

onesided as the thesis against which it is directed. He complains that Tertullian is regarded as a very feeble-minded person if it is supposed that he could not keep clear of legal conceptions in thinking about the Doctrine of the Trinity. To regard Tertullian as allowing his thought on the subject to be dominated by a single analogy from human institutions would shew, of course, singular incapacity to appreciate the most wide-awake and fertile of early Christian minds. But to no one, I suppose, do telling illustrations come more readily from all kinds of sources, and there is no reason why, even if he were no *iuris consultus*, nor even a *causidicus*, he should not have availed himself of illustrations from Roman law in his exposition of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

The value of Dr Schlossmann's work, which must be fully recognized, consists accordingly more in the evidence he has collected together than in the use which he makes of it in regard to the particular explanation of the doctrinal terms in question. He has abundantly, with much most interesting illustration, proved the non-juristic origin, and continuous usage of the terms; he has not, I think, disproved their currency even in Tertullian's time in a juristic sense.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.

## ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

*The English Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I.* By W. H. FRERE. (London: Macmillan. 1905. 7s. 6d.)

MR FRERE has written a very interesting book and one full of information often novel and always accurate, but his work suffers from a want of sympathy with the generations whose religious fortunes he traces. Perhaps if he entered more into their difficulties and the feelings which were then inevitable he would be able to give a clearer account of the general tendency of national thought in that critical period. As it is, we must thank him for a profusion of facts, but he leaves us without any satisfactory generalization or even antithesis, and without a picture of the English Church at the moment when it was taking the form which it still holds. Mr Frere is so much interested in what the Church has come to be and in the evidences, often scanty enough, for the continuity of usage that he lays little stress for its own sake on the most significant feature of Church life in the Elizabethan age, the vigorous and profound reaction against all that was characteristic of the Marian time and in general of the older mode in religion. But he is not content with

passing over without systematic consideration the temper of mind of Spenser and his contemporaries ; by a series of attacks spread through the book he endeavours to depreciate it. Instead of measuring its fervour by its symptoms he emphasizes the ugliness of some of these, and there are times when his sarcasm reminds us of Professor Maitland. He would have done better to point out that it was inevitable, the times and the men being what they were, that progress should take the form of repugnance to the past ; and since he heartily approves the result he should have shewn himself at least tolerant of the necessary means. A dilettante interest in the revival or survival of seemingly customs would have been fatal to the end in view. Our people obeyed a true instinct when whole counties rejected the surplice ; we may even see in the squalor of their churches an evidence that they were determined to have a future unlike the past. Their leaders were careful in more important matters to preserve their heritage, but a rough work had to be done if the new step was to be made irrevocable and the centre of English religion was to lie within its circumference ; nor is it quite consistent with the spirit of gratitude or of history if we who have entered into their labours judge our fathers of the sixteenth century by the standard of 1500 or of 1900. We need to contemplate the religious tendencies of the Elizabethan age as one exemplification among others of that great outburst of intellect and action. Perhaps the spirit of adventure in religion is not less creditable than the kindred daring of Drake. Enthusiasm always expresses itself emphatically, and seems to derive strength from the consciousness that it is shocking its adversary. No source of strength could be despised in that memorable conflict ; and all who look back with gratitude to a robust Laudianism should be grateful also for the robust anti-papalism which was its necessary forerunner.

It seems lamentable that Mr Frere should have chosen to disparage rather than to interpret. No doubt 'dull morning prayer or a dreary homily', though they satisfied Hooker and have had an unaccountable attraction for successive generations of Englishmen, were less bright than the worship of an earlier or a later time ; no doubt, had we been present, we should have vented our disgust in such language as Mr Frere employs on p. 208. We may, in fact, read it in abundance in our contemporary ecclesiastical journalism. But Mr Frere has allowed his feelings to master his memory for facts in the comparisons he draws between Elizabethan custom and discipline and those of the preceding century. Abbots and monasteries, we are told, made a better use of their advowsons than their lay successors in the patronage. It may be so ; and a natural reaction against the calumnies which accompanied the suppression disposes us to think as kindly of them as possible. But ecclesiastics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were fully acquainted

with the method by which favours were dispensed at Rome and walked loyally (though no doubt with discretion and at a modest interval) in the same steps. Mr Frere can certainly recall instances where the clerk presented to a valuable benefice bore the same surname as the abbot who presented him, and he knows the use of papal chaplaincies and of licences in plurality. Perhaps he could estimate how often a living formed a cheap and convenient retaining-fee for the clerical lawyer whose services were constantly required by a religious house. Now that so much material has appeared in print we may hope to know as much about the ways of Lancastrian abbots and monasteries as we do about Hanoverian bishops and chapters; our judgement will probably incline towards the more recent body.

