

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

be established, then there is everything in the Old Testament to sustain rather than to disprove that testimony. We have manifestly no right to assume the possibility or the impossibility of such Divine direction or enlightenment as is implied by inspiration, or that the Old Testament does or does not contain the evidence thereof; but the question is, Which position is most consistent with all the facts; namely, that the Old Testament was so ordered and prearranged as to present an insoluble enigma, or that the New Testament was the result of a series of mistakes, based mainly upon an entire misconception of the Old; or that the New Testament and the Old, being what they severally are, and that, as is clear, independently of any human design, the relation in which they stand to each other is such as to warrant us in the conclusion that the Old was Divinely designed to foreshadow the New and the New the historic witness to the validity and reality of its foreshadowings? If there is, as I maintain, sufficient and valid ground for this conclusion, then it is simply impossible that the Old Testament can ever rightly be regarded as an obsolete collection of books. Its significance is determined by other considerations altogether beyond its sphere, and its interest is mainly derived from events and circumstances long subsequent to it, which combine to show that its claims on our attention are permanent and indestructible.

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

ART. II.—JOHN SINCLAIR, ARCHDEACON OF
MIDDLESEX.

(Concluded from page 308.)

IN 1853 the mind of the Church was much occupied with the proposal to throw the Crystal Palace open on Sunday; with the question of Church rates; with the proposed Charity Commission; and with the usual educational discussions. On these four topics accordingly the Archdeacon addressed the clergy. The Charge has a vigorous defence of the authority of the Lord's Day: it contains a useful history of Church rates; discusses the charities department, which was then being projected for the control of the 28,840 charities of England and Wales, with property estimated at 75 millions sterling. It contains also a very accurate forecast of the difficulties that would be engendered by any proposal for school rates. He earnestly deprecated suspicions, misapprehensions, and jealousies, reminding the clergy that the watchful

eye of the Papal enemy was never closed in slumber, and eager to profit by their own divisions.

In 1855 the Archdeacon gave a very useful and memorable address on preaching. He thought that there was not enough of faith and earnestness in the discharge of this great office, and pointed to some of the great monuments of the past as the result of preaching. He showed that thus an effective oral address might be attained by study and practice; he urged, however, that for the purposes of such oral speaking a previously written sermon was not less necessary than for one delivered from manuscript. He enforced the study of popular science amongst those who had to address educated audiences, and earnestly exhorted the clergy to some acquaintance also with mental and moral philosophy and economic thought. The passage on the latter study, delivered thirty-five years ago, is very remarkable, in view of the attention which has been lately turned to that subject. In language of humorous pungency he deprecated the evil of hasty composition, and of confusion and inappropriateness of thought and style. He pointed out that there were two dialects in popular use, the learned and the popular, and advised that sermons as far as possible should be in the latter. He recommended means for avoiding meagreness of thought, and showed the absurdity of such arbitrary restrictions as bringing all Christian doctrine into every discourse. He reminded the clergy that edification was more important in dealing with a settled congregation than conversion. "Personal appeals," he said, "were needed, not pulpit essays." He concluded with excellent and sensible rules for delivery.

The resignation of Bishop Blomfield in 1856 and the appointment of his successor gave a welcome pretext to the Archdeacon, whose unobtrusiveness was ever so distinctive a feature in his character, to retire for a while into the background, and not to anticipate the questions which were ripening under the newly-appointed Bishop. It was at this time that he wrote for subsequent publication that charming series of personal reminiscences and experiences, to which allusion has already been made, and from which many quotations have been borrowed in this short biographical notice.

