

suit the case of 'some other Jewish leader of other days who had other foes to face' (p. 183), but he rightly feels that the times of Nehemiah help us to understand the imprecations of *vv.* 22-28. And here I must once more quote from Dr Barnes words which I would gladly make my own.

'The foes whom the Psalmist curses are not primarily his own, but those of his people and of his God. They are not cursed merely because they do not conform to the Psalmist's standard of Jewish orthodoxy, but because their malignant opposition threatens the very life of the Jewish Church. The imprecations are, in short, intended as prayers of defence; the Psalmist prays against the wickedness of his people's foes. The language of this Psalm is therefore defensible in its historical connexion. Imprecations are a true part of the expression of the Hebrew religion, as it existed before Christ; they have, indeed, their natural place in the mouth of the Israelite by the side of Prayer and Praise. . . . But the old historical connexion of the Psalm is broken to-day. We stand in the presence of one greater than Nehemiah and under a nobler law. It was once said, "Thou shalt hate thine enemy", and Nehemiah obeyed the command by hating the enemies of his people even at the sacrifice of all that he had of wealth and ease. But the command given us now by the supreme Judge is, "Love your enemies". For us to repeat the prayers of Nehemiah and the imprecations of Ps. lxi is not loyalty, but treason. *Vv.* 22-28 cannot be fitly used for Christian Psalmody, though in the mouth of the teacher they have power to convey by contrast vivid instruction in the new Christian law of Love.'

I trust that this fine passage will induce many readers to search for themselves in these thoughtful studies, and I can assure them that their search will be duly rewarded.

EDW. G. KING.

### BOOKS ON CHURCH HISTORY.

*A History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, by F. W. CORNISH. Two parts. (Macmillan & Co., London, 1910.)

THE important history of the English Church, begun under the editorship of the late Dean Stephens of Winchester, and of Dr William Hunt, is at last complete, and a reviewer who has noticed all its volumes in this JOURNAL can now express his hearty admiration for the work as a whole and his gratitude for the instruction he has derived from it. For many years to come this series will certainly be the standard authority to which readers who are not specialists will best turn, and there is no volume of the nine that will disappoint them.

But in these two which Mr Cornish has written they will detect a certain change of tone. When the first volume of the series was published, in 1901, English history was dominated by Bishop Stubbs, and the writers were members, and among the best members, of his school; not only their method but their spirit, that of the 'good Churchmanship' which he so powerfully recommended, was his. The ideals of Mr Cornish are different. He is no adherent of the Oxford Movement, nor is he definitely attached, so far as can be observed, to any other school of thought. His work has been education, and a certain detachment from party has been characteristic of schoolmasters. His own hero is Archbishop Tait 'who for wisdom, statesmanship, and force of character stands at the head of all'; and therefore it is not surprising that though Bishop Samuel Wilberforce is praised in set terms he is also subjected from time to time to very frank criticism. But Mr Cornish is no unqualified admirer of the Broad party. He is an enthusiast for Maurice, whom no school can claim, and sufficiently kind to Hampden, but Thirlwall incurs occasional reproach.

The author's chief interest, however, is not in persons, whom we could often wish that he more definitely described since personal leadership is of decisive influence in religious history. His concern is rather with tendencies and transactions. His view of tendencies is that of a cool, though kindly, observer. Unfortunately he starts with a stock of conventional prejudices against the eighteenth century. No statistics are more misleading than those of non-residence, on which he relies. At the present day, after all the amalgamations that have been effected, there are hundreds of toy parishes which always have been, and must be, held in plurality. These used to be recorded at length, and are in a considerable degree the cause of the assumption that the clergy were largely absentees. Even to-day they are sometimes used to reduce the average value of benefices, and so to heighten the pageant of clerical poverty. It would have been as much to the point had stress been laid upon the stately rectories of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries which so often overshadowed neglected churches, and prove that residence, if not attention to duty, was common enough. But no one should write of these things who has not examined the evidence as to residence of a hundred or two parish registers, and there is no sign that Mr Cornish has done this. He gives clear and sympathetic accounts of the Clapham and Hackney schools; the latter, dealing with unduly forgotten worthies and based on full and special knowledge, being particularly valuable. There is one point, however, in regard to the anti-Roman feeling of the period which he has not made. That feeling, which was to have such serious effects in regard to the Oxford Movement, was due to the controversy on Roman Catholic Emancipa-

