

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1884.

ART. I.—PRESENT PROSPECTS OF PROTESTANTISM
ON THE CONTINENT.

THE subject before me is so large that I find it very difficult to approach and address myself to it. It is easy at a glance to see over how wide an area it ranges. Within the limits allotted to me I cannot hope to do more than take a partial and surface view of it. The utmost I can attempt, conscious all the while of the incompleteness of the attempt, is to give some general impressions. Having lived abroad from my childhood in Germany, France, and Belgium, having been Chaplain of Marbœuf Chapel in Paris for more than three years under the Empire, and having recently taken charge of Christ Church, Neuilly, under the Republic, I have enjoyed opportunities, not given to all, for leisurely and dispassionately considering the condition of religion on the Continent, and of taking some humble part in the great evangelizing movement which, like network, is spreading itself over France in particular.

“Protestantism on the Continent” just now possesses additional interest, inasmuch as the subject has been brought forward in connection with the fourth centenary anniversary of that Reformation which is indelibly and gratefully associated with the name, zeal, and resistless ardour of Martin Luther.

At the outset I may be allowed broadly and simply to define what I imagine would be generally accepted and regarded as the three great, commanding, fundamental principles of what is ordinarily understood by Protestantism, and which, without at first himself formulating into so many dogmatic statements, form the foundation of Luther's work. They are these :

1. Justification by faith alone ; not by the Sacraments, and not by works.

2. Scripture, and not tradition, the source of truth and standard of faith.

3. The right of private judgment, not dependence on the authority of the Church.

These three great principles, leaving out of consideration minor questions, may be generally regarded as the three leading data or "notes" of Protestantism. They are embodied in the Liturgy, crystallized in the Articles, affirmed more or less clearly in public religious exercises, attested to by every candidate for Holy Orders in the Church of England, and publicly assented to on the occasion of "institution" to a benefice. If we look steadily at these fundamental principles, in their doctrinal and practical importance, they constitute that gulf between our own and the Roman communion which the Reformed Churches, so far from desiring to bridge over, should regard as irrevocably "fixed." Whatever differences of opinion may exist touching some questions of ritual, or even on the possible interpretation of our Thirty-nine Articles, is it too much to affirm that the fundamental principles of the Reformed Church, where earnestly believed, cordially accepted, and loyally subscribed to, must in themselves be the most effectual security and safeguard against any return on the part of the Church of England to the bosom of the Church of Rome? Why do we affirm this? For this simple reason. If you consider the opposite of these principles, you find that they form the essence and gist of that system which, wherever it dominates and prevails, unduly exalts the powers and prerogatives of the Christian ministry, consistently keeps the mind of the laity unenlightened as regards saving truth, enslaves the conscience, subjects its adherents to spiritual bondage, if not tyranny, cripples all the finest powers, fetters the noblest aspirations, takes from man God-bestowed rights and privileges. What the effect must be of such a system pursued to its legitimate results, it is not difficult to infer or describe. It is true, no doubt, as Archbishop Whateley in his interesting "Essays on Romanism" shows, that Romanism is the "religion of humanity," *i.e.*, it could never have attained such gigantic dimensions, acquired such power, exercised so wide-spread an influence, if it had not found in human nature its encouragement, its *raison d'être*. It must be remembered that it was not Aaron who forced on the people the worship of golden calves. He yielded to the clamorous voice of the impatient and rebellious people: "Up! make us gods which shall go before us!" *Populus vult decipi et decipiatur.* There is a tendency to be religious by proxy; to say in so many words, "Give us of your oil, for our lamps are going out." There is a disposition, arising out

of our native indolence, to entrust our spiritual well-being to the care of another, as we entrust our health to a physician, or our affairs to a lawyer. There is such a thing as making another the keeper of our conscience. Men and women, to a greater degree than they are either aware or willing to allow, do not like the trouble of thinking or the pain of inquiry. They accept and take on trust that which they assume their religious guides to have made their special study, and with which they are more *au fait* than themselves. There is a subtle thought also, a faint hope, though it may not shape itself into so many words, that there is some merit in multiplied acts of devotion, in religious exercises, fastings, penances, mortifications, pilgrimages.

It is not until the soul has learned how it owes all to Christ that it also learns that, however good the deed may seem, "whatsoever is not of faith hath the nature of sin." Religious sentiment, all that we commonly understand by the devotional element in our complex nature, has, of course, its proper place and use; but it is capable of abuse. It may be so excited and played upon by the accessories of religion, by the pomp and witchery of ritual, as that we may come to mistake devoutness for faith, excited feeling for real godliness. Say what we please, there is no real disinclination on the part of many, especially of women, to confess. Fewer men than women confess. This anyone can observe for himself in the churches on the Continent. The strength of the Church of Rome lies notoriously and confessedly more in the adherence of women than of men to her system. The reason of this, without dilating upon it, is not far to find. The Church of Rome has taken advantage of what she finds in human nature. She suggests a quietus in her doctrine of Infallibility for all doubt and all doubters. In her communion she offers a land-locked haven for all storm-tossed minds. Unexamined, such a quietus has its attraction and charm. Who would not have all perplexity, questionings, doubts, thus easily set at rest, if he could but persuade himself and believe that the Pope is infallible? With the exception of the Greek Church, the Church of Rome stands in the very forefront of religious communities for the gorgeousness of her ritual, for all the circumstance, and accessories of Divine service. She ransacks Art in its various departments; she brings all that is most sensuous and fascinating to bear on the emotional part of human nature. She does not discourage the idea that works are meritorious, or that they may be a procuring means of salvation. She shuts her eyes to the fact that we can never know when or if we have done enough, and so she has invented the theory of works of supererogation wherewith to cover all deficiencies;

a bank is established on which drafts for holiness can by adequate payments be drawn. To maintain such a system, supported by purgatory and masses for the dead, it is absolutely necessary that the laity should remain unenlightened. The Bible is a sealed, if not a forbidden and manipulated book. If not actually on the list of the *Index Expurgatorius*, it is practically interdicted to the laity. Her offices are said in Latin, and if now and then the Scripture warrant for any dubious teaching or doubtful practice be hinted at, she falls back upon and shelters herself within the entrenchments of the vague word "tradition."

Without pursuing further a subject with which every intelligent Christian should be fairly familiar, as to the points of difference between us and Rome, what, we may ask, must be the inevitable effect, sooner or later, on any one mind, ultimately on many minds, by degrees on the mind of a nation, thus taught, thus manipulated by its priesthood? What cannot but be the natural and legitimate result where the conscience yields in passive submission, where the right of private judgment is not exercised, where the fair opportunities of investigating and knowing truth are foregone, where all the actings, promptings, instincts, aspirations of the spiritual life are habitually restrained, where body, soul and spirit are made over unquestioning to one authoritative and domineering power, professing to hold, for reward or retribution, for recompense or punishment, the keys of heaven and of hell?

Go abroad, reside in a Roman Catholic country, and you find the answer. I do not say that there are not many devout, sincere, godly men and women in the Roman Catholic communion, earnest in their convictions, most exemplary in their lives. Some of our best books of devotion are from Roman Catholic sources. Many familiar prayers and hymns are drawn from the same fount. There is not a little that we of the Reformed Church might well and safely imitate in their reverence for sacred things and sacred places. Some of the more devout Roman Catholics hold by what is best and of Scripture warrant in their communion, but tacitly repudiate much which they regard as superstitious or venial, the end, in their eyes, justifying the means. Allow a large margin for those who, brought up in her communion, attached to it by preference and strong family associations, find in Romanism much in accord with their religious sympathies; granted that there are many who hold fast by what is good and reject what is doubtful without necessarily forsaking her communion; yet where, under the name, sanction, and guise of Christianity, do you find atheism more rank, infidelity more blatant, scerp-

ticism more cynical, than in those countries where the Roman system is the most fully developed? I am not now thinking of the decay of religious belief in Germany, marked and confessed as that is. We must not be misled by centenary celebrations of Luther into thinking that Germany is *au fond* a religious country. It is grievous indeed to think what a rationalizing spirit of interpretation has for some time past been bringing about in the religious life of the country which gave birth to Luther, what havoc it has made of all belief in the supernatural in the domain of theology! Infidelity in Germany is not of the light, flippant, coarse nature which characterizes infidelity in France. It is more solid, massive, and thoughtful. Voltaire and Strauss are two very different minds. Rationalism in Germany is penetrating all strata of society. Its effect is visible in the open desecration of the Sabbath, in the scant attendance at all places of worship, in increasing indifferentism. A preacher of commanding eloquence will fill to repletion a church otherwise empty; and in the readiness to hear some great preacher, in the attention with which they will still listen to one of whose earnestness they are satisfied, we may say of Germany that the bruised reed is not broken, and the smoking flax is not quenched. The religious instinct is there, notwithstanding and despite all that Rationalism has endeavoured to do in the way of repression and ridicule. I believe that Germany is ripening for some great revival which shall once more rouse her slumbering ashes into rekindled fire, and that that will not be so much by a second Luther protesting against what has received the *coup de grâce* in Germany, as by a wider diffusion and more Spirit-guided study of that Word of God which Luther gave to Germany, as Tyndal gave it to our own favoured England.

Now, no one can reside for any length of time in France, Belgium, or Spain, without being brought face to face with infidelity in its most blatant and painful development. I confine my observations to France. France may truthfully be characterized as infidel to the core. Look at her observance of God's holy day. It is avowedly the day set apart for pleasure and holiday-making. All her museums, theatres, concert-rooms are open, the best plays are performed, the best concerts given, on Sunday. It is the day for races at Chantilly or Longchamps. Look at her system of education. During my recent stay in the French capital, one of the leading professors in Paris, on the public occasion of distributing prizes to children, thus addressed them: "On dit, mes enfants, que nous avons chassé Dieu de nos écoles. Ce n'est pas vrai. Pourquoi n'est ce pas vrai? Parce-

qu'il n'y a pas un Dieu à chasser." Here are some questions out of a freethinking Republican catechism, which is hawked about in every town and village.—"What is God? An expression. What is the value of this expression? Nature. What is nature? The material world. All is matter. What is the soul? Nothing." The religious orders from which the famous preachers at Advent and Lent are selected being suppressed, there is now scarcely any preacher of any note to be heard in the great pulpits of Notre Dame, St. Roch, the Madeleine, and other well-known churches. A systematic effort is being made to abolish all chaplaincies in the army and navy. The *Sœurs de Charité* in prisons, penitentiaries, and asylums are being gradually eliminated, and this leaven of better and more gentle influence will ere long be lost. Even the sick and dying are not to have a chaplain near at hand in the wards of those world-famed hospitals of Hotel Dieu and Lariboisière. They threaten to erase the name Hotel Dieu, and designate that splendid hospital by some secular name. It is only very recently that the present Archbishop of Paris, commenting on this, uttered words to this effect: "Who would believe that the day would ever come when the founder of this hospital, if he could now speak, would warn men and women against going to an hospital founded originally for their good?" There seems, in fact, to be a positive, malignant hatred to almost anything and everything in the shape of religion, and this hate is shown in numberless even petty and uncalled-for ways. Interments by civil rites, and not by the Church's offices, are vastly on the increase. Not content with asserting her unbelief in public and undisguised forms, and not allowing or recognising any symbols of faith, a Comic Bible—*Bible pour-rire*—is being sold in the streets of Paris. The *menu* of a dinner given in Paris on last Good Friday by the Anti-Clerical League is too utterly blasphemous for publication. Suffice it to say that the dishes consisted of a travesty of our most holy and cherished truths. I give but two: "*gigot d'agneau Paschal*," "*cognac d'Esprit Saint*." Facts such as these speak for themselves. They are boils on the body, symptomatic, as are all surface eruptions, of a system disordered, out of health. Whence does this for the greater part arise? To what cause must we in all truth assign this atheism so flippant, so coarse, so revolting? It is the inevitable reaction from superstition. It is the revolt of the mind from what it discovers to be fraudulent and untrue. It is the natural recoil from what thinking for themselves has brought men of thought and intelligence to pronounce unworthy of a rational creature's belief. Can we be surprised?

I have stated it more than once in public—I restate it fearlessly—that during the time of my ministry in Paris, many

years ago, priests officiating in prominent churches sought me out, anxious to forsake the Communion of the Church of Rome. They assured me in the most positive terms that a large proportion of priests in France are infidel. To repeat the exact words one used to me, "We do what we do, and teach what we teach, to keep up our power with the people." I could not have *imagined* such words or such conversation. I learnt more from their voluntary acknowledgments than from many books on the Roman system. More than one priest told me that it was the hideous abominations of the confessional which first opened his eyes to the corruption of his communion. It is notorious that many of the lower classes seek the priesthood to avoid conscription. It is equally certain that many cab-drivers at this moment in Paris are priests. What more significant and yet more painful than what my friend Père Loyson himself told me? I took the opportunity on a recent occasion of being present at the veneration of relics at Notre Dame. Nuns knelt two at a time for one hour, counting their beads, etc., in veneration of an old tooth, the reputed tooth of St. Peter or St. Paul. Whose it was I forget; but it is not to the point. This decayed tooth was the object of protracted veneration. I told Père Loyson I had been to this service, and said to him, "Time was when you brought all Paris to your feet at Notre Dame, and preached on the occasion of the veneration of this relic. Did you yourself really believe that that old decayed tooth was the tooth of Apostle or saint?" His answer was frank and unreserved: "No," he replied; "of course I did not."

Now facts such as these simply cannot be gainsaid. They cannot be pooh-poohed. For how much of the infidelity of France finds its excuse, its *raison d'être*, here! The man has been trained from childhood in a system which, if it is to be maintained, must repress inquiry. He has been taught that the Roman Communion is the only safe fold; that the perdition of anyone outside that fold is more probable than his salvation is possible. He has learned to regard all other religious bodies as heretical, and the punishment for heresy is severe and merciless, being excommunication on this, and hopeless damnation on the other side of the grave. He holds on to his soul's anchor as long as he can; but by-and-by he begins, as an intelligent man, to think for himself. He is restless under the green withes with which Delilah would fain bind his growing intellect. He breaks these withes "as a thread of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire." He finds nothing in his creed, certainly nothing in its public offices, which addresses itself, as one once said, *à l'âme*. Of the officiating priest he sees little more than his back. The service is not in the mother tongue. The confessional is loathed and

detested because of the power it gives the priest over the conscience, and because of the family secrets which it puts into another man's possession. It is felt that the greater part of religion is associated with fees and payments, from which even the dead are not by death delivered.

The spirit of inquiry, of scepticism in its best sense, now so markedly abroad, applies its crucial test to all superstitious practices; it rejects as simply and utterly unworthy of credit much on which the Church of Rome has always based her pretensions and built up her power. If thoughtful Germany casts off her faith in the supernatural, which presents itself for acceptance under no guise of imposture, how much more will the intellect of France, lost, I believe, irrevocably to the Church of Rome, reject and ever ridicule all mechanical views of the Sacraments, all winking Madonnas, bleeding statues, and superstitious uses in which the priests themselves do not in their heart of hearts believe? And this creed, found unsatisfying to the soul's deepest cravings, supported to a large extent by that which will not bear examination, what is the consequence? The man is ignorant altogether of one Book, which he never opens. He knows nothing about religion save as it is imperfectly or erroneously taught at the lips of those in whose sincerity he has lost all confidence. His conscience revolts at the thought of indulgences for sin. He sees the communion in which he has been cradled throwing the ægis of its traditions, position, culture, art, resources, over superstitious uses, untenable doctrines, and in some cases immoral practices. The result is, he breaks with all religion. It is Roman Catholicism or nothing. It is with him either a yielding up of himself to it, body, soul, and spirit, passively and blindly, or he takes up with a life of indifferentism, ends it with a deathbed of suppressed agony, and death itself is an awful perhaps, a venture into the dark with no sure light to irradiate the darkness. It cannot but be so. Ceasing to believe in religion, he throws off all its restraints. Having no longer any hold over the intellect, having lost any it ever had on the affections, religion soon loses control over the life. Marriages are more often celebrated at the nearest Mairie than with the Church's benediction. Excommunication is ridiculed as some nursery scare. Extreme unction is looked upon as the sublime effort of superstition. The man who with his whole heart rejects religion, ignores her place, declines her offices, will not play false at the last.

There is good reason to believe that Gambetta was not an atheist, but he, like not a few thoughtful Frenchmen, had long seen the hollowness and unreality of the dominant faith. He had all throughout his life consistently inveighed against

the pretensions and assumptions of sacerdotalism, and so, when it came to the last, he preferred to be laid down in his grave amid the genuine tears and heartfelt regrets of the thousands for whom he had lived and toiled, rather than at the last moment do violence to all his convictions. He would be buried with no religious ceremony rather than contradict his frequent protests against the Church of Rome by being borne to one of her churches and laid to rest with her flambeaux, her incense, her lustrations, and her prayers.

And what is to be the outcome, the finale of all this? Can true religion ever again assert herself or lift up her head in Paris, which is France? Is there absolutely no hope for that fair land? Is she doomed irrevocably to infidelity? Is she committed hopelessly to atheism? We answer unhesitatingly, confidently, thankfully, No! for at no time does God leave Himself without witness. Not yet has the sentence gone forth, "Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone." There are not a few on the Continent who are alive to the painful spiritual facts amidst which their lot is cast, and whose earnest prayer, seconded by earnest effort, must, in God's good time, prevail. The attitude abroad is really more anti-clerical than anti-religious. The God Whom so many profess to deny is not so much the God of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as a God associated with superstition, a God identified with the denial of liberty of conscience, with suppression of all right of inquiry, a God as presented through the medium and interpretation of a priesthood itself not credited. The feeling toward the priests just now is bitter to a degree. Were a revolution on any large scale unhappily to break out in Paris, the cut-throats of La Roquette would raise the cry *à bas les prêtres*, and it would be taken up fiercely throughout the city. If the ministers of any religion be hated and despised, what must become of the influence of the religion they represent?

Some of the more thoughtful, earnest and far-seeing men on the Continent have for some time past been fully alive to the present miserable condition of things. Men like Bishop Herzog of Berne, Bishop Reinkens, Dr. Dollinger, and Père Loyson, leaders of the remarkable movement amongst the Old Catholics, have been stretching out their hands, whether in vain or not, remains to be seen. This is the comment of Père Loyson, one of the most eminent of her children, on the communion from which, with infinite sorrow, he felt constrained to take a wide departure: "Des penseurs éminents voyaient avec peine que la religion devenait étrangère aux besoins réels de la société." The reform which he, with men of like mind, is attempting to bring about, must not be lightly thought of, still less ignored. It is fully recognised by the Anglo-Continental Society.

Loyson's aim and dream, for which the modern Massillon has foregone and sacrificed the most brilliant prospects, is to purify the Roman Communion and to restore to France the old Gallican Church. He seeks to evangelize the Latin Church. "Nous demandons," he says, and in what better words could his object be stated?—"nous demandons seulement à l'Église Catholique, dont nous sommes les fils, de se réformer elle-même." His points of departure from Rome are very important. 1. The rejection of the dogma of Infallibility. 2. The celebration of all the Offices of religion and the public reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue. 3. That confession should be in every case voluntary, and always "morale." 4. That Bishops be elected by the clergy and "le peuple fidèle." 5. That the clergy should have the same liberty to marry as the laity. These are very important points. The Gallican Church which he represents is neither a sect nor a schism. It is a keeping of the old faith once delivered to the saints, having the Nicene Creed as its standard of orthodoxy. With some little modification of ritual, perfect unity reigns between the Old Catholics of France, Germany and Switzerland. Of this movement it may be premature to form a decided opinion. It does not command much sympathy in England. It is kept alive, in my judgment, more by the earnestness, inspirations, and personal influences of its honoured leaders, than by its own intrinsic and enduring credentials. It does not go far enough for those who would break with Rome, and yet fail in discerning sufficient departure from Rome to justify such rupture. It does not satisfy the French Protestant, for much that is retained of teaching and ritual is closely identified with Rome. None who knew Père Loyson can fail to be attracted by the man. No one can listen, as I have, in his church in the Rue d'Arras, to that burning eloquence with which he, in the very heart of Paris, fearlessly exposes the abuses of a Church in which, himself cradled, he is now excommunicate, without having the warmest sympathies enlisted, without wishing him God-speed. Unless, however, his mantle fall on some yet unborn Elisha, and the movement be made to depend less and less on the influence of any one man, I venture to predict that the effort, so noble, so chivalrous in its aim, if not Quixotic, is not destined to succeed.