The Charge of 1859 might be taken as a commentary on the statement made the other day by Mr. Charles Booth, the economist and statistician, to the effect that the one thing which had struck him more than anything else in his inquiries into the state of the poor in London was the enormous and unsuspected social benefit of the parish system of the National Church. The title was "The Parochial System of England," and it opened with the quotation from the American states-

man, Daniel Webster: "Among the many great advantages," he said, "which the English nation enjoy, the greatest is their parochial system. It not only is an institution of inestimable value in itself, but it gives stability to all the rest." After an eloquent appeal, suggested by an English landscape, the Archdeacon reviewed in detail the pastorate and its blessed administration, the visitation from house to house, the care for the education of the children, the influence for good over the powerful and wealthy, the auxiliary forces which the parish minister summons, the social benefits of provident funds, hospitals, asylums, wise charitable foundations of every kind, the benefits of toleration and civil liberty, and other like inestimable advantages. He pointed out, in language which is very appropriate to the present epoch of blazing self-advertisement, that this good comes not with observation, but is like the little leaven which leaveneth the whole lump, quiet, gentle, and unpretending. He showed in language which is even truer in the present day, when so many new and poorly-equipped parishes have been established, how grievously this great work was hindered by the poverty of ministers. Altogether opposed to robbing patrons and parishes, he suggested that poor parishes in public patronage should be transferred to any patron who showed his interest in the matter by providing the requisite endowment—a proposal which was afterwards embodied in the Act of Lord Westbury. The Archdeacon related how he had himself been the means of freeing poor parishes from certain inequitable burdens and rent-charges. He next spoke of the terribly redundant population of London, and described in vigorous language the heathenism of large districts of the Metropolis, earnestly bespeaking the cordial sympathy of all public bodies as well as private individuals with church builders.

The Charge of 1860 was on the subject of school rates in England and America. It is interesting to observe that at this time school accommodation had fairly advanced with the increase of the people. The total number of children in England and Wales between 3 and 15 years of age was in 1851 4,908,696, and was assumed to have since increased to 5,350,000. After necessary deductions, the whole number who ought to be in attendance in elementary schools might be estimated at 1,800,000. According to the returns of the National Society in 1857, the number of week-day scholars in Church schools alone was 1,187,000. For many years there had been a genial calm in the educational atmosphere. Nothing could be more satisfactory than the denominational system of education, because each religious body threw all its energy into its own schools. The Archdeacon, however, fully foresaw the

impending struggle with the rate system, which took effect ten years after, in the Act of 1870. He therefore reviewed the secular system in the United States, with a careful narrative of its rise and progress, and testimony from various sources as to its important results. He showed what all impartial people must acknowledge at once, that the Sunday-schools are a very impotent supplement. He quoted from the German Church in America, from the English Church in the States; he proved from facts how inefficacious secular education was in repressing crime, and how inseparably proportional were ignorance and vice; he gave the opinions of professors at New York; he related how the Americans had been driven to erect parochial schools in addition to the common schools system; and he produced real evidence as to the inefficiency and expensiveness of the educational system in Canada. He concluded with an impressive passage on the preciousness of the few years spent at school.

In the Charge of 1861 he dealt with the subject of modern scepticism, naturally suggested to him by the interest excited through the appearance of "Essays and Reviews." He recalled the interesting conference at the house of his old friend, Sir William Hamilton, the philosopher, at Edinburgh, at which he had been present, which included members of the Church of England, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics and German Lutherans, where the latter had astonished the rest by their unshrinking scepticism. The Archdeacon, while not placing all the essayists or all modern rationalists on the same level, lamented that men among them, holding opinions so clearly contradictory to all that they had promised in their ordination vows, should think it right to remain in the orders of the Church; and he quoted the strong language of his learned and judicious predecessor, Archdeacon Waterland, in condemning subscription to the English formularies by men who were practically Arians as the plainest breach of sincerity and trust. He pointed out the false principle of all neology, the attempt to degrade and deprave the Divine agency. He showed that the idea of creation implied the arrangement by an eternal intelligence of all principles of development; every law of matter and mind which can be discovered only expresses the thought of God. In support of the ordinary theistical view of God, as the preserver of all things, he quoted the opinions of Bacon, Newton, Kepler, Reid, Stewart, and Clarke. He defended the unremitting energy of God, and put in a very strong and clear light, in opposition to Professor Baden Powell, the moral government of the universe. In describing the feebleness of modern Epicureanism, he asked in a passage of forcible eloquence whether the deity of Epicurus or of Christ

