical feeling was Mithraism ; and this had not yet risen into prominence by St. Paul's time.

These, then, are the two types in one aspect ; and it is from this point of view that the question assumed its most patent importance in the Early Church. All St. Paul's discussions of faith and works, law and grace, are concerned with this underlying problem—*viz.*, that he had to present Christianity as a sacramental religion, mainly because the Sacraments were of Christ's own institution, but also because that was the only type of religion likely to appeal to his Gentile hearers ; and that nevertheless he had to avoid the danger of an unethical sacramentalism, in which mystery might become magic by being divorced from all relation to practical conduct.

2. The Jewish religion was strongly eschatological. The whole outlook of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, is forward. And the Apocalyptic literature only added detail, colour, and definition to the Messianic hope. The Jewish Christian did not renounce this hope in embracing Christianity. To him the expectation of the Parousia of Christ was absolutely central. The Pauline Epistles are full of this idea, and the Apocalypse closes on the promise, "Behold, I come quickly." Thus, like the Jews, the Jewish Christians believed in a future

<sup>1</sup> Though we owe to the Oriental cults that they legitimized the element of rapture in religion, which Hellenic and Roman religion alike tended to discourage.

resurrection, though they conceived of this as physical in its nature. On the other hand, the Greek expected a present rapture into eternal life, without the intervention of death, through the mysteries. None of the mystery-religions seems to have had any idea of a general resurrection of the dead. Mithraism again is the only exception, but, as has been said, this had not yet come into vogue in the world of St. Paul. The Greeks, therefore, on the whole did not look to a future completion, but expected it now and at once. To obtain it was the object of their mysteries, and their conceptions of immortality were therefore exceedingly vague, whilst the idea of a future Messianic reign was quite foreign to their thought.

Here, again, Christianity had to make up its mind. Was it to make eternal life future or present? Was it to relegate communion with God to the after-life, or to make it a possible possession of this life? St. Paul's dealing with the problem is contained especially in 1 Cor. xv. He mediates between the two views.<sup>1</sup> Eternal life begins now, at baptism, in which the Christian at once enters into a share of the life of Christ risen through death. But, because this life is eternal, therefore physical death can make no difference to it. The dead Christian is not extinguished; and there will be a resurrection in the Parousia, when the Christians will rise in bodies of spiritual substance, and the Messianic Kingdom will be inaugurated. That this would soon take place was St. Paul's and the primitive Christian belief. But, as the event delayed, the Christians learnt to project their expectation into the distant future, and to lay more stress on the present possession of eternal life; though at the same time they never renounced the eschatological hope.

3. The third question is not that of a social *versus* an individualistic religion. Both types were social: the Jewish type by its character as the religion of a nation; the Greek mysteries as being the rites of a brotherhood. The question is rather that of a religion of authority *versus* a religion of the spirit,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. iv.

and is indeed only another form of the difference between ethical and sacramental religion. The Greek asked for the power of a new nature and a direct relation to the Divine. He cared nothing, therefore, for constituted authority in religion; that became unnecessary, since the god could communicate directly with him. His priest was a mere hierophant. Nor did the Greek care for a historical basis to his creed. In this respect he was more modernist than the most rabid exponent of the latest modernism. The Divine voice within could speak through the most mythically-based mysteries, and that was all that he asked for. But the Jew asked for a constituted authority and mandate. The Scribes and Pharisees were real legislators of his moral code and authorized teachers of his religious belief. Thus the Jew was appealed to by a religion embodied in an institution. So, too, he never forgot that his religion was intimately connected with the national history. The basis of the Mosaic Law was that God had spoken to Moses on Sinai. The basis of the Temple ritual lay in the historical legislation of the Pentateuch. The substratum of Jewish religion was the national history of God's relation to the Jewish people.

These being the issues in the problem of early Christianity, it becomes easy to see that the Church has attempted to compromise between the two sides. The sacramental theory has on the whole been dominant, but with a very large admixture of the ethical interest. The idea of a presently realized eternal life has been paramount, and yet the eschatological hope has never been abandoned. If we consider the debt of Christianity to Judaism under the same three heads, we find: (1) That Christianity inherited its moral standard from the Jewish spirit. It is hard for us to realize that licence and obscenity could ever have been a constitutive element in religious practice. And the fact of our difficulty is a measure of the power which the ethical outlook of Judaism has exercised on Christianity. For the Hellenistic religions were in general avowedly tolerant of ceremonial and ritual immorality; and Christianity had a very hard fight to quell this tendency among its Gentile converts. The Epistles

to Corinth show the danger ; and it was constantly recurring. Gnosticism and Manichæism were in certain forms but recrudescences of the old theory. The Church conquered the tendency and adjudged the sects who professed such a theory to be heretical ; the body was the temple of the Holy Ghost, and moral conduct was a proper verification of spiritual faith. And it owed this view to the Jewish influence working in St. Paul and the other early leaders to produce a repulsion from any theory which seemed to weaken the moral demands of God.<sup>1</sup>

2. The eschatological hope which Christianity inherited from Judaism served at first to produce in Christians an other-worldly detachment from the life of their time. But thereby, as the organization of the Græco-Roman world fell to pieces, the Church was enabled to survive by the mere fact of its aloofness from that culture.<sup>2</sup> And in time, when it was realized that the hope of a new world in the near future was an illusion, the expectation became an ideal. The Messianic kingdom, which had been anticipated as near at hand, became the ideal for which the world was gradually to prepare. The Church was able to hold up an other-worldly picture before mankind, as that which was to be the end of their efforts to better this world ; and so it became a force of practical improvement of the present.

3. The Jewish desire for a historical and institutional basis for religion remained in two forms within the Christian Church. In the first place, Christianity was saved from evaporating into nebulous vagueness by the growth of the New Testament Canon, which provided the historical groundwork of the Christian Creed. Thus the Church was enabled to reject the fancies of Montanism and all other tendencies which aimed at substituting mere personal ecstasy and inspiration for a religion with a basis in a historical act of revelation. In the second

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Glover, "Conflict of Religions in Early Roman Empire," chap v. : "It was the Jew who brought to the common Christian stock the conception of sin," etc.

<sup>2</sup> This is the point which is brought out in illuminating fashion in K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. vii. *ad fin.*, and in this paragraph I have done little more than summarize his arguments.

place, Christianity became the religion of an organized Body, with rules and rites and officers. This characteristic degenerated often enough into Ecclesiasticism, whereby the society is exalted at the expense of its head, and the Church becomes the source of rule instead of being the organ of Christ's government. But, apart from such perversions, there is no doubt that the coherent organization of the Church was the fact which helped it to keep Christian tradition, faith, and practice, articulate, definite, and systematic.

In order to show more clearly the value of our Jewish inheritance, we may take the instance of one Christian doctrine, and that the doctrine which superficially might seem the most alien to Jewish and most akin to Hellenistic modes of thought. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the basis of all Christian mysticism. The Holy Spirit is the source of personal inspiration, working within man, unseen and uncontrolled by him, working through the rapture of prayer and the mysterious media of the Sacraments, to produce in man the sense of God's presence, to raise his being to a higher power by the communication of the Divine Life, to enable him to realize freely here and now the eternal life which he seeks. So far the doctrine is, though on a higher plane of theology, at one with the mystery-religions, speaking much the same language, and moving in the same range of ideas; and so far everything is vague; ecstatic communion, inarticulate rapture, a sensation of new life, so far we are taken, but not much farther. But the Christian doctrine has also its other, its Jewish, side. The Holy Spirit is connected with the historic Incarnation, the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. He is also the Spirit of righteousness, and the fruits of the Spirit are seen in the moral qualities of a particular character, the character which is after the pattern of the historic Jesus. He is, moreover, the Spirit of an articulate Church life, the Spirit of unity and order and method, and His normal working is through the society to each individual member of it. He is the Spirit of Life, but of an organic life, of that life which fills the Body of Christ, and so is imparted to each member of that Body.

Thus the Spirit gives not only new life, but a new life of a special ethical character, by its historic basis in the historic Incarnation, and its institutional medium of operation in the divinely ordained society.

Thus the Jewish spirit survives in Christianity to save its doctrines from the form which they might have taken, if the Hellenistic spirit had been allowed to prevail undiluted and unmitigated. It is clear enough that this was a real danger. The constant warnings to "try the spirits"<sup>1</sup> make it plain that there was among the early Christians a great output of ecstatic prophesying and utterance, which needed regulation and testing. The phenomena of Montanism show the danger actually coming to a head. And modern instances of sudden and ecstatic conversion continue to illustrate the fact that such a type of inspiration is not always accompanied by a real change of practical conduct. Similarly, as has been said, the occurrences alluded to in the Corinthian Epistles are evidence that early Christianity was not free from danger of lax morality under the pretext of religion, and this danger, too, came to a head in some sects of Gnosticism and Manichæism. Christianity, therefore, while trying to meet the demand for a mystical, personal, spiritual religion, yet tried to avoid the exaggerations which might attend on an exclusive regard to this demand, by laying a strong emphasis on the historical basis and moral outcome of Christian Faith. As such, it is debtor to both Jew and Greek. To the Greek it owes<sup>2</sup> its mystical spirit, its insistence on personal faith, and on the direct relation of God to each soul

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3; 1 Thess. v. 20, 21; 2 Pet. ii. 1; 1 John iv. 1. They recur in later Christian literature—e.g., Didache xii. 1. Cf. my "Studies in Apostolic Christianity," p. 85 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> I would not be understood to assert that these elements were additions to the "simple Gospel" of Jesus Christ. They are all implicit or explicit in that Gospel. All that Christianity is and shall be it owes to Christ. But it was these two types of mind which respectively looked in His Gospel for these respective elements, and insisted on their importance. That is, indeed, the result of every new accession to the Christian Church. Every new convert or section of converts has to elicit from Christ the elements in His Gospel which specially appeal to them; this is the work of the Holy Spirit; and so the full-orbed truth of our Lord's revelation may at last be seen perfected.

whom He inspires. To the Jew it owes its strong ethical sentiment, its insistence upon its historical foundation, and its institutional system. To the Greek, it owes its belief that God is the immanent fount of spiritual life in the soul; to the Jew, its belief that God is the transcendent ruler and law-giver of the Universe. From the Greek, it has learnt to know the present as days of Communion with Eternity; from the Jew, it has learnt to anticipate the future as the Day of ultimate Judgment. It is thus an attempt at a synthesis of two opposite elements. We may, if we like, accept Mr. Houston Chamberlain's language,<sup>1</sup> and call it "a hybrid." But it is a hybrid because it aims at covering both sides of life—the inward and the outward. It declares that conduct by itself is not enough, that conduct must have a soul, a motive-power in the rapture of communion with God; but it declares also that feeling, however exalted, must have a body, a means of expression in the life of obedience, discipline, and fellowship. It resists, by the force of its Greek inheritance, the tendency to externalize religious principle, to make religion a mere system of acts, with the propensity of such a view to encourage formalism, precision, casuistry, and dry pedantry. But it also resists, by the force of its Jewish inheritance, the tendency to evaporate religious practice, to make religion a mere series of emotions, with the propensity of that view to generate vagueness, inarticulateness, indiscipline, and intoxicated sensationalism. It teaches that God is a Father, that man is saved by the blood of Christ, and that the Holy Spirit is the life-giver. But it also teaches that God is the God of Love and Holiness, that Christ is a definite historical individual of a definite ethical character, and that the life which the Holy Spirit imparts must bear fruit in a character and conduct after the model of Christ.

Thus it combines the appeal to both types of mind, and tries to provide a response to both types of need. And in doing so

<sup>1</sup> In that most interesting and suggestive but somewhat irritatingly pretentious and prejudiced book, "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century."

it shows its right to call itself so far a really Catholic religion. The question was to arise again in other contexts for answer. In the age of the Teutonic conversions, the Church had to show that it was able also to consecrate their manly virtues of fortitude, courage, independence, and self-respect, and that so it was a religion for them as well as for Jew and Greek.<sup>1</sup> And in the present time it is faced with the duty of discovering and formulating the right relations, in which it can find room for the stored wisdom and traditional qualities of the ancient Oriental nations, while at the same time the extraordinary speed with which western culture and civilization are developing new thoughts and aspirations presents the Church with another problem in adaptation. In each case the question is that of Catholicity, not in the narrow sense in which the word is abused by party and denomination, but in the wider and truer sense, viz., the question whether Christianity can prove itself to be a religion for all mankind, by being able to assimilate and consecrate the various characteristics which each nation in turn bring to it, and so to build up the Body of Christ to that fulness, in which every joint, according to the working in due measure of each several part, supplies its share in the fit framing and knitting together of the whole Body, and in the increasing of it unto the building up of it in love.

<sup>1</sup> This is the truth which has been felt, but perversely worked out, in Mr. Garrod's interesting essay, entitled "Christian, Greek, or Goth?" in his book of studies called "The Religion of all Good Men."