It will naturally be asked, "But what of the old or modern Protestant Church? Is it not doing a great work? Is it not salting the religious life, however corrupt? Or has it lost its savour?" It has been asserted confidently of late that whole villages in the provinces are going over *en masse* to Protestantism. I am not in a position either to confirm or gainsay this assertion. It is true also that Paris is not, in one

sense, France; but I am bound conscientiously to affirm that I do not believe that French Protestantism, in its present aspect and operation, is a *power*. This is not to say that the French Protestant Church does not contain within its fold good men and true. Pressensé, Bersier, Monod, and many more, are men of honoured names; but you will no more replace the Roman communion by French Protestantism than you could replace the Church of England by Methodism. The contrast between the Church of Rome, with her splendid edifices, gorgeous services, impressive ritual, and the coldness, nakedness, and severe Puritan simplicity of the Church in the Rue l'Oratoire, or the Avenue de la Grande Armée, is too great—too marked—to be *per saltum* accepted. Imagine any one going at a bound from St. Alban's, Holborn, to Spurgeon's Tabernacle! The great majority of those who have wandered far from Christian paths cling with tenacity to the traditional rites and name of the Catholic Church. I asked a priest on one occasion why he, and men like himself, did not at once embrace French Protestantism? His reply was, "Parceque on s'éloigne de trop." That exactly expresses this difficulty, "on s'éloigne de trop." Add to this that no little suspicion exists as to the orthodoxy and soundness in the faith of some of the French Protestant *pasteurs*. There are liberal Protestant *pasteurs* who preach no Christ. The freethought which characterizes our age, which has brought its crucial tests to bear on Roman Catholicism, has found its way into French Protestant theology, is leavening its literature and pulpit. If the teachers of religion be not themselves orthodox, how can they hope that their hearers will be sound in the faith? There is also a remarkable craving for some form of liturgical service; and if French Protestantism is to do any real work, it must in some way satisfy this demand, which men like Bersier have been forward to recognise.

Whence, then, shall help come? From what source shall real reform be looked for? How shall true religion once more gain firm footing abroad? It must, I am persuaded, come from without. The cry is as of old, "Come over and help us." This call is one to which a remarkable response has of late years been made. The Foreign Aid Society, so largely indebted to Lord Shaftesbury, Mr. Burgess, the Dean of Ripon, and others, has been for many years eminently useful in distinct evangelistic work, in the diffusion of the pure, unadulterated Word of God, and through the well-organized system of *colporteurs*. In their last Report is given a detailed and most interesting *résumé* of the God-owned labours of this excellent, too little known, too slenderly supported society for the spread of the Gospel. The Comité Auxiliaire d'Évangélisation de Paris, originating in the Exhibition held in Paris,

and working on the lines of the London City Mission, is doing, with its system of evangelistic addresses and Scripture Readers, a confessedly good work in the same direction. Who can speak at all adequately of the marvellous work organized by Mr. MacAll and his devoted wife, spreading as some life-giving stream over the whole domain of Romanism and indifferentism? It has been my privilege to attend and take part in the simple services under their auspices. I can testify from personal observation to the profound and intelligent interest with which the service was followed and engaged in. The service is warm and hearty, the prayers are fervent and touching, the singing is sweet and moving, the preaching plain and persuasive. Whether in the West End or at Grenelle, whether amongst the more cultured or the less educated classes, there prevails a great and eager desire to hear the Word of God. How great the Frenchman's ignorance of the Scriptures is may be gathered from this fact. The question was once put to a group of market-people, "What think ye of Christ?" The answer, to which all agreed, was, "Oh, he was a Jew, who turned Roman Catholic."

Who can speak adequately of Miss De Broën's self-denying toil in Belleville, in the very heart of the Communists, amongst the most *outré* of Republicans? When I saw the eagerness with which the poorest of the poor pressed forwards at the close of a simple Gospel address to purchase with hard-earned savings a copy of the New Testament for four sous, it reminded me of what Blunt tells us in his "History of the Reformation." He says that when the English version of the Scriptures was first given to us, men would give a load of hay for a few verses. The Bible is an unknown book to thousands in France. The Gospel comes, therefore, with all the force and charm of some new message, with its enlightenment, consolations, and promises. One fruit of the Republic is that whereas under the Empire silence was almost imposed on the lips of those who were not of the Roman Communion, now, partly through indifferentism, partly in keeping with the creed of Republicanism—freedom of thought, liberty of expression—large toleration is accorded to all creeds, all denominations, all teachers. To the cynical Frenchman, Gibbon's sneer is congenial, that to the statesman all religions were equally true, to the philanthropist equally useful, to the philosopher equally false. But God has overruled all this, so that a great and effectual door is open, which many are taking advantage of and entering.

For the present I am disposed to think we must be content with the unsectarian and undenominational form which evangelistic work is taking abroad. The molten-metal is being

run at present into one mould rather than into many. The time has hardly come for giving it shape and hammering it out into one or more schools of thought. France, Belgium, and Spain know too well the dominion and tyranny of one overmastering aspect of religion. They who are seeking to save the Continent from utter unbelief approach it less with a system than with a message. They do not aim at having but one uniform mould, into which the awakened spiritual life shall at once and of course flow, but they preach the message common to all believers: "Jesus and the Resurrection." What shape the awakened life shall take remains to be seen. I look on all these efforts much as one looks on the preliminary and pioneering work of settlers. They first clear the forest and the brushwood, are content with a rude log-hut until they are in a position to construct a more settled and substantial residence. I look on it as on the work of the humble worm, which perseveringly and unobservedly bores the soil, making the hard earth porous, preparing it for the rain that shall percolate and make it fruitful. I look on it as on the work of sapper and miner preparatory to a great crisis. All this good work, carried on noiselessly and unostentatiously by these various evangelizing agencies, must, in God's own way and time, bring forth fruit. He has promised that His Word shall not return to Him void. Meanwhile, there is a plain duty consistently with our own position as a Reformed Church in our relation to other branches of the Church of the Reformation.

It is very noteworthy and interesting that a very general feeling prevails abroad that the Church of England, not as represented by any one school, but in her moderate ritual and faithful teaching, is the *beau ideal* of a Church. There is no desire to cut adrift from a system Apostolic in its order, Catholic in its tradition, Evangelical in its teaching. This being so, it is all the more important, that the Church of England should maintain this moderate position; going neither Rome-ward in teaching and uses such as the Gallican Church is seeking to expunge; not going Geneva-ward, so that men anxious to forsake the Roman communion could not identify themselves with her. It is not too much, but it is only the sober truth, to say that the Church of England is looked to all over the Continent as the Church of the future. Our influence will be great, just as we are true to the fundamental principles of the Reformation, rejecting all that is unapostolic and superstitious, retaining all that is Apostolic and scriptural. And if a Döllinger can hold out the right hand of Christian fellowship to a Luther, we, without necessarily committing ourselves to all which Herzog and Reinkens and Loyson teach, may by our sympathy,

prayers, and alms do much to help forward the great religious movement set on foot by them. We can help to circulate those Scriptures which bring enlightenment to souls now sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death. We can give French Protestantism an impulse which shall quicken its stagnation. We can extend the right hand of fellowship with earnest grasp and hearty good wishes to all who, however they may differ from us in things not essential to salvation, yet love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Our motto may be—

In things essential, unity ;
 In things indifferent, liberty ;
 In all things, charity.

FRANCIS PIGOU, D.D.

ART. II.—DEAN COLET.

THE name of John Colet is known scarcely to any, perhaps, but to men of extensive reading ; and yet he was the first in this country and in Europe to give utterance to those primary ideas on the study of Holy Scripture which are now universally accepted. He was the eldest son of Sir Henry Colet, a wealthy city merchant, who had been twice Lord Mayor of London. He had been early sent to the University of Oxford, where he took his degree of Master of Arts. Having afterwards taken orders, he was presented to a living in Suffolk and a prebend in Yorkshire. When he was a young man, he diligently studied the scholastic philosophy, and the works of Plato, Plotinus, and Cicero. He had willingly sacrificed the wealth which he might have accumulated if he had followed his father's occupation, as well as the prospect of distinction in the service of the State, which, through his father's influence, presented itself to him ; he had forsaken those temples in the great metropolis where Pleasure erected her throne, and assembled constantly crowds of her worshippers, that he might devote himself at Oxford to the study of the Scriptures and to the propagation of the results of that study among all who came within reach of his influence. In the year 1496 he began to deliver at Oxford a course of lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul. He was at this time the sole survivor of a family of twenty-two brothers and sisters. This great mortality must have produced in his mind serious impressions. He had just returned from Italy, to which country he had gone because he was anxious to cultivate the new learning.

Colet happily escaped the contaminating influence of those who, at this time of the revival of classical literature, professed belief in the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle, and Pliny, and treated Christianity as a cunningly devised fable; of those who, as Lord Macaulay observes, "regarded those Christian mysteries of which they were stewards, just as the augur Cicero and the high-pontiff Cæsar regarded the Sibylline books and the pecking of the sacred chickens; who, among themselves, spoke of the Incarnation, the Eucharist, and the Trinity in the same tone in which Cotta and Velleius talked of the oracle of Delphi or the voice of Faunus among the mountains." He had been led to quench his thirst in a purer fountain than any which sparkled amid the "consecrated bowers of Athens." When he was in Italy, he no longer devoted himself to the works of Plato, but, as his friend Erasmus informs us, "to the study of the Holy Scriptures. He studied the Fathers, and was especially delighted with Dionysius, Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, but he was not partial to Augustine. He had also read carefully every book having reference to the history and constitution of his country. Thus he hoped to polish his style and to prepare himself to preach the Gospel in England."¹

At the time of Colet's visit, Alexander VI. wore the Papal tiara. The vice and profligacy which prevailed in his Court were enough to disenchant the most ardent admirer of the Papal system. His palace was the scene of bacchanalian orgies. Licentious songs, swelled by a chorus of revellers, echoed through its banqueting hall. The Pope himself quaffed large draughts of wine from the foaming goblet. The grossest venality prevailed in the Papal Court. The highest dignities in the Church were conferred without shame on the best bidder. We may suppose that thus an earnest desire was awakened in his mind for the reformation of the Church of Rome in its head and its members. We may imagine, also, that he had heard at Florence how Savonarola, the celebrated prior of San Marco, horror-stricken at the revival of Paganism in a Christian city, and at the vice and scepticism which very generally prevailed, had determined to confine himself almost entirely to prayerful meditation on the records of heavenly truth. We may fancy that Colet had often been a member of those crowded congregations in the Duomo of Florence which listened spell-bound to the burning words of this preacher of righteousness, as, carefully expounding the Scriptures, he denounced the Divine vengeance on the rulers of the Church and the inhabitants of Italy for their vices and crimes; and

¹ Eras. Op., tom. iii., p. 456, B., edit. Lugd.

that he had witnessed the wonderful effect produced by this oratory when the citizens, whose life had hitherto been one long holiday, read the word of God as they pursued their accustomed occupations, and banished from their walls that sensuality which lifted its unblushing front in the streets in the full light of day.

Thus, then, Colet had been led to expound the Scriptures at Oxford, hoping that, through the influence of his hearers, many of whom "would go everywhere preaching the Word," he should promote the onward march of moral and spiritual improvement.

The Schoolmen had hitherto reigned supreme at Oxford. They fixed attention on single verses of Scripture, to which they attached different senses, and they employed them to carry on subtle and unprofitable disquisitions on such subjects as these: "Whether we shall eat and drink after the resurrection?"—"Whether angels can be in more than one place at the same time?"—"What was the physical condition of the human body in paradise?" Their appetite for this kind of strife was insatiable. They became heated by argument, and continued to dispute on these trifling questions as though their eternal destiny depended on the settlement of them. To their rash speculations the words of the poet may be applied:

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

They dared even to pry into the secrets of Jehovah; to talk as if they had been admitted to His council-chamber, and knew for certain how he had caused chaos to disappear and had called the vast fabric of the heavens and the earth into existence; through what channels the pollution of Adam's sin had come down to all his posterity; in what manner, with what measure, in what time, Christ was formed in the Virgin's womb. They dared even to describe minutely the infernal regions, as though they had themselves been admitted to that dark prison-house of pain. The dust raised by these encounters—as the combatants met in the centre of their tilt-ground with the reverberation of two mighty thunderclouds which rush together in the firmament of heaven—obscured the view of those great and solemn truths, on the due reception and maintenance of which depended their eternity. The Bible had become in their hands a mere arsenal of texts, which they wrested from their connection with the preceding passage, and employed for the purpose of weaving their theological subtleties. It had ceased to be a record of real events, or to give a connected account of the lives of individuals. Practically the Schoolmen neglected its teaching altogether.

Against this system Colet entered his decided protest. He

looked upon Scripture as a whole, and not as a carefully prepared collection of texts. In this respect he was beyond his age. He endeavoured to ascertain the drift of the Apostle's argument; he compared St. Paul's statements of Divine truth with those of St. John, in order that he might show the harmony existing between them; he proved that the Epistles were a series of letters addressed to living men, and designed to be "profitable to them for correction and instruction in righteousness." But while he constantly evinced his love for St. Paul as an earnest teacher of Divine truth, he considered that to Christ was due his devoted and dutiful allegiance. "When I turn," he says, "from the Apostles to the wonderful majesty of Christ, their writings seem to become poor, as it were, when compared with the words of their Lord." His hearers were now told for the first time to look upon the Gospels as a vivid record of the life and teaching of Christ—a Being whom he could take as "his Leader on the heavenly road," whom he could love with a love far greater than that which he gave to any earthly object of attachment, and to whom he could devote that body, soul, and spirit which are His.

"Here I stand amazed," he says, "and exclaim in those words of my Paul, 'Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! O Wisdom! wonderfully good to men and merciful, how justly Thy loving kindness can be called the 'depth of riches!' Thou Who, commending Thy love towards us, hast chosen to be so bountiful to us that Thou givest Thyself for us, that we may return to Thee and to God! O holy, O kind, O beneficent Wisdom! O voice, word, and truth of God in man! truth-speaking and truth-acting! Who hast chosen to teach us humanly that we may know divinely; Who hast chosen to be in man that we may be in God; Who, lastly, hast chosen in man to be humbled even unto death—the death even of the Cross, that we may be exalted even unto life—the life even of God."

These expositions of Divine truth seem to have produced a wonderful impression at Oxford. Multitudes flocked to hear him. As Erasmus says,¹ "He had not taken any degree in theology (the qualification required by the statutes for lecturing on the Bible), yet there was no doctor of the law or divinity, no abbot or dignitary, who did not come to hear him." Some, no doubt, came to cavil at the lecturer, and to find matter of accusation against him, because he assailed the dominant school of theology at Oxford; but as we are informed that they "came again and again, and brought even their note-books," we may reasonably conclude that they came at last because they were convinced that he was bringing before them the fundamental truths of Christianity.

The celebrated Erasmus was one of his audience. He had

¹ Eras. Op., tom. iii., p. 456, C.

just come over to England in the train of the young Lord Mountjoy from Paris, and at once repaired to the University of Oxford, that he might join that little band of men north of the Alps who were applying themselves with ardour to the study of the Greek language and literature. Prior Charnock, with whom he had taken up his abode at the college of St. Mary the Virgin (the gateway of which, nearly opposite New Inn Hall, is the only part now remaining), introduced him to Colet. The latter at once saw that he was no ordinary man, and made him an offer of his friendship. He indulged the confident expectation that he should have with him that fellowship for which he yearned, and that he would aid him in carrying forward toward completion the work which he had commenced at Oxford.

Erasmus spent the greater part of 1499 at the University. During this time he often argued with Colet on the system of the Schoolmen. The study of their works had created in his mind a disgust for theology altogether; but he was not at first prepared to abandon his allegiance to them. The result, however, of their discussions was that he was at length brought to see the absurdity of the system in which he had been trained. But he was not yet prepared to do battle with the Schoolmen. He thought that he might sustain an ignominious defeat if he endeavoured to smite down these foes before his weapons were properly sharpened, or he was sufficiently skilled in the use of them. At the end of the year 1499, indeed, he told his friend that he must shortly leave Oxford. Colet was greatly disappointed. He had indulged the hope that, sustained by the sympathy and ready help of Erasmus, he should be able to do valiantly in the conflict with his formidable antagonists. But now these expectations were in vain. Erasmus, however, assured him that he would endeavour to further his studies. He made him a promise, indeed, that when he had obtained the requisite strength he would openly place himself on his side.

Colet, after the departure of Erasmus, continued his solitary work at Oxford. No kindred spirit had risen up to take a place by his side. He was, however, cheered by the assurance that the leaven was gradually pervading the mass. In the year 1505, Henry VII. conferred upon him the deanery of St. Paul's. He soon began to preach in his own cathedral, where he always had, as his friend Erasmus tells us, a crowded congregation, in which were often to be seen courtiers and the first men in the country. He did not preach, as we are informed, upon isolated texts, but continued his subject from Sunday to Sunday in a regular course till he had completed it. The citizens of London, who had hitherto been bewildered by dis-

courses on the metaphysical jargon of the Schools, listened with wrapt and eager attention to Colet, as, like one inspired, he spoke of the life and teaching of the man Christ Jesus as it is contained in the Gospels or embodied in the Apostles' Creed, or of the wonderful majesty of that invisible King, Who had an undoubted claim on the homage of all His intelligent creatures.

The Dean acted out in his life the lessons which he taught from the pulpit of his cathedral. After his elevation to this high dignity, he was as simple in his habits as he was during his residence at Oxford. Erasmus informs us that when other divines went clothed in purple, he always wore his plain black robe.¹ The late dean gave costly entertainments, and allowed boisterous revels in his house;² but Colet never passed the bounds of moderation, and provided only a frugal repast for his guests. "After grace, a boy read in a loud voice a chapter from the Epistles of St. Paul or the Proverbs of Solomon. He often selected a passage and began to converse upon it, asking the unlearned as well as the learned what was the meaning of this or that word. He showed so much tact in conversation, that though it had reference to weighty and important truths, it was not at all tedious.³ Thus, then, he dismissed all his friends refreshed in mind and body, so that they left better than they came." When he was on a journey he was always full of gaiety, but he always had a book with him; and not only at his private table, but also at that time, he delighted in leading the conversation to the unparalleled love, the unsearchable riches, and the spotless example of his Divine and adorable Redeemer.

A short time after his elevation to the deanery, Colet acquired a large fortune by the death of his father. Animated by that spirit of Christian self-sacrifice for which he had always been distinguished, he determined to apply this property (amounting to about £30,000 of our money), to the foundation of a school in St. Paul's Churchyard for 153 boys.

His design was that they should be taught good literature, both Latin and Greek; 'specially Christian authors who wrote their wisdom in clean and chaste Latin, whether in prose or in verse; for,' he said, "my intent is by this school specially to increase knowledge and worshipping of our God (and our Lord Jesus Christ), and good Christian life and manners in the children." An image of the child Jesus, to whom the school was dedicated, in the attitude of teaching, over the head

¹ Eras. Op., tom. iii., p. 456, E. & F.

² Ibid., p. 465, E.

³ Ibid., E. & F.

Master's chair, with this motto, "Hear him," gave evident proof of his determination to bring the great Teacher himself prominently before the children. As he did not find the old books exactly adapted to his purpose, he asked his learned friends to provide him with others. As Linaere failed in producing a suitable grammar, he wrote one himself, which, having been corrected by Erasmus, Lilly, and others, afterwards became known as Lilly's Latin Grammar. His objection to the former was that it was too long and too learned for his "little beginners." Accordingly he provided "this little book, in which he left many things out on purpose, considering the tenderness and small capacity of little minds." Erasmus, who was now again in England, and who had renewed that friendship with Colet which continued to the end of his days, wrote a treatise *de copia verborum* for the use of the school, in which he pronounces the following eulogium upon his friend: "What is this work, I ask, but to act as a father to all your children and fellow-citizens? You rob yourself to make them rich. You wear yourself out with toil, that they may be quickened into life in Christ. In a word, you spend yourself away that you may gain them for Christ."

Shortly before his death, he framed statutes for his school, and committed them to the "most honest and substantial fellowship of the Mercers of London," with the distinct and wise understanding that they were not to consider his rules as of perpetual obligation, but that they were to alter them according as the circumstances of the times might seem to require. This is a singular instance of prophetic sagacity. The studies may be adapted to every period and stage of civilization.

Colet, soon after the foundation of his school, had a duty imposed upon him for the conscientious discharge of which no common courage was demanded. In his noble cathedral, unsurpassed by any in the world in the harmony of its proportions, its elaborate adornment, and the magnificence of its architecture, beneath its elegant spire, were assembled on February 6, 1512, members of both Houses of Convocation, summoned for the purpose of imposing a tax on the clergy to aid Henry VIII. in carrying on a war with France. Colet was appointed by Archbishop Warham to preach the sermon with which their proceedings were opened.