was the more rational. He showed how natural it is that mind should act on matter. Having an intimate acquaintance with the writings of Hume, he was able to show that Hume, far from denying the possibility of the miracles, questioned only the sufficiency of the evidence. He reminded his hearers that the purpose of the Bible miracles was fully adequate to their character. In contrast to the method insisted on by Bacon in the study of the Book of Nature, by first investigating the facts and then forming a theory, he pointed out how with regard to the Book of Revelation the Neologists first formed their theory of what a Revelation ought to teach, and then investigated the facts accordingly. He cautioned the clergy against relaxing in some fit of enthusiasm for liberality the subscription to the Church's creeds, so as to admit those who rejected the essential doctrines of Christianity; against taking up opinions as a matter of mere curiosity and speculation, when they were of serious and even vital importance; against being ready to accept almost anything which was taught by amiable and respectable men; and, lastly, against tampering with the authority of the Bible, for there was nothing else to stand upon.

In the next Charge, that of 1863, he continued the subject by taking the question, "Is it possible to find out God?" He began by clearing the ground, and showing that it was to the ancients rather than to the moderns that recourse must be had in reference to such a question, because the moderns could not get free from the influence of the Bible. He quoted a number of sentiments from Greek and Latin authors illustrating the extreme poverty and inadequacy of their notions of the Deity, reminding his audience that even Socrates was waiting for a Divine messenger. With all this he contrasted the incomparable superiority of the teaching of Scripture; to find God, in short, we must go to Revelation. The heathenism and crime of the nations which had not the Bible was worse now than ever. In opposition to Romanists, fanatics, and infidels, he showed, alike from science and from Scripture, that reason must be used in matters of faith. In the work of reason he laid down that the evidences of the authenticity and authority of the Bible as the Word of God must still be studied; secondly, that the Bible must be investigated, not with respect to natural science or political economy, but to religion. He ridiculed the pretensions of the higher criticism, and recommended certain safeguards for the use of the reasoning powers. Among these were the Creeds, which are of the highest historical value. He pointed out the hopelessness of making gradual concessions to neology, for neology would be satisfied with nothing less than complete surrender. Hume

himself had pointed out that the best way to undermine faith was by small successive attacks—a position which Bishop Berkeley also illustrated in his “Minute Philosopher,” and which Sir William Hamilton enforced in repeated conversations. He concluded by showing that toleration and honesty were not incompatible, while he earnestly advocated the primary virtues of loyalty and sincerity. He added four very interesting appendices: (1) Plato on “Divine Providence”; (2) Berkeley on “Scripture Inaccuracies”; (3) that Hume was sceptical rather than infidel, with an estimate of his discourse on the evidence of nature; (4) “Socrates and the Messiah.”

In the Charge of 1864, which the Archdeacon called “The Rights of Bishops, Presbyters, and Laity,” he desired, amidst all the countless debates, theories, and discussions of the day, to lay down certain fixed principles, around which all these discussions might ebb and flow without harmful effect. In discussing the Episcopal constitution of the Church, he quoted from the Lutheran framers of the Augsburg Confession, in which they declared their desire to testify to the world that they would gladly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical government if the bishops would only cease to exercise cruelty on the churches. Calvin, in the same way, in describing the character of a truly Christian bishop, continued: “I should account those men deserving of every the severest anathema, who did not submit themselves reverently and with all obedience to such an hierarchy.” The Archdeacon went on to express a desire for the erection of six or seven new sees as soon as requisite funds could be found—an aspiration which was translated into fact by Lord Cross’s Act about ten years later. The division of the Charge on the rights of presbyters is extremely interesting. To show that bishops are not autocrats, he quotes from Ignatius, Archbishop Spottiswoode, Archbishop Leighton, Field, and others; and he points out that, according to the constitution of the Primitive Church, all presbyters had the right to be members of diocesan synods, either personally or by representatives; that they ought to be more fully and fairly represented in the Convocation of Canterbury, to be included in commissions raised by the Crown on ecclesiastical affairs, and to bear testimony for any candidate for the office of ecclesiastical ruler. Amongst the rights of presbyters he included pew-rents, on which he gave a very learned and remarkable defence. In dealing with the rights of the laity, he recommended that, as in the days of the early Christian councils, the Christian emperors appointed learned and able laymen to sit as members or assessors, who were called “Judices gloriosissimi,” so it would be advantageous that the Convocations should include some of the highest judicial authorities, together