## The Church and the Poor.

### A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

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

#### XIII.

##### THE POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1834.

IN the two previous chapters we have brought the history of our subject down to the close of the reign of George III. In this chapter I propose to deal, first, with the conditions which existed during the years immediately preceding the passing of the extremely important Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834; secondly, with the chief provisions of that law; and, thirdly, though very briefly, with the history of the years immediately following its enactment.

The years which followed the close of the great war with France—that is, from 1815 onwards—certainly witnessed an immense increase in the aggregate wealth of the nation<sup>1</sup>; but they did not witness a corresponding general improvement in the economic and social condition of the poorest classes. I use the term “general improvement” advisedly, because there is evidence to show that among certain sections of the workers there was a very decided increase of welfare during this period.<sup>2</sup> But, speaking generally, the condition, at any rate of the very poor, grew steadily worse and worse as time went on. Eventually it became so evil that, in spite of a growing acceptance of the principle of *laissez-faire* (at any rate, so far as the conditions of trade were concerned), the minds, and to some extent the consciences, of thoughtful people became greatly exercised.

<sup>1</sup> The general trade of the United Kingdom (merchandise only) in 1820 was £81,421,646, or £4 1s. 10d. per head; in 1840 it was £183,973,725, or £6 6s. 8d. per head.

<sup>2</sup> Savings banks were constituted and regulated by 57 George III., cap. 150, and 58 George III., cap. 48. In 1833 there were in England and Wales 408 savings banks, with 425,283 depositors, and balances of £14,334,393.

It became more and more clear that either national bankruptcy or revolution must ensue, unless some drastic change was made both in the nature and the administration of the Poor Law. The evidence of the Commissioners of 1833 upon the first of these dangers is very striking. They state that there are many parishes "in which the pressure of the Poor Rate has reduced the rent to half, or to less than half, of what it would have been if the land had been situated in an unpauperized district, and some in which it has been impossible for the owner to find a tenant."<sup>1</sup> The worst case was that of Cholesbury, in Buckinghamshire, where the collection of the Poor Rate had "suddenly ceased . . . the landlords having given up their rents, the farmers their tenancies, and the clergyman his glebe and his tithes."<sup>2</sup> The evidence of widespread lawlessness—the usual precursor of revolution—is equally strong. The burning of stackyards became appallingly common. Even patrols of soldiers were useless to prevent it, as were also rewards of as much as £500 for the convictions of offenders. These evil conditions were naturally the cause, as incendiarism was the expression, of the existence of the bitterest feelings between the labourers and their employers.<sup>3</sup>

If this was the state of things in the agricultural districts, that in the manufacturing towns was certainly no better. Engel's book upon "The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844"<sup>4</sup> may paint the picture in the darkest possible colours; it may be condemned as an *ex parte* statement—indeed, that to a great extent it is so I am perfectly prepared to admit—but when every allowance or deduction has been made for the writer's predilections and prejudices, the conditions of the slums of Manchester and other large towns which he describes can only be regarded as appalling. In reading his book two things must be remembered: First, that

<sup>1</sup> Nicholls, "History of the Poor Law," vol. ii., p. 238.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 283, 284.

<sup>4</sup> Published in German in 1845; in English in New York in 1885; republished in England in 1892.

what he saw in 1844 was the result of a very considerable period of the influence of something even worse than *laissez-faire* on the part of the particular authorities who were then in a position of responsibility; actually the evils he describes had been gradually accumulating ever since the beginning of the "Industrial Revolution." Secondly, Engel is not content with general descriptions or general charges; he gives chapter and verse for his statements, even to the names of the streets and the numbers of the houses. Moreover, his book is full of extracts from official reports, to which he gives exact references, and in case after case he gives both dates and figures. Because my space is limited, and because his book is so easily accessible, I shall forbear from giving any quotations; all I would say is that if anyone wishes to realize how terrible were the conditions of life and health and morality among immense numbers of the poorest strata of the people during, say, the first thirty years after the Battle of Waterloo, let him read carefully what Engel has to tell of the results of personal observation made during several months spent in careful investigation.<sup>1</sup>

The question may well be asked, Why had these evil conditions been permitted to grow until they became so utterly bad? or, Why were they still permitted to exist? A complete answer to these questions would involve a lengthy description of the condition both of political thought and the actual constitution of the Houses of Parliament during this time. Briefly, the chief factors in the neglect were, first, the extraordinary dread of reform by means of legislation which existed during the early part of the nineteenth century; and, secondly, a dominant belief in the principle of *laissez-faire*, which in this particular connection might almost have been interpreted to mean, "Leave things to themselves, and in due time they will work out their own solution." One of the strangest—indeed most paradoxical—features of the period was that side by side

<sup>1</sup> The evidence which Engel produces of the state of the towns may be supplemented by that of "The Hungry Forties" for the agricultural districts.

with this, in the actual administration of the Poor Law this principle was the one last to be applied. Here, so far as administration was concerned, a measure of *laissez-faire* would have been of immense benefit to the poor. In this connection the following sentences from the Report of the Commission of 1833 are of exceptional interest: "Things were not left to take their own course. Unhappily, no knowledge is so rare as the knowledge when to do nothing."<sup>1</sup>

But with the passing of the first Reform Bill in 1832 the period of "legislative quiescence," which synchronized with the domination of the old Toryism, came suddenly to an end.<sup>2</sup> It must not from this be inferred that the change in public opinion was equally sudden; on the contrary, the forces which produced the Benthamite Liberalism, which so strongly marked the next forty years, had been gradually, though surely, gathering in strength.<sup>3</sup> Previous to the appointment of the Commission "to inquire into the operation of Poor Laws and report thereon" in February, 1832, at least two serious attempts to amend the law and its administration had recently been made; and though both the Bills to which I refer failed to obtain the sanction of Parliament, both undoubtedly exercised considerable influence upon the Act of 1834. The first of these two Bills was that of Mr. Scarlett, which was introduced in 1821,<sup>4</sup> but was withdrawn after its second reading in the Commons. There was much in this Bill which was admirable, but the changes which it advocated were too drastic to obtain acceptance at that time. The second Bill<sup>5</sup> was introduced by a Mr. Nolan, who was certainly an authority upon the subject. This Bill was of a far less sweeping nature than Mr. Scarlett's, but, although it was before the House for more than one session, it also failed

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Commissioners made in 1834; reprinted in 1905 [Cd. 2728], p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Grey became Prime Minister in 1830, and formed the first Whig or "Liberal" Ministry since 1782.

<sup>3</sup> On the "Close of the Period of Quiescence," and on "The Period of Benthamism or Individualism," see Dicey, "Law and Opinion," pp. 110 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 208.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.

to become law. I mention these two Bills in order to show that the subject was not only receiving attention, but that those who had studied it were becoming more and more convinced of the necessity of change, both in the law itself and in its administration.

One factor which undoubtedly most strongly influenced not only the appointment of the Commission of 1832, but also the nature of some of the recommendations of that Commission, was the evidence from Southwell and one or two other places of what a strict and judicious administration of even the existing law could effect. The reforms at Southwell commenced in 1821; in four years the amount expended on relief of the poor fell from £2,006 7s. to £517 13s.; that expended on providing employment for able-bodied labourers, from £292 10s. to nil; that in payment of rent, from £184 18s. also to nil; that expended upon bastardy was reduced to a third; besides these other reforms, the workhouse itself was thoroughly reformed, the sexes were separated, the inmates classified, and the "House" was made what it should be—a test of destitution. The results of these reforms in the administration of the law were made widely known, especially those of the application of workhouse relief, and, as I have just stated, they undoubtedly had an immense influence upon the recommendations of the Commission and, later, upon the framing of the Act of 1834.<sup>1</sup>

The history of the Commission upon whose Report that Act was framed, the chief provisions of the Act, and the beneficial results which followed (wherever the Act was efficiently administered), are so well known—or at least may be so easily learnt elsewhere—that I need not enter into them at any considerable length. The following brief summary will, I hope, be sufficient to indicate the successive steps which led to the passing of the Act:

On February 1, 1832, Lord Althorp stated in the House of Commons "that the general question of the Poor Laws was

<sup>1</sup> Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 227 *et seq.*

a subject of such magnitude, and involved such a variety of important considerations," that the Government had determined to appoint Commissioners to ascertain by means of local investigation how the different systems worked throughout the country. Upon the results of this investigation the future action of the Government would depend." The Commissioners appointed Assistant Commissioners, who visited the various districts. In March, 1833, the Commissioners presented a volume of extracts from the evidence which by that time had been obtained.<sup>1</sup> In this preliminary Report it is stated that maladministration appeared to have spread over almost every part of the country, and that of this maladministration actual intimidation of those supposed to be unfavourable to profuse relief was one of the most extensive sources. On February 20, 1834, the complete Report of the Commissioners was issued, accompanied by an Appendix, in which the evidence collected was given, though much of this evidence was embodied in the Report itself. The Commissioners state that the evidence comes "from every county and almost every town, and from a very large proportion of even the villages in England. It is derived from many thousand witnesses of every rank and every profession and employment . . . differing in every conceivable degree in education, habits, and interests, and agreeing only in their practical experience as to the matter in question." They further state that in their opinion the amendment of the Poor Laws "is, perhaps, the most urgent and most important measure now remaining for the consideration of Parliament."<sup>2</sup>

A Bill embodying the recommendations of the Commissioners was introduced into and read a first time in the House of Commons on April 17, 1834; it was read a second time on May 9, when 299 members voted for it, and only 20 against it; it was read a third time on July 1; on the following day it was read for the first time in the House of Lords, and, finally, it

<sup>1</sup> This was signed by the Bishop of London (Blomfield), the Bishop of Chester (Sumner), Sturges Bourne, Nassau W. Senior, H. Bishop, H. Gawler, W. Coulson, James Trail, and Edwin Chadwick.

<sup>2</sup> Reprint of Report (1905), p. 5.

received the Royal Assent on August 14. During the passage of the Bill through the two Houses it received various amendments, the chief of which were, first, the limitation of the duration of the Act to five years, and, secondly, the limitation of the powers of the three Commissioners under whom the various local authorities were to act, and who were to be at once the final authority and the ultimate court of appeal in all matters relating to its administration."<sup>1</sup>

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this measure, not only because it practically revolutionized the administration of the Poor Law, but because, in spite of the Reports of the Commission (appointed in December, 1905) presented to Parliament in 1909, it still remains to all intents and purposes the law under which the relief of the poor is administered to-day.

The two following verdicts, the first relating to the Report of the Commissioners, and the second to the passage of the Bill through Parliament, are worthy of being remembered :

1. "In February, 1834, was published perhaps the most remarkable and startling document to be found in the whole range of English—perhaps, indeed, of all social—history. . . . In the list of nine gentlemen who composed the Commission there is not to be found a single ornamental name. . . . It was their rare good fortune not only to lay bare the existence of abuses and trace them to their roots, but also to propound and enforce the remedies by which they might be cured. It is seldom, indeed, that the conditions of so vast and sweeping a reform are found coexisting. The evils were gross and alarming; there was a Ministry that had been carried into power by an outburst of reforming zeal; above all, there was a readiness to be guided by principles of purely scientific legislation. . . . Success was therefore at once inevitable and assured."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Upon omissions in the Act see Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 271. It may be questioned whether the framers of the Act intended that quite so large a discretion should be left the Guardians, as these were afterwards proved to have.

<sup>2</sup> T. W. Fowle, "The Poor Law," pp. 75, 76.

2. "The successful passage of this necessary but, unfortunately, all too limited measure of reform is one of the most remarkable incidents in our constitutional history. There is no other instance in the history of democracy in which a Government has dared to benefit the people by depriving them of a right to participate in a public fund, where also the Opposition, as a party, has refrained from making capital out of the obvious difficulties of the situation. It may be added, that the experiment then succeeded because legislation in detail was taken out of the hands of Parliament, and put into the hands of a non-elective body."<sup>1</sup>

The recommendations of the Commission and the actual contents of the Act were, in the main, so similar, that, at any rate for our present purpose, they may be considered together. So far as the principles are concerned upon which the Act was framed, these may be pronounced excellent. Where the Act has failed, as undoubtedly in many instances, especially in recent years, it has failed, the failure has not been due to wrong principles, but because, as was the case with the previous great Act of Elizabeth's reign, those who have administered it have either forgotten its principles, or have administered it in a spirit which was not in accordance with that of those who framed it. The chief weakness of the Act, as experience has proved, lay in the fact that too much freedom of action was left to the amateurs who constituted the Local Authority; that the latitude permitted to these in the practical (and, I would add, personal) application of the law was too wide. The professional—*i.e.*, the Relieving Officer—has been too often and too much overruled by the amateur, the ignorant Guardian, who apparently had learnt little from the experience of the past, and who declined to administer the law in strict accordance with the wisdom of its authors.