This unconscious bias leads Mr Frere into a serious expenditure of space upon alien affairs. Not only have we the history of the really heroic Roman mission, but also the internal disputes of its adherents, and even the names (and that in a narrative which is chary of the names of English bishops) of the obscurest of seminary priests who suffered or recanted. And if this work is meant to be a history of the sixteenth century rather than an antiquarian study of matters which came to be interesting in the nineteenth, we have a right to complain that an excessive attention is paid to very faint survivals; how faint they are appears from the unsparing labour which it has cost Mr Frere to trace them. These excursions—though they are so numerous that it seems incongruous to give them the name—are among the most attractive parts of the volume; but their very attractiveness tends to mislead the student into thinking that in the age of Elizabeth they loomed as large as they do to-day. A want of proportion tends to involuntary anachronism.

This excess of interest on one side betrays Mr Frere into a defect of sympathy on the other. Mr S. R. Gardiner has shown how, on the very eve of the Civil War, many leading Puritans were wholly averse from an open breach with the ruling party in the Church. If the process of differentiation even then was not complete, there must have been, a generation or two earlier, a mass of almost homogeneous Protestant feeling which was the characteristic type of English religion in its day. To describe this as a whole, stating its relation to contemporary foreign Reformers and tracing its gradual cleavage into definite and antagonistic parties, is the task of the historian, and Mr Frere is too much of a partisan to perform this part of a historian's functions. He is so impartially busy in belabouring both that he forgets to discriminate between them, nor does he seem to be interested in Hooker's attempt to fix Anglican thought upon an Anglican basis. The notice of Hooker is curiously meagre, and the really serious question how far Hooker practically influenced his age, or whether like Bacon he was a man of genius

beyond his time, is not clearly answered. The broader issues, in fact, fail to interest Mr Frere, and he has allowed his own tastes and feelings, which are refined as well as vehement, to dominate his understanding. He has even neglected to give an outline of the working system as it was clumsily started under Elizabeth. Universities and schools, the poor and the parish vestry, the origin of the family living; these are some matters of living importance for which space should have been found in a book which tells us all that is known about plainsong and the fortunes of Martin Marprelate's printers. And at the head of an episcopal Church stand bishops. Many of these were, in Mr Frere's words, men of 'indifferent or squalid reputation'. Here is a grave assertion, and one easy of proof. It is allowed to remain an assertion. The dealings of even one bishop with the revenues of his see would have been a valuable, and even necessary, addition to the work; as would an examination of the constitutional position of the bishops as affecting their powers and the use made of them. Nor should the deliberate retention of many of the abuses of the Canon Law in regard to benefices have been passed without remark. This action, or failure to act, on the part of the State was, like the continuance of the cumbrous testamentary system, part of the price paid for the maintenance of the bishops in their constitutional position, and is itself a point of extreme historical importance.

But Mr Frere has preferred the part of the chronicler to that of the historian, and he has fulfilled it so well, and put such life into the details of forgotten controversies and the passing events of a former time, that we cannot quarrel with him. Everything he tells us is interesting, even though we might often wish that his selection had been different and that he had chosen to draw our attention to some point which we are in danger of missing. He is frankly interested, for instance, in monastic institutions; but he does not tell us how largely the course of the Reformation was shaped by men who had learned in the cloister to rebel against its training. Yet nothing in the record is more significant; not even the silent approval of change on the part of the obscure multitude of the secular clergy. And surely a sympathy, however discriminating, with the ideal of a national Church, expressing its mind in destruction as well as in conservation, would have been a better guide through the dimness of the period than an abstract standard of what the Church should be, which has never, attractive as it is, been realized in experience.

E. W. WATSON.