with a few Privy Councillors, being members of the Church and nominated by the Crown. If any national synod were ever assembled, he thought it just that the Crown should summon it in concurrence with the Metropolitans. The Charge contained two appendices: one on the re-establishment of diocesan synods by the Council of Basle; the other, "Boniface IX. on Pew-Rents."

In 1865 the Archdeacon investigated the question of "Free Thought." He began by pointing out the absolute freedom of the laity, from whom no subscription or test of any kind was required. With regard to disbelieving clergymen, he pointed out that every minister solemnly undertakes to teach certain doctrines, and to read in the congregation certain formularies of devotion. It would therefore be preposterous and intolerable that he should be at liberty to disbelieve those doctrines, and to have no sympathy with those formularies. The first security against such dishonesty is the ordination vow; the second, the fact that every incumbent, on taking possession of his benefice, is required to read the Articles of Religion; third, the form of subscription; fourthly, the public recitation of the Liturgy, which no unbeliever could go through with comfort to himself. Beyond these securities, he showed that the rules and precedents established by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council present almost insuperable difficulties to the conviction of an unsound clergyman. Their first principle, that of regarding a benefice, not in the light of a trust or office, but simply as a freehold, has done more than anything else to outrage the common-sense of the working classes against the Church of England. The Archdeacon mentioned other points, which in his opinion were still more dangerous. He then proceeded, in a very witty passage of considerable length, to imagine the trial of David Hume as a sceptical clergyman before the Judicial Committee, and showed how plausibly he might be acquitted. He argued for the establishment of a clerical tribunal, with aid from certain august laymen, such as secular judges; but he concluded that no Court of Appeal, however constituted, would avail without some change in the law. If the present view of the clerical freehold must remain, let the clergyman keep his income, but not be allowed to profane the pulpit and the holy table.

The Charge of 1867, on "The Morals of the Church of Rome," created a great stir. The Archdeacon began by pointing out the plausible pretensions of the Church of Rome in this country. Influenced by the presence of the English Church, it put forth its best side, and presented merely a popular variety of faith. He took as his theme the Romish system of casuistry, or the direction by precise rules of what it

belongs to feeling and to conscience only to judge. With vigorous sarcasm he demonstrated the absurdity of the science: "Casuists," he said, "are not only Jesuits—they have belonged to all religious orders throughout Papal Christendom during upwards of three hundred years. Some were cardinals, some bishops, some professors of theology, some confidential advisers to Roman pontiffs." He went on to show that Rome has not only to answer generally for the teaching of the casuists, but is especially responsible for the moral principles of the Jesuits. For although in 1773 the order was suppressed and abolished by Pope Clement XIV., it was fully re-established in 1815 by Pope Pius VII. The Archdeacon first quoted the teaching of the casuists on theft, citing in particular Diana of Palermo and Busembaum, and illustrated his citation with venial cases of stealing. With regard to murder, he showed when sons might kill their fathers; quoted the most startling opinions of Launay and Sattler, and related the story of Riembaur, the Bavarian Jesuit, who murdered his mistress, and for four years asserted his innocence. He showed when perjury might be excused according to this system, and how equivocation might be held venial, and a desire for a parent's death might be excused. In reference to the Seventh Commandment, he observed that there is scarcely any abomination which these fomenters of evil do not justify or extenuate. In the works of Antonius Diana alone there are passages relating to acts of fornication and lasciviousness of every kind, which almost exceed belief; and, hateful as are the maxims of Romish casuists on this subject, the questions which it is the duty of confessors to ask are still more atrocious. With regard to the first table of the Decalogue, he showed that indifference to God might be excused; and quoted, with regard to idolatry, from Gabriel Vasquez, that all inanimate and irrational things may be legitimately worshipped. The Jesuit Escobar, who, with the benevolent view of smoothing the way to salvation, published no less than sixteen volumes folio on morals and divinity, gravely stated that a man of a religious order, who for a short time lays aside his habit for a sinful purpose, is free from heinous sin, and does not incur the penalty of excommunication. In the same spirit very easy and indulgent excuses are brought forward for all kinds of blasphemy. The Archdeacon then proceeded to show how greatly all these evils were increased by the two terrible Romish doctrines of probability and obedience. In the language of Rome, an opinion is said to be probable, even when it appears to be more likely false than true, if there is some argument for it at all; and you are at liberty to take the less rather than the more probable opinion. No less dangerous is the doctrine of obedience.