Briefly, the following may be regarded as the root-principles of the measure: A clear distinction must be made between "the poor" and "the indigent," and it must be understood that the

<sup>1</sup> "History of the English Poor Law," T. Mackay, vol. iii., p. 151.

latter "alone come within the province of the Poor Law.' Relief must be so administered to the indigent "that their condition shall in no case be so eligible as the condition of persons of the lowest class subsisting on the fruits of their own industry." This principle, which, unfortunately, has often been disregarded in practice, is essential, if people are not to be tempted to become paupers, if they are to be encouraged to use any measure of self-effort. In practice, it was found that when out-relief was withdrawn or diminished in any district, the wages paid immediately increased.<sup>1</sup> There was also a diminution in the number of improvident marriages, and also in the amount of crime.<sup>2</sup> Another principle asserted by the Report, and embodied in the Act, was "that the practice of giving relief in well-regulated workhouses, and the abolition of partial relief to the able-bodied, having been tried and found beneficial, be extended to all places."<sup>3</sup> As showing the continuity of our English Poor Law, it is interesting to notice that there was appended to this assertion the following words: "This being the only means by which the intention of the Statute of Elizabeth<sup>4</sup> can be beneficially carried into effect." At least the implied ground for an application for public assistance should be the inability to maintain life or existence, at any rate by lawful means. Hence, such an applicant must accept relief on the terms which it has been shown from experience that the common welfare requires. It is, of course, "the exceptional case" which is a difficulty, and which evokes a sympathy which is tempted to legislate for such a case as if it were typical rather than exceptional. The wisdom of the Commissioners is seen in the following words: "The bane of all pauper legislation has been the legislation for extreme cases. Every exception, every violation of the general rule to meet a real case of unusual hardship, lets in a whole class of fraudulent cases, by which that rule must in time be destroyed. Where cases of real hardship

<sup>1</sup> Reprint of Report, pp. 237 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 241 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 262. An exception is made in regard to medical attendance.

<sup>4</sup> 43 Elizabeth, cap. 2:

occur, the remedy must be applied by individual charity—a virtue for which no system of compulsory relief can be, or ought to be, a substitute.”<sup>1</sup>

The value of the “Workhouse Test” is, as the Report explains, “a self-acting test of the claim of the applicant,” for by this the “line between those who do, and those who do not, need relief is . . . drawn perfectly.” Pauperism among the greater number of the able-bodied “has originated in indolence, improvidence, or vice, and might have been averted by ordinary care and industry.”<sup>2</sup> To give out-relief, even in small amounts, to such people is only to pander to idleness or thriftlessness. The offer of the “House” will, it is proved by experience, induce many whose wants arise from idleness to earn the means of subsistence; it represses fraudulent claims for support, and frequently calls forth the aid of assistance from friends. Another great principle for which the Commissioners most wisely contended was “the removal from the distributors of all discretionary powers, and thereby diminishing abusive administration.”<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, experience has proved that, with all their care to effect this, the actual working of the Act has not achieved the object which the Commissioners had here in view. The “discretionary powers” left to the Guardians are still very considerable, and are frequently most unwisely used. The Report speaks of “the increased liability to every sort of pernicious influence” to which local distributors of relief, popularly elected, are subject. One of the most pernicious forms of influence is that of intimidation—*e.g.*, of small tradesmen from their customers; the Guardian who is a publican is particularly open to this.

The real crux of the problem in 1834, as in almost every reform suggested or legislative change enacted for the better relief of the poor, lies in the *administration* of the law. The Commissioners were fully alive to this danger. As they say: “The instances presented to us throughout the present inquiry of the defeat of former legislation . . . often by an adminis-

<sup>1</sup> Reprint of Report, p. 263.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 264.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 294.

tration directly at variance with the expressed will of the Legislature, have forced us to distrust the operation of the clearest enactments, and even to apprehend unforeseen mischiefs from them, unless an especial agency be appointed and empowered to superintend and control their execution.”<sup>1</sup> Much is also said upon “the want of appropriate knowledge,” “the short duration of the authority,” “the inadequacy of motives to support a correct administration,” “the strength of interests in abusive administration” on the part of popularly elected distributors of Poor Relief.

The administration of the Act was placed in the hands of three Commissioners, who were empowered to appoint nine Assistant Commissioners (whose places in 1847 were taken by the Poor Law Inspectors). The powers placed in the hands of the Commissioners were very extensive, the chief of these being that of making and issuing “rules, orders, and regulations for the management of the poor, for the government of work-houses, and the education of children therein . . . for the guidance and control of all guardians, vestries, and parish officers, so far as relates to the management of the poor, and the keeping, examining, auditing, and allowing or disallowing of accounts . . . or any expenditure for the relief of the poor, and for carrying this Act into execution in all other respects, etc.”<sup>2</sup> It will at once be realized how extensive these powers were; but upon the admirable manner in which they were used by the first Commissioners there cannot be two opinions. In 1839 the term for which they were appointed came to an end, but this was renewed annually until 1842, when it was further renewed for a period of five years. In that year a change was made by a ministerial department responsible to Parliament being constituted, the Minister responsible being named the President of the Poor Law Board. Finally, in 1871, the name of the department was changed into the “Local Government Board,” which was placed under one responsible head.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Reprint of Report, pp. 280, 281.

<sup>2</sup> Section 15. Nicholls, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> Fowle, “The Poor Law,” p. 104.

From the date of the passing of the Act of 1834 to the present time the organization and administration of Poor Relief has been in the hands of the Central Board, which has freely exercised the large latitude given to it by the Act. The chief instrument used by the Board has been the Poor Law Orders, which it has so frequently issued, and which, under the Act, may be said to constitute the law under which the relief of the poor is now administered. Many of these Orders are of very considerable importance. For instance, the so-called "General Prohibitory Order," issued in 1844, prohibiting out-relief to the able-bodied, and the "Consolidated Order" of 1847, which laid down strict regulations in regard to the meetings of Guardians, the management of workhouses, and the duties of officers. Besides these Orders, the Local Government Board from time to time issues "Circulars," which are practically declarations of policy — in other words, "exhortations" — to the local authorities. These cannot be enforced by law; they are obeyed by some and disobeyed by other authorities. Hence there has arisen a state of things which is contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the Act of 1834—namely, a wide divergence in certain matters of administration.<sup>1</sup>

In considering the immediate effects of the Poor Law Amendment Act, we must remember that the Commissioners had two kinds of obstacles to overcome.<sup>2</sup> The first kind arose both from the Local Authorities and from the recipients of relief. The Guardians were in some cases, from motives of economy, slow in providing effective workhouse buildings, and in a few places there were riotous proceedings, mainly on account of the rule requiring that half the relief given to able-bodied paupers should be given in kind. But on the whole the obstacles purposely raised against the measure were far less than might have been expected. The second class of obstacles, which were due to circumstances entirely beyond the control of the Commissioners,

<sup>1</sup> See Majority Report of 1909, 8vo. edition, pp. 120 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> On this subject see "History of the English Poor Law," vol. iii. (Mackay), chap. xii., pp. 257 *et seq.*

were far greater and more serious. The autumn of 1836 was very wet, and the following winter one of such great severity that outdoor employment was for a time entirely suspended. In the following year there was a bad harvest, a great rise in price of the necessaries of life, and, in addition, a very serious mortality from an exceptionally severe and widespread epidemic of influenza. In 1838 and 1839 the high prices of food and a general stagnation of trade continued, as was the case more or less for at least five years after this time. During all this time much hardship and privation were undoubtedly suffered by the poor. A period of still greater distress began in 1845, when a cold spring and a wet summer was succeeded by a severe outbreak of potato disease, both in that year and the following one. Wheat advanced from 54s. to 75s. the quarter, and the price of other provisions rose in proportion. To add to the trouble, the winter of 1846-47 was also one of unusual severity. On the top of these difficulties there was a very considerable immigration of Irish poor, owing to the famine in that country, into all the western ports of England, the number arriving in Liverpool alone during three months in the spring of 1847 being upwards of 130,000. When we remember all this, we cannot wonder that the administration of the new law was attended with peculiar difficulties, and it says much for the administrative ability of both the Commissioners and their assistants that they weathered the storm as successfully as they did.

It is important to bear the fact of these "lean years" in mind—the "hungry forties," as they have been termed—not only because they greatly accentuated the difficulties which naturally met the Poor Law reformers of those days, but because they were the years which immediately preceded the work of Maurice and the earlier "Christian Socialists." They were also the years of the Chartist agitation. The England which nearly broke the tender and sympathetic heart of Maurice, and which called forth the bitter invectives of "Parson Lot," was the England of these terrible years. Undoubtedly the new Poor Law came only just in time. What would have happened had

not public relief in those days been under the wise administration of the men who were then responsible for the manner in which it was distributed we know not ; but we can well imagine that the condition of the poor, dreadful as it was, might have been infinitely worse. It said much for the new law that its promoters were able, in the midst of such overwhelming difficulties, to pursue the path which they felt sure was for the ultimate benefit of the people. Had the administration of the Poor Law since that time been consistently carried out in the spirit in which its promoters intended that it should be, the condition of the poorest classes in England would to-day be far more really prosperous than what it actually is.<sup>1</sup>

The history of the Poor Law since 1847—the date of the dissolution of the Commission—is one rather of difficulties of administration than of new legislation ; indeed, it would be true to say that since the Act of 1834 there has been no measure of outstanding importance dealing with the Poor Law placed upon the Statute-Book. One reason for dissolving the Commission was that it had no representative in Parliament ; hence there was no one who was primarily responsible for administering the law and at the same time able in Parliament either to answer questions or refute criticisms. By the Act<sup>2</sup> of 1847, which dissolved the old Commission, all the powers of this were transferred to the new Commission. By the same Act it was ordered that aged couples were not to be separated in the workhouses, and that Visiting Committees for these institutions must be appointed by the Guardians. In 1847-48<sup>3</sup> the amount expended on Poor Relief, especially so far as related to the able-bodied, reached a relatively high figure. This was doubtless in part due to the evil conditions of the poor at this time, with which I have already dealt ; but it also shows that already the original purpose of the Act was to some extent being lost sight

<sup>1</sup> This period is dealt with at length by Mackay, *op. cit.*, chap. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> 10 and 11 Victoria, cap. 109.

<sup>3</sup> In 1848 the amount expended for relief and maintenance of the poor was £6,180,675, against £4,954,204 in 1846. The rate per head of population in 1848 was 7s. 1½d., against 5s. 10½d. in 1846.

of, and that the intentions of those who framed it were not being carried out by the local authorities responsible for its administration. There can, I think, be little doubt that Mr. Mackay is correct when he states that "it should be remembered, in justice to those who conceived the Act of 1834, that central control meant to them the gradual supersession of local empiricism by introducing the rule of salaried experts responsible to a central authority, and merely inspectable, to use Bentham's word, by the local authority."<sup>1</sup> Apart from such questions as those connected with "settlement," "vagrancy," and "rating" (which may be regarded as belonging to definite sections or departments of the law), the chief difficulties which have arisen in connection with the Poor Law during the last eighty years have been due to the fact that by the Poor Law Amendment Act too great a power was still left in the hands of the amateur administrator; and that term is certainly not too strong a term for the average member of the ordinary Board of Guardians.

When we consider the conditions existing at the time, especially in regard to administration, the Act of 1834 probably went as far as it was then possible to go. The Commissioners felt obliged to recommend that at least some measure of responsibility should be left to the Local Authorities, though they realized that these were hardly fit to exercise this. The failure of the law during the last half-century to accomplish what it might have done has been due chiefly to three causes: First, to the ignorance of many Guardians; secondly, to the inability of these to resist pressure from outside influences; thirdly, to greatly altered circumstances. However far-sighted a body of legislators may be, they can hardly be expected to foresee the immensely altered conditions which may arise nearly a century hence. That the principles upon which the reformers of 1834 acted were right we cannot doubt; indeed, it will be an evil day for the permanent welfare of the poor of this country should different principles be substituted for them, and a Poor Law, or

<sup>1</sup> Mackay, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

a substitute for this, be enacted which disregards these principles, whose truth and usefulness have been proved by experience.

In saying this I am not condemning an opinion, which has already been largely expressed in practice, that much which eighty years ago was regarded as coming within the province or jurisdiction of the Poor Law Authority should be so regarded no longer. During recent years, from a variety of causes, the province within which governmental agencies enter into the daily life of the people has been much extended, and the nature of this interference has become much more complex. Other authorities—such as those of the municipality, including, for instance, the authorities dealing with the public health and with education—now to a certain extent overlap by doing work which is also done by the Guardians. Whatever be our opinion as to which is the best authority to do a certain work, we must be agreed that overlapping—which means waste, if not friction—should be avoided.<sup>1</sup> In any prophecy as to the probable future functions of the Poor Law, or as to the direction in which this may develop or be curtailed, this fact must be remembered, as also must the growing conviction that the day of the amateur administrator is over. Inefficient administration is too expensive for those who have to find the funds; also, in spite of the most excellent intentions, because it so often does harm rather than good, it is ultimately terribly expensive to those who are the objects of its activities.