Never was a more faithful sermon heard within the walls of St. Paul's. His voice rang through the choir and along the nave in eloquent denunciation of the vices and crimes of many who were assembled before him. He saw sitting there those who had been elevated to the episcopal dignity, not because they had "fed the Church of God," but because they had rendered im-

portant political services; those who had sought promotion from one dignity to another that they might be the better enabled to gratify their carnal appetites and passions; the bloated epicure who ransacked sea and land in search of the choicest delicacies for his festal board; those who wallowed in the mire of sensuality; those whose walls often re-echoed to the rude laugh and boisterous mirth of the assembled revellers; those who rode out on their richly caparisoned horses, with their hawks and hounds, followed by a cavalcade as splendid as any which ever marched in the train of this world's potentates. Colet lifted up his voice like a trumpet in condemnation of their vices; he told them that their excessive worldliness led the multitude to dig deep into the bowels of the earth in search of perishing earthly treasure; that they ought not to lay hands on any rashly; that they ought to enforce the laws concerning the residence of bishops in their dioceses; that they ought to spend their worldly wealth in feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and in promoting the ingathering of the wandering sheep into the fold of the Redeemer. Thus, then, this faithful preacher of righteousness, acting in that spirit which the contemplation of the scandalous lives of the Popes caused him to exhibit at Oxford, preached against abounding iniquity, and, regardless of persecution, reminded his hearers of the account which they would have to give of their stewardship at the judgment-seat of Christ.

In 1513 we find Colet again fearlessly giving utterance to his conscientious convictions. Having been summoned to preach before Henry VIII. on Good Friday in that year, he administered a sharp rebuke to him for the warlike policy which, with his friend Erasmus, he felt had "interrupted that revival of philosophical studies which was designed to lead to an acquaintance with the simple and pure Christianity of the Bible." The same friend has given in a letter the substance of his discourse, and we shall admire his courage when we find him "preaching wonderfully before the King and Court on the victory of Christ, and exhorting all Christians to fight and conquer under the banner of their King. For those who engaged in war from hatred or ambition, and slew one another, are marching under the standard of the devil, and not under that of Christ. He showed also how difficult it was for a man to have that Christian charity without which we cannot see God face to face, and at the same time to sheathe his sword in the body of his brother."¹

After this sermon all, including Fitzjames, the Bishop of London, who were opposed to him on account of his teaching,

¹ Eras. Op., tom. iii., p. 461.

especially because he declared that the lives of wicked priests are the worst heresy, rejoiced because they thought that the anger of the King would be inflamed against him. The King sent for him. He was afraid that his address would lessen the warlike ardour of his soldiers. Colet came in obedience to the royal command, and dined at the monastery of the Franciscans, near the palace at Greenwich. When the King knew that he was there, he went out into the garden to meet him, and dismissed his attendants. He thus addressed him: "Do not suppose, Dean, that I have sent for you to interrupt your holy labours, for the success of which I am very anxious, but that I may relieve my mind of certain scruples, and that I may be the better enabled, by your advice, to do my duty." The result of the conversation was that Colet, by his singular discretion, satisfied the King that he did not mean to say that no war was lawful for the Christian. An arrangement was then made that he should give this explanation to the soldiers. The King then took a most affectionate farewell of him. The courtiers were waiting in the palace for the termination of the conference. Then the King said in the hearing of all of them: "Let every man have his own doctor, and let every man favour his own; this man is the doctor for me." "From that day forth," says Erasmus, "no one dared to attack Colet."

History has again recorded that Colet addressed publicly words of warning and exhortation to one who very much needed them. In that great Abbey, over whose dim aisles many centuries cast an awful shadow, a vast crowd was assembled at the installation of the Cardinal who had just risen to the pinnacle of worldly greatness. As he sat, intoxicated with vain glory, the centre of a great assemblage of dukes, earls, and prelates, the mightiest in the land, the following words fell on his ear: "Let not one in so proud a position, made most illustrious by the dignity of such an honour, be puffed up by its greatness. But remember that our Saviour in His own person said to His disciples, 'I came not to be ministered unto, but minister;' and again, 'He who exalts himself shall be humbled, and he who humbles himself shall be exalted.'" We know from history that the words of Colet were disregarded, and that Wolsey retired from the Abbey to heap up around him piles of wealth, and to prosecute his schemes of worldly aggrandizement. But when, at the end of his life, he bade "farewell, a long farewell, to all his greatness," the form of the preacher may have come back to him; he may have remembered the lesson on humility, and the instability of worldly glory, which the voice ascending from the tombs of the monarchs and warriors around him should, he might have

felt, have aided in fixing in his mind; and he may have grieved deeply that he did not profit by the exhortation then addressed to him, and may thus have been led to utter those well-known words: "If I had but served my God as faithfully as I served my king, He would not have forsaken me in my old age."

Colet exhibited the same honest boldness when standing before the shrine of Thomas à-Becket, in Canterbury Cathedral. His friend, Erasmus, who accompanied him, has left us a vivid picture of the visit in his colloquy entitled "*Peregrinatio Religionis Ergo*." He has described the wondering stare of the verger at the visitors out of his gorgon eyes, when Colet uttered the sacrilegious remark that the glittering heap of gold and jewels around them, instead of being hoarded up, should be applied to the relief of the poor. He has told us of the disgust which appeared on Colet's countenance when the Prior offered him, as a present of great value, one of the rags on which the saint wiped his nose and the sweat from his face or neck, and the disdainful chuckle with which he touched it with the tips of his fingers, and then laid it down again; and the passionate words which he addressed to Erasmus when the old mendicant from Harbledown offered him the upper leather of St. Thomas's shoe to kiss: "What! do these idiots want us to kiss the shoes of every good man? They select the filthiest things, and ask us to kiss them!" At the close of this narration Colet stands in remarkable contrast to his timid and prudent friend Erasmus, who, while the former could not restrain his indignation, coldly argues that these evils should be tolerated, until they can be corrected without disturbing the peace of Christendom.

We have now little to add to the life of Colet. Harassed by his great enemy, the Bishop of London, he was preparing to resign his preferments, and had built a house at Sheene, near Richmond, as "the home of his old age"—which we do not know whether he lived to occupy—when the angel of death came to him. He died, "to the great grief of the whole people," from the sweating sickness, on the 16th of September, 1519, and was buried in St. Paul's Cathedral in a tomb prepared by himself.

How deep was the sorrow of Erasmus when he heard of his death, the following extracts from letters to his friends bear full testimony:

"O true theologian! O wonderful preacher of evangelical doctrine! with what earnest zeal did he drink in the philosophy of Christ! How eagerly did he imbibe the spirit and feelings of St. Paul! How did the purity of his whole life correspond to his heavenly doctrine!"

Again, writing to Bishop Fisher :

"I have written this weeping for Colet's death. I know that it is all right with him, who, escaped from this evil and wretched world, is in present enjoyment of that Christ Whom he loved so well when alive. I cannot help mourning in the public name the loss of so rare an example of Christian piety, so remarkable a preacher of Christian truth !"

Erasmus had reason to speak thus of Colet, for he was greatly indebted to him. The poet has indeed said :

"At length Erasmus, that great injured name,
The glory of the priesthood and their shame,
Stemmed the wild torrent of a barbarous age,
And drove those holy vandals from the stage."

But the truth is, that Erasmus would not have opposed the Schoolmen if Colet had not taught him to do so. They were at the time of his death one in spirit. Colet had taught him a principle of interpretation not textarian. They both looked on Scripture as a connected whole. Their constraining and animating motive was love to their Divine Redeemer. They valued the Bible because they found in it, to use the words of Erasmus, "His living and breathing image;" because "it places Christ vividly before us;" because "it brings Him back to us, healing, speaking, dying, rising again," so that "we could not see Him better if we were to see Him with our bodily eyes." They wished thus to be enabled to approach as near as possible to Christ, that they might catch the reflection of the brightness of His character. Above all, they wished to be conformed to Christ in the inner man—to drink deep into His spirit, to be in truth so one with Christ as to estimate at the same value every object in earth and heaven, every interest both in time and eternity. They were anxious also that Christ should be brought near to the world around them. "I wish," says Erasmus, who here expresses the feelings of Colet, "that these books were translated into all languages, so that they might be read and understood, not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also by Turks and Saracens. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey." Thus studying the Saviour's character, they hoped that a surpassing loveliness would appear investing their own, and that they would be surrounded by an atmosphere breathing all the sanctity and sweetness, all the purity and peace of heaven.

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH AND THE ARMY.

IN a recent number of THE CHURCHMAN, the organization and work of the Army Scripture Readers' Society was ably set forth. Of the need for such instrumentality there can scarcely be two opinions; it is admitted on all hands. The article treats of one agency in a concern of momentous import—the Spiritual Requirement of the Soldier; momentous, because his influence for good or evil is nowadays not limited to the ever-present associates with whom the man's lot in life is cast for a term of years, but extends, in a degree heretofore unknown, to the community at large. This result of re-organization of the army—its social bearing—demands more attention than has hitherto been accorded it. And perhaps if one individual more than another should feel interested in the matter, it is the parish clergyman. For the military leaven will permeate his flock—a factorage borne on the current of a quiet, steady stream from barrack to cottage. Especially must the village and village church tell their tale in the furtherance or hindrance of ministerial work. In large cities and manufacturing towns the returned soldier stands less predominant; his voice is less weighty. In the hamlet it is otherwise: he is an oracle—a man who has seen the world.

Two questions arise for consideration:

1. Has religion¹ in the army been recognised and advanced in a like proportion with the temporal welfare of its members?
2. How far do existing means cope with the spiritual wants of the soldier?

To weigh these points thoroughly, it is expedient to look at his condition morally and socially at the beginning of the century, and to compare it with that of his successor toward the end.

Then, the soldier was uneducated; his animal nature was unchecked, if not indeed fostered, by the State. As he entered the ranks through the portals of the beer-shop, so he lived at it, and, save when war and pestilence intervened, practically died at it. For though disease—*much* both avoidable and curable, as seen in present daylight—slew its thousands, truly drink, with its handmaid, vice, slew its ten thousands. Yet the greatest general of the age considered men of such material best fitted for their calling, and viewed adversely, as a weak concession to philanthropy, humanizing measures of reform! *Now*, he is sent to school a second time, and is provided with a library and reading-room. Temperance (*i.e.*,

¹ We use the term in its generical—highest—sense.

abstention from drink) is approved by all the military authorities, quite as much, perhaps, on grounds of State economy as of morality. *Then*, he was regarded as the black sheep from the country,¹ a waif of humanity, to be tolerated and expended. *Now*, he is beginning to be recognised, entitled to the respect of society as much as the civilian, nay, even to deserve and share some of the good things heretofore reserved for hard-worked butlers and worn-out valets! As his life was animal, so, too, was his punishment when the code of military law was transgressed. He was flogged.² *Then*, what was the lot of the married private—even of the sergeant? It was a condition that entailed such loss of womanliness and self-respect as hardly a wigwam could present; a toleration of profanity happily unknown to the Indian. *Now*, the Benedict is comfortably housed in quarters of the approved model-lodging-house order. As to the unmarried man, he occupied a kind of “bunk,” with scarcely more light and air than pertained to the cabin of a ship. Sanitary procedure was a thing unknown. *Now*, he has his regulated cubic feet of air, is regarded much as a valuable plant, and, indeed, sleeps in a “conservatory.” More care, more scientific attention, is bestowed upon him than upon any other public servant of the same rank in life. *Then*, his food—daily boiled meat—was nauseating alike from sameness and from ill cookery; the “cuisinières,” ignorant (necessarily) of the very rudiments of the art, were changed almost daily, and “told off” in rotation for this as for any other duty. *Now*, cooking is varied, the nutritive properties of the meat are preserved, and the food is served up by trained soldier-cooks retained in such post.³

The recruit was asked his creed when he joined a regiment. Very generally the reply would be “Church of England.” But it was a well-known fact, viewed rather as a joke, that the answer came often from without, and at the suggestion of the recruiting sergeant or orderly-room clerk. These officials

¹ Formerly, the army was almost wholly recruited from the rural districts.

² While heartily condemning the indiscriminate use of the lash in former days, the writer cannot acquiesce in an unreasoning and emotional humanitarianism which would, in military life, abolish flogging for *all* offences, and, in civil, capital punishment for *all* murders.

³ The greater aptitude of the French soldier for campaigning may be set forth by an incident or two witnessed by the writer. Before the “famine” period of the Crimean War, our soldier-butchers viewed the heads and tails of oxen as so much valueless offal. The Frenchman found this out, and for the merest trifle bought them. Again, when spring came, and scurvy abounded, he has noticed the latter exploring the desert plateaux, and here and there picking out with his knife a blade of young dandelion or other material for *une salade* of antiscorbutic property.

hurried through a necessary formality, and on several grounds the National Church was most convenient. Hence Dissenters were by stroke of pen sometimes transformed into Churchmen. Things are changed now. The sectarian is given every facility for worship in the denomination to which he has hitherto belonged. The declaration of faith is, in every sense, a "sober" procedure, and, in some measure at least, it may be said, "as a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

As regards godly living, practical religious life among our soldiers, speaking broadly, we must look back to the first quarter of the present century; its ground was India.¹ Expatriation from country and home undoubtedly helps onward any latent or feeble desire for the better life. Especially does such condition speak to the young man. So among Indian officers, detached when subalterns to isolated military or civil posts, and shut off from Church ministrations, it came to pass that first on one, then on another, the light of Divine truth shone through the Bible. Some slight evidence of awakening—not through official channels—is noticeable in Legh Richmond's "Annals of the Poor." But religious life in the army can only be said to have established a firm footing in the days of the Crimean War, and then from the example of Hedley Vicars. Among officers, the Gospel found quickest apprehension, most followers, in the higher-educated, "thinking" branches of the service—the Artillery and Engineers. The field officer or captain of a battery or half battery has a greater field and influence for good over his men than the captain of a troop of cavalry or of a company in the line. The intercourse between officer and man is more individual, and, so to speak, there is more of home life than pertains to a regiment. Yet of every corps it may be said that witnesses to the truth gathered from all ranks—men whose prototype was that centurion who feared God and led his soldiers to do likewise—are happily to be found.²

To come back to our subject, the question whether the spiritual needs of the soldier have met with the same proportionate recognition as the physical, and whether the agencies are such as would be pronounced satisfactory by the incumbent of a well-worked parish. We venture to answer "No." Fully admitting the difference of sphere and far greater obstacles incident to army life, yet to a certain extent there is some parallelism between the two. The regiment is a condensed

¹ The records of Wesleyanism show that there were godly soldiers serving in the French wars of George II.; e.g., at Fontenoy.

² Witness the large annual gathering in London of naval and military officers for united prayer. The youngest subaltern, the grey-haired general, there meet.

parish, with its constituent men, women, and children, its schools and services, its hospital. But the word "change" is now stamped on every part of Army life, and this fact, while it constitutes the difficulty in a military chaplain's work, also points to the grave moment of the subject under consideration.

As long as the life of a soldier was almost virtually dis severed, save in the pot-shop, from that of the civilian; his military career so hedged in that it might be indeed said "there was no discharge in that war;" the public might be excused, though not exonerated, for lack of interest in its lost sheep. Regiments served as long as fourteen or even sixteen years in such climates as India, and were completely remanned during the period. Few men lived to obtain a permanent pension. Those who succeeded reached it through a questionable portal—some obscure ailment, to which the military surgeon gave the benefit of a doubt when the sufferer was an old veteran.¹ All that is changed. Still young, after serving at the most impressionable age just long enough to form a character for good or evil, the soldier returns home to leave the field and workshop, to sow tares or wheat. Which shall it be?

We cannot dissever ourselves from obligations which, ignored, may—must—react prejudicially on the home. A lesson may be taken in time from France, and a horoscope be drawn as to possible consequences from military commingling with the populace. An empire of reason, of communism, or of religion—which shall it be?

If further argument for fuller evangelistic work in the army were needed, it may be founded on the increase of crime—drunkenness and insubordination. In a recent article,² rather alarmingly pessimist in tone, one of our highest military authorities, while treating the subject of army organization with unanswerable facts and logic, mentions these ill-omened truths. Much of this crime doubtless arises—assuredly the latter form—from the age of recruits. Boys are enlisted, and of course they think and act "as boys;" especially when their non-commissioned officers are scarcely older and wiser than themselves.

How, then, is evil to be combated?

Let us look at existing agencies. And there are two aspects in which these may be considered: Peace and War.

¹ Worse things happened occasionally. "Malingering," a well-known military term forty years ago, was practised. A young soldier on the eve, say, of embarkation, sought by some destructive process to an eye or limb to obtain emancipation from a dreary outlook.

² See *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1883, article on the British Army, by General Sir Lintorn Simmons, G.C.B.

Religious ministrations come through three recognised channels,—

1. Commissioned chaplains (Church of England, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic) attached to the larger stations at home and abroad.

2. Chaplains not commissioned. These are ordinarily clergymen of the parish where troops are quartered, and are *ex officio* appointed. They are paid by a fixed scale proportionate to the number of their charge. Roman Catholic and Presbyterian ministers also, when the attendance meets a certain numerical requirement, are salaried.

3. Army Scripture Readers, located in garrisons, and working under the control and supervision of chaplains. They are for the most part retired non-commissioned officers of varied Protestant denominations. Such men are restricted to unsectarian Bible-teaching, and are paid by a Society.

Of instrumentalities *ab extra*, the chief is the "Soldiers' Home." Its influence for good, admirable administration, every way, by lady-superintendents, can scarcely be over-rated. These homes are but few, however. Effort, not hitherto very successful, has of late been made to establish them on Established Church lines, and to associate more of the secular, less of the religious, feature. It emanated from those who viewed public-houses and Dissent with much the same aversion.

In London, some sixteen years ago, a "Soldiers' Institute," of professedly secular character, was established by officers of the Household Brigade. It was virtually a club for non-commissioned officers and men, and, as such, alcoholic drinks were supplied there. A considerable outlay was incurred; a handsome building erected. The movement fell through completely; and, by a strange irony of circumstance, the house which resounded to the feet of soldiers' wives and sweethearts¹ has become the residence of Cardinal Manning!

It is only fair to add that a "Guards' Home," formulated on the Aldershot plan, has also met with but qualified success. The exceptional temptations of the metropolis, distance from barracks, together with severity of military duty, sufficiently explain why the boon is less appreciated there than elsewhere. It would seem that much in proportion to mileage from the home centre (regarding London in such light), so is the likelihood of good result in Mission-work. Thus, when two battalions of Guards were sent to Canada, during the "Trent" difficulty of 1861, religious influences brought to bear on them

¹ Occasional dances were given.

were attended with happy results, previously unattainable. The village-church, the Sunday-school, and, more than either, the mother's voice, spoke from distant fatherland.

More recently, a coffee-palace, on the distinctive Church lines referred to, has been opened in London. The locality is Pimlico, a good central position. The house is situated in the same street as the pre-existent Home, and they can only be regarded, unhappily, as in antagonism.

In former days a commissioned chaplain was borne on the strength of each regiment. It may be asked, Why not revive the appointment now?

Let us glance back at old times, which in no sense may be designated "good." What kind of man filled the post then? What were his qualifications, how was he appointed? We know little, and that little may be gleaned most reliably from the condition of the Church at large in the time when Whitfield and Wesley preached. Yet, making due allowance for exaggeration by novelists, such as Fielding, and in our own time by partisan historians, like Lord Macaulay, light comes to us through their pages. The military chaplain could not have stood higher than his civil brethren; it may possibly have been, lower. Religion was closely interwoven with politics in those "Stuart" days, and, overriding sectarianism for awhile, they together leavened even the lowest stratum of society, men and officers alike. So, doubtless, a staunch Protestantism and "interest" would be the qualifications—nothing higher. And the army, in all ranks, "drank and swore as in Flanders."

Dating from the year 1662, such chaplain, then, formed part of the establishment of every regiment. These functionaries were also appointed to most of the garrisons and fortresses. The outcome was unsatisfactory; and we need scarcely stop to surmise why such should have been the case. Were the antecedents of "the parson" (as he would colloquially be styled) even above suspicion, the homely adage concerning the touch of pitch may well account for something worse than a barren ministry. A veritable Gomorrah must a regiment have been formerly. Who may cast a stone at an unfortunate man brought into closest contact with evil, and living in days when vice was as fashionable, as openly avowed, as is the profession of religion itself in this nineteenth century?