"The Church," says Cardinal Bellarmine, "is inviolably bound to believe that to be morally good which the Sovereign Pontiff commands, and that to be morally bad which he forbids." As the whole Church is bound to obey the pope, so each individual member must yield obedience to a confessor. "Let him that desires to grow in godliness," says S. Philip Neri, "give himself up to a learned confessor, and be obedient to him as to God. He that thus acts is safe from having any account to render of all his actions. The Lord will see to it that his confessor leads him not astray."

Having given these instances, the Archdeacon proceeded to quote from Alfonso Liguori a complete defence of casuistry. The Archdeacon admits that there was a temporary reaction against the casuists during the pontificate of Innocent XI., which, however, was undone by the canonization of Alfonso Liguori by Pius VII. The Charge concluded with an expression of astonishment that any who had been accustomed to a scriptural form of religion should adopt one so corrupt as that of the Roman casuists. Secondly, he pronounced a solemn warning against the practice of auricular confession, from which had originated all the frightful evils which he had been exposing. Thirdly, he showed how it had been observed by philosophical moralists that the only way the moral sentiments of mankind can be seriously perverted is by false views of religion. Any doctrine must be vigorously opposed which would make Christ a minister of sin.

In 1868 he chose a topic which is much before us in the present day: it is that of the Indifference of the Working Classes to Religion. He showed how God is less prominent in town than in country; he quoted an interesting passage from Dugald Stewart on "Civic Irreligion"; and he pointed out how, to a very large extent, love of nature is love of God. He next discussed the license of the press, noting how very considerable a proportion of the working classes never read anything but what is antagonistic to the Church and to religion; at the same time warning the clergy against underrating the intelligence of the mechanics, or placing before them arguments which were beneath their ability. The next section was devoted to the temptations to a death-bed repentance; and in proving how improbable it was, he quoted strong testimony from Archbishop Leighton and Governor Maconochie, of Norfolk Island. Fourthly, he investigated the alleged indifference of the clergy to the movements of artizans in the case of Benefit Societies; but stipulated that before the clergy sympathized actively with them, it must be shown that their financial principles were sound. With regard to Trades Unions, he vigorously defended the liberty of men

who did not belong to the Unions, and protested against all interference with the liberty of the subject, and all tyrannical and arbitrary restrictions. In dealing with the next reason for the indifference of artizans, the prevalence of intemperance, he quoted a very valuable report of the Kirk of Scotland. It may be noted that the example of that Church was followed not long after by the report of Convocation of the province of Canterbury. He spoke very strongly of the tremendous evil of filthy and crowded dwellings. In considering complaints about the length of Church services, he advocated that sub-division which has since become so frequent. He also pointed out the absurdity of expecting unlettered persons, totally unaccustomed to worship, to enjoy the Prayer-Book of the English Church, and heartily rejoiced that the practice was becoming more general throughout the diocese of assembling the working classes in unconsecrated buildings. He proceeded to urge on Churchwardens the duty of making full accommodation for the poor in the churches, and of welcoming them and making them comfortable. He concluded by an urgent warning against neglect in training children of the rising generation; against allowing the working classes to identify religion with capital and the aristocracy, showing them how all the blessings of modern civilization are directly owing to the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