<sup>1</sup> The Minority Report of 1909. The chief proposal of the Minority was that all the various functions of the Poor Law should be handed over to the existing authorities which were now overlapping its various departments.

## Sunday-School Organization.

By E. M. HIGHFIELD, S.T.H.

PRINCIPLES of Sunday-school reform have now for some time been freely discussed amongst Church-people, and the signs of the times show that we do not intend to lag behind our Nonconformist friends in meeting the crying needs of the day. We must provide our children with religious instruction in the Sunday-school, more especially now that our hold on the day-schools is becoming less firm, and above all we must see to it that their Christian education rests on a sound basis of Churchmanship.

It is not the purpose of the writer of this article to try to say anything new about proposed systems of teaching. Everyone to-day who is interested in Sunday-schools is acquainted more or less with the system of grading, and probably will admit that in some form or other the system must be adopted if the work of the school is to be carried out efficiently in accordance with modern theories of education. Many admirable books dealing with this subject have been recently published, so that those who wish to make a careful study of teaching methods will not be at a loss for guidance. It is, on the other hand, the purpose of the writer to call attention to some of the difficulties which lie in the way of the ordinary average parish Sunday-school, and to try to encourage Sunday-school workers to meet these difficulties.

Now, all our difficulties will be found to fall under two comprehensive divisions—namely, Accommodation and the Teaching Staff.

Let us take the first—Accommodation and Equipment of the School. Now, it is an axiom that we must make the best of what we have, but when we have done this it is a very useful corollary to add that we must get more. We must not placidly sit down and say that essentials are luxuries, and that, as we are

“only a country parish,” we can get along very well without them. We must decide what are essentials for our own particular school, and when we have decided this we must use our enterprise to raise additional funds, if need be, to provide them.

Take a fairly average example. Here is a country school with 200 scholars on the register. What may we consider the bare essentials for accommodating these scholars? Now, suppose we are adopting the Three Grade System.<sup>1</sup> We shall probably have some five or six classes in each grade; clearly, it would be impossible to have anything like order and good teaching if we attempt to carry through the lesson in one room. Supposing, however, we have only the one large room where the children assemble for the opening and closing hymn and prayer, or at best, perhaps, we have one or two classrooms in addition. Now, obviously this is a case of having to do the best we can with what we have, for we cannot make classrooms without considerable outlay. It is, however, possible to improvise a substitute without very serious expense. It may be desirable to partition the room for the three grades, and if so curtains will be found admirable, because they can so easily be closed or opened as required. But in many rooms it may be found that a sufficient number of screens placed between classes will be preferable. If the size of the room permits, both methods in combination may be adopted with good success. In this latter case we should have the room divided by curtains for the three grades, and each grade subdivided by screens according to discretion.

So much for division. It must not, however, be overlooked that the chief reason for screening at all is the blackboard. It is impossible to have blackboard lessons in one room for many classes without one class distracting the attention of its next-door neighbour. In many Sunday-schools the blackboard is

<sup>1</sup> The children are grouped into three sections, or grades, according to their standards. Sometimes there are several classes in one grade, but in any case all the children in that grade are taught the same lesson. Each child spends two years in each section, and there are different lessons for each of the two years.

still out of work ; and even though it is within call, where the Sunday-school and day-school are one, it is always allowed and expected to keep Sabbath rest. It is often urged, in defence of this attitude towards the blackboard, that we do not want to introduce a day-school atmosphere and day-school methods into Sunday-school. There is certainly something to be said for this view. From a psychological standpoint alone, it is most desirable that the Sunday-school atmosphere should be completely different from the day-school atmosphere, but the difference is not necessarily attained by making Sunday-school methods entirely different from day-school methods. If the principle of education is sound at the root, the method which carries it out effectively in one case should be equally effective in another. It is the subject-matter of the lesson which constitutes the difference, and if a "schooly" element is introduced into the Sunday lesson, it is not the blackboard, but the teacher, who is at fault.

Let us, then, regard the blackboard as one of the essentials of the Sunday-school furniture. If, however, we have some fifteen to twenty classes in the school, as a matter of economy the blackboards will probably have to be shared. It would be possible to work with one or two blackboards to each grade, since all the classes in one grade would be doing the same lesson ; but this arrangement would mean a certain amount of co-operation on the part of the teachers, and in many cases it would not work happily. It is far better, if it can be so arranged, to have a small, light blackboard at the disposal of each teacher. The teacher, provided with a blackboard, and the class adequately screened off from neighbouring classes, will be able to keep the attention of two or three times as many children as the same teacher could when seated at the apex of a triangle of restless little beings, who are either bent on trying what they can find to do to annoy one another, or craning their necks to see what the next class is doing.

The blackboard, however, is not the only method of maintaining the principle that "eye-gate" helps "ear-gate."

Pictures, diagrams, and models, will be of great service to the teacher in the lesson; but let us be duly fastidious—it is far better to have nothing to do with them unless they are good. Such, however, can be procured at a reasonable outlay, and, with a little amount of judicious distribution on the part of the superintendent, blackboards and pictures can be made to “go round” amongst the teachers. A picture in the hands of a clever teacher will often be quite sufficient help without the blackboard.

Let us now turn our attention to the other main class of difficulties which fall under the head of the Teaching Staff. Here, in reality, the greatest difficulties are involved, because no amount of equipment will be of avail in making a good school, if we can only put a staff of inefficient teachers on the ground. But, on the other hand, if we have a staff of trained and efficient teachers, such teachers will eventually demand the necessary equipment, and, what is more, they will see that they get it. Now, we do not mean, let it be always understood, the mere gratification of fads, but the equipment necessary for organizing the work of the Sunday-school on the basis of a definite system of education, and thus enabling it to take its rank side by side with the elementary and secondary schools of our day.

We are not now, however, considering the case of one of those favoured few schools which has a staff of trained and efficient teachers. In many a parish, either in the country or small provincial towns, we may think ourselves fortunate if we can number one trained teacher on our staff. But here again, as with the equipment, it is our business to make the best use of the material at our command. Moreover, it should be recognized that trained teachers, though very desirable, are not always essential to the welfare of a Sunday-school. It is often possible to find volunteers for the work, who, though they have never had any training or experience, have a natural faculty for teaching. This faculty can always be developed, and where such would-be teachers are to be found ready to hand our difficulties will be

greatly diminished. It is, however, a more common experience that, instead of having to draw recruits from this excellent "raw material"—if we may use the phrase without any disrespect to this really valuable class of workers—we find ourselves already supplied with teachers of a much less plastic type. There is, for instance, the teacher who follows one fixed routine, and cannot find a use for any other; or there is the well-meaning but incapable teacher whose main qualification is willingness to work. In such cases the difficulties of the superintendent will be great; but special cases require special treatment, and tact, one of the most essential qualities for a superintendent, will be constantly in requisition. It may be worth while remarking, by the way, that the experience gained by one superintendent might often be of service if passed on to another. We also venture to hint to superintendents that the "raw material" of which we have been speaking can often be found if searched for, but very seldom presents itself uninvited.

Let us now leave the teachers and turn to the superintendent. It will not be very far wrong to say that a good superintendent is the making of the school. Experience shows this to be the case. A well-disciplined school will very soon become slack in the hands of an incapable superintendent, while a school that is worked up from the start by one who is keenly in touch with his or her work, and in sympathy with the children and teachers, will not be very long before it makes its influence felt in the district.

I remember hearing some years ago an amusing incident connected with a few village Methodists who prided themselves on the readiness with which all hands were put to the plough. One of the leading "members of the society," on being questioned by the visiting minister about the work of their Sunday-school, replied: "It goes right well, sir: we're all teachers—that is, those who're old enough." "But you were telling me, Thomas," said the minister, "that two of your oldest members could neither read nor write." "I was just about to explain that, sir," replied Thomas. "You see, we thought, as

they couldn't hardly manage the teaching, we'd best make them superintendents." Village Methodism has advanced many stages since this incident was recorded, but we are not sure that, apart from village Methodism, the old idea has quite died out, that any senior man who walks the room can fill the office of superintendent, if he will. We do right to emphasize the fact that we must have more than a figurehead.

The entire organization of the school work devolves upon the superintendent. In addition, however, to the more obvious duties, such as the allotment of suitable classes to fit teachers and direction of the general course of study, there are other duties which are apt to be overlooked. To hold the office does not mean the mere giving up of an hour on Sunday afternoon, and calling an occasional teachers' meeting in the week. A good superintendent will wish to know something of the children in their homes; and, although it should be strongly advocated that teachers should at least attempt to visit their own absent scholars, it is most desirable that the parents should know that there is such a person as the superintendent, and that they should know this, not merely from hearsay, but from direct personal acquaintance.

To maintain good discipline is a very difficult work. It does not simply mean to keep order. That is a great thing, but there is no really effective discipline without sympathy. Take, for instance, the superintendent, on the one hand, who only recognizes in all the children a number of little living creatures to whom in time he learns to attach different names. Then, on the other hand, take the superintendent who knows the children as definite personalities, not only the forward or attractive children, but also the shy, retiring little mortals who never speak unless they are spoken to—whose little faces brim over with eagerness to answer a question, yet they dare not stand up to say so uninvited. The difference between discipline, which simply means order, and really effective discipline, very soon reveals itself. If Grade III. is in perfect order when the superintendent is present, but all out of hand as soon as his attention is con-

centrated upon Grade I., then it is certain that neither superintendent nor teachers have mastered the principles of effective discipline.

It is very desirable that the superintendent should be able to hold weekly classes for the teachers. A lesson-book for each grade may be used, and perhaps should be used ; but even then the teaching will be far more effective if the teachers meet regularly for instruction or discussion. The class should not be regarded as a mere help for the teacher to make a lesson—which every teacher thinks that he or she is quite competent to do without such assistance—but it should be regarded as an opportunity for one teacher to find out how another teacher goes to work, and to profit by interchange of thought and experience. Moreover, the method of grading will amount to nothing if it is not carried out by the teachers in unison.

We must not, however, say that it is essential for the superintendent to conduct the teachers' classes. In many parishes it may be possible for the Vicar to do this himself. If he has the faculty for it, such an arrangement is excellent, because, although the responsibility of organizing rests with the superintendent, the Vicar is ultimately the head, and must make himself responsible for what is taught in the school. But, on the other hand, he can control the teaching through the catechizing without making himself responsible for the teachers' classes ; and if he has a really competent superintendent, he will in most cases be glad to be relieved of the responsibility. But where the Vicar, or one of the assistant clergy, conducts the classes, it is certainly very desirable that the superintendent should be able to take some responsibility in training or assisting the younger teachers for their work. The difficulties of religious teaching at the present time are very great, and it is essential that teachers should be to some extent abreast with current thought. We must not, however, expect very much knowledge on the part of young teachers, nor, if they possess it, would it be safe to leave them to strike out lines for themselves. In view of these considerations, we should have a tremendous advantage if we could appoint

superintendents thoroughly competent and qualified to guide the study and preparation of the teachers.

Now, if a superintendent is to undertake such duties as we have sketched out, it is easy to see that a fit person must be chosen, and that such a person will be difficult to find. The question is sometimes proposed as to whether a woman is more desirable for the office than a man. It is a question that cannot be answered by "Yes" or "No." Fitness for the office depends entirely upon individual personality. As a matter of experience, we have seen schools admirably managed under women's superintendency. The work is, moreover, eminently suitable for women who have the ability and qualifications for it. Further, in most parishes it will be more difficult to find a layman who possesses the necessary qualifications, and who at the same time has sufficient leisure for carrying out the work efficiently. If a layman is chosen, it would generally be desirable to enlist the assistance of a lady for supervising the junior classes and helping the young teachers to master the difficulties of their work.

Where can we find a "fit person"? In many parishes we look round, and are tempted to say we give it up. In such cases it is usual to fall back on one of two alternatives—the parish priest or an unfit person.

We are glad to see that it is now becoming more widely recognized that Sunday-school work is a work for the laity. The parish priest already has his hands full with duties in which laymen cannot help him. It is therefore neither fair to himself that the burden of Sunday-school work should rest on his shoulders, nor to the school that the superintendency should be undertaken by one who can only give a small fraction of his time to it, and who may often have to be replaced by a deputy. When the question turns round the "unfit person," surely we ought to decide that this is not a case in point where we have to make the best of the material ready to hand. If there is really not a fit person in the parish, it does seem to be a case where outside help should be sought. We are not very keen to advocate the appointment of paid professional workers, but it is worth while considering the desirability

or otherwise of appointing paid workers for such important posts. The point at stake is whether or not our work will progress without them. We have nothing to say against the principle of paid work in such a case, it simply falls on the same level as the case of organists and choristers ; the main difficulty will be, as in all other cases, to raise the funds. Of this difficulty we can say nothing here ; each parish must determine for itself what is possible and what is impossible in this respect. We do, however, wish to lay stress on the importance of using every available means to attain a really high standard of work in the Sunday-school.

