

vantage. Perhaps the standing of the clergyman in all ages has been what each individual achieves for himself, since our national Church, to its honour, has ever been democratic. No one was much poorer than Chaucer's parson, yet to the poet, and to all his later readers, he was a more satisfactory character than the rich monk with his fur-lined coat and his epicurean tastes. It is quite clear that the Reformation clergy were inordinately poor, since what was sufficient for a celibate priest was utterly inadequate for a married clergyman with a family in times when the value of money had decreased, and, as the author remarks, "clerical poverty has produced many evils," the best-known example being the trencher-chaplain, whose treatment by his patrons was a degradation of religion. Doubtless some literature of this period exaggerated the type, but the poet Crabbe shows that the office was a difficult and humiliating one.

Nevertheless, no class of men have figured more frequently in literature, and when we do find our social historian, it will probably be seen that the parson has exercised his influence over almost every phase of our national life.

We learn incidentally in Mr. Ditchfield's book much about those clerical terms and customs which should be, but so seldom are, part of the common knowledge of Church-people—when we should use the "Very Reverend" or the "Right Reverend"; what is the difference between the Rural Dean and Mr. Dean; the origin and duties of the sidesman, the Canon, the Archdeacon, in which connection reappears that old chestnut about "archidiaconal functions." There is a delightful story about Canon Parkinson, illustrating that wide tolerance which is so typical of Englishmen. Dean Herbert of Manchester was rather fond of inveighing against the teaching of the Fathers. His views diverged from those of the learned Canon, and upon one occasion the Dean administered a severe philippic upon Tertullian. Canon Parkinson was annoyed, but he only remarked "Well, Mr. Dean, Betty Jones [an old woman who was a regular worshipper at the Collegiate Church] will never care to read Tertullian again after your attack and exposure of his character."

But the book abounds in good stories, and the humour is always genial and kindly. It has recently been issued in a cheap edition by Messrs. Methuen, and is thus brought within the reach of everyone interested in quaint old customs now passing away, and in those personal anecdotes which tend to give reality and humanity to the dignitaries of our Church, whether of high or low degree.

ELEANOR TROTTER.

WHAT RELIGION IS. By Bernard Bosanquet, D.C.L., LL.D., Fellow of the British Academy. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited. 1920. Pp. xii, 81. Price 3s. 6d.

"Dr. Bosanquet never, like Mr. Bradley, falls foul of the Christian pulpit in heated language. But that is precisely because he has not a religion of his own, not one which is a vital interest." So wrote Professor A. E. Taylor in the first number of this review. In this short book Dr. Bosanquet certainly claims to possess a religion, and one feels as one reads it that Professor Taylor's words are not quite fair. It is not the work of "a curious observer from the outside"; there is even a subdued fire in Dr. Bosanquet that gives vitality to the central grasp by the mind and will on the supreme values. The categorical character of truth, love, and beauty as ideals for faith to be followed with supreme disinterestedness, and the conviction that our present imperfection is not the reality of ourselves, but that we can enter into union with the supreme good and "rise

into another world while remaining here," are based on the depths of experience. As the writer deals with that experience he gives us assuredly something warm and vital. But the warmth is chilled by self-imposed limitations. The religion of Dr. Bosanquet knows nothing more definite for its object than "the supreme good"; predicates like Father, Creator, King, and Lord are expressly ruled out as accidental, and indeed likely to lead the soul astray from union with the true Eternal, with whom our highest values are associated. This seems to be the point of attack upon Dr. Bosanquet's conception of religion. "When faith weakens, the unity of the spirit tends to sever itself into ideas of persons in relation with each other, and the common conceptions of persons begin to react," he writes, and exposes a point of view that is scarcely comprehensible to the Christian thinker. For the predicates which Dr. Bosanquet so airily rejects as "words which may help our sluggish imaginations" are precisely what makes religion real to the Christian, whatever element of symbolism he may recognize in the terms. Christianity is, indeed, the revelation of God as personal, and the personal predicates rejected by Dr. Bosanquet are practically what we mean by religion. It is that very stress on the intimate personal relations between God and man which is central for Christianity. Prayer and Sacraments in our religion are not subjective "means to renew and fortify faith," but actual communion of person with person.

A religion very like Dr. Bosanquet's ruled the thinkers of the Western world when Christianity arose. Like the Stoic, he finds the supreme values within, he extends them to the Eternal without, he makes earthly circumstances indifferent, so long as unity with the world-spirit is attained. Stoicism was a magnificent religion, but it fell before Christianity as surely as the pagan cults. Or rather the larger truth absorbed the lesser, because it passionately held those personal predicates which Dr. Bosanquet considers likely to lead the soul astray.

W. J. FERRAR.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF RUSSIAN HISTORY. By W. F. Reddaway, Censor of Fitzwilliam Hall, Cambridge. No. 25 of the series "Helps for Students of History." London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1920. Pp. 32.

The greatest credit is due to the author of this useful booklet for the zeal with which he succeeded in collecting and sifting a great deal of the available material that may help the beginner to gain an interest and an adequate insight, not only into "the strangeness of Russia's expansions, contractions, and transformations," but also into the "widely different contents of her history, with matters unknown or even unintelligible" to the ordinary historians (p. 4). Dealing in a general survey with the "outlines" of Russia's history, her language, the periods of her development and her literature (§§ 1, 2, 4, and 5), Mr. Reddaway, in the section on "Method," insists upon "the advice to feel keenly before attempting to know systematically" (p. 22), quite in accordance with his view of the "central mystery of the study—the racial character of the Slavs" (p. 18). This formula, of course, cannot be taken literally, Russians and Slavs being by no means identical conceptions. It is to be regretted that the selection of authorities is bibliographically incomplete, lacking dates of publication; otherwise the beginner will no doubt have the full benefit of Mr. Reddaway's sobriety and soundness of judgment, especially if he remembers the paramount importance of the right methods and discipline, which will help him to recognize the minor masters, whom the author, in a mood of generous appreciation, has considered it unfair to omit.