"Irregularities" prevailed, and these led to reform. Regimental chaplaincies were abolished. By a warrant in 1796 it was provided that, to corps serving abroad, chaplains on the staff, in the proportion of one to three or four regiments, should be appointed. On home service the troops were to

attend the parish church, or else a curate in the vicinity was to be paid a small additional stipend for the charge.¹

This procedure obtained until 1809, when civilian clergy, in Great Britain, gave place to staff-chaplains, for all large bodies of troops at home and abroad. Parochial clergy were left only in charge of detachments. Prior to this year, matters, judging from army-lists of the time, could not have been very satisfactory. Regiments were raised or disbanded as the scare of war or State economy prevailed. Hence the circumstance that, in the year 1800, there were but 22 chaplains on full pay, 39 on half-pay. And again, in 1806, the yet more curious feature is presented of 38 of the former to 73 of the latter! Corps appear to have been ill-advisedly (?) disbanded, too, on return from lengthened foreign service. Some exception doubtless, on the heads of both nationality and religion, was made in favour of subsidized foreign troops. Thus, in 1811, we find 5 chaplains serving with the King's German Legion.

Looking yet nearer to our own days, what was the strength of the department about the close of the first quarter of the century? We see some 16 chaplains apportioned to about 90,000 men, and a half-pay list of 18. It must be borne in mind, however, that the infantry was largely recruited from Ireland, a procedure that obtained, more or less, until pronounced national disaffection, together with increased facility for emigration, checked it.² For their religious needs civilian priests would be provided.

Enough has been said to show that any reversion to the old system of chaplaincy of a regiment is simply impracticable. A corps is now a town or village, so to speak, with the like varied forms of religion.

After Waterloo, the office of chaplain-general was created. Exclusive of this administrative head, there are at the present time 105 commissioned officers classed as follows: Church of England, 83; Presbyterian, 7; Roman Catholic, 15. As the entire strength of the British army is somewhat under 100,000, this would give an average of about 1 to 1,900 men; roughly, 1 to two battalions. But a large proportion of our troops is quartered in India, where no British army chaplain is stationed. Hence concentration of the latter is available. Yet, as the services of the Presbyterian and Roman Catholic chaplains must not unfrequently be limited to one corps of such persuasion in

¹ See Clode's "Military Forces of the Crown."

² The exigencies of the Peninsular War led to enlistment of Irishmen for even Highland corps. More recently the famine years of '47-'48 filled our ranks with fine-framed, but half-starved Roman Catholic youths.

a garrison, it is practically found that two regiments, or a number numerically equivalent, is ordinarily the minimum charge of the Church of England officer.

It will be observed that the chaplain's department has been much strengthened since the century opened. A special feature has been the extension of commissions to ministers of other bodies than the Church of England.¹ Let us look in detail at the work of these officers.

If it were asked, where is the chief sphere, the most hopeful ground for successful ministrations, we would unhesitatingly answer—the hospital. In the barrack-room there is more or less interruption, antagonistic influence in one form or other. This applies to visits even of the Army Scripture-reader; obviously still more to those of the chaplain. But in the hospital ward, where, with scarcely an exception, all men pass sooner or later, it is otherwise. This is *the field*. There are no distractions from without: the monotony of life is *very* great, *malgré* means such as books and periodicals, and the patient welcomes every instrumentality that breaks it.

How is this field utilized? Generally a service is held on Sunday in one of the wards, or day-room, and includes men out of bed. This service is brief, necessarily, for the public duties (embracing a parade service in the morning, and, often, voluntary one in the evening) together with distance traversed, taxes the chaplain considerably. A similar service obtains about the middle of the week. And, like the picquet officer, the chaplain looks in after the surgeon's visit on most days to inquire if anything special has occurred, or to visit special cases. He signs his name in a book likewise. Add to these, manifold offices of the ordinary parochial character, necessary interviews with the commanding officers of regiments and General, certain returns and reports, and it will be found that a conscientious man is much "put to it," and tempted to a more or less perfunctory routine, and to the acquirement of the smartness incident to other officers.

The Army Scripture-reader ordinarily comes about once, sometimes twice, a week. His work, it must be remembered, extends over a whole garrison, irrespective of denomination. It is only in the exception of a great hospital like that of Netley that he, and that the society which he represents, can do more. His hospital ministration is varied and valuable—only but too limited by demand on his time elsewhere.

One other lay agency, but sometimes utilized, may be

¹ The appointment of Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Chaplains to the Forces dates from the Crimean War of 1854-56.

mentioned: that of officers, personally working among their own men. They are often regarded as "obstructives," and inconsistently tabooed as such: inconsistently, because generally—almost invariably—their line of procedure is identical with that of the Scripture-reader; viz., a simple, unsectarian Bible exposition. Very occasionally a hot, perhaps fanatical, young officer may, by disrespect to an ordained ministry, bring down merited rebuke. Far oftener it is otherwise. The individual is too soberly, seriously in earnest to regard anything but "Christ and Him crucified." Officers have some qualifications higher than the reader. They have the weight of position in dealing with *their own men*, and they possess classical attainments—telling adjuncts. But they are looked upon as "dangerous;" *why*, we need not go far in these days to inquire.¹

The position in India is exceptional. The chaplains of the three recognised denominations are there appointed by the Secretary of State. They are no longer military, but civil servants, and receive instructions from Government through the Bishop in whose diocese they are stationed. These employés are fixed in garrisons. When small bodies of men are detached, the routine functions of a minister devolve on the officer in command. Hence, as we have said, sometimes very striking and providential issues. The Army Scripture Readers' Society, recognising fully the great field of India, has striven (with but little commensurate result hitherto) to raise a special fund for this department of their work. It has but thirteen readers in India, and no less than twenty-four important garrisons are as yet unappropriated. It is much to be

¹ If there be one individual of this order who may be used as an instrument for good, it is he who, by virtue of his calling, is brought most in accord with the daily objective life on earth of the Great Physician. Add to experience in it some measure of the "mind of Christ," of the love which St. Paul portrays, and who should be more fitted to combat sickness as well as "sin," through which, overtly or otherwise, that sickness comes? Who can speak with like force of the frail tenure of life? of the subtlety of disease? who else forecast an issue in health restored or—the grave? And who may so weightily set forth the fatal error of delay, of waiting for the "more convenient season" of a death-bed?—a season which he knows must ordinarily, from pain, or mental confusion, or utter loss of consciousness, unfit the sick for seeking peace. The example of a dying repentant thief prompts many to relegate pardon to the issue of the "last syllable of time": the Medical Officer can teach that few—very few—visitations of death leave, as did crucifixion, unclouded faculties for many hours. Hence, too, the great value—weight—of the Medical Missionary—a humble, human type of the Divine Master.

regretted that while appeals for men are reiterated from the East by our evangelical brethren there, almost all the funds have to be supplied by the mother country.

Non-commissioned, *i.e.* attached, chaplains.

It might, at first glance, reasonably be supposed that the civil requirements of a parish or district would militate against the subordinate interests of a military charge. This is not the case. Experience shows indisputably that both the clergy and Nonconformist ministers appointed to detachments enter heart and soul into the work, and are instruments of much blessing to soldiers. With the close union between civil and military elements now foreshadowed, this branch of Army Church ministration is the more important and hopeful.

To such good end, doubtless, the absence of reticence, incident to relation between the military chaplain, as an officer, and private, must contribute. The confidence of the man is more readily obtained. Again, there is more of home life—that feature which the better, *thoughtful* class of soldier yearns for amid the racket and publicity of a barrack-room. He enjoys social tea-meetings, and the temperance cause is undoubtedly thus furthered in the Army. Possibly the great frequency of such gatherings among Nonconformists may help to account for the indisputable fact that the bulk of soldiers brought under religious conviction—the men truly pious—belong to one or other form of Dissent, and notably, Wesleyan. In a former article¹ the “spell” of hymnody over the lower classes was noticed: the present instance affords apt illustration of a great fact.²

Let us look at the relation of war to our subject. A commingling of good and evil, surely. If the campaign be very brief and decisive, as in those which have characterized British arms of late, then the good side of human nature is apparent, rises to the surface. But in protracted war, with its contingent suffering of every kind, the evil assuredly crops up largely. The value of a life, of a soul, what is it then? The young soldier ordinarily passes through three several phases. There is the shock (which none may forget) at first viewing violent sudden death; then, indifference; then, callousness. “Self,” broken though it be at times by chivalrous acts, develops much. Few conditions of mankind more powerfully demand Christianizing agencies. And here, *en passant*, it may

¹ See CHURCHMAN, January, 1882. The writer may be allowed to express his satisfaction at the increased feeling in favour of shortened services in the church everywhere manifested.

² The Wesleyan body now sets apart ministers for Army work.

be remarked as a pleasing feature of the present day that a high, not infrequently distinctly religious, tone, often characterizes the public utterances of distinguished generals.

It has been maintained in these pages that there is need for—room for—additional workers in peace times. But in war the chaplain is simply overpowered, much as the medical officer in past days. Some parallelism indeed exists between the two. But the latter is *now* helped materially by new agencies, such as the Red Cross Society and self-sacrificing lady nurses.

Not so the former.¹ True, the Army Scripture Readers' Society steps in happily, as in Egypt, but its hands are sorely hampered by lack of funds, and two or three readers among 10,000 men—what are they among so many? Reference has been made to the Red Cross Society, and it might be said, "Could not its members be utilized for religious purposes also?" On grounds sufficiently patent to need no comment, the reply should be "No." A passing word to direct the dying on a field of battle to their Redeemer might indeed well fall from their lips, as from the lips of any Christian man.²

If we face the contingency of war, let us ask (as to the National Church), Would any Government supply an adequate number of clergy as chaplains, and, if so, are ministers experienced and fitted to be obtained? Past and present both point negatively in each direction. Since the last great war competitive examination came in, and very many young men at the Universities enter the lists. Already—not altogether from such cause, however—the requirements of an ever-

¹ In the Crimean War a Church of England chaplain had charge of a brigade—three regiments. The routine duties were very heavy, and such officers were often incapacitated through sickness. Hospitals were left unvisited. A sad vision of men, young for the most part, dying without spiritual succour, rises to the mind of the writer.

² The writer can never forget a lesson taught him of the value of a dozen words under such circumstances. The incident has been told, but may bear reiteration. At the battle of Inkerman, a soldier of his regiment, when lying wounded and disabled on the ground, subsequently received another (and, as it proved, fatal) stab. When ministered to, he was loudly cursing the Russian who had acted so inhumanly towards him. A glance showed the fatal nature of the injury. Shocked at the thought of a soul passing to eternity so awfully unprepared, the sufferer was urged by the surgeon to seek pardon from God. The whole current of thought was instantaneously turned; the dying man as fervently supplicated Divine mercy for himself as previously vengeance on another. He was placed for support and shelter behind the low bank of an earth-work, and necessarily left awhile. On return, at the close of the action, with a party to remove the wounded, the medical officer found his patient in the position where he had been placed. He was in the same attitude, too, sitting against the parapet, and—dead.

increasing mass of city populace fall short. Bishops are in accord as to the urgent need for lay ministration as an adjutant. It is no longer a question with them, "Shall we employ laymen?" but *only* what is the best form of utilization—designation—limit.

It is from such *matériel*, we submit, aid must be sought—existing means be supplemented in the Army. Voluntaryism is a growing force in this age. Statesmen are not slow to take advantage of it. Were theological students forthcoming in adequate number, it would not do to send them, like their medical *confrères*, to a war camp, but rather men experimentally taught in the school of life, and in the Master's service. Such happily may be found. Government would so far assist, doubtless, as to grant quarters and rations, essential requisites. The educated layman would supply a link between the commissioned chaplain and the Army Scripture-reader. Fitted by education and position, he could take the place of the former in emergencies, help him at times in functions (which, indeed, already devolve, not unfrequently, on isolated laymen abroad), and further religion—especially among the officers.¹ It is more than likely that under such circumstances Non-conformists will put forth much voluntary aid.

Whether it be with us war or peace, as God's good providence disposes, the object of these remarks is to show the paramount importance of the soldier being more fully equipped, more fully armed, for a yet higher warfare. To this end all "divisions" may well be subordinated. And, from another standpoint, it may be wise and in accord with the equally Christian and State policy of the late Archbishop Tait, to look forward, and, in the interests of our Church, strengthen her hold on an increasingly important element of society—an element which may otherwise in our children's days be potent in the direction of religious, *ergo* national, decadence.

FREDERICK ROBINSON.

NOTE.—Since this article was penned the "Story of Chinese Gordon" has issued from the Press. In it the following passage, illustrative of Spiritual wants during the Crimean War, appears: "We have a great deal to regret in the want of good working clergymen, there being none here, that I know of, who interest themselves about the men" (p. 20). And this was written by a very young officer—one whose very name is now an incentive to "holy living."

¹ In the latter part of the Crimean War, *after* the great strain of the famine period was ended and procedure rendered feasible, such help would have been very valuable.

ART. IV.—CHINESE GORDON.

The Story of Chinese Gordon. By A. EGMONT HAKE. With two portraits and two maps. Third Edition. Remington and Co. 1884.

IN the August CHURCHMAN of 1881 was reviewed "Colonel Gordon in Central Africa," a work of singular interest, consisting mainly of the Colonel's own letters, with supplementary papers. This *quasi*-autobiography was edited by Dr. G. B. Hill; it covers the Chinese as well as the Central African period. Mr. Wilson's narrative of Colonel Gordon's campaign in China is also known, probably, to many of our readers. The book before us, Mr. Hake's "story," is the "life" of General Gordon; and it is given to the world, Mr. Hake tells his readers, not only without the General's consent, but even without his knowledge. Never has a book appeared, perhaps, more truly opportune. A sixth edition, we notice, is already announced, and there is no doubt the circulation will be large. The book includes many facts already published in the late Mr. Wilson's "Ever-Victorious Army," and in Dr. Hill's work, as was inevitable, these facts forming part of the private letters, despatches, and so forth, placed at Mr. Hake's disposal.

It was in the year 1860 that Captain Gordon—already distinguished—left home for China. In the operations of the allies against Peking he took part, and he was present at the sacking and burning of the Summer Palace. The prisoners in the Palace, it will be remembered, had been ill-treated :

The General (wrote Gordon) ordered it to be destroyed, and stuck up proclamations to say why it was ordered. We accordingly went out, and after pillaging it, burned the whole place, destroying in a Vandal-like manner most valuable property, which could not be replaced for four millions You can scarcely imagine the beauty and magnificence of the places we burnt. It made one's heart sore to burn them; in fact, these palaces were so large, and we were so pressed for time, that we could not plunder them carefully. Quantities of gold ornaments were burned, considered as brass. It was wretchedly demoralizing work for an army. Everybody was wild for plunder. You would scarcely conceive the magnificence of this residence, or the tremendous devastation the French have committed. The throne and room were lined with ebony, carved in a marvellous way. There were huge mirrors of all shapes and kinds, clocks, watches, musical boxes with puppets on them, magnificent china of every description; heaps and heaps of silks of all colours, embroidery, and as much splendour and civilization as you would see at Windsor; carved ivory screens, coral screens, large amounts of treasure, etc. The French have smashed everything in the most wanton way. It was a scene of utter destruction which passes my description.

In 1862, the Tai-ping rebels becoming troublesome in the neighbourhood of Shanghai, successful operations, by English troops, were made against them; and during active service, and

afterwards in surveying, Gordon gained a most useful knowledge of the country.

In January, 1863, the most famous soldier and statesman of modern China, Li Futai, better known as Li-Hung-Chang, the Governor-General of the Kiang provinces, was sent to Shanghai by the Generalissimo of the Imperialists, Tseng-kwo-fan (father of the now famous Marquis Tseng), to take measures against the rebels in that quarter. Li-Hung-Chang, always in sympathy with foreigners, solicited General Staveley to appoint a British officer to the command of the Shanghai force, officered by foreigners, maintained by the Chinese Government, which bore the title of the Ever-Victorious Army. Staveley's choice fell on Gordon, who had never commanded, but who, above all other men, says Mr. Hake, had impressed those who knew him with a sense of his great abilities. In February, 1864, Major Gordon, after due consideration, took the command of the auxiliary force, about 4,000 strong. "I think that anyone," he wrote home, "who contributes to putting down this rebellion fulfils a humane task." He held the command of the "Ever-Victorious Army" until May, 1864, when, the backbone of the rebellion being broken, there was no longer any need of such a force.

The narrative of Gordon's services at this critical time is full of interest; it reads as an exciting "story" which has the master-charm of reality. Li, the governor of the province, soon perceived what manner of man the new mandarin was. Pay was prompt. The force was reorganized; and while the privates (all Chinese) were kindly treated, they, as well as the mixed company of foreign officers, were made submissive to discipline. The Tai-pings were defeated in several engagements, and the auxiliary force, handled with remarkable skill, proved of the greatest possible service. But Governor Li (since termed the Chinese Bismarck), though he became Gordon's friend and admirer, and has remained so to this day, did not quickly learn to appreciate his commanding qualities.

Of Gordon's courage several anecdotes are related. The officers of his force were brave men enough, but were not always ready to face their desperate antagonists. They would sometimes hang back, and Gordon, in his mild way, would take one or other of them by the arm, and lead him into the thick of the fire. He himself seemed to bear a charmed life, and never carried any arms, even when foremost in the breach. To him a shower of bullets was no more than a hailstorm. In his hand he had a small cane, and with this he would direct his troops. In the Chinese imagination this cane soon became magnified into Gordon's magic wand of victory.

Once and once only was Gordon wounded. In leading the

assaults at Kintang he was shot in the leg. When the news of his wound was known much anxiety was evinced. The Emperor, it is said, was sadly grieved, and issued the following proclamation :

Li-Hung-Chang reports that General Gordon some time since started from Liyang to attack Kintang. He carried with him mortars to breach the walls. At the attack he was wounded in the leg ; Li has therefore recommended him to remain at rest. Such is the despatch. Now Gordon being excessively brave and fearless, was wounded in consequence. We are on this account deeply moved with grief and admiration. On the other hand, we are informed that the wound is not serious. We order Li-Hung-Chang to visit Gordon and inquire for him daily, so as to keep his mind at rest, requesting him to wait till he shall be perfectly restored to health and strength. Respect this !

Gordon's wound was by no means serious, and he was soon as active as ever. By movements of extraordinary rapidity he broke in pieces the Rebel power ; and when news came that the Order in Council which permitted British officers to take service under the Chinese Government was withdrawn, he felt that his work was done. He visited the General-in-Chief, Tseng Kwo-fan, at Nanking, and gave excellent advice as to completing the success of the Imperial arms.

The Imperial Government, in its gratitude, offered him a considerable sum of money. This was the second offer. He declined it, though he did not now wave with his cane the treasure-bearers from his presence. He had spent his pay of £1,200 a year in comforts for his army, and in the relief of the victims of the Rebel leaders. Nothing would he do, says Mr. Hake, which might give a mercenary stamp to his services, or deprive him of the reflection that he had acted in the cause of humanity alone. When he went to take leave of Li, he was received with the highest distinction. The Chinese Bismarck had learned to recognise the greatness of Gordon's character. Nor was the Government backward in acknowledging his services. In an Imperial decree, frank and generous in tone, the highest honours were conferred upon him :

"We command," so ran the decree, "that Gordon be rewarded with a yellow riding-jacket to be worn on his person, and a peacock's feather to be carried on his cap ; also that there be bestowed on him four suits of the uniform proper to his rank of Ti-Tu, in token of our favour and desire to do him honour. Respect this."

Gordon had been officially invited to Peking ; but his dislike of being made a hero of prevented his going. It is pleasant to know that the Imperial Ministers, really grateful, were anxious to do him service as an English officer. An instance is related : Sir Frederick Bruce, the representative of our Government, was leaving Peking at that time, and he received a

farewell visit from Prince Kung, the then Regent of China. A few days later the Prince returned.

"You will be astonished," he said, "to see me again, but I felt I could not allow you to leave without coming to see you about Gordon. We do not know what to do. He will not receive money from us, and we have already given him every honour which it is in the power of the Emperor to bestow; but as these can be of little value in his eyes, I have brought you this letter, and ask you to give it to the Queen of England, that she may bestow on him some reward which would be more valuable in his eyes."