May it be permitted in conclusion to say a word about the term "reformed" Sunday-school? To the present writer the term is, to put it bluntly, objectionable. It is not unlike giving a repulsive name to some deft culinary art, and, by so doing, turning at least the epicures against it. And even if we are all agreed upon setting a high ideal as our standard, we are not all agreed about the method of attaining it. It is hardly fair, therefore, to designate any particular method by the term "reformed."

Let us, however, continue to set our ideals high, no matter if we never attain them, nor would they be ideals if we did. We aspire to have the children in our Sunday-schools instructed in the Catholic faith and the Bible by a body of well-equipped teachers, inspired with a sense of duty and the nobility of their work, conversant with the subject-matter of their teaching, and, more than this, fully awake to the presence of new phases of thought which must be grasped and sifted—not shunned, but welcomed as leading to a fuller and richer revelation of the truth. If we can raise the standard of our work to such a level, then we may take courage and go forward, confident that in our Sunday-schools we are erecting a strong bulwark which will prove invincible against irreligion and scepticism in the coming generation.



## Berkeley.

BY THE REV. E. G. PACE, M.A., B.D.,  
*Fellow of the University of Durham and Lecturer in Theology.*

### I.

“WHAT shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” The question was asked by our Lord from the religious and moral point of view, but it may be asked again to-day with a different, but not less pertinent, meaning from the point of view of philosophy. Each year sees rapid advance in our knowledge of the universe and the marvellous system of its workings. The telescope extends its bounds till our very imagination fails us, and we shrink in fear from the prospect of whirling suns in unfathomable space; the microscope brings into our vision organisms inconceivably small; and the several sciences teach us that all this world of matter changes and develops according to laws which are fixed and irrevocable. Man, too, is part of this material world; he has his place, and it is no large one, in this system; he lives and dies, and in his life and death are seen those same processes which are at work around him. The material world looms very large before our eyes, if we have followed, however far off, the march of science. And even if we have not been touched by the influence of scientific thought, still the town-dweller of to-day, in constant contact with the mechanical wonders of this inventive age, surrounded by telegraphs, telephones, motors, and the like, by machines which seem to do everything that man can do, and do it better, may easily come to feel himself but an insignificant being in contrast with the things about him. In the country we may be awestruck in the presence of mighty forces, but in the town and amid the whirring wheels of factories we seem to lose ourself and become a mere fraction of a mechanical world. All without us has become more complex, more imposing, and our comforts and

pleasures have increased beyond the dreams of our forefathers. We have in truth gained a new world, and it is to be feared that many of us are in danger of losing our own soul. It is so fatally easy to become engrossed in the material world, whether through the eager pursuit of scientific knowledge, or through the enjoyment of the luxuries that civilization affords, or, it may be, through daily occupation in commercial and industrial enterprise ; and then that inner world of our own soul loses interest in our eyes. Our vision is always straining outwards, and we forget what lies within. Now, it is part of the task of philosophy to question in its own way, as religion does in its way, this attitude towards the material world, and to ask whether what is of supreme importance for mankind is to be found in the world without or in the soul—to ask whether in fact the soul is a mere by-product of physical forces, or that for which, and by means of which, the experience of a material universe exists. The answer of philosophy is becoming ever clearer. Not matter, nor force, nor physical law, but mind is the supreme reality. Such is the answer, not only of the majority of English philosophers, but also of such masters of thought as Bergson in France and Eucken in Germany, yet perhaps the general reader who would know how philosophy estimates the value of man's soul in the universe would do well to turn first to our great English philosopher, Bishop Berkeley. True, he flourished two centuries ago, but he grasped the essence of the problem, he gave a direction to all subsequent thought, and he is readable. We need not fear that in opening his works we shall be met with the technical language of the schools, or be carried away from this world of our daily life and labour into some abstract and distant region. We shall find that to be profound it is not necessary to be obscure, and that subtle thought may be expressed in ordinary language, and beautiful language, too. Berkeley's main position, if not unassailed nor unassailable, remains uncaptured by the assaults of the materialists, and still forms part of the line of defence which in these days protects the soul from subjection. Those who seek an introduction to

philosophy can find none more delightful than the works of Berkeley. A shilling will buy his "Theory of Vision," the "Principles of Human Knowledge," and the "Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous," all of which are contained in one volume of the Everyman Library.

## II.

Like some other great Englishmen, George Berkeley was an Irishman, born in 1685 in the county of Kilkenny. At fifteen he went to Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated in 1704. Three years afterwards he was admitted to a fellowship, and later took Orders in the Irish Church. There still remains an invaluable record of the working of his mind from his twentieth to his twenty-fifth year in his Commonplace Book. From it we learn that the germ of the great thought which his later treatises expound—that reality is to be sought in mind and not in dead matter—had already taken root in him. His life in Dublin, as tutor, Greek lecturer, and Junior Dean of his college was a busy one, but he found time for philosophical pursuits, and in 1709 appeared the first of the volumes which have made him famous, "The Essay towards a New Theory of Vision." "The Principles of Human Knowledge," appeared in the following year, and the "Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous" in 1713. Here ends the first period of Berkeley's literary activity.

The winter of 1713-14 was spent by Berkeley in France and Italy as chaplain to Lord Peterborough. Then for two years he was in London, where his eloquence and gracious manners won him many friends, though few became converts to his philosophy. From 1716 to 1720 he was again abroad, and did not return to London till the end of the latter year. It was then that the world first heard of the great project which filled Berkeley's heart and mind for the next ten years or more. He had conceived the idea of founding a university in the Bermudas, "with the object of reforming the manners of the English in the American plantations, and of endowing the American savages with the light of religion and learning." He was made Dean of

Derry in 1724, and devoted the influence of his new position, as well as his private fortune, to the furtherance of his scheme. At last his energy and patience were rewarded, and in 1728, soon after his marriage, he set sail for the West. He landed at Newport in Rhode Island towards the end of January, 1729, but nearer than this he never came to the islands of his dream. For nearly three years he waited, expecting the money the English Government had promised, but he waited in vain. In the autumn of 1731 he returned to England, disappointed. Yet it was a noble project of an unworldly spirit, and, as Professor Campbell Frazer finely says: "The country in which and for which he lived now acknowledges that in his visit it was touched by the halo of an illustrious reputation." During this period of leisure in America, Berkeley composed one of his most popular and delightful works, "Alciphron." It is written in dialogue form, and makes a brilliant assault on the Freethinkers of the coffee-houses and the clubs.

For two years Berkeley remained in London, and then returned to Ireland as Bishop of Cloyne. Here, twenty miles from Cork, he spent the next eighteen years of his life in almost unbroken retirement, continuing his studies with unremitting attention. Some years after his settlement at Cloyne the district was ravaged by famine and fever. This proved a fresh stimulus to Berkeley's warm-hearted philanthropy, and was the occasion which called forth one of the most profound and interesting of his treatises. He had learned from the American Indians of the medicinal properties of tar-water, and in this drug he believed he had found a panacea. With a missionary fervour worthy of the earlier days of his Bermuda project, he flung himself into the proclamation of the virtues of his new medicine. In 1744, in the midst of this tar-water enthusiasm, appeared "Siris." From a consideration of the universal properties of his remedy, Berkeley is drawn on to a chain of philosophical meditation upon the Power at work in the material world and the unity of the Universe in God. "Siris" became the most popular of Berkeley's works, not

because of its metaphysical theories, but because of its announcement of a profitable physical fact. Not the real power of the spirit, human and Divine, but the unreal powers of matter took hold of the imagination of men!

Berkeley, now broken in health, left Ireland in August, 1752, and settled in Oxford. The change at first seemed to revive him, but on January 14, 1753, he passed away.

### III.

In seeking to understand the principles of Berkeley's philosophy, we must remember that most of his writings have a controversial aim. His was the age of the Deists—men who, in the eighteenth century, anticipated many of the movements of modern thought. They demanded a religion without miracle or mystery, a morality which ultimately was reducible to the pursuit of pleasure, and a philosophy which took as its base solid matter and did not concern itself greatly about intangible and invisible souls or spirits. Without being Atheists (as Berkeley at times somewhat unfairly called them) they were anxious, as far as possible, to do without God in the world. Berkeley held that the source of their doctrines, as also of most of the unprofitable disputes of philosophy, lay in the attribution of power to inert matter. His own philosophy, cutting at the root of the error, is an exposition of a startling and far-reaching thought which had entered his mind (whence we know not) as early as his twentieth year. This is it in his own eloquent words: "Some truths there are so near and obvious to the mind, that a man need only open his eyes to see them. Such I take this important one to be, to wit, that all the choir of heaven and furniture of earth, in a word, all those bodies which compose the mighty frame of the world, have not any subsistence without a mind, that their being is to be perceived or known; that consequently, as long as they are not actually perceived by me, or do not exist in my mind, or in that of any other created spirit, they must either have no existence at all, or else subsist in the mind of some eternal spirit: it being

perfectly unintelligible, and involving all the absurdity of abstraction, to attribute to any single part of them an existence independent of a spirit. To be convinced of which, the reader need only reflect and try to separate in his thoughts the being of a sensible thing from its being perceived."

To reach Berkeley's point of view we must try to imagine a universe from which all intelligence, human or Divine, is excluded. Can we conceive of such a universe? Must not a dead material world (if it existed) be destitute of all qualities? What meaning can we give to an unheard sound, or an unseen colour, or an untouched hardness? Does sound exist in the vibrating string or in the hearer? Is the colour of the rose in its petals or in him who looks upon it? Can there be any flower "born to blush unseen," not only by our eyes but by any eye whatsoever? "Must not" (in Berkeley's language) "the *percipi* be the *esse* of the things of sense?"

Suppose, for example, you perceive, as you say, an apple. What is it you really perceive? You *see* a round shape, and a colour—red, or yellow, or green; you *smell* a certain odour; you *feel* a certain hardness, and smoothness or roughness, according to the kind of fruit; you *hear* a certain sound, if you tap it; and *taste* a peculiar flavour, if you eat it. Here, then, you have a group of experiences. What is there in the apple besides these experiences of yours? What more is the apple than this bundle of qualities presented to our senses, this collection of "ideas of sense"—an "idea" for Berkeley being anything presented to the mind? "There is something more," said Berkeley's opponents, and we at first might agree with them. "There is the matter to which these qualities belong, the stuff of which the apple is made." "Very well," Berkeley would say, "what can you tell me of this matter? Can you say anything of it save that it exists? You cannot attribute any qualities to it, for qualities must be perceived, and all perceptions are in some mind and not in any unthinking substance. Your matter is invisible, intangible, unperceived and unperceivable. It explains nothing and does nothing.

You can say nothing intelligible about it. It is a word without a meaning. Continue, if you will, to talk about matter, so long as you are content to mean by *matter* what the plain man means by *nothing*."

#### IV.

Berkeley's contention, therefore, is that in the universe there exist only minds and their contents or perceptions; that there are no material things, but only ideas presented to the mind. Then, do objects come and go as I perceive them, or not? Do these pages, reader, cease to be, when you, perchance, fall asleep over this article? Is a universe created afresh when each individual soul comes into being, and does the universe grow as that soul grows in experience? This is unthinkable. What I do not perceive at this moment may be perceived by others, and exist in their minds. Still, there are many things which we firmly believe to exist, which no human being, nor even any lower animal, perceives. Where are such things, how do they exist?

Berkeley's answer is: "The things—*i.e.*, the ideas which we perceive—are not created by us, still less do they exist in unthinking matter (which, after all, is mere nothing). They exist in the omnipresent and omniscient mind—*i.e.*, in God, in Whom we live and move and have our being. It is He Who presents to our mind the series of ideas which makes our world."

Thus God is not reached at the end of a long chain of reasoning. God is involved in the very existence of a world without us, and all we touch or hear or see is but the language in which God Himself continually, unceasingly speaks to us. Berkeley finds two realities—the soul and God. The material world is but a system of signs revealing God. This doctrine is vastly different from that sometimes put forward in the name of science, according to which the world is a product of matter and motion, consciousness a "function" of the grey matter of the brain, and God is the unknown and unknowable. Against such a doctrine Berkeley's arguments are conclusive still, for

the primary fact from which all philosophy must start is the fact of our own consciousness; nothing else can be known save as it enters into consciousness, and matter is the unknown and unknowable.