tion. The taunt has often been brought against the clergy that they superfluously denounced the errors of Rome to congregations which had never seen a Roman Catholic. In fact it was not as dull theologians but as keen politicians that they developed a topic, the practical bearings of which upon the Church's fortunes no one could have foreseen. With the Oxford movement and its 'retrograde notions' Mr Cornish is out of sympathy, and he shrewdly criticizes the weak points of Newman's position. But of the course of events he gives a patient and conscientious record, continuing it with equal care through the later ritualistic controversies. The same fullness marks his treatment of the doctrinal strifes of the middle of the century, in which there seems to be only one notable omission, that of Maurice's famous protest against Pusey's attempt to collect clerical signatures for the 'Declaration of Faith' in 1864. It is needless to say that the progress of education is amply described, and that such topics as the struggle over Church rates are sufficiently treated. Yet in this last case the chief argument on the Church side, one which sounds strange to-day, is omitted. We are not told how public maintenance for our Churches was demanded chiefly on the ground that the buildings were public property.

Mr Cornish's work has two characteristics which mark it off from its predecessors in the series, the space he allots to the materials of history and his amplitude of comment. He has devoted many pages to *précis* of debates and to summaries of the results of litigation. Since the public will not turn over old newspapers or read Brodrick and Fremantle, this is a useful service, as is the account given of the more important Acts of Parliament affecting the Church. Yet it does not improve the work on its literary side, though the liberty which the author allows himself of commenting not only on the past and present but also on the prospects of the future adds interest to his pages.

This personal element also shews itself in Mr Cornish's choice of subjects. I cannot think that a writer so well informed and widely read is unconscious of the existence of Cowley and Mirfield. Since they do not appear in his pages, I am tempted to regard the omission as an evidence of want of sympathy. Sometimes, on the other hand, what seems to be a personal interest has introduced a topic of minor importance, as when the work of undenominational Bible Women in London is mentioned with praise, while the similar but much larger work of the London City Mission is ignored. But there are subjects on which the writer, compelled to say something, has not troubled to acquire accurate information. Among these, strangely enough, are the Universities. Neither Oxford, Cambridge, nor London is adequately and exactly treated. There are grave errors in the account of the results of the last Commission; under the name 'Ridley Hall Clergy Training

School' two distinct institutions are confused; and we are told that Oriel was one of the two Colleges in Oxford that could elect a lay Head, while in fact, till the death of Dr Hawkins in 1882, the endowment of the provostship consisted of a canonry at Rochester and a rectory in Essex. Nor is Mr Cornish always accurate in regard to colonial affairs. He says that the troubles in Natal were settled in 1893. They lingered on into the present century, and perhaps are not yet quite appeased. But no one can be universal in his interests, and there are drawbacks as well as advantages in a detached position. Mr Cornish has earned our gratitude by a scholarly and comprehensive and statesmanlike survey of almost every portion of an excessively wide field, and those who differ from his judgements will find the evidence in favour of their own view set out with scrupulous impartiality. I wish that the indices had been worthy of the work.

E. W. WATSON.

*Early Church History to A.D. 313*, by H. M. GWATKIN. (2 vols. Macmillan, London, 1909.)

WITHIN the last five years three works, of capital importance, on the history of the ante-Nicene Church have made their appearance. The first volume of Mgr Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* bears date 1906. In the spring of 1909 came Dr Bigg's *Origins of Christianity*, the MS of which left his hand only a few hours before his short but fatal illness. In the summer of that year Professor Gwatkin published the fruits of long years of teaching in his *Early Church History to A.D. 313*.

A comparison between the three is inevitable. The first two make for what the Dean of Christ Church, in his preface to the second, calls the 'central traditional view of things' as that which has survived from the re-examination of Christian origins. Dr Bigg would, no doubt, have accepted this description of his conclusions; and he would have given a humorous welcome to Mgr Duchesne's confession that if the choice were offered him between the *systèmes* of the one side and the *légendes* of the other, 'je crois même que, s'il fallait choisir, les légendes, où il y a au moins un peu de poésie et d'âme populaire, auraient encore ma préférence'. But no legends at any price for Mr Gwatkin: and, above all, none from 'the Catholic (Roman and Anglo-) writers' (i 9). They 'are not the only sinners against history, though they are much the worst' (i 10). 'Church history was as respectable as any other till it was covered with reproach by the partizanship and the credulity of the Tractarians' (i 6). It is some mitigation of condemnation so unqualified for the author frankly to avow that he has 'made no attempt to conceal personal opinions'. We at least know where we are, and what to expect next. But it is odd that Mr Gwatkin's *History*

VOL. XII.

I i