"The individual is coming home," he wrote to his mother in November, 1864, "but does not wish it known." On his return, none, save his relations, heard anything of the campaign; and he declined all invitations. In 1865 he received the appointment of Commanding Royal Engineer at Gravesend, where he remained until 1871; and during those six years, "perhaps the happiest of his life," he lived a life of Christian usefulness, one of happiness and "pure peace." "His house," says Mr. Hake, "was school and hospital and almshouse in turn—was more like the abode of a missionary than of a Colonel of Engineers. The troubles of all interested him alike. The poor, the sick, the unfortunate, were ever welcome, and never did suppliant knock vainly at his door. He always took a great delight in children, but especially in boys employed on the river or the sea. Many he rescued from the gutter, cleansed them and clothed them, and kept them for weeks in his home. For their benefit he established evening classes, over which he himself presided, reading to and teaching the lads with as much ardour as if he were leading them to victory. He called them his 'kings,' and for many of them he got berths on board ship. One day a friend asked him why there were so many pins stuck into the map of the world over his mantelpiece: he was told that they marked and followed the course of the boys on their voyages—that they were moved from point to point as his youngsters advanced, and that he prayed for them as they went, day by day." The light in which he was held by these lads, adds Mr. Hake, was shown by inscriptions in chalk on the fences. A favourite legend was "God bless the Kernel."

One who saw much of him at this time writes:

His benevolence embraced all. Misery was quite sufficient claim. The workhouse and the infirmary were his constant haunts . . . All eating and drinking he was indifferent to. Coming home with us one afternoon late, we found his tea waiting for him—a most unappetising stale loaf and a teapot of tea. I remarked upon the dryness of the bread, when he took the whole loaf (a small one), crammed it into the slop-basin, and poured all the tea upon it, saying it would soon be ready for him to eat, and in half an hour it would not matter what he had eaten . . . His mystical turn of

mind lent a great charm to his words . . . We saw him very frequently, but there was a tacit understanding that we were never to invite him nor to ask him to stay longer when he rose to go. To ask him to dinner would have been a great offence. He would say, "Ask the poor and sick; don't ask me, who have enough."

In 1871, Colonel Gordon was appointed British Commissioner to the European Commission of the Danube. In taking leave of Gravesend, we read, he presented a number of Chinese flags of all colours—the trophies of his victories—to his "Kings" at the Ragged Schools. These are still yearly exhibited on the occasion of school-treats, and the donor's name is cheered to the echo.

Of his wonderful work in the Soudan, during the five years 1874-1879, some account was given, as has been said, in *THE CHURCHMAN* of August, 1881. Mr. Hake's narrative will deepen the impression already produced: the more we know, the more we admire—the character of the man shines ever more brightly.

Mr. Hake writes with enthusiasm; he is quite a Carlyle in admiration of a hero. But it is the man's religion, his Christian character, which apparently is most of all admired; certainly, nothing is brought out so glowingly as the hero's trust, his temper of prayer, his dependence upon God. When Gordon was leaving Cairo for the Soudan in 1877, his words, we read, were these: "I go up alone, with an Infinite Almighty God to direct and guide me; and am glad to so trust Him as to fear nothing, and indeed, to feel sure of success." This was after his second appointment; he was Governor-General of an immense territory, not only of the Soudan, but of the whole region south of the Nubian Desert.¹ He was keenly alive to the tremendous responsibilities of such a post; and no wonder, if sometimes the burden of it seemed heavier than he could bear. "With all his strength of will, with all his trust in the guardianship of an unseen Power," says Mr. Hake, "we must not marvel if, alone in the great desert, with the results of ages of evil and wrong, the mystic and the man of action sometimes give way in him, and he utter a cry of despair." He was doing heroic work for the hero's true wages—the love of Christ and the good of his fellow men. He laboured as the hand of the providence of God; he believed that his mission was of God's own setting. And though occasionally great weariness came over him, it quickly fell from him; "the valiant simplicity, the frank and happy faith" of former days, came back to aid

¹ For the first three years (1874-1877), it will be remembered, General Gordon was Governor of the Equatorial Province. In this he succeeded Sir Samuel Baker. During the years 1877-1879 his rule extended over a vastly increased territory.

him in his noble enterprise. He had put his trust in the LORD, and he never was confounded. Nay, as a rule, he took a cheerful view of the difficulties of his task.

“The work he had now undertaken,” says Mr. Hake, “was fraught with peculiar perils. It demanded a tact, an energy, and a force of will, almost superhuman. He had to deal not only with worthless and often mutinous governors of provinces, but with wild and desperate tribesmen as well; he had to disband 6,000 Bashi-Bazouks, who were used as frontier guards, but who winked at slave-hunting and robbed the tribes on their own account; he had to subdue and bring to order the vast provinces of the Bahr Gazelle, but now beneath the sway of the great slaver Sebehr. It was a stupendous task: to give peace to a country quick with war; to suppress slavery among a people to whom the trade in human flesh was life and honour and fortune; to make an army out of perhaps the worst material ever seen; to grow a flourishing trade and a fair revenue in the wildest anarchy in the world.”

The immensity of the undertaking (adds Mr. Hake); the infinity of details involved in a single step towards the end; the countless odds to be faced; the many pests—the deadly climate, the horrible vermin, the ghastly itch, the nightly and daily alternation of overpowering heat and bitter cold—to be endured and overcome; the environment of bestial savagery and ruthless fanaticism—all these combine to make the achievement unique in human history. . . . Like the adventurer in Browning’s magnificent allegory, my hero was fated to face with a vast and mighty wrong; he had everything against him, and he was utterly alone; but he stood for God and the right, and he would not blench. There stood the Tower of Evil—the grim ruined land, the awful presences, the hopeless task, the anarchy of wickedness and despair and wrath. He knew, he felt, he recognised it all; and yet—

And yet

Dauntless the stag-horn to my lips I set

And blew: *Childe Roland to the Dark Tower came.*

It was in January, 1879, that the power of Sebehr fell. His son Suleiman was out-manceuvred, beaten, and shot. Sebehr was tried in Cairo for rebellion against the Viceroy, found guilty, and condemned to death. But as Gordon anticipated, “nothing was done to him.” He was permitted to live in Cairo, and in fact received a pension of £100 a month from the Khedive. The slave-trade, however, had received a heavy blow; and if a worthy successor to Gordon Pasha had been found, the peaceful results of his splendid successes would undoubtedly have remained. But the Khedive Ismail abdicated; and apart from the difficulties of serving the new Khedive, Gordon longed for rest. “I am neither a Napoleon nor a Colbert,” was his reply to some who praised his beneficence in the Soudan; “I do not profess to have been either a great ruler or a great financier; but I can say this—I have cut off the slave-

dealers in their strongholds, and I made the people love me." Eight months earlier, Ismail had said, "Do I mistrust Gordon Pasha? That is an honest man." Before he sailed for England, this "honest man" (it is a curious fact) sent to one of the worst of the Pashas in Egypt a telegram, which ran: "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin."

How General Gordon was invited by the King of the Belgians to conduct an expedition round the Congo, and, while on his way, was summoned by his own Government to see what he could do in the Soudan, is known throughout the civilized world. The course of his mission will be watched with the keenest interest, and prayers will be daily made on his behalf.



ART. V.—DEAN BURGON'S "REVISION REVISED."

The Revision Revised. Three articles reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*—I. "The New Greek Text;" II. "The New English Version;" III. "Westcott and Hort's New Textual Theory." To which is added, "A Reply to Bishop Ellicott's Pamphlet in Defence of the Revisers and their Greek Text of the New Testament, including a Vindication of the Traditional Reading of 1 Timothy iii. 16." By JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street.

HAD the reprint of these articles been issued shortly after their first appearance, no doubt the book would have been eagerly bought and read. But the delay of more than a year between the publication of the third article and the appearance of the present volume has produced two distinct results. In the first place, the blow struck by the three articles has had its full effect. The Revised New Testament does not, at present, show much sign of vitality. It may be a book for scholars, or a book of reference for the many. It has not yet taken the place of the Authorised Version. Nor is it likely to do so, in our judgment. Hence there seems but little necessity, at the moment, for any renewed attack upon it. Why should we draw the sword against the slain?

But this book of Dean Burgon's also presents us with another result, of a somewhat different and special kind. The year's delay, which we have referred to, has been a year's hard work for the Dean. Seldom leaving his desk, except for the cathedral, for meals, or for his bed, he has steadily devoted himself to a question raised by the chairman and another member of the New Testament Company in their published reply to his

Reviews. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and Archdeacon Palmer, challenged the Dean's criticisms on their reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16. We have it in our Authorised New Testament as "GOD was manifest in the flesh." The Revisers read, "HE who was manifest in the flesh." In the first of the three articles in the *Quarterly*, Dean Burgon devoted eight pages to a short summary of the evidence concerning this passage as known to us then. "To us," we say; very much as the blower of Handel's organ insisted on saying "we," and enforced the pronoun by letting the wind out of the instrument at a critical moment. But, in truth, there was a mass of evidence as to the authorities for the various readings in this verse, which was known only to Dean Burgon himself. A very large number of his references to the Fathers are, as he has been forced to remind us, "*not to be found elsewhere!*" We cannot even claim to have blown the bellows of the fire in which the Dean has laboured with such effect.

However, not content with having already exhibited considerably greater knowledge of the question at issue than the Revisers themselves, Dean Burgon at once accepted the challenge of the Bishop and the Archdeacon, and turned his whole strength to an exhaustive inquiry into *all* the existing evidence for the text of the famous clause in 1 Tim. iii. 16. To his eight pages, his opponents had replied in twelve. "That I may not be thought wanting in courtesy, the present rejoinder," he says, "shall extend to seventy-six."

This monograph of seventy-six pages is the gem of the whole volume. Its appearance is an event, even in this eventful century. But, if the circulation of the treatise is desired, one thing seems absolutely necessary. The seventy-six pages in question must be taken out of the thick volume which contains them at present, and issued in a separate form. It is deplorable that the age in which we live is not a learned or a studious age.† But facts are facts; and, among other facts, it is undeniable that mankind in general will not spoil a sovereign, or half a sovereign, current coin of the realm for the sake even of a gem like this, valuable as it is. Books that deserve to live are not usually appreciated in anything short of a lifetime. If Dr. Ginsburg had been a little slower, and some other persons a little less pertinacious, and M. Clermont-Ganneau not quite so quick, it is just possible that Mr. Shapira might have secured his million, or at least enough of it to pay his expenses from Jerusalem to London and back. But though the true reading of a single passage in the New Testament which asserts that JESUS CHRIST is very GOD is worth more than a million, the treatise which establishes the truth is not one that will sell rapidly, more especially if those

who buy the treatise are compelled to buy a good deal more than they think they know the drift of and do not want to keep. We say this much to direct attention to a fault of this generation, and not for the sake of depreciating the volume, which in our opinion is well worthy of a place, not only on the shelves, but in the hands of every student of the New Testament. It can never lose its value; and, therefore, it is a truly profitable investment. We cannot shut our eyes to the unpleasant truth that this is not the common opinion; and our own estimate of the exceeding value of Dean Burgon's labours is in no way affected thereby.

Howbeit, we must do our best to acquaint our readers with the value of this treatise; and so let us return to the main point.

Those who already know will accept our apologies for repeating what so many know nothing about, that the authorities for the text of the New Testament fall under three different heads: I. *Manuscripts*; II. *Versions*, i.e., translations of the Greek into other languages; III. *Fathers*, i.e., Church writers (especially Greeks) who quote the text of the New Testament in one or another form. For his knowledge of this *third* branch of the subject the Dean of Chichester is absolutely without a rival in the world. He has *himself searched out and indexed all the references to the New Testament in all the Fathers*, and is consequently possessed of a larger amount of information on this part of the question than any other writer living or dead. He is, moreover, no blind follower of the blind. He is thoroughly acquainted with the distinction enforced by Dr. Scrivener, that the mere quotation of a text in the writings of a Father is not always decisive as to the reading of the text. It may be that several ways of reading it would have served the Father's purpose equally well in the passage under dispute. But where the whole exposition of the text depends on the actual wording of it;—where the interpretation adopted by the patristic expositor is applicable to one form of the words and to no other—there the Father must perforce be witness to the language in which that particular text stood in his New Testament. This principle is fully acknowledged, and its results are adhered to, in the treatise before us. But this is only the third part of the subject. Let us return to the first.

Manuscripts of the New Testament are divided into: (a) Uncial, (b) Cursive. We cannot apologize for stating this; for there are many worthy and able men of just too many years' standing to be aware of the fact, which was not part of the education of Macaulay's schoolboy. The Uncial Manuscripts are written in capital letters. Sometimes the words are

not divided; sometimes not even the sentences. These manuscripts contain many abbreviations. In particular the Greek word for *God* is written "ΘC." The very similar combination, "OC," means "who." In the text under discussion this is the great point at issue in the uncial manuscripts.

The cursive manuscripts are very much more numerous than the uncials. In these the words are divided. Small letters as well as capitals are used. Sentences are marked. Accents, breathings, and stops find a place.

The cursive manuscripts are also much more modern than the uncials. Most critics disregard their testimony, as of comparatively little weight. But we must observe that there is a fallacy in the common view. Men write far too much as if uncial manuscripts were *all* the manuscripts, and cursive manuscripts were like printed editions. That 100 printed copies of a document should exhibit the same error is not only natural but even necessary. It can hardly be otherwise. But that 252 *cursive* manuscripts should exhibit one and the same reading of any particular text is by no means necessary. And it is a fact for which we cannot easily assign any other cause than this, that the reading which they preserve is *accepted by the universal Church*. For these cursive manuscripts are "not copies of one another;" they all have their own peculiarities. Nor are they copies of any older manuscripts which we now possess. A collator will necessarily register, and a textual critic will easily set aside, those manuscripts which exhibit the same text, or are copies of a common original. That this is not the case with the mass of cursive manuscripts all critics are aware. But they do not always give the fact its due weight. For if we once allow that the cursive manuscripts are, on the whole, *independent* witnesses, it becomes very difficult to reject their joint testimony.

In any critical edition of the Greek Testament, it is usual to exhibit the authorities for each particular reading in the order above given: (I.) Manuscripts; (II.) Versions; (III.) Fathers. Under each of these three heads, the order of authorities is chronological; and uncial manuscripts naturally take precedence of cursives.

Without blaming those who have adopted this arrangement, a careful consideration of what Dean Burgon has written upon textual criticism has convinced us that it practically often misleads the reader. For example, in this very text. The *uncial* manuscripts apparently give less decisive and distinct testimony than the cursives; and the cursives again, perhaps, weigh less, though they count up to more, than the "torrent of the Fathers." But when the whole evidence is re-assorted chronologically, and the several centuries of the Christian

era are compelled to speak in order, beginning from the eldest unto the last, a very different impression is created from that which we receive by the perusal of an ordinary critical note.

On pp. 486, sqq., we have the following summary: The statement that "God was manifest in the flesh" is recognised to be the true reading of 1 Timothy iii. 16

1. In the first century by Ignatius and Barnabas.
2. In the second century by Hippolytus—twice.
3. In the third century (probably) by Gregory Thaumaturgus; by the Apostolic constitutions; by Basil the Great; by Dionysius of Alexandria.
4. In the fourth century by Didymus; Gregory Bishop of Nazianzus; Diodorus of Tarsus; Gregory of Nyssa; Chrysostom; and by an ancient title of the section to which the passage belongs.

To this century belong the oldest uncial manuscripts, the Vatican and the Sinaitic. Only one of these contains the passage: the Sinaitic manuscript. It reads not "God," but "Who." The Vatican manuscript is not available here.

5. In the fifth century, the Alexandrine manuscript (in the British Museum) reads "God." This fact has been disputed by Bishop Ellicott and others. But by an abundance of testimony, placed on record before the manuscript became illegible, Dean Burgon has established the truth.

As the centuries proceed, the testimony for reading "God" is greatly multiplied. But we desire to direct the attention of our readers to the fact that an ordinary critical note would not convey to the reader any idea of the real order of this testimony. He would see first of all that the testimony of the oldest manuscript extant is hostile to the reading "God"; the next manuscript is probably in favour of it; but the reading there is disputed. The next is disputed also; the next is hostile; the next two are doubtful. The number of cursive manuscripts in favour of "God" is overwhelming. But only a few of them are referred to by some critics. Tregelles, for instance, is silent as to the testimony of all but a very few. The versions in general do not, by any means, support the reading "God" in this place. The investigation of their testimony, by Dean Burgon, in this treatise, is exceedingly interesting. He shows that they have been much misrepresented by critics: some of them being actually set down as witnesses on the wrong side. Still, in an ordinary critical note, the impression derived by the reader from what is said of them would be unfavourable to the Authorised Version. Next he would find a few references to Fathers; nothing like so many as Dean Burgon has produced; and he would not gain any clear idea of the

immense preponderance of their testimony in favour of the received text.

What would certainly *not* appear on the face of any critical edition of the New Testament is, that there are at least twelve witnesses for the reading "God was manifest in the flesh," as old as, or older than, the oldest witnesses against it.

We cannot help wishing that the textual critics would henceforth *alter the order* in which they cite the testimony for the various reading of the New Testament. If A, B, ~~8~~, C, D, and the rest of the capital letters are always to stand first, the impression is necessarily created that the authorities which they stand for are the oldest and the best. We cannot all be expected to remember, even if we know, that this is not the case.

No less issue is at stake in this conflict than the whole question as to the value of modern methods of textual criticism. The Bishop of Gloucester and the Archdeacon of Oxford were correct in their statement that if Dean Burgon is right, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf and Alford, as well as Westcott and Hort, are all wrong. There is no doubt of it. And the same observation applies to a certain extent to Dr. Scrivener. For though, in a great many of his particular conclusions, he and Dean Burgon are agreed, yet Dr. Scrivener's method of citing and arranging authorities, and the deference which he pays to them severally, resemble the generality of modern critics far more than the attitude adopted by Dean Burgon. Respecting the theory of Dr. Hart, however, these two writers are perfectly agreed: that it has no foundation at all.

But it is time to say something of the fresh discoveries with which this treatise of Dean Burgon's is enriched. He has been in correspondence with nearly all the public libraries in Europe. The results appear in the following passage:

The inquiries into which I was led (January to June, 1883) by my dissertation in vindication of the traditional reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16, have resulted in my being made aware of the existence of a vast number of sacred codices which had eluded the vigilance of previous critics.

I had already assisted my friend Prebendary Scrivener in greatly enlarging Scholz's list. We had, in fact, raised the enumeration of "Evangelia" to 621, of "Acts and Catholic Epistles" to 239, of "Paul" to 281, of "Apocalypse" to 108, of "Evangelistaria" to 299, of the book called "Apostolus" to 81; making a total of 1,629. But at the end of a protracted and somewhat laborious correspondence with the custodians of not a few great Continental libraries, I am able to state that our available "Evangelia" amount to at least 739, our "Acts and Catholic Epistles" to 261, our "Paul" to 338, our "Apocalypse" to 122, our "Evangelistaria" to 415, our copies of the "Apostolus" to 128; making a total of 2,003. This shows an increase of *three hundred and seventy-four*.

The last sentence of the appendix is also a notable one. *The Codices which are known to witness to "God was manifested," in 1 Tim. iii. 16, amount to exactly three hundred.* It is also supported by three versions, by upwards of twenty Greek Fathers. Against this, the reading "who" in place of "God" is countenanced by six manuscripts in all, by only one version for certain (viz., the Gothic), *not for certain by a single Greek Father.*

The reading "which" is supported by a single manuscript (D), by five ancient *versions*, by two late Greek Fathers.

This is the sum of the whole matter. But the investigation through which this conclusion has been reached, and the discussion in which it is presented, abound with interesting and instructive passages. One of the most important features in the problem is the presence of the horizontal stroke above the abbreviated word $\Theta\bar{C}$ (God.) If this mark were always the sign of contraction, even the absence of the smaller stroke in the middle of the Θ would not make it possible to read $\bar{O}\bar{C}$ as anything else but $\bar{\Theta}\bar{C}$. But it appears that this horizontal stroke has other uses. It is found over other letters, vowels in particular, where it *cannot* be the sign of contraction; and hence some have maintained that in 1 Tim. iii. 16, this horizontal stroke is the rough breathing over the word $\bar{O}\bar{C}$, *who*. This suggestion is met by Dean Burgon with most marvellous learning and acuteness. He shows that it cannot possibly be the rough breathing, but that its constant presence over the vowel *I* in Greek and Latin shows that "it is nothing else but an ancient substitute (in that case) for the modern dot over the *i*. It is not, however, limited to *i*, but appears occasionally over other vowels. Over the vowel *O* it is comparatively rare, And the result of the investigation respecting 1 Tim. iii. 16 is, that the line there is "probably the sign of contraction." But if so, its presence points unmistakably to the reading $\bar{\Theta}\bar{C}$, *God*, in every manuscript where the horizontal stroke over these two letters appears.