## V.

Berkeley thus got rid of matter by showing it to be a mere abstraction to which no conceivable meaning could correspond. But David Hume a few years later carried this reasoning a stage further by urging that the same arguments by which Berkeley had banished matter were equally potent to banish soul or spirit from all intelligible discourse. Hume said: "I can never find this idea of myself; I only observe myself wishing, or acting, or feeling something." He found himself to be but a series of conscious states with nothing to support those states, just as a thing was a bundle of qualities with no material substratum. But Berkeley had anticipated this criticism. He admitted that we have no *idea*—*i.e.*, no sense perception—of the soul, as we have of a colour or a sound, a table or a chair. We cannot directly perceive the soul, any more than the eye, which sees, can directly perceive itself. But the soul is no unmeaning substratum of ideas, such as we have seen matter to be. "True, in the whole world of sense-presented appearances, I find nothing corresponding to the self that I am obliged to presuppose in all perceptions, but it is in a manner revealed in memory, when I recall the past, and recognize that I am a person who is still the same person as I was years before." Berkeley explains that though we have no *idea* of the self, we have a *notion*, which is intelligible and necessary as a basis of all thinking.

## VI.

Thus philosophy secures for us by reasoned argument the two great realities which religion postulates—God and the human soul. But, in gaining the soul, has it lost the world? What becomes of science, it may be asked, with all its ordered system of laws of Nature, its forces, causes, and interactions?

If the universe in which we are living consists of bundles of sense-presented appearances, or ideas, all dependent on spirit or mind, what room is there for physics and chemistry, for botany and zoology, or even for mathematics? Do not all the sciences, upon which men have spent so much labour, achieving such imposing success, assume the independent existence of matter? Berkeley answers that those united qualities perceived by us, which we call substances or things, undergo transformations in an order which we commonly call the order of Nature. The steadiness of that order enables us, after sufficient experience, to foresee coming changes, so that present phenomena become signs of absent phenomena. As *substances* in the material world are only bundles of qualities, so *causes* in the material world are only *signs* of coming changes. My experience of apples enables me to foresee the taste of an apple before I eat it. Experience of the motions of the heavenly bodies enables the astronomer to predict their risings and settings and eclipses. Science loses nothing of its interest and validity, if we substitute for the abstract ideas of force, cause, and uniformity of Nature, the orderly, calculable presentation of facts to our perception by the omnipresent and omniscient Mind of God.

But how do we know that there must be a steady, calculable order pervading what often appears on the surface to be chaotic? Berkeley refers the universal belief in this order, this uniformity of Nature, to observation. "Having always observed that our perception of a certain round luminous figure which we call the sun is accompanied by a sensation which we call heat, we conclude that the sun and heat are constantly connected, so that the appearance of the one is a sign of the appearance of the other, and so the one is called the cause of the other."

We must recognize, however, that observation can acquaint us only with the present and the past. How can we be assured that the order observed in the past will be maintained in the future? How can science frame universal laws? Only by our having a reasonable faith that we are living in an orderly and trustworthy universe. Such a faith is as necessary to the

materialist as it is to Berkeley and his followers. The scientist has no other source than observation from which to obtain his natural laws. If they are to be for him anything more than a statement of what has happened in the past, he, too, must make the venture of faith ; but he, if a materialist, must put his trust in dead, unconscious matter, while Berkeley teaches us to trust, as our guarantee for an orderly universe, a living Person, to whom we can attribute moral qualities.

## VII.

The plain man might view with equanimity the threatened overthrow of the edifice of science, but he is likely to be exasperated when first asked to accept for himself this doctrine of the non-existence of matter. It will be remembered how Dr. Johnson to his own satisfaction demolished Berkeley's theory. When asked his opinion of it, he vigorously kicked a post, saying the while, " Thus I refute it." But he did not, in fact, refute it, for Berkeley was far from denying the reality of Dr. Johnson's visual perception of the post, or of his tactual perception, or of the pain in the learned doctor's toe, if he kicked hard enough, but only the reality of a material substance inferred from these perceptions.

Paradoxical no doubt this great thought of Berkeley's must always seem to most of us, accustomed as we have been all our life to assume for our practical convenience the independent existence of the things around us, but what is useful in practice is not necessarily true upon reflection, and thoroughly to think oneself into Berkeley's position, if not to remain in it, is essential for all advance in philosophy, and may prove salutary to many who are not likely to become students of philosophy, but need to be reminded of the unique and infinite value of the soul, at a time when

" The world is too much with us ; late and soon,  
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers ;  
Little we see in Nature that is ours ;  
We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon."

## SERMON OF THE MONTH.

---

### The Altered Decision.

BY THE REV. J. E. GIBBERD.

Mark i. 15 : " The kingdom of God is at hand : repent."

Luke xv. 7 : " There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth."

Matt. xxi. 28, 29 : " A man had two sons ; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. And he answered and said, I will not : but afterward he repented himself, and went."

" **A** CERTAIN man had two sons ; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. And he answered and said, I will not : but afterward he repented himself, and went." For in the meantime he thought things over. When he thought about it, he knew he owed something to his father. When he knew what he owed, he knew his father's request could not be lightly set aside. In a sound mind other considerations came into conflict with his first inclination. Good purposes do overflow bad ones. Obedient resolves do exclude disobedient ones. The good and obedient purposes and decisions have a force of their own which, like a healthy breeze, imbued with sunshine, undoes the ill that gusts of wild weather have done. The first impulse of self-will would have set up a division between father and son. The work in the vineyard would not wait on a wayward man's convenience. The unhappy and injurious moods of a soul, which set it against duty, against filial feeling, against noble aspiration, declare themselves in active defiance of the will to which obedience is due. The father is set second to the son. The unity of the family, the prosperity of the holding, is marred by the son who eats his food off the produce of the vineyard, and finds his comforts in the protection of the home. He takes all he can get, and gives as little as he can. " I will not " stands for the wilful, defiant, eruptive temper. It is the barrier against welfare, the assailant against peace.

But when this son repents himself and turns "I will not" into "I will" he is a new man. The former disposition is changed; the old attitude is abandoned; a new mind is at work; new actions come of it. A hindrance changes to a help. Refusal is reversed by consent. Defiance is converted to amiability. The idle hand becomes a worker. The listless heart becomes busy in loving service. Even the countenance changes. For everyone knows what a willing heart can do which the unwilling cannot. "Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 3).

But to turn "I will not" round to "I will" needs works behind the hands of the clock. The "works" of the mind are motives, inducements. "I will not work" yields to "I will work" when the mind perceives a distinct and definite boon to be refused or won. Repentance turns on motives. Christ gives repentance because He gives all the motives for godly living.

What is the motive for repentance? The Gospel *is*; the kingdom of God *is*; the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord *is*. The prodigal son failed to discover any motive for repentance till he came down to husks and bethought himself of the pantry at home. Even at that he was better off than a prodigal who grows luxurious on a prodigal's pantry and leaves an unhealed sense of wrong at home. For a prodigal at ease is far from enviable. In himself he suffers the loss of the marrow of worthy manhood.

Now, repentance implies that one attraction will counteract another, one force overcome another, in the mind as well as in material things. We are told of fields in France where lilies grow so profusely that their scent destroys the scent of the deer and frustrates the hunt. The deer feed among the flowers in safety. So, too, we know of an innumerable company of men and women of many nations who are no longer a prey to the world, the flesh, and the devil, because they have themselves been drawn away from the dry and barren places where they were easily overtaken by the hounds of temptation and have

found peace and security among the perfume of the life in the influence of Christ. The higher attraction of the spirit of life in Christ has counteracted the attraction of inferior things. If the better life in them be incomplete, it is, nevertheless, real.

Does one think to himself that his bluntness of feeling towards God and the Saviour is blameful? Does he have occasional uneasiness about the great Hereafter? Does he have qualms about the character of his influence at home and abroad? Does it sometimes occur to him that religion has a vitality, and has claims on him that may have to be faced some day? Does he know that a lack of power is manifest in him to think and feel, to act and be, what he would wish—a lack of prevailing moral mastery, of inward peace, of generous consideration? Is he sensible of inward unsettlement as of a life without reliable foundations, and of an inward strife as of a life in which no fine influence has gained dominion? If a soul have these sentiments or feelings, or, not having them, has the still worse torpor and toughness, the need is palpable of a strong motive to throw off by strong effort this poverty, this deadness, this paralysis of inward life; to terminate this oppression of conscience and suffocation of the higher feelings, this estrangement of mind from God and the eternal issues of life; and to grasp some strong tow-rope which may draw him into a more happy, exalted, energized state of mind, and a more refined character. If it be so with one, he has the witness in himself of his need to repent. He is a child who in the knowledge that he has become offensive to his father imagines his father is offended, and fails to perceive that his father's displeasure has no other root than love and the desires which love begets.

To him Christ comes, invested with authority from God, teaching at the outset, as the beginning of better things, "the kingdom of God is at hand. Repent ye, and believe the Gospel" (Mark i. 28).

Repent; shut the valve from which the old ways of thinking steamed; forsake the dry indifference; give thought to loftier aspirations; open the lock-gate of your heart that the stream of

thoughts of God and eternity may flow. You have been walking with your back to the sun, and the shadow of self always fell in front before your eyes ; your own fancies led you. Turn and face the sun. Your own shadow will fall behind you. Before you the way will all be light. Turn the face towards Christ. Let all the winning grace of His great heart, exalted character, heavenly thoughts—all the wondrous revelation of Divine truth in His words, come as the spreading rays of sunlight on you. Turn from the pleasures of sin, from a life of mere self-pleasing, to a life in which pleasing Christ and carrying the yoke of Christian service is the choice boon. The reason and incentive for reversing your life is, The kingdom of God is at hand. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." "You are not your own, you are bought with a price." Your King is God ; your province is the whole area of the will of God, made known to you by Jesus Christ ; your law is Christ. The kingdom of God is among you. So far are you from having to seek it that it encompasses you. From it comes all the impact of good desire, and elevated thought, and fine instinct of truth, and noble outline of character, that invests you. Surrender to Christ. In such surrender you will find full repentance.

A youth leaves his home and emigrates. He gets engaged with many interests, having a home and occupation different from those he left in the old land. By degrees he drops his communications with the old home. His forgetfulness is felt. Strong love could not forget. Another emigrant meets him who has knowledge of the old home. After greetings the talk naturally turns to the place of mutual youthful interest, and in the course of conversation it comes out that good fortune has come to his father, and there is a much pleasanter home than the one he left. "I should write if I were you," says the companion. And do not we all know how the opulent home is an incentive to the forgetful man ? He repents of his neglect because a happier state of things is in store should he ever want to return. A new motive is in force that overcomes his indifference. And there is

joy at home because the son who was estranged has put himself in the way of restoration.

The good news of the grace of God towards transgressors, attested by Jesus Christ and magnified by His sacrifice, is the great motive for repentance. Fear of the consequences of sin, than which no worse "wrath to come" could well be imagined, is a motive that appeals to our frailty. And it is well that we have a wholesome shrinking from harm and destruction, and are deterred by it from sins of vice and violence. Better, however, and more exalting, is the appeal to our affection and aspiration in the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, and the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

And one wonders how he may repent—how the right feeling and action may come to his soul. How may he draw water from a well? Even as he lowers a vessel into its water and turns a windlass to raise water, so let him "draw water from the wells of salvation." Let him put his mind into the resources of saving thought, saving belief, saving sentiment. Let him have discernment quickened by practice into the contention between truth and falsehood, selfishness and kindness, exaction and grace, quarrelsomeness and peace, heavenly-mindedness and worldly-mindedness. Let him ask help of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not—except, indeed, He upbraideth us for not asking and not trusting, as Christ upbraided the cities of Galilee because they repented not (Matt. xi. 20). Let a man examine himself reasonably—not to make himself moody nor to deprecate himself unduly, but sufficiently to know whether he be of God or evil hath the mastery of him. Let him know the value heaven sets on repentance, for He that came from heaven and knew heaven in His own spirit declared, "There is joy in heaven, among the angels of God, over one sinner that repenteth," as a shepherd rejoices over one sheep saved from the perils of the wilderness, and the woman over one piece of silver she finds after she had lost it. Repentance is the passport into the kingdom, because the kingdom of God is within us, and its shrubs and trees, its flowers and songs, are righteousness, peace,

and joy in the Holy Ghost. We clothe to suit our climate, and change our clothing for a different climate. Our mind and temper, our disposition and propensities, are to be changed to suit our heavenly family and station. And the outfit for heaven-born hearts must needs be of heavenly make. No amount of repentance could be like changing a carnation into a rose. But true repentance is like changing a wild rose into a cultured rose. The infirm, inferior soul is changed into the capable, superior soul. The numb, unresponsive soul is changed into an attentive, alert soul. The ungodly becomes godly, the unbelieving becomes believing, the undevout becomes devout ; the pivot on which life turns is moved ; the old centre of resources is given up for a new centre, the things that pleased once are superseded by things that used not to give pleasure. For he that is after the flesh minds things of the flesh, and he that is after the spirit minds things of the spirit.