In the Charge of 1869 Archdeacon Sinclair examined the question of Progress: Was it a fatalist groove, in which everything alike must advance willingly or unwillingly for good or for evil? He began by sketching the physical and civil limits to progress. It was highly improbable that the human body would ever become much stronger, or that there would ever cease to be a class who must perform the most elementary kinds of labour. He pointed out the possibilities of progress in taste. Progress he showed to be possible in knowledge, but unlikely in intellect; in the spread of science it was extremely probable. With regard to progress of government, he showed that a republic had no antecedents of necessary superiority over other forms of constitution; a republic required special circumstances, and was always more open to violent changes and personal ambitions than a limited monarchy; in most cases it seemed to rest on the principle of federation. With regard to Church principles, he did not see what progress there could be in measures of disestablishment and disendowment; union of Church and State dated from the Christianization of the State in the time of Constantine. Romans, Goths, Germans, Saxons, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians,

all had the option in their different countries of establishment and endowment. It was libellous to say that the Church of England was alone in ascribing authority to the civil power; and he quoted, in acknowledgment of the authority of the supreme magistrate, important passages from the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Bohemian Confession, the Belgian Confession, the Confession of Helvetia, and the Confession of Saxony. Where were the Church endowments more respected than in America? As to matters of faith, he showed that natural religion was continually progressive. This was also strictly the case with revealed religion until the death of the last of the Apostles; in revealed religion since that time progress lay rather in the direction of understanding more fully what was revealed. There must be progress in the interpretation of Scripture; the early Creeds might be taken as sufficiently expressing, without additions, the mind of the Primitive Church. With regard to the progress of the extent of Christianity, he pointed out hindrances which might be removed, as well as reasons for the most hopeful anticipations. He concluded by a contrast between zeal in the progress of science and the unfortunate lukewarmness that was shown by so many in the advance of Christianity; and he eloquently urged the Clergy, while remembering the heathenism abroad, to be still more keenly alive to the mass of heathenism in their own country.

The Archdeacon did not charge again till 1873. In that year the restless spirit of change displayed by the Convocation of Canterbury in its appointment of no less than thirty-six Committees on Church matters of more or less importance led him to invite his Clergy to consider the advantages which they already possessed. He showed that it was their duty to inquire into the principles and example of the Primitive Church rather than of mediæval times. He reminded them that this position had been fully established in the Charge of ten years previously. He applied the example of the Primitive Church first to Diocesan Synods. He showed, what he had laid down in previous years, that it was an essential of a Diocesan Synod to be representative of the whole clergy of the Diocese. The Diocesan Synod must meet for business, not for talk, and by this means the power of the Bishop for usefulness would be greatly multiplied. He next examined the example of the Primitive Church with regard to Creeds; and showed that the Athanasian Creed, although an admirable doctrinal canticle for singing, was not suitable for public recitation by the congregation in church. In sketching the history of the Creeds, he related how the simple Apostles' Creed was first added to, in 325 A.D., by that of Nicea; how

many excellent persons were at the time of an opinion that the earlier Creed was sufficient, and how others were afraid that this would lead to the multiplication of such documents. It was stated at the Council of Florence that no fewer than thirty different Creeds, contributed by thirty different Councils, were actually in circulation. St. Hilary of Poitiers pronounced those Christians happy who neither made nor received any other symbol besides that most simple Creed, which had been used in all the Churches ever since the days of the Apostles. St. Athanasius, in writing about the Nicene Creed, pronounced that no such Creed ought to be composed. The Archdeacon quoted three other passages from Athanasius; he quoted also passages to the same effect from St. Basil, the second General Council of Constantinople of 381, the third General Council in 431 at Ephesus, the stringent Canon of the fourth General Council in Chalcedon of 451, against any other faith or creed; St. Cyril of Alexandria, the Council of Constantinople in 553, the Council of Constantinople in 680, the second Nicene Council of 787, the Great Western Council at Aix-la-Chapelle in 809, Bishop Jeremy Taylor and others, against all additions to the Nicene Faith.