We cannot attempt in any degree to reproduce the brilliant pungency of Dean Burgon's controversial style. Both in this treatise and in the preface to the entire volume his adversaries are well satirized. But this style, which was quite correct in the time of Bentley, is not understood by the moderns; and Dean Burgon's arguments suffer in consequence. His style is thought to be abusive; and "abuse," we are told, "is not argument." To which the reply is both natural and easy, that neither is argument abuse. The Dean's *arguments*, both here and in "The Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark," are quite

irrefutable. The strange thing is, that the arguments in his book on St. Mark certainly, and apparently in this case also, are not only not refuted, but not even read. We have heard men far inferior, both in learning and scholarship, pour contempt on what they had evidently never studied at all. Why this is so, is a question which admits of more than one answer. There are fashions even in criticism: and "men love darkness rather than light," if darkness is fashionable. Dean Burgon is too much of a student to be popular. He is too painstaking, too exhaustive, too accurate, too minute, for the age in which we live. Books which are written with so much labour cannot be appreciated at their true value by those who have not laboured at the same task themselves.

Yet the style throughout is as easy as English can well be. Who else is there that can write about "codex" letter this, or "Praxapostolus" number that (we wonder how many of our readers have the faintest notion *what a Praxapostolus* is!) as familiarly as a commercial traveller can describe a railway junction, and be as interesting as a novelist all the while? And that this learning and this facility should be all thrown into the scale, together with life, health, recreation, and even necessary rest, and all to vindicate a single sentence of God's written Word—this, we say, is a sight not for a season, but for a century; not a lesson for the period ("for the fashion of this world passeth away"), but an example for all time.

C. H. WALLER.



ART. VI.—THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S ON THE CHURCH IN WALES.

A Charge delivered at his Third Triennial Visitation to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's. By WILLIAM BASIL JONES, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's. Rivingtons.

AN effort is to be made this Session, it seems, to carry a resolution in favour of the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales. The people of Wales are supposed to be keen and vigorous politicians; and they return to Parliament, as everybody knows, strongly Liberal representatives. In England, happily, politicians of even pronounced Liberalism, not seldom, are loyal supporters of the National Church; but in the political circles of Wales, perhaps, "Liberal" stands for much the same as "Liberationist." For this reason, no doubt, the first blow at the Establishment is to be directed against

the Church in the Principality. The Church of England is to be assailed on what is supposed to be its weakest side.

Under these circumstances, as is natural, Churchmen in Wales are setting themselves to work. Through the instrumentality of the Church Defence Institution, and in other ways, making known the real facts of the case, they are appealing to the people. This work, we hear, is being done in earnest, and not without success. People in England, as a rule, it is said, "are singularly ignorant of the real condition of the Church in Wales;" but of the Welsh people themselves, probably, no small number are scarcely any better informed, while of the historical claims of their ancient Church they really know nothing. Yet excellent work, as was remarked, is being done in Wales; and observers, whose opportunities of judging are great, have given expression to their belief that the Welsh people "are awaking to the hollowness and the insincerity of the Liberationist attack; and there are not wanting most encouraging indications that its main effect will be to strengthen the position of the Church in the Principality, to stimulate it to greater efforts, and to confirm it in the enduring affections of the people." The Bishop of St. David's, whose welcome and interesting Charge is now before us, does not fear to express his opinion that "the policy of the Liberation Society will not be ultimately successful."

The chief matter, at the present moment, is one of statistics. We thoroughly agree with the remark of the Bishop of St. David's as to parochial statistics. Careful returns from the Clergy of the Welsh dioceses are of high importance.¹ For the making of full and accurate statistical calculations, which may be published and regarded as trustworthy, there is a very real and pressing reason. "I am convinced," says the Bishop, "that a full, plain, and unvarnished statement of facts would

¹ A correspondent of the *National Church* (Feb., 1884) calls attention to some very startling statistics of the Nonconformist bodies in Wales that have been recently issued. The *Nonconformist and Liberator* claims a million and a half Nonconformist members, adding that this million and a half represents four and a half million persons; multiplying the members by three to arrive at the adherents of the denominations. In the county of Cardigan, the Calvinistic Methodists return 12,030, the Independents 11,734 members. Adding these figures and multiplying by three, we have a total of 71,292, or actually 966 in excess of the census of 1881. But this is not all. The Baptists claim 6,000, and the Wesleyans 3,600 in the same county—making a total Nonconformist population of 80,892. The census return is 70,266. That is to say, the Dissenters by their own calculations exceed the total inhabitants by more than 10,000, and leave no room for a single Churchman, clerical or lay. Applying the same test to the counties of Merioneth, Carnarvon, Anglesey, and Carmarthen, they each exhibit the same marvellous results.

do more for Church defence than any amount of political agitation. I think that the following points would be established by statistical inquiry, at least as regards the large Diocese of St. David's: first, that, as regards the proportion of real Church members to the population at large, it is scarcely, if at all, behind some of the English dioceses; secondly, that, as regards the progress of the Church during the last ten or twenty years, it has at least kept pace with most of the dioceses of England, though it doubtless started from a lower point; and thirdly, while there are among us, unhappily, parishes in which the Church is at the lowest possible ebb, these are exceptional, while in many the condition of the Church is as flourishing as in any part of the kingdom. There is in fact, so far as I can see, no reason for treating the case of the Welsh dioceses as in any way exceptional. But we certainly need accurate statistics in order to enable us to make this position good."

The Bishop gives, and examines in detail, statistics as to Baptism, Confirmations,¹ Sunday-schools, Holy Communion, Church-building, and so forth. There are many encouraging symptoms of reviving activity in the Church; and those which have to do, directly, only with the externals of religion, are at once symptomatic of increasing earnestness and self-denial on the part of the people, and productive of the happiest consequences as regards the life of the Church. Thus, in answer to the question whether the work of the Church has increased in proportion to the growth of its advantages, the Bishop of St. David's has no hesitation in stating that it has done so. "There is a distinct advance in this respect," he says: the number of services is steadily increasing. In the important and even vital matter of pastoral visitation, he mentions an increased activity of the clergy. In this one respect, indeed, you cannot gauge by statistics the comparative amount of clerical labour; but an increase in the Christian activities of any parish, probably, will be the proof, as it is the result, of the kindly and prayerful visits of the pastor from house to house.

¹ Referring to some admitted to Communion, who had been communicants in other denominations, and not unreasonably objected to be deprived of Communion until they could be presented for Confirmation, and to others, "who, having been brought up as Dissenters, did not understand or appreciate the ordinance of Confirmation," his Lordship gives gentle and gracious guidance. "In the two last cases," he says, "however much we might advise persons of full age, having been brought up as Nonconformists, to submit to the rite (like Him who, though sinless, underwent a ceremony of human institution symbolizing the washing away of sin, that He might fulfil all righteousness), I suppose few of us would wish in such cases to make Confirmation an indispensable prerequisite to Communion." The case of persons of mature age who have come over from Dissent was not contemplated when the Rubric ["there shall be none admitted . . ."] was drawn up.

In the pulpit, no doubt, the Nonconformist minister may equal, or even excel, the clergyman; but week-day work in the parish, if truly spiritual, is sure to tell, and its results will abide. On a political platform the spiritually-minded clergyman may never appear; but in the weekly prayer-meeting or the communicants' meeting, in the parish school-room, his place is not likely to be often empty. Christ's Gospel the keynote of his message, the representative of the ancient Church of the land, in the best sense of the word *unsectarian*, the servant of the people for the Saviour's sake will minister in trust and hope. "*Our land shall yield her increase.*"

On the subject of lay agency, a most important subject, the Bishop of St. David's comments at some length. He alludes, of course, to the expected Report of the Committee of Convocation; and he remarks that some impatience was expressed in the Diocesan Conference at the delay in the publication of that Report. He says:

It was justly felt that, especially in Wales, lay agency might be made the means of solving many of the Church's difficulties, and that any delay in arriving at a decision in this important matter was so much time lost to the Church. This is, doubtless, true to some extent; but the statement is subject to one qualification. For the lay agency which is so much desired exists already in this, and probably in every other Diocese, even though it may not have received—among ourselves at least—episcopal recognition. In fact, I do not doubt that this agency is at present somewhat more freely resorted to than would be altogether possible if a scheme were adopted making episcopal sanction necessary in every case for the employment of laymen in quasi-ecclesiastical functions. The establishment of any such scheme, while it will encourage the employment of laymen in fit and necessary cases, must, on the other hand, tend to limit it.

In regard to lay help, no doubt, the special point with many Churchmen in Wales, is this: What is to be done in the large, poorly endowed parishes? You have two congregations in one place, or the distance between the parish church and the mission-room is considerable. For five services, then, what can you do? At the Swansea Congress (*CHURCHMAN*, vol. ii, p. 160) the self-supporting Diaconate, it was urged, gives the best practical answer.¹

As regards rubrical revision, Bishop Jones points, as he has pointed before (*CHURCHMAN*, vol. iii, p. 467) to the reform of Convocation. The present Parliament has shown no readiness to pay respect to Convocation; and "he must be a very sanguine person who considers that the next Parliament will be more likely to agree to the acts of Convocation. In fact," says his lordship, "I see no solution of this difficulty except

¹ The Bishop of St. David's recommends the "institution of a separate and distinct Order of the ministry," and for such ministers the title of Sub-deacon is, his lordship thinks, the best.

in the reform of Convocation, or rather in the substitution for it of a mixed representative body of Clergy and Laity, which shall have authority to speak and to act for the whole body of the Church. If such a body were once instituted, I am inclined to think that Parliament would gladly leave to it a large part of the power, labour, and responsibility of legislating for the Church."¹ There is little doubt about it, we think. It has long been our own opinion that the reconstitution of the Convocations is the most pressing of all "Church reforms." In the meantime, however, the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, directly and indirectly, is doing good service. We have supported the movement from the first, and it will have, we believe, important consequences.

The Central Council movement, as regards the object which it has in view, has the "warm sympathy" of Bishop Jones; and his criticisms (with those of the Bishop of Worcester and the Bishop of Liverpool), and also his suggestions, will be very carefully considered on all sides among sober and thoughtful Churchmen. "The system of Diocesan Conferences," says his lordship, "has now spread its network nearly over the country, since there are only two Dioceses at present untouched by it. At last the great Diocese of London has come in; and I cannot imagine that the time is far distant when the system will have been established throughout England and Wales. It was felt by some of the most ardent promoters of the system that it was desirable to gather up the results of these scattered assemblies into a single head. And it was at the same time felt to be an evil that there existed no central deliberative assembly of the Church of England in which the laity have a place. Hence it was proposed to form a Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, consisting of lay and clerical members delegated from every Conference. It was decided at the last meeting of the St. David's Conference to send representatives for this year, as a tentative measure; and it is very possible that the experiment may be repeated. I honestly confess that I consider this step somewhat hasty and premature, although it is certainly one in the right direction. I cannot recognise, as in any sense representative of the Church of England, a self-constituted body, summoned by no superior or external authority, from which the Bishops are excluded, which stands in no acknowledged relation to them, and which is presided over by a layman, however able and eminent. It is not that I desire to exclude the laity from a share in the councils of the

¹ The opinions of the Earl of Chichester, the Bishop of Peterborough, the Right Hon. H. C. Childers, M.P., and of other eminent Churchmen, in consonance with these remarks, have been quoted in this Magazine. See *e.g.*, THE CHURCHMAN, vol. iii., p. 138.

Church : quite the reverse ; as I am convinced their admission to a share in such councils is the best solution, or, rather, perhaps the only possible solution, of our present difficulties. But I feel that the recently established Central Council can never, for reasons which I have stated above, be looked upon as the true Church of England by representation, and my anxiety to give the laity their proper place in Church government is the principal ground of my dissatisfaction with the present, as I consider, not very felicitous experiment."

The Bishop proceeds as follows :

At the same time, I consider that, pending the establishment of a more really representative body to which the duty of deliberating on affairs of the Church may properly be entrusted, there is a function which may very properly be undertaken by the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, and which it may discharge without any suspicion of arrogating to itself a position which cannot rightly be accorded it. You are, doubtless, aware that it has long been the practice of the Bishops of both Provinces to hold private meetings at Lambeth Palace, or elsewhere, more than once during the Session of Parliament, but invariably about the time of the commencement of the Session, when the most important meeting is generally held. These meetings come down from the time when Convocation was silent ; they deal with a large variety of subjects on which it is desirable that the Bishops should seek the benefit of each other's experience and wise counsel ; and they frequently handle matters which can be most profitably and safely discussed *in camera*. Of course, such meetings are not in any way official or authoritative ; their resolutions can only bind an individual Bishop by his own consent ; and, speaking generally, they are more useful as a means of comparing notes and eliciting advice under difficult circumstances than in any other way. There is, however, one class of subjects in relation to which these private and informal meetings are especially important. I mean the measures directly or indirectly affecting the Church which are, or are likely to be, brought before Parliament. For it must be remembered that the Bishops of England and Wales are, with the exception of the five junior prelates, members of the Legislature, and it is desirable that their legislative action should be, if possible, harmonious, but in any case well considered. Now, it is here, as it seems to me, that the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences may make itself very useful. It can sift and discuss questions which are likely to take shape in the form of Bills in Parliament, and can bring the opinions of the clergy and of the faithful laity before the Bishops in a definite and tangible form. Or the Bishops, after considering such matters, might send their own resolutions for consideration by the Central Council, with a view to their own guidance in their legislative capacity. This, I think, is the way in which the Central Council is most likely to be useful at present. . . . The opinion of the majority of a body constituted like the Central Council both deserves and would command respect, and the expression of such an opinion would be one very important element in the calculation which has to be gone into in the process of making up one's mind on public questions.

In regard to the Disestablishment resolution in the House of Commons, to which we have referred, the observations of such a prelate as the Bishop of St. David's have a peculiar

weight, and we have pleasure in quoting them. The Bishop said :

I deny the existence of any reason for treating the position of the Church in Wales as in any way peculiar. Wales is neither geographically nor politically distinct from England, and so far as there is an ethnical distinction between the two countries, it is not greater than that which divides the Highlands from the Lowlands of Scotland. Doubtless there exists in Wales a strong national sentiment, and it is deserving of all honour. But this does not form such a barrier between our fellow-subjects and ourselves as to justify the separate treatment of our country which would be involved in the disestablishment of the Church in Wales alone. . . . The late Archbishop of Canterbury paid me a visit four years ago, and was surprised to see the crowds of communicants coming up to the Lord's Table in a simple country church in a part of the kingdom in which he had been led to suppose that the Church was dead or moribund. What I am now contending for is, not the maintenance of the Church Establishment in Wales (although I desire this, and believe that its destruction would be injurious to the cause of true religion), but its being dealt with on equal terms with the Church in England. Of course, we know that every effort will now be made by the Church's enemies to show that the condition and the position of the Church in England and in Wales respectively are wholly unlike, and that they should be dealt with separately. Should those who desire to disestablish the Church succeed in Wales, there is no doubt that the opposite line will very quickly be taken, and that we shall be told that after all there was not very much difference between the state of these two portions of the same Church.

Leaving this point, the Bishop proceeds to what, after all, is a leading thought. As regards the Nonconformist bodies and the Church, what is the essential difference between them? "I am not blind," says Dr. Jones, "to the great advantages which the Church of England and (as I believed) true religion derive from her position as an Established Church. But this position is surely an accident, and is no part of her essence. If she were to be disestablished to-morrow, though doubtless some other great changes would speedily follow, she would still be the same Church. We have seen this in the case of the Church of Ireland. She was disestablished, and, as a result of her disestablishment, first her constitution and then her formularies were modified. She has rather drifted away from the position which she previously occupied—a position in which she was perfectly at one with the Church of England in respect of her standard of ritual as well as of doctrine. But she is the same Church still, and is still joined to us, if by no legal or official connexion, at all events in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. Now it appears to me that those who rest upon their positions as members or ministers of an Established Church, as if this were the main feature of our Church's position, lay themselves open to the attacks of those who are unfriendly to the Church in an unnecessary manner." Many of the denominations, no doubt, may make

remarks which a mere establishmentarian would find it difficult, if not impossible, to answer.

In what then, according to the Bishop, does the real difference between the Church and the Denominations consist?

Primarily [he says] in our being *the* ancient Church of this nation, and a branch of the ancient and once undivided Catholic Church throughout the world. I rest our claim upon this far more than upon our Episcopal constitution or upon Episcopal succession. These are important elements in the catholicity of our Church, or, as I would rather say, they are strong evidences of it. But the great thing is, that we are a Church, and are not a sect. Those who assail our position speak and think as if we were one sect among many, unfairly singled out for favour by the State. Nobody who knows anything of history can accept this position. There was but one Church in the country, and this was an integral portion of the State, or, more truly, was the State itself in its religious aspect. First one and then another body fell away from it, on more or less defensible grounds; but the old Church stood where it was. It is upon this that we must take our stand. We are the Church of the country, and we cannot give up that title, whether we are recognised by the State or not. This is our grand principle, and this is the true charter of our position; on no other ground can we claim it. Dissenters, generally speaking, cannot understand this. They start from a totally different conception of a Church. One of the largest of the Nonconforming bodies, and certainly one of the most important, is that of the Congregationalists, and at least one other great body is congregationalist in constitution and principle; while Congregationalism has largely influenced the ideas of others who do not formally acknowledge it.

The Right Reverend Prelate concludes with counsels of charity and concord. Churchmen and they who have separated from the Church have been baptized in one Name and have been made to drink into one Spirit. It is our duty, says his lordship, as a Christian Bishop, to bear this in mind; and by all the means in our power to seek the things which make for peace in relation to them. "It seems to me impossible that any true Christian, except under the distorting influence of theological traditions, should fail to desire external unity among all who bear the worthy name by which we are called, and have been admitted into covenant with God through Holy Baptism. But since external unity is, in the present condition of the Church, a thing to be desired and prayed for rather than to be expected, we should surely all follow after that charity which is in itself at once more precious than external unity, and the only means of securing and preserving it."

Reviews.

First Principles of the Reformation; or, the Ninety-five Theses, and the Three Primary Works of Dr. Martin Luther, translated into English. Edited, with theological and historical introductions, by HENRY WACE, D.D., and C. A. BUCHHEIM, Ph.D. With a portrait. Pp. 240. John Murray. 1883.

THIS is an appropriate, though somewhat late, contribution to the efforts recently made to commemorate the fourth centenary of the birth of Martin Luther. It is likely, however, from its nature to prove of more real service than any, because it embodies in a popular and permanent form some of the most important and representative of the Reformer's own works; and in this way Dr. Wace and his coadjutor have conferred a benefit upon the English public, as well as added a wreath to Luther's memory.

It was not a little interesting to those who could penetrate beneath the surface to see how deeply the Romanists were stirred by the Luther agitation. It became at once the signal for letting loose some of the most virulent and extravagant language against the Reformer and his doctrines, and showed, in fact, that it is impossible to arouse interest in the fifteenth century struggle without awakening at the same time the strongest and most fiery of human passions on the opposite side. In short, the Reformation itself, and still more the name of Luther, is the touchstone of principle. And when a man is brought face to face with either in such a way as to be obliged to declare himself, he finds questions suggested that refuse to be dealt with by compromise. As long as the issues really involved can be concealed or disguised, it is easy to dilate upon the advantages of brotherly love, the good that is to be found everywhere, and the like; but it is impossible to look closely into the history of the times in which Luther flourished, and not feel that we must range ourselves definitely on one side or the other, and that to attempt to be friends of both is inconsistent with hearty attachment to the interests of either. And yet, as we read the ever famous and ever memorable ninety-five theses, it is astonishing to find how moderate and mild they are. The light broke gently and gradually upon Luther's mind, and it was not till he found compromise impossible that he became the fierce and fiery opponent he so often was.

It is a great advantage to the English student to have these famous axioms and propositions made readily accessible to him as they are made now, and that our readers may judge for themselves how tame and innocuous many of them are, we transcribe the following:

"9. The Holy Spirit acting in the Pope does well for us, in that, in his decrees, he always makes exception of the articles of death and of necessity.

"30. No man is sure of the reality of his own contrition, much less of the attainment of plenary remission.

"31. Rare as is a true penitent, so rare is one who truly buys indulgences—that is to say, most rare.