There is, no doubt, a heavy obstacle of natural disinclination to finding ourselves in the wrong and falling out with ourselves. The son who said, " I will not go," and afterwards repented and went, had to contend with the pride of spirit which will hold by a wrong resolve rather than exchange it for a right one. And it is not merely the change of mind which baffles us, but its confession. If one could change and no one know it, change might seem easier. It could not actually be easier, because it is precisely someone else knowing it that is a help to us in maintaining the altered resolution. Whosoever will hide his good resolves sets himself a double task. One soldier cannot at the same hour man the rampart and the trench. If one mount the ramparts of good resolve, he may well consent to another keeping the trench. The prodigal of Christ's parable took his first step towards restoration when he " came to himself, and said, How many hired servants of my father have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger ! I will arise and go to my father." But he took a longer step when he settled to say, " Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son." For in this confession

he took his father with him into the compact of restoration. One need never fight shy of owning himself in the wrong. The wrong has been visible to others long enough ; it conciliates their good-will to acknowledge it. Forgiveness is turned to waste, however rich and comfortable it be, when it is not sought. Forgiveness is always ready in the heart of the heavenly Father ; its great breadth and depth, its thoroughness and intensity, are shown in the sacrifice of His Son. And with our confession we go with open hands to our Father for our acquittal, and find how fully justified we are in seeking His mercy. Such grace answers from heaven to the penitent heart that it brings with it peace and joy to the recovered child. The joy of God's angels has its echo in the joy of earth's sons.

Therefore, count it all honour to repent. Build no ill-constructed house, to pride yourselves on a few white bricks turned up on end to decorate it, while the inside is inconvenient and common. See first to the convenience and comeliness inside. Let repentance be full and sincere. The time past may suffice to have done the will of the flesh. God's will has too long waited its turn. Let His sovereign will have respect and submission. Repent, because God rules in love. Repent, because God bestows unmeasured grace on child-like spirits. Repent, because Christ died for the remission of our sins.

“ O God, with whom renewing is,  
Add to Thy mercies manifold,  
That my life from its sombre grey  
May get some light and gold.”



## For 1914.

"Certainly I will be with thee."—*Exod.* iii. 12.

"My Presence shall go with thee and I will give thee rest."—  
*Exod.* xxxiii. 14.

1.

**M**Y path may be rugged and steep,  
Through tracts of a wilderness drear,  
Through rivers o'erflowing and deep,  
Yet nothing need know I of fear.

2.

The world with its charms and alarms  
May dazzle or threaten in vain ;  
For once in omnipotent Arms,  
In safety I ever remain.

3.

His Presence is absence of ill,—  
Nay, more, it is fulness of joy ;  
Complaints find no place, for His will  
Must ever my praises employ.

4.

His Presence illumines the road  
Which leads from Night's darkness to Morn ;  
It lightens and lifts the sore load,  
Too heavy by me to be borne.

5.

His Presence,—in Covenant-bond,—  
For ever stills Care's weary quest ;  
His Presence,—both here and beyond,—  
Leads straight to a haven of rest.

6.

The Vale of the Shadow of Death  
I fear not with Him by my side ;  
I firmly believe what He saith,  
And trustfully lean on my Guide.

ARTHUR J. SANTER.

## The Missionary World.

CHRISTMAS-TIME draws us to stand once more by the cradle of the manger, and to look out with thankful hearts in the light of the Incarnation upon the world. The revelation of the Father through the Son of man is an inexhaustible source of inspiration, and contains a message whose fulness of meaning is not yet fathomed, much less proclaimed. More and more, for the life of the Church and for the quickening of the nations, the knowledge of Christ in personal experience is our only hope. As through His Cross He completes the world's redemption, so through His Incarnation He expresses God in terms which sons of men can apprehend. Out of Bethlehem Ephratah, little among the thousands of Judah there comes the Eternal One, born of a travailing nation, and in great humility, who is the Ruler, and the source of life and peace. From that lowly place, in the midst of national and international tumult, there rises, strong in simplicity and impressive in majesty, the figure of the great Shepherd standing to feed in the name of the Lord, who by His Presence gives sustenance and secures continuity. The picture which the prophet Micah sets before us is unsurpassable in beauty, full of stability and of rest. Can we, facing this new year of missionary service, ask more than a realization of that Presence, tender, strong, resourceful in our midst? Is it not enough to be the sheep of His pasture, fed from His Hand, watching with Him for those "other sheep," till we and they become "one flock"? In our strenuous days of committees, or of meetings, or of interviews, or even of controversies (which God avert!) let us practise withdrawal into the sanctuary of this vision of the Christ, calm, protective, life-giving, for ourselves and for the world. We need such refuge in our toil.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Conference recently held at Kikuyu, in British East Africa, raises questions of great and far-reaching import. The

subject, to which the religious and even the general Press are giving close attention, is editorially dealt with elsewhere in this number. It only remains here to note the striking endorsement of the statement often made that the outstanding problems which the Church has to face will be raised, and in God's time solved, in the new conditions of expanding life in the mission field. This is a powerful argument for sending out our best men and women to the places where formative work must be done. Those who have to take final action in regard to the issues raised at Kikuyu need the aid of our prayers.

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

The official report of the meeting of the Continuation Committee in Holland has, at the time of writing, not yet been issued. It will shortly be put into circulation through the societies. But informal statements in the Press, and the testimony of individual members, leave no room to doubt that the Committee is moving wisely and steadily towards the accomplishment of its high aim. Some of the action taken—such as the Committee's definition of its relation to the mission boards and to missionary bodies abroad, to both of which it offers its services with no desire to legislate or to control, and the call to Dr. Mott, to which he cordially responded, to give himself mainly to forwarding the great undertakings which the Continuation Committee has in view—opens out a whole world of possibility. The spirit of love and unity in the meeting impressed those present very deeply, and is held to be the beginning of a new international fellowship in the furtherance of the Gospel.

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

We have already in these pages called attention to the high value attaching to the "findings" of the twenty-one conferences in Asia presided over last winter by Dr. Mott. Even in their first inconvenient form—small pamphlets of varying size with no common index—they proved themselves indispensable to those who intelligently worked for missions. Now they have been issued by Dr. Mott in a well-ordered volume (price 7s. 6d. net,

from the office of the Continuation Committee, 1, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh), with excellent general and analytical indexes which make it easy to trace any topic through all the conferences. No book of reference published on missionary matters has ever equalled *The Continuation Committee's Conferences in Asia* in value, it is the condensed expression of the best thought and experience of the three great Asian mission fields. When Dr. Mott gives us a like volume for Africa and the Near East, the science of missions will enter upon a new era.

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

On his way to the meeting of the Continuation Committee, Dr. Mott spent a few memorable days in the British Isles, first visiting Ireland and Scotland, then England. He had, as the *Student Movement* tells us, three main objects in view: "First, to report in person to the missionary societies of the British Isles the results of his tour in the Far East as Chairman of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh; secondly, to confer with the General Committee of the Student Christian Movement; and, thirdly, to receive a sum of money for the work of the British Movement and the Federation, especially in Central and South-Eastern Europe and the Far East." The paragraph from which we quote indicates that the two latter objects were largely attained; the missionary magazines of the various societies record Dr. Mott's strenuous work in pursuance of the first object. Two of the S.P.G. papers have a brief but sympathetic reference to his interview with the Standing Committee; the *C.M. Review* has a series of able and extremely cordial notes arising out of his interview with the Committee of Correspondence, and *Mercy and Truth* notes his emphasis on the need for Union Medical Schools in China; the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*, notwithstanding the pressure of its centenary record, gives a column to Dr. Haigh's description of Dr. Mott's "three hours' visit"; the *L.M.S. Chronicle* says of his address that "the procession of facts and experiences as they flowed on for ninety minutes had all the wonderful impressiveness of an army marching past to

war"; the B. and F.B.S. report an interview "of an unusually important and profitable nature"; in *China's Millions* a brief discussion of how to increase the number of missionary intercessors is based on the impression left by Dr. Mott's address to the Council. Since the meeting of the Continuation Committee Dr. Mott has in like manner been visiting missionary organizations on the Continent, and goes thence to present the results of his tour to the mission boards in North America. We may well give thanks, in the words of the editor of the *C.M. Review*, that "God has raised up a man of peculiar gifts, and especially gifted with the grace that wins the respect and confidence of His servants."

\* \* \* \* \*

Space forbids any attempt to touch on many other matters of interest in the December magazines. We can only express thankfulness for the success of the Conference of the Laymen's Missionary Movement at Buxton, the report of which—*Men and the World Enterprise*—has just been issued (Oliphant, 1s. net); our sympathy for Bishop Montgomery and the S.P.G. in the disappointment caused by his serious illness and consequent early return from India; and our sense of the great value of tours of careful survey by missionary experts, such as the joint visitation of Madagascar by representatives of missionary societies working there, the visit of the L.M.S. deputation to India led by the Rev. Frank Lenwood, and now the deputation sent by the B.M.S., consisting of their chairman, Sir George Macalpine, and their foreign secretary, the Rev. C. E. Wilson, to attend the Triennial Conference of the Society to be held in Calcutta this month.

\* \* \* \* \*

Slavery and oppression die hard while greed for gold still dominates men. A special sub-committee of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society has been following up the work of the Putumayo Select Committee, and has just presented a strongly backed memorial to the Prime Minister, signed, amongst others, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the

President of the Free Church Council. The recommendations urge the desirability of consolidating and extending the Slave Trade Acts, in order to render evasion of them more difficult and to fix more responsibility upon the British directors of companies employing native labour in the tropics; the need for the revision of British anti-slavery treaties with foreign Powers in order to adjust them to modern conditions and secure the fulfilment of their obligations; and the appointment of a few specially qualified consuls commissioned to investigate conditions of labour in the less accessible parts of the world. The book on *Portuguese Slavery* (Methuen, 1s.), recently issued by the Rev. J. H. Harris, author of *Dawn in Darkest Africa* and one of the secretaries of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, gives overwhelming evidence that in an African area there is need for active intervention just as really as there was in South America, though the oppression is different in form.

\* \* \* \* \*

We have been asked to make known that the January number of the *International Review of Missions* contains a "Missionary Survey of 1913" by Mr. J. H. Oldham, some 30,000 words in length, based on the reports of Missionary Societies and organizations in the mission field, on a regular examination of 250 magazines, newspapers, and reviews, both general and missionary, and on personal communications from over 150 correspondents in all parts of the world. The international resources at the service of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference have been fully utilized to make this connected literary record of a year so full of world-wide political, social, and religious significance unique in value to students of missions. Ministers will find in this survey a background for the missionary propaganda of their own denomination. The material is grouped under different countries, including all the mission fields and the home base in America, Great Britain, and the continent of Europe; side-notes facilitate reference to the various topics, and the main published sources of information are indicated in footnotes.

## Notices of Books.

THE FUTURE OF THE EVANGELICAL PARTY. By Rev. B. Herklots, M.A.  
London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Just as Mr. Balleine has taught us to value our heritage by "looking to the rock whence we were hewn" in his "History of the Evangelical Party," so Mr. Herklots now undertakes the task of showing us how we may best "press forward towards those things which are before"; and there is little doubt Evangelicals will rise from the perusal of his vigorous and inspiring little volume with their hearts cheered and encouraged, and with the assurance that they are well able "to go up at once and possess the land" of future promise. The author states his own personal view with the utmost courage combined with the fullest charity, while his book is pervaded throughout by a delightful spirit of breezy optimism, as well as by the firm conviction that the future of the Church rests largely in the hands of the Evangelical Churchman, who is the true representative of Anglican Catholicity. Mr. Herklots is, however, a frank and fearless, even if a friendly, critic of the shortcomings of his own school of thought, and in his effort to "clear away the rubbish" from the Evangelical household, he points out some useful home-truths which we shall do well to lay to heart, probably the most valuable of which is the imperative need of overcoming "the spirit of internal suspicion and disunion" which is too often displayed.

He deals comprehensively with his subject, outlining the attitude and policy which should be adopted by Evangelicals to modern doctrinal speculations, Biblical criticism, and ritual questions, as well as their right relationship towards Church Reform, modern Nonconformity, and "the spirit of the age." We think that he makes rather an artificial and superfluous distinction between a "party" and a "school of thought"; the difference is so difficult of definition that it is scarcely justifiable, for men, whether in political or religious matters, holding the same principles and convictions, will naturally and inevitably tend to unite and work together to advance them, and in this connection his strong plea for better consolidation of the Evangelical forces is well timed. Mr. Herklots voices, however, a much-needed truth in reminding us that "enthusiasm for the party does not connote subservience to partisanship and party spirit." Although the author re-emphasizes the distinguishing Evangelical maxim of "spiritual men and spiritual methods for spiritual work," and well says that Evangelicals have always "coveted spiritual results and not ecclesiastical advancement," he rightly complains of the flagrant injustice, as well as the short-sighted policy, of consistently ignoring their claims to a proportionate share of the higher offices and government of the Church. Believing firmly "that the future lies with Evangelicalism and not with Sacerdotalism," Mr. Herklots protests also against the attempt to introduce a foreign and un-English ritual and doctrine into our Church, and pleads for a new development which shall attract and consolidate instead of repelling "all the religious elements of the Anglo-Saxon race."