In the last Charge—that of 1874, the year before he died, when the friends of the Church had recently come into power—the Archdeacon discussed the subject of Church Reform, describing the recent lull in politics as a chance for the clergy to put their house in order. With regard to the ecclesiastical legislature, he pointed out the absurd anomaly of two Convocations sitting at York and London for one nation, while only a few hours' journey from each other by railroad. He also protested against the preponderance of the official element in the Lower House. With regard to lay representation, he showed that the first Christian Synod consisted not only of the Apostles and elders, but also of the brethren, and reminded the clergy that in the Œcumenical Councils lay representation was most efficiently secured by the presence of the Imperial Commissioners, or "Judices Gloriosissimi." He showed that Diocesan Synods, properly constituted, should have an authoritative and coercive jurisdiction, which could not be safely entrusted to a single individual—quoting the remarkable passage from Bacon on "Episcopal Autocrats." With regard to the proposal for the establishment of Parochial Councils, he referred to the example of the Kirk of Scotland, only stipulating that the lay members of the Council should unquestionably be members of the congregation, as also should be the electors. In conclusion, he dealt with the important and interesting question of Church patronage; he showed the value of

having a variety of patrons, representing numerous schools of thought. While deprecating all public elections in so sacred a matter as the appointment of the parish minister, he proposed a plan for the gradual transference of patronage, where so desired, to Parochial Boards, chosen for the purpose, who would thus have to compensate the private patron, if they desired to acquire the right. He added a proviso, that if the patron pledged himself not to select the next presentation, he might be empowered to retain the advowson. In the case of public patronage of parishes with a vicarage under £150 a year, he would allow such Parochial Boards to acquire the patronage, on making up the stipend to a suitable sum.

These Charges, extending over a period of thirty-two years, were edited in 1876 by the present writer for his father, William Sinclair, Prebendary of Chichester, Rector of Pulborough, and formerly Vicar of St. George's, Leeds. Their style is remarkably terse and pungent; a model of English prose composition, full alike with learning and humour. A passage may be quoted from the Archdeacon's life-long friend, Canon Jenkins, who wrote an historical introduction to the book:

The union of the teaching and the life was eminently seen in him whose loss our Church may well deplore; the prudence, sagacity, clearness, and above all, the enlightened charity and manly piety of all his teaching, cannot but render it increasingly valuable at a time when "fighting without and fears within" are threatening every Christian community, and which may be learned by all from that calm and unobtrusive life, which illustrated the parting prayer of a great man of old:

Make me a streamlet flowing toward the sea,
That I may seek the lowest place in Thee;
In wisdom prove my soul's humility,
And shun the heights of pride,
Then happy in the path by Thee assigned,
I still shall walk with firm and willing mind,
Till that last gift of love in Thee I find,
Thy peace, Eternal Guide!

Sermons of the Archdeacon were published from time to time, but they were not collected into a volume. The style of the sermons is like that of the Charges; and they contain many passages of great originality and beauty. Besides a Defence of the principles of the English Church, which he published in 1833 before the issue of the "Tracts for the Times," he wrote a very interesting life of his father, Sir John Sinclair, the well-known agriculturist and statistician, in two volumes, in 1837. In 1875 he published the charming little book of personal reminiscences, to which reference has already been made. Although he was unmarried, his social life was extremely pleasant. The old vicarage at Kensington, a large roomy house in the style of

Queen Anne, has now been swept away by the enlargement of Church Street, Kensington. It stood amongst many acres of ornamental grounds, kitchen gardens and hay meadows. Here the Archdeacon lived in the quiet enjoyment of abundant work and unimpaired intellect till the last day of his life. From time to time he received visits from his brothers and sisters from Edinburgh, among whom should be specially mentioned Catherine Sinclair, the authoress of "Holiday House" and "Modern Accomplishments," and many other works, well-known in the earlier part of the century. The most frequent visitors were the family of his brother, Prebendary Sinclair, with whom he stood on terms of absolute understanding and esteem. The household was completed by three secretaries, who alternately read and wrote for the Archdeacon, and managed the business matters of his various churches. He was of a very sociable disposition, and mixed whenever he had time in congenial society. He entertained his own friends frequently at his own table, and as he had an extraordinary memory and a keen humour it was a great privilege to enjoy his conversation. The hearty laugh which he freely indulged in as he lay back in his chair, after some point had been made, showed that care and trouble, however deeply felt at the proper moment, sat very lightly on his conscience, "void of offence before God and man." "Who that had the advantage of personally knowing him," writes his successor, Archdeacon Hessey, "can forget his kindly presence, his courteousness, his chastened hilarity, his knowledge of men and books, always ready to be communicated to all, but never rudely forced upon any?" "Erat in illo viro," says Cicero, speaking of the capturer of Tarentum, "comitate condita gravitas;" and this is my recollection of our friend's demeanour, whether in private life or in the public societies over which he had to preside, and the internal storms which his geniality of temper not unfrequently allayed." In person he was tall, spare, and athletic, with a manner and carriage remarkable for grace and dignity. His face had a mixture of keenness, shrewdness, kindness, and humour, and his long white silvery hair was hardly thinned at all at the time of his death; his complexion was as fresh as that of a child. There were few figures better known in the West of London than Archdeacon Sinclair's, or, as he was familiarly called, "the Bishop of Kensington," as he paced along with his head a little bent forward in silent meditation, with long ecclesiastical great-coat, broad-brimmed hat, and white-handled umbrella—accompaniments from which he never varied.

In May, 1875, he had driven over to Tottenham to visit his friend Prebendary Wilson. An east wind was blowing.

As he had an habitual delicacy of the chest the windows of the carriage were kept closed. He arrived home rather heated, and threw open his coat to take his usual walk under the lime-tree avenue in the vicarage grounds. He thus caught a chill, and after a few days' illness passed unconsciously away, from congestion of the lungs, before any of his family could be summoned. His secretaries continued almost to the last the usual reading of the *Times*, Sir Walter Scott, and other literature, as well as the daily religious exercises. The last of his great works, except the rebuilding of the parish schools, was the erection of the splendid new Parish Church of Kensington, in which he preached for about two years, including the very last Sunday of his life. His elocution was so perfect that there was not the least difficulty in hearing him all over that vast building. His remains were buried at Hanwell, and his funeral was a very remarkable sight. Every shop in Kensington was closed, and every inhabitant seemed to have come out to pay their last tribute of respect to their revered Archdeacon. His life was very unobtrusive, but his work remains in the foundations of that national system of Church elementary education which, vigorously followed up by his successor, the present Dean of St. Paul's, now has 2,257,000 children in average attendance, or more than one half the children of the country; in the great work of Church building and parish organization, to which he devoted his energies; and in that education of modern and clerical opinion, which his earnestness, learning, abilities, and sound judgment, conspicuously qualified him to promote.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. III.—A VERY EARLY CHRISTIAN ROMANCE.

A Study on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

SOMEWHERE, probably in the first or second decade of the second century, a Jewish Christian, not unlikely living in Pella¹—a survivor of the Jewish congregation of Jerusalem, wrote the fanciful but deeply interesting book which is the subject of the present article.

He called it the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," and it purported to be a writing containing the last utterances of the twelve sons of Jacob.

These "Testaments" contain solemn warnings to the descen-

¹ *Pella* was a small city of the Decapolis, the "other side" of Jordan, about twenty miles south of the Sea of Tiberias.