"38. The remission imparted by the Pope is by no means to be despised, since it is, as I have said, a declaration of the Divine remission.

"46. Christians should be taught that, unless they have superfluous wealth, they are bound to keep what is necessary for the use of their own households, and by no means to lavish it on pardons.

"65. The treasures of the Gospel are nets wherewith of old they fished for the men of riches.

"66. The treasures of indulgences are nets wherewith they now fish for the riches of men,

"77. The saying that, even if St. Peter were now Pope, he could grant no greater graces, is blasphemy against St. Peter and the Pope.

"78. We affirm, on the contrary, that both he and any other Pope has greater graces to grant; namely, the Gospel, powers, gifts of healing, etc. (1 Cor. xii. 9.)"

The three treatises, which seem, with the exception of the second, "Concerning Christian Liberty," to be now given to the English public for the first time are—I. "An Address to the Christian nobility of the German nation respecting the reformation of the Christian estate," with a dedicatory letter to his friend Amsdorf, Licentiate and Canon of Wittenburg, and a special ascription to his "most serene and mighty imperial Majesty," Charles the Fifth. In this he attacks what he calls the three walls of the Romanists; which are, first, the assertion that the spiritual power is above the temporal, and secondly, the assertion that the Pope is the only sufficient interpreter of Scripture, and thirdly, the assertion, if they are threatened with a council, that no one may call a council but the Pope. II. "A Treatise concerning Christian Liberty," with a dedication to Leo X. This is by far the most representative and distinctively Lutheran of the three, and it is especially valuable for its full and clear-toned assertion of the true nature and functions of faith. III. "On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church," with a salutation of his friend Hermann Tullichius. In this he treats of the seven sacraments, and with particular fullness of that of the Lord's Supper. These are recognised in Germany as "The Three Great Reformation Treatises" of Luther: and as such they contain unquestionably the first principles of the Reformation, as he gave the impetus to it; as such, also, they are of primary importance in the present day, because the questions which are most importunate are not those in which the Church of England defines her attitude in relation to other Reformed Churches, but those in which she resolutely maintains her entire independence of Rome, and her deliberate adoption of a contrariant and adverse position. It is useless attempting to slur over this fact. The Church of England has no right to separate from the Church of Rome unless on the score of the false and dangerous doctrines cherished and taught by the latter against which she protests; according, therefore, as the Church of England declines the attitude of a Protestant Church, however little she may take to the *word*, she fails to justify her position as a separating Church. The treatises of Luther show very plainly what the primary principles of the Reformation were, and it is only too manifest that as long as these principles are tenaciously held in their simplicity, union with Rome is impossible. The difference is one of incompatible principles, and therefore of irreconcilable antagonism. It was because Luther saw this so plainly that he, after the manner of his time, did not hesitate to indulge in unmeasured and violent language, which in an age of greater external softness and culture redounds very often to his discredit. He is accused of want of balance, of a tendency to unguarded statements, intemperate propositions, onesidedness, and the like; whereas the truth is, that in his position, had he spoken otherwise, he would have incurred the malediction denounced against those who do the work of the Lord deceitfully. It was only by the sharpest possible contrasts that the full enormity of the Church of Rome could be perceived, or the full peril of her false and pernicious teaching be exposed. Luther set himself face to face with Rome in the full front of the truths which she had corrupted and denied, and was concerned only to utter those truths freely, fully, and fearlessly. And in so doing he did not care, for he had no present need,

to see that other correlative and supplemental truths had their full recognition. It was not these that were at stake; the others were. It is this that to many persons makes Luther's earnestness, thoroughness, and depth of conviction seem like extravagance, exaggeration, and onesidedness. The truth is, he could not have done the work he had to do had he weighed his statements with greater nicety, balanced his sentences with more regard to propriety, or counted the cost of his audacity with less indifference; and certainly all generations of mankind will have reason to bless Luther for his magnificent enunciation of the Gospel doctrine of faith. For the first time since the Epistles to Rome and Galatia left their master's hand, this doctrine was inculcated in all its purity and sublimity as the very message and Gospel of God. Of course, it struck many persons—nay, all whom it did not persuade and convict—as paradoxical, irrational, and absurd—nay, more, as impious and essentially immoral. But then so did the Epistles of St. Paul strike those against whom they were written; and so, for that matter, setting aside the prescription which hedges them as the expressions of inspired orthodoxy, they do now those who read them without bias, and who think that in his zeal to defend one position he went to the very verge of truth and propriety in so doing. In both cases the only consideration that could weigh with either was the question that St. Paul asked, "Do I now persuade men or God, or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." It is impossible to state the doctrine of faith and not offend those who have no experience of its blessed nature and its mighty power as a cleansing agent. Nay, more, it is impossible to enforce rightly the claims and the character of faith, and not incur, as St. Paul himself did the charge of Antinomian rashness; but for all that, faith is, and will continue to be, the gift and the work of God, and, as always, Wisdom will still be justified of all her children.

The treatise on Christian liberty, which is ostensibly written on the two-fold thesis that "a Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none: a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to every one," deserves to be widely read, not only for the intrinsic value of its teaching, but also because it is a very adequate expression of Luther's real principles. We are greatly mistaken if the sympathetic reader, in perusing this treatise, will not note many a passage and sentence that he will be glad to recall, and often refer to, with pleasure and gratitude.

On the whole, there can be no doubt that this recent publication of Mr. Murray will supply a want that must have been often felt, and will put the ordinary English reader in possession of information he had previously no ready access to, however much for theological or historic purposes he may have desired it. But over and beyond this we may hope that a fresh impulse will be given by it to the first principles of the Reformation, which are somewhat in danger of being crowded out in the present day by questions and disputes of very subordinate weight. It is as well that we should be reminded of what that Church and system against which the Reformation protested really was, for it is essentially unalterable. We are not absolutely committed to every act or speech of extravagance which the reaction against Rome may have produced, but we must not be blinded to the fact that the question is one of elemental principle. No one before Luther revealed and enforced the principle so clearly as he, and it is not too much to say that the principles he inculcated are fatal to the system and pretensions of Rome, and for this reason are more than ever of importance now. There is good cause to believe that many of the essential principles of the Romish Church have not only been disseminated, but received unconsciously, in the Church of England of recent years. It is right, therefore, that the counter-prin-

ciples should be equally diffused, that the two may be seen in more direct contrast, and then there will be an opportunity of choosing between them. It is impossible for the two to co-exist, for they are mutually destructive, and it is not a little remarkable that the Spirit of God seems to have foreseen and foretold no less, by embodying in the apostolic letter to the Roman Church these very principles of faith which are surely destined to undermine and to overthrow its power.

The first principles of the Reformation, as asserted in these treatises, and in the excellent introduction of the chief editor, are first the supremacy of the Divine Word, as that to which even Popes are subject, and which even councils may not contravene. This touches the whole question of Church authority. It anticipates and forestalls the dilemma of the perplexing question whether the Church made the Bible or the Bible made the Church, by maintaining the antecedent truth that God is the author of both, and that neither can be worth anything unless He is ; but that if so, the Church must be subject to the Word of God, which has called her into being, and cannot be permitted by any device or subterfuge to set it aside. Luther maintained the objective reality of the Word of God, and in that respect is no less opposed to the subjective and disintegrating theories of the present day, than to the perversions and corruptions of unauthorised tradition. To the antecedent question, Whence is it that the Bible has this authority ? he has perhaps not provided an answer. It may not have suggested itself to him. He bowed before the authority of the Word of God, which awed him as a living thing with hands and feet, and in submitting to its authority he found the truest and the noblest freedom. To the question why the Light was Light, he had perhaps no answer, or cared to give none : it was enough for him that in God's light he saw light, and knew that it was light he saw, as he knew it was the light of God by which alone he saw it ; and it may well be doubted whether in our own day, or in any other, it has been, or ever will be, possible to go beyond this point.

The second primary truth of the Reformation enforced in these treatises is the essential character of the priesthood. After referring to the statements of St. Peter and St. John, that Christians are a "royal priesthood" and "kings and priests," Luther says in his address to the nobility, and says truly (p. 21) :

If we had not a higher consecration in us than Pope or Bishop can give, no priest could ever be made by the consecration of Pope or Bishop ; nor could we say the mass, or preach, or absolve. Therefore, the Bishop's consecration is just as if in the name of the whole congregation he took one person out of the community, each member of which has equal power, and commanded him to exercise this power for the rest. That is why, in cases of necessity, every man can baptize and absolve, which would not be possible if we were not all priests. This great grace and virtue of baptism and of the Christian Estate, they have almost destroyed and made us forget by their ecclesiastical law. In this way the Christians used to choose their Bishops and priests out of the community ; these being afterwards confirmed by other Bishops, without the pomp that we have now. So was it that St. Augustine, Ambrose, Cyprian, were Bishops.

Most assuredly, if an ordinary Christian "in cases of necessity" can baptise and absolve, it must be because these functions are the prerogatives of the body to which he belongs, and not the exclusive privilege of a section of the body. As Dr. Wace puts it (p. xxviii.) : "Luther urges that all Christians possess virtually the capacities which, as a matter of order, are commonly restricted to the clergy. Whether that restriction is purposely dependent upon regular devolution from Apostolic authority, or whether the ministerial commission can be sufficiently conferred by appointment from the Christian community or congregation as a whole, becomes, on this principle, a secondary point. Luther pronounced with

the utmost decision in favour of the latter alternative ; but the essential element of his teaching is independent of this question. By whatever right the exercise of the ministry may be restricted to a particular body of men, what he asserted was that the functions of the clergy are simply ministerial, and that they do but exercise, on behalf of all, powers which all virtually possess." This, according to Luther, is the principle of the Reformation as opposed to the Church of Rome, which made the *secondary point* prior to the first, as do so many in the Church of England at the present day. It seems, however, that logically and philosophically Dr. Wace is perfectly right, for, granting whatever importance may be due, and justly due, to that which he calls the "secondary point," it stands to reason, and seems to be the true teaching of Scripture, that the thing restricted must be of higher and greater concern than the form or conditions restricting it. These exist for the sake of that, not that for the sake of these.

The third fundamental principle, which is last only in point of order and not in importance, is the true nature and prerogative of faith. We are unwilling to diminish or dilute in any way the simplicity and force of the Lutheran statements on this supreme subject. As Coleridge said, no one, since the Apostles and Apostolic men, has ever preached the Gospel as Luther preached it, and well would it be for all Churches and for all preachers if they could steal fire and life from this first of un-inspired evangelists. The treatise on Christian liberty is a precious and inexhaustible treasury of such Gospel life and energy, and we are thankful to have it within our reach, and earnestly hope that its salutary teaching may have free course and be glorified among us, for in the truth it inculcates, if anywhere, is to be discovered the *articulus aut stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*.

We are obliged by space to take leave of this subject, and we cannot do so more fittingly than in the words of Dr. Wace himself : "It is but "recognising an historical fact to designate the truths asserted in these "treatises as 'First Principles of the Reformation.' From them, and by "means of them, the whole of the subsequent movement was worked "out. They were applied in different countries in different ways ; and "we are justly proud in this country of the wisdom and moderation "exhibited by our Reformers. But it ought never to be forgotten that, "for the assertion of the principles themselves, we, like the rest of "Europe, are indebted to the genius and the courage of Luther. All of "these principles—Justification by Faith, Christian Liberty, the spiritual "rights and powers of the Laity, the true character of the Sacraments, "the Supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the supreme standard of "belief and practice—were asserted by the Reformer, as the Treatises in "this volume bear testimony, almost simultaneously in the latter half "of the year 1520. At the time he asserted them, the Roman Church "was still in full power ; and the year after he had to face the whole "authority of the Papacy and of the Empire, and to decide whether, at "the risk of a fate like that of Huss, he would stand by these truths. "These were the truths—the cardinal principles of the whole subsequent "Reformation, which he was called on to abandon at Worms ; and his "refusal to act against his conscience at once translated them into vivid "action and reality. It was one thing for Englishmen, several decades "after 1520, to apply these principles with the wisdom and moderation "of which we are proud. It was another thing to be the Horatius of "that vital struggle. These grand facts speak for themselves, and need "only to be understood in order to justify the unprecedented honours "now being paid to the Reformer's memory" (p. xxxiv.).

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

"*When ye Pray;*" or, *Lessons on Prayer.* By C. H. WALLER, M.A., M'Neile Biblical Professor in the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Liverpool. John F. Shaw and Co. Pp. 192.

This work is so characteristic of its author, that we have had some doubt whether the reader unacquainted with his personality may not be at some disadvantage in its perusal. But we have been reassured by feeling, at every page, how the written letter preserves and reflects the qualities which have won our admiration and love in the living teacher. None can fail to recognise the combination of sound learning and intimate knowledge of the sacred text with singular ingenuity, and even quaintness, in its exposition and illustration, but all informed and animated with the spirit of pure devotion, inviting a spiritual response in the reader. Whatever else we may see of the author, one thing is plain, "Behold he prayeth," and he teaches us to pray. And as the material of prayer is furnished by the Word of God, so here we have the Lord's Prayer treated as the groundwork of Evangelical truth; the whole doctrine of man's salvation and the Christian life is presented to us in the most attractive form of direct communion with our God and Saviour. Thus the book has impressed us with its fitness to supply, especially to the young, an inviting epitome of doctrine, that they may feel, as well as know, "the certainty of the things wherein they have been instructed."

The framework of the book is the LORD'S PRAYER, regarded, as the title implies, both as a prayer and a pattern, and especially from the latter point of view. It is easy to use, or to deceive ourselves with the belief that we are using, that sacred form, sometimes in states of mind when all other words and thoughts fail us; sometimes, alas! when the "vain repetitions" are as unmeaning as the Pater Noster beads on a rosary. But that comprehensive brevity, which forbids the thought of its being an exclusive form of prayer, marks it as an inclusive pattern, which must be diligently studied, if we are to find in it the chiefest use for which it was first given—the response and satisfaction of the yearning desire of every true disciple, "Lord, teach us to pray."

Mr. Waller's method and style often remind us of those glass geometrical solids cut with many facets, which, placed so as to receive the pure rays of the sun, cast on the walls around us the varied colours, all of which are derived from the source of light, though not always free from some distortions and shades due to the imperfect medium. To follow him through his seventeen chapters would be impossible within our limits, nor would we forestall the reader's pleasure in the book itself. We must be content to mark certain salient points. One of these is the strange fallacy that the Lord's Prayer belongs to the old dispensation rather than the new; for it is a mere *cento* of Jewish petitions, which are preserved in the Talmud; it was given before the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Ghost, nor is it offered in the name of Christ. Seventeen years have not obliterated the sensation produced by a certain article on the Talmud, which many did not know to have been written by a Jew, and few could say with Lord Beaconsfield, "It is not so strange to me, for I read Lightfoot in my youth."¹ Now Mr. Waller reminds his readers of the simple fact, that the *Talmudical writers are more modern than the New Testament*; and, further, Delitzsch has clearly proved how directly they were indebted to the New Testament. To the second objection, which would apply equally to every word spoken by our Lord, and so would

¹ We can vouch for the fact, which struck us the more from having had a like experience. But in these days of contempt for "ancient history," some may even need a warning against confusing the living Bishop of Durham with the author, at least equally learned, of the "*Horæ Talmudicæ*" in the seventeenth century.

make all His teaching Jewish rather than Christian, Mr. Waller replies that "although the words of Christ were spoken before Pentecost, *they were not written till after Pentecost.* And they were written in obedience to the order recorded by St. Matthew, that the disciples should teach all nations *to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them.* Therefore they wrote the Gospels." And when it is asked, If we can only come to God through Jesus Christ, how is it that the name of Jesus is not mentioned in the Lord's Prayer?—the answer is, not only that the prayer He taught must needs be offered through Him, but also that His intercession is implied in every one of its clauses, from the opening address to the closing attestation. "We can only call God 'our Father' through Jesus Christ; or, as one has said, 'Through the Brotherhood of Jesus we rise to the Fatherhood of God.'" Not to pursue the argument clause by clause, we see the mediation of Christ in the prayer for the forgiveness of sin, the remission of that "debt" which only His atoning sacrifice can cancel; the last petition, "*Deliver us from evil,*" recalls the name of the Deliverer; and the "*Amen*" is the very name which our Lord has taken to Himself: "'These things saith the *Amen*, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the Creation of God.'" In view of this fact, who can say that the Lord's Prayer is not offered in the name of Jesus? *Its closing word is His Name.*" Indeed, the whole exposition of that closing word, in its etymological significance, its use in Holy Scripture and in Jewish worship, and its practical application, furnishes a happy example of Mr. Waller's method and style. We can only find room for the last point:

"When we say *Amen*, we bind ourselves to support our prayers by our efforts, to the full extent of the power which God gives us. We have 'spoken with our mouth,' we must 'fulfil it with our hand' also, as far as it lies in us to be 'fellow-workers with God.' We bind ourselves by that *Amen* to *live as we pray.*"

In the whole structure of the prayer, Mr. Waller finds a recognition of the Holy Trinity; and his *arrangement* of it is a conspicuous example of his sacred ingenuity. In that part which relates to God, and which preponderates so greatly over what concerns ourselves, we have the Holy Name and the Everlasting Kingdom of the *Father*; the Kingdom of the *Son*, which *comes* in His dispensation, but is to be delivered up to the *Father for ever*,¹ when "the end cometh," and the Power (the *Ability*, *δύναμις*) of Him who is able to save to the uttermost; the Will of God wrought through the *Holy Spirit*, Who reveals His Glory. And in the petitions which concern our own daily wants and trials, it is the special attribute of the *Father* to give us both our daily bread and the bread that cometh down from Heaven; of the *Son* to make satisfaction for the hopeless debt of sin; of the *Holy Spirit* to keep us from temptation and deliver us from evil. How each of these points is worked out in the several chapters can only be seen by the perusal which the book will well reward.

Though full of the rich fruit of sacred learning—we may mention, in passing, an example in the appendix discussing the words used for prayer in the New Testament—its prevailing character is so pre-eminently devotional, that verbal criticism sounds a jarring note. But unhappily that note has been sounded throughout the Church by those who ought to have known better, and it is not Mr. Waller's fault or ours that silence will no longer still the mischief that is done. Accordingly, we have more than one reference to the unhappy distortion and mutilation of these most sacred words of our Lord in that performance which was meant to

¹ We can only glance, in passing, at Mr. Waller's admirable discussion of the *æons*, about which we have lately had so much unprofitable and dangerous speculation.

be, and was *bound* to be, a "Revised Version," but the Revisers were "led into the temptation" of making it something entirely different. We insist on the right, nay the duty, of stating the case thus, as all the pleas urged in the Bishop of Gloucester's preface leave untouched the original limitation under which the Revisers accepted their commission from Convocation. For that was no arbitrary commission; but the deliberate expression of the public feeling and desire. We believe that no *new translation* was demanded even by those Christian bodies in which a certain tendency to innovation is perhaps reflected in the work of the Revisers; but it is beyond all doubt that the opinion of our own Church against such an attempt was faithfully represented by the plain and stringent rule laid down by Convocation. The revision was meant to be a practical work, for daily use in public and private; and the practical question for the myriads of British Christians is this—whether this most sacred and familiar form of their daily prayer was infected by such "*plain and clear errors*" as to require the omission of the Doxology, the unscriptural recognition of the personal "evil one" as the *one evil* from which we are alone to ask deliverance, and the remarkable mutilation of the prayer as given by St. Luke. The *jarring note* of "bring" for "lead" evidently cannot come under the rule; and it stands as one of a multitude of examples of *irritating* changes, which are something worse than merely irritating in the solemn utterance of prayer in our Lord's own words.¹

This formal restriction does not of course apply to the liberty which a commentator has to exercise his own independent judgment; and while we gladly welcome Mr. Waller's brief, but very able and decisive, vindication of the Doxology, we cannot but regret the partial concession which he has made to the alteration, "Deliver us from the *evil one*." True, he hits the blot, far more serious than might seem at first sight, involved in the Revisers' uniform toning-down of "the *wicked one*" (for ὁ πονηρός) into "the *evil one*," which seems only explicable on their unfortunate principle of "alterations by *consequence*." To assimilate other passages to their rendering of this one, they have always, except in the one passage where Satan is *not* referred to (1 Cor. v. 13), obliterated the distinction which the Latin Versions and Fathers express by the use of "*malus*" and "*malignus*." But when Mr. Waller goes on to say that "'*Deliver us from evil*' and '*Redeem us from the wicked one*' are both equally correct versions of the petition," we cannot but think that his desire for a comprehensive sense has betrayed him into one of those truisms which, the moment that *prima facie* character is stripped off, stand revealed as clear fallacies. For, not to stay to discuss the translation of *ῥῶσαι* by "*redeem*," of course the *bare words* τοῦ πονηροῦ may be either masculine or neuter; but this same simple fact of grammar assures us that *both* cannot be "equally correct versions" in one and the same sentence; nor do we think the argument improved by the large place which Mr. Waller seems disposed to assign to Satanic agency in physical as well as moral evil. When he says that "the Revisers would have materially strengthened their position if they had translated the sentence thus, 'Deliver us from the *wicked one*,' we ask him to go a step further, and apply the test proposed by Stier: "In a plain outspoken way at any time, even in the most joyous festival of the Church, nay, at the Lord's Supper, try to wind up your prayer with the outcry of anguish, '*Deliver us from the devil*.'" Is this to be the daily prayer of those recovered from the snare

¹ A similar example, happily not allowable in the public worship of our Church, is that substitution of "who" for "which," which aggravates the offence by betraying ignorance of the grammar which it affects to mend.

in which they were taken before their redemption?—of those who *have overcome* the wicked one?—taught by Him who, in His victorious conflict, once for all saw Satan fall as lightning from heaven? Are the ransomed sharers of His kingdom still to agonize for redemption from the yoke of the Prince of this World as *the one sole evil* from which they ask deliverance, repeated and renewed from day to day? Against such a law of life as this we may well plead, with double emphasis, "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." No! The true prayer of the Christian and the Church is expressed in the simple comprehensive language of the Ethiopic version, "Deliver us from ALL EVIL," "comprehending" (as St. Cyprian says) "*all adverse things which the enemy in this world devises against us; wherefrom*" (*a quibus, not a quo*) "we have a faithful firm protection, if God deliver us and grant us His aid to our entreaties and complaints;" or, to sum up all in the comprehensive phrase, which our Litany expands into some thirty distinct forms of danger that beset us daily, "From *all evil and mischief; from sin, from the crafts and assaults*" (not from the *power*) "of the devil, good Lord deliver us."

The critical argument to sustain this position would be out of place here, and our space is exhausted; but we may well be content to leave the discussion on what we venture to call the irrefragable ground established by Canon Cook.¹ Nor must we conclude without saying that the point is so slight and incidental a flaw in Mr. Waller's work, and so little affecting even his treatment of this petition, that our protest must not be regarded as any qualification of the confidence and pleasure with which we recommend it as a most beautiful and instructive guide "to pray with the Spirit, and to pray with the understanding also."

P. S.

The Golden Decade of a Favoured Town. Biographical Sketches and Personal Recollections of the Celebrated Characters who have been connected with Cheltenham from 1843 to 1853. By CONTEM IGNOTUS. Pp. 200. Elliot Stock, 1884.

Whoever may be the author of this book (and we know nothing about the authorship), he has written what many will deem a profitable as well as a very readable book. Those readers who have some knowledge of the "favoured town" will no doubt regard it with special favour; but for Churchmen by whom the names of Francis Close and Archibald Boyd are held in respect and regard, these "Memorials" will have a peculiar interest. The book is ably written, the tone is admirable, the suggestions are sensible, and a good impression is likely to be produced on unprejudiced minds. Where one differs from the author, one is pleased to admit that it is well to hear both sides of the matter.

Sixty pages of the work have been given to Dean Close, thirty to Dean Boyd, fifty to F. W. Robertson, and forty to the poet Sydney Dobell.

In regard to Francis Close, the author may well appeal to "those who knew the man and his ministry, whether we have not given a true and faithful portrait of him. In most respects he ever seemed to us the very model of what a pastor of the Reformed Church of England ought to be." An article in the *Morning Post*, "far more characterized by animus against Evangelicalism than by knowledge of its subject, Dean Close," is criticized with undeniable force; and the work which the honoured

¹ "Deliver us from Evil": a Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of London in answer to Three Letters of the Lord Bishop of Durham. By F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter. John Murray.

Dean did for years in Carlisle is plainly shown. In addition to decanal work and church-building work, he laboured as the pastor of a city parish, visiting the sick and poor, and he took regularly a working men's Bible-class. Not till he was approaching his eightieth year, when his infirmities could sustain such an amount of extra labour no longer, did he resign "that preferment" (to quote the *Morning Post*). Neither as regards the church nor the cathedral had Dean Close "preached himself dry"! But the author of the book before us criticizes a "Dean Close" article in another morning paper. The *Standard*, endorsing the sketch in Mr. Mozley's "Reminiscences" of the High Church pastor "doing his best to make his people virtuous, while the Low Church pastor thought more of the views than of the virtues of his hearers," etc., etc., pointed the moral at the expense of Mr. Close, "the Vicar of Cheltenham, busy, earnest, zealous, plunged knee-deep in sermons, tracts," etc.

As to Mr. Close's sound Churchmanship, it is pointed out that at the beginning of his ministry in Cheltenham he published a volume of sermons on the Liturgy, aiming to extol it and exhibit its beauties. This deep attachment to the Prayer Book "characterized his ministry throughout its lengthened career even to the last . . . It is worse than unfair to say that Dean Close was 'no Churchman.' The truth is, that he was a far more true and real, and even attached and enthusiastic one than many of his slanderers." The same may be said of his two great contemporaries, Hugh M'Neile and Hugh Stowell. "In every legitimate sense of the word, M'Neile and Stowell were the most loyal and obedient of Churchmen."¹

Our author's remarks on Dean Boyd's ministry are sound and pertinent. "A very leading feature of Mr. Boyd's preaching was that it was remarkably edifying and instructive preaching. He was a thoroughly well-read theologian." Our author quotes, in connection with this, a passage from that ably written work "Romanism, Protestantism, and Anglicanism;" and in passing we are glad to repeat our recommendation of that book. Instances of Evangelical Bampton Lecturers and theological authors of eminence may well be quoted against the assertion that the clergy of the Evangelical School have been ighorant of theology. It is an absurd assertion, and scarcely worthy of even the slightest notice. We thoroughly agree with the author (referring to our dear friend the Rev. Edward Garbett), that "it is no honour to the powers that be that that brilliant Bampton Lecturer should be in his honoured old age nothing higher than an honorary Canon."

We must quote a little more about the Dean of Exeter; and, in passing, we may remark that the Dean contributed one article, and two or three reviews, to THE CHURCHMAN. Our author writes: "Dean Boyd's powers of conversation, when in congenial society, were both great and fascinating. We once had the pleasure of staying some time at one of the German baths where he was sojourning with the late Mrs. Boyd, and of meeting him daily at dinner at the *table d'hôte*, as well as occasionally having intercourse with him in other ways. His characteristics were very strikingly manifested at that *table d'hôte*. When surrounded by strangers, and especially by uncongenial people, he would be reserved almost to severity. But when near his friends, and specially if they were

¹ In a letter from Dean Close as to his friendly relations with Bishop Monk, while he himself was Incumbent of Cheltenham, we read: "I continued in 1826 what I found there, viz., prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays and on all Saints-Days . . . Monk once talked to me about giving the Sacrament by railfuls, and I asked him to come and give it himself. We had from 400 to 500. That settled it."

“thoroughly congenial people, his reserve would thaw into sunny and witty cheerfulness, and flow forth into the most entertaining conversation. Like Addison, of whom it has been written that ‘he was good company with his intimate friends, but in mixed company he preserved his dignity by a stiff and reserved silence.’ Some of the Dean’s good stories we have never forgotten, and two of them are so good that, as we have never elsewhere met with them, our readers will be pleased if we repeat them. The Dean did not expect that ‘a chiel was amang them takin’ notes, and faith he’d print it.’ Nevertheless, there can be no harm in the printing such stories as these. They are not like the extracts from luckless Bishop Wilberforce’s Diary, or from that of the equally luckless Thomas Carlyle : they will wound none, and they will amuse many. The first was an amusing story about Charles Simeon : ‘Simeon,’ said the Dean, ‘was once riding near Cambridge, when his horse—he was, as you know, very fond of riding—shied at something in the road and threw him. Simeon fell on to the hard road with such violence that he thought every bone in his body must be broken ; and for some time he was quite afraid to move a muscle, lest he should discover that he had sustained one or more most dreadful fractures. However, he at last ventured, slowly and cautiously, and one need not add fearfully, to stretch out one arm, and he felt he could do it. He then ventured slowly to stir the other arm, and he felt he could do it. But now it was more than likely that his hip was broken, and, very cautiously and slowly, he tried to stretch out his right leg, and to his joy he felt he could do it. Only one more limb was to be essayed, and so, with much hope and much fear, he tried to stretch out the left, and he felt he could do it. “Ah,” said Simeon, slowly gathering himself up on to his knees, “he keepeth *all* his bones, *not one* of them is broken !”’

“The other story was as follows. A clergyman near the Dean—the English summer chaplain at Schwalbach—had been speaking of his own extraordinary experiences in the pulpit at Trinity Church, Margate, when preaching there as a stranger on behalf of the excellent sea-bathing infirmary in that place. There was at the back of that pulpit, he said, a sounding board, shaped and concaved like a large oyster or scallop shell. And the effect of his own voice on that shell and on his own ears was most peculiar and unpleasant. When he stood back in his preaching towards the shell, the boom in his ears was quite startling, and when he stood forward, his voice seemed diminished almost to inaudibility.

“That reminds me,” said the Dean, ‘of a very humbling experience of a friend of mine who was preaching in a pulpit with exactly such a sounding-board as you have described. He too was not the minister of the church, though he had preached there two or three times before. And that pulpit had such extraordinary acoustical peculiarities that it caught and reflected at peculiar angles, back upon the preacher, even whispers spoken at a long distance. My friend went up into the pulpit, and knelt down to say his private prayer. He then stood up and looked at the congregation, and, as he did so, he heard a voice, as it were from behind, say distinctly—“*Oh, that dreadful man again !*” And, remarked my friend drily, it was not encouraging.’”

The author’s remarks on Robertson of Brighton and of Cheltenham are well worth reading, as are his criticisms on the Life of Robertson, by Mr. Brooke.

Of Mr. Money, at one time the congenial curate of Mr. Close, an anecdote is given. One Sunday evening, some juveniles returned from church with bright faces and a certain animation ; they had heard the new curate, and “Mr. Close was nothing to him !” Canon Money, how-

ever, has been more than a "popular preacher" and a diligent pastor; he has done good service to the Church in manifold ways.

On Dr. Boulton (whose death is announced even as we write), the author's remarks are just. "It is a rare thing in our day," he says, "to see Church dignities conferred on an Evangelical;" but, after all, Principal Boulton, one of the ablest divines of the day, was only a Prebendary, and this distinction was not conferred till he had reached the closing year of his laborious and most useful life.



Short Notices.



The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper as taught in Holy Scripture and by the Church of England. A Sermon preached in St. John's Church, Reading, on Monday, October 1, 1883, the evening before the Meeting of the Church Congress. By CHARLES PERRY, D.D., late Bishop of Melbourne. Hatchards: Church of England Book Society. 1884.

THAT such a sermon as this was preached at Reading, on the eve of the Church Congress there holden, is a fact to be rejoiced in; and the value of the fact is enhanced by the weight attaching to the preacher's office and reputation; being known, as he is, not only for attaining the highest University distinction, but as a Bishop of large experience and a theologian of ripe judgment. It is well that the utterances of so sound and judicious a prelate should now be brought within reach of all Churchmen.

The thought, the feeling, and the object of the sermon are all apparent in the first paragraph, which it is best to give as printed: "To preach upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which I propose, in dependence upon the help of the Holy Spirit, to do this evening, is difficult; not, as it appears to me, from any obscurity in the language either of the Scriptures or of our own Church concerning it, but from the necessity of pointing out the errors which have prevailed in respect to it during a long course of years in other Churches, and which now prevail to a great extent in our own. Hence there needs great care on the part of a preacher that he does not, by any mistake he may commit, impair the force of his argument, or, by any expression into which he may be betrayed, give just cause of offence to those who differ from him; and I am well aware of the responsibility upon me to use such care on the present occasion." Excellently said, both as to clearness and as to charity; and fully is this indication followed to the end. With a mathematician's instinct for reasoning, all side-issues and secondary points are avoided, and the argument is led along the highway of main facts to a conclusion which is a demonstration. First, what the Holy Scriptures declare; second, what the Formularies of our Church teach; to these the whole attention is given; and no excursion is taken into the debatable land of Christian writings, ancient or modern: in fact, so to travel away from the Bible and the Prayer-book is to give opponents all room for finding somewhere anything they wish to discover. Quotations from Fathers and Anglican Divines can be culled by collectors of most opposite opinions; but all such passages leave the controversy where it was. "What saith the Scripture?" and, next to that, "What saith our Reformed Church?" must be our position if we would convince gainsayers. Keeping to the lines laid down, the Bishop proves how untenable is the

would-be literal acceptation of "This is My Body;" and this he does by the most scientific and scholarly method, namely, that of induction from the Lord's words in other like cases and the usage of the inspired Apostles. That consubstantiation is really the doctrine put forth by the imitators of Rome is made plain enough; and that this is in nature one with transubstantiation is as plain; concerning which the observation is made, in solemn plainness of speech, that none of our "clergy can, consistently with their ordination vow, preach or teach it." In like manner, the language of the Communion Office, of the Catechism, of the Articles, and of the Homilies, is analyzed by a masterly hand; and at the end there is nothing left to the upholders of the materialistic doctrine but the gross traditions of those who in dark days did err, not knowing the Scriptures.

The whole sermon, both in matter and method, is a pattern of sound sense, spiritual purpose, and charity of feeling combined in rare harmony with faithfulness to truth: nothing can be better than the following, concerning the "objective presence" and "commemorative sacrifice" in the Sacrament:

They that hold it think that by it they exalt this distinctive ordinance of the Christian religion; but, surely, in believing and teaching that a minister of Christ by consecrating—breaking and setting apart with certain words—a piece of bread for its celebration, can cause the body of our Blessed Lord to come into that bread, and by holding it up can present Him in it as a commemorative sacrifice to God, they do grievous dishonour to the Lord. I am aware that by speaking thus I lay myself open to the reproach of presuming to condemn many of my brethren, who are far superior to me both in learning and in holiness of life. I am very sorry to do so; but I dare not be silent. I dare not refrain from lifting up my voice against a doctrine which will, I fear, if it continue to prevail and increase as it has recently done, and seems to be doing, among our clergy and people, provoke the Lord to remove our candlestick out of its place.

We join in this reverent fear. May God avert from our Church the sin and the peril, and to that end raise up and send forth many more preachers and teachers of such sound doctrine as we have now brought before the notice of our readers. D. D.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1884.

This work will prove, as we anticipated, of great value. It has already done good service in several ways, and as the fairness and accuracy, as well as the far-reaching extent of the Records becomes more and more acknowledged and appreciated, the value of the work will proportionately increase. The present volume is divided into—Part I.: "Historical Records;" Part II.: "Statistical Records;" Part III.: "Officers and Societies of the Church;" Part IV.: "Reference Section;" there is a general Index. So far as we have examined, the volume everywhere merits the praise of thoroughness and trustworthiness. The section on Home Mission work will have a special interest for many readers. To the resolutions on page 79 might have been added the paragraph in a report adopted at the Chichester Diocesan Conference last year, viz.:

The Committee recommend the institution of a Diocesan Body of Mission Clergy.

This subject was not, however, practically before the Conference, and it was not discussed. The weak point of the recommendation, as we think, is that there is no connection between the Diocesan preachers and the Cathedral. (THE CHURCHMAN, vol. viii., p. 380.) Mr. Hay Aitken's paper is valuable.

There are several new sections in this volume, but from lack of time we must leave them unnoticed. A great portion of the work is very readable.

In the Official Year-Book list of Sisterhoods it might be well, next year, to specify in each case what official relation there is, if any, between the Sisterhood and the Bishop of the Diocese.

Roman Life in the Days of Cicero. Sketches Drawn from his Letters and Speeches. By the Rev. A. J. CHURCH, M.A., Professor of Latin at University College, London. With Illustrations. Pp. 290. Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday.

The present volume is a capital companion to the classical works by the same author, which have been commended in these pages: "Stories from Homer," and "Stories from the Greek Tragedians," and other admirable volumes. The author has grouped round the figure of Cicero various sketches of men and manners, so as to give his readers some idea of what life was in Rome, and the provinces of Rome, during the first six decades of the first century before Christ. His sketches are exceedingly good; the picture, as a whole, is clear and informing; and the illustrations add much to the interest of the work.

In the February *National Review* (W. H. Allen), Mr. HUBBARD writes on "Forty Years of Income Tax," and the LORD MAYOR on the Boers. Mr. Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma* is very cleverly criticized in "The Two Lucians." By Lord EUSTACE CECIL, M.P., a vigorous protest in regard to "Social Deterioration" is made—too true, alas! The average interest and power of the articles in this ably-edited magazine keeps high.

The second issue of Messrs. Clark's "Foreign Theological Library" for 1883 is formed of *Weiss's Life of Christ*, Vol. II., and *Goebel on the Parables of Jesus*. These volumes, through some mischance, were not noticed in an autumn CHURCHMAN soon after they were published. Dr. Bernhard Weiss is a very able writer, but like so many of the German professors, he is given to "freehandling." We are pleased in many respects with the volume on the parables; it may be used with Trench and Bruce by all thoughtful students of the parables.

Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments. A Sketch of the most striking Confirmations of the Bible, from recent Discoveries in Egypt, Assyria, Palestine, Babylonia, and Asia Minor. By A. H. SAYCE, M.A., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. The Religious Tract Society.

This is the third volume of the series "By-paths of Bible Knowledge," and a very good volume it is. Seldom does one see so interesting and so highly informing a little book, quite up to date, and thoroughly worthy of confidence. In the preface we are told that Cyrus was King of Elam (not of Persia); it was Elam, as Isaiah's prophecies declared, which invaded Babylon. Babylon was taken without a siege; and "Mr. Bosanquet has proved to be right in holding that the Darius of Daniel was Darius the son of Hystaspes." Against this we have often argued; but if the facts be really against us, we must submit.

Short Chapters on Buddhism. By the Right Rev. J. H. TITCOMB, D.D., First Bishop of Rangoon. Religious Tract Society.

We fear this little book will fall flat. The "general reader" will put it aside as not interesting enough; pious readers will find it unprofitable; and in regard to the sceptical or doubtful, it is not likely, we think, to be

of any service. The great point in regard to Buddhism just now (we allude, of course, to cultured English students) is to show the real character of the disciplinary laws of Buddha. This was done by Mr. Coles (twenty years Church Missionary Society's Missionary in Ceylon) in a recent CHURCHMAN.

Letts's Popular County Atlas is good and cheap; four capital maps for a shilling. Our present notice must be brief.

We have received, too late for notice in the present CHURCHMAN, *The Clergy List for 1884*; apparently excellent (J. Hall, 291, Strand).

THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT met on the 5th. The Queen's Speech, which was read by the Lord Chancellor, was unusually long. Four paragraphs were devoted to the state of affairs in Egypt. Of the measures to be presented, first was mentioned that which "will have for its principal object the enlargement of the Occupation Franchise in Parliamentary elections throughout the United Kingdom." Next was mentioned a measure for the extension and reform of Local Government:

This comprehensive subject embraces all that relates locally to the greater efficiency of administration, to the alleviation of burdens by improved arrangements, and to the enlargement of the powers of ratepayers through the representative system, including among them the regulation of the traffic of intoxicating liquors.

It was known that the disasters in Egypt would be discussed at the earliest possible opportunity. The defeat of Baker Pasha (a disaster similar to that of Hicks Pasha) created a very unfavourable impression; and a notice of vote of censure was given in both Houses:

That this House, having read and considered the correspondence relating to Egypt laid on the table by her Majesty's command, is of opinion that the recent lamentable events in the Soudan are due, in a great measure, to the vacillating and inconsistent policy pursued by her Majesty's Government.

On the 12th this motion was moved, in the Upper House by the Marquis of Salisbury, and in the House of Commons by Sir Stafford Northcote. Before the debate it became known that Sinkat had fallen, and its garrison had been cut to pieces. The noble Marquis, in the course of a remarkably clear and able speech, spoke of "a resolute renunciation of responsibility." When the division was taken, at midnight, the contents were 181, the non-contents 81, being a majority of 100 against the Government.¹

¹ Lord Cairns, referring to General Gordon, said: "General Gordon was one of our national treasures (cheers), and he did not think that our

In following Sir Stafford Northcote the Prime Minister made an effort not unworthy of the occasion; but to many