We have read this little book with much profit and with a sustained interest, and although we may occasionally have been inclined to question

some of the author's suggestions or opinions, yet we venture to predict that the book contains a distinct and valuable message, not only for those styling themselves Evangelicals, but also for all who have the future welfare of our Church truly at heart.

THE RELIGIOUS INSTINCT. By T. J. Hardy, M.A. *Longmans, Green and Co.*  
Price 5s. net.

The cry for a new religion, voiced in the temper and tendencies of to-day—that is the starting-point of this well-planned and well-written apologetic. But what really is religion? That is what Mr. Hardy is at pains to discover, and the study of comparative religion leads him to find its fundamentals in two elements common to every known form of religion—the instinct of expectation and the instinct of approach. So he offers us a definition of religion as consisting in “consciousness of God and desire for union with Him.” But in Christianity we have the full interpretation and renewal of these elemental instincts. The Life of Christ is the unveiling of the Divine object of our consciousness; His Sacrifice is the summary and interpretation of the instinct of approach. And Christianity, moreover, has proved itself the only effective regenerative force in the world. Therefore, the need for a new religion seems to break down, and the only answer to the modern cry for such can be “a rehabilitation of the religion of Jesus Christ.” In the course of the development of his main theme, the author brings us face to face with such vexed questions as the “miraculous,” the Fall, the personal agency of evil, the problem of the Cross, the law of continuity in the history of religion; while he tilts whole-heartedly at Modernism, Determinism, Naturalism, and several other “isms” of present-day popularity.

The two chapters on “Estrangement” and “Reconciliation” deal strikingly and convincingly with the fact of sin and the necessity and credibility of the Cross. We cannot forbear a line or two of quotation: “The Cross has ever been the measure of man’s estrangement. . . . The only thing that saves Calvary from being the proof-text of pessimism is the Divine overruling with which it was invested by Christ Himself. . . . The background of Redemption is not a literary or philosophical acumen, but the fact of sin.” The appeal of the closing chapter is as stirring as its title: “Wanted—a Venture of Faith.” The writer deplores the modern obscuration of spiritual faith by the tendency to thrust intellectual explanation into the place of spiritual religion. He lays the burden of blame for the unfaith of to-day upon the teachers, because, in the face of the needs of an age supremely secular, they are obsessed with its spirit, and are providing only what is interesting from an intellectual, or political, or controversial point of view. But he goes on to say: “In the darkest hour of Western destiny, it was not morality and it was not intellectual novelty that saved the race. Christ . . . had nothing that would not have been spurned with scorn by the Modernism and Ethics that dominate us to-day. . . . Yet one thing He did, and out of that sprang a new life, a new zeal, a new peace, a new humanity: He struck the spiritual note, and men responded.”

We thank Mr. Hardy for a book that is hopeful and helpful, abounding in brilliant epigrams and incisive phrases and happy illustrations. Some very conservative folk may take exception to part of his argument drawn

from comparative religion. Some very critical folk may be shocked at the glaring errors in the few Greek words printed. But for all that, they will agree that the author has made a skilful diagnosis of the modern spiritual need; he has suggested the right prescription, and written it out fully and proved its merits in a work of unusual freshness and vigour.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL. Section I.—Introduction. By Edwin A. Abbott, 1913. *Cambridge University Press*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Abbott's purpose is to describe those events in the Gospels which in some sense are attested "through four" witnesses. But his work is by no means like Tatian's Diatessaron. Nor does he mean that four must directly witness to what he accepts. They may witness "indirectly, or even"—paradoxical though it may seem—"by verbal omission." The chapters argue the priority of St. Mark, the posteriority of St. John, discuss St. John's allusions to St. Mark, his supply of synoptic omissions, and finally the question of order and arrangement in each of the four Gospels. There is always much to learn in Mr. Abbott's books—some might say too much—but this volume is more free from long footnotes than the others; he is rather drawing conclusions. The discussions of Matthew and Mark run along familiar lines. In the chapter on St. Luke there is an interesting page showing that "Luke, like most other educated Greeks, agreed with Dionysius of Halicarnassus that Thucydides and Demosthenes were good authors for him to follow when writing in the historical style with narrative and speeches intermixed." We cannot help feeling that Mr. Abbott gives too little credit to St. John for writing history, as when he says that "the Daughter of Samaria stretched out her hands to receive the living water from the Lord, after having played the harlot with many husbands and gone to the waters of Sychar (drunkenness)." Yet he finds that "the Fourth Gospel, in spite of its poetic nature, is closer to history than I had supposed," and we rejoice that it has to his mind given "increased weight to Christ's claims on our faith and worship."

THE GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE. Edited by J. Hastings, D.D. Vol. I.: Adam—Joseph. *T. and T. Clark*. Price 10s. Subscription rate, 6s.

Every preacher will want this series, and will find in it immeasurable value. Round each of the greater names that come before us in the Bible-story, careful scholarship has collected from authoritative literature all that variety of material for which the hard-pressed preacher finds so little time. Not a single ready-made sermon is to be found in the book, but rich and stimulating food for the mind, accurate, brought together within reasonable space, from which the preacher can build up sermons without end, impressed with his own personality. The present reviewer never yet was conscious of any help from books of "sermon outlines," etc., but a series like this is a mine to be explored, from which rich treasure is continuously secured. "The Greater Men and Women of the Bible" must go on the shelves side by side with "The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels" as indispensable. Fourteen names are dealt with in this first volume: Abel, Abraham, Adam, Cain, Enoch, Esau, Eve, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Melchizedek, Noah, Rebekah, Sarah.

**A CHURCH IN THE WILDS.** By W. Barbrooke Grubb. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s. net.

This is the story of the South American Mission amongst the natives of the Paraguayan Chaco. The hardships and difficulties that had to be encountered are narrated in pleasant, fluent English, and though the author gives us details of the work, which might have been omitted, we are bound to say he has made them intensely interesting. Nothing escapes his notice, and his knowledge of the subject is thorough. Treating of the moral codes of these peoples, for example, he puts the matter so well and fairly that we must quote his words: "Their ideas of honesty vary considerably from ours. Without compunction they will appropriate a few pumpkins from a garden, while they respect a tree containing honey which has been marked for possession by another. The same applies to household utensils or firewood left in a deserted hut, as if such were placed under a sacred taboo. The real fact of the matter is that among themselves they look upon certain kinds of pilfering much in the same way as some good people at home regard white lies, but what they consider serious they are quite conscientious about."

The author expresses his belief that with Christianity, as well as with all other religions, there is a tendency to degenerate. In these heathen nations he observes many signs of this. Superstition in all its worst forms had a firm hold of the people, and the tendency was on the down grade until the Gospel reached them. The question arises: Are the spiritual results permanent? The possibilities of this people are great, but evil influences are at work which, if not checked, will hinder progress.

This book is really a review of the whole missionary problem, which is not the same as it was a generation ago. The Edinburgh Conference showed that the native races may not receive just what we are disposed to give them, but will appropriate what is suitable to their different environment and in accordance with their past history.

**BEYOND THE GATE.** By Lionel Payne Crawford, M.A. London: *Skeffington and Son.* Price 2s. net.

These are addresses given in the Parish Room of Ramsgate on the Friday afternoons of Lent this year. The author is broad in his views: his teachers are found in various schools of thought. His words are helpful, and suitable for those who want to think out some of the difficulties of life. He believes in the necessity of mental and spiritual growth; if there is not this, there is stagnation. Here is one of his sentences: "Surely we need all of us to be growing, and to be growing on every side of our nature." We heartily commend this book.

**THE STORY-BOOKS OF LITTLE GEDDING.** With an Introduction by E. Cruwys Sharland. London: *Charles J. Thynne.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

These quaint story-books take us to the seventeenth century. They were written by the Ferrars of Little Gedding, and were carefully preserved for two hundred years. Finally, the manuscripts passed into the hands of a descendant of the Ferrars, and the present volume is a copy of the original vol. i. and the first part of vol. ii., both of which are in the British Museum. To lovers of the curious this book will be found interesting; it is neatly produced, there are several good portraits, and the binding is everything that can be desired.

Received: RICHARD WEAVER'S LIFE-STORY. By Rev. J. Paterson, M.A., B.D. London: *Morgan and Scott*, 12, Paternoster Buildings. Price 1s. 6d. THE LIFE OF D. L. MOODY. By his Son, W. R. Moody. London: *Morgan and Scott*, 12, Paternoster Buildings. Price 2s. 6d. net. RELIGION AT HOME. By L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2d. net. THE CHALCEDONIAN DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. A. J. Mason, D.D., Canon of Canterbury. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. net. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. net. Two valuable little pamphlets. OUR WONDERFUL PRAYER-BOOK. By Gertrude Hollis. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. net. A GLORIOUS HOST. By E. B. Trist. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. net. SACKVILLE COLLEGE SERMONS. By the late Rev. J. M. Neale, D.D. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.*, Racquet Court, Fleet Street. Price 2s. 6d. net. THE MIRACLES OF UNBELIEF. By Frank Ballard, D.D., M.A., B.Sc., F.R.M.S. London: *T. and T. Clark*, 38, George Street. Price 1s. net. THE LAIDLAWS OF LAMMERLAW. By Frances Browne Arthur. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co., Ltd.* A CYCLOPÆDIC BIBLE CONCORDANCE. London: *Henry Frowde*. Price 1s. net. VOICES OF GOD IN LIFE AND NATURE. By Annie McDonnell, with a Preface by the Bishop of Lewes. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co., Ltd.* PERSONAL SERVICE. A Short Memoir of Agnes Burton. By Ellen Maples. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*, 39, Paternoster Row. Price 1s. 6d. net. HOW SHOULD GENESIS I.-III. BE INTERPRETED? The Substance of Three Addresses given in Highgate Road Chapel, N.W., by Pastor James Stephens, M.A. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 2d. net. SCHEMES OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION FOR INFANT DAY-SCHOOLS. Edited by Rev. R. W. Balleine, M.A., with a Foreword by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Manchester. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*, Paternoster Row. Price 1s. 6d. net. An exceedingly valuable pamphlet for the real teacher. PUBLIC SPEAKER'S TRAINING COURSE. By G. Bower Codling. London: *Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net. THE CURATE OF WEST NORTON. By Rev. G. R. Wynne. London: *Walter A. Limbrick*, 57, Berners Street. THE LIFE OF FULLER PURPOSE. By J. Stuart Holden, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. net. THE SECRET OF LONESOME COVE. By Samuel Hopkins Adams. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s. Quite a good story. FAMILY PRAYERS. By a Layman (W. H. Somervell). London: *Robert Scott*, Paternoster Row, E.C. Price 1s. net. MEMORIES OF A VICARAGE. By the Right Rev. Handley C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. net. A touching account which many will be glad to read. GAZA, A CITY OF MANY BATTLES. By Theodore Edward Dowling, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. IN HIS NAME. By the Rev. Thomas Wilson, B.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 3s. 6d. A series of prayers. VIA VERITATIS. Notes for Daily Bible-Reading. By W. B. Trevelyan, M.A., and J. E. Dawson, M.A. With a Preface by Charles Gore, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*, Paternoster Row. Price 6s. 6d. net. A LITTLE FAIRY OF LOVE. By Gertrude Doughty. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. ARCHIE'S CHRISTMAS PRESENTS. By Ellen M. Blunt. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. A HOME IN THE BUSH. By H. L. Bedford. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF THE PARISH OF NORTH WRAXHALL, CO. WILTS. With a Life of the late Rector, Francis Harrison, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. 6d. net. TEN YEARS NEAR THE ARCTIC CIRCLE. By J. J. Armistead. London: *Headley Brothers*, Bishopsgate. OUR EMPIRE. Vol. II. A weekly magazine for Sunday-schools. Advent, 1912-13. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. 6d. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ALMANACK. London: *Church Association*, 13 and 14, Buckingham Street, W.C. Price 1d. THE RIVER TRAMP. By John Comfort. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. GUINEVERE; OR, THE LADDER OF LOVE. By Charlotte Ainsley Gillespy. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. THE DEFEAT OF THE SPANISH ARMADA. By Albert Close. London: *Protestant Truth Society*, 3 and 4, St. Paul's Churchyard, E.C. THE WHITE PIRATE. By John A. Higginson. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. 6d. A SOLDIER OF THE CROSS. By H. E. Boord. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s., and cloth 2s. A book for recruits and others in the service of the King of Kings. DAILY THOUGHTS. A Selection from the Works of the Right Rev. Handley C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham. By Louise Buckland. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. 6d. net. CHURCHMAN'S ALMANACK. London: S.P.C.K. In various forms and at various prices the S.P.C.K. send us their almanacks and diaries. There are none better, and each year emphasizes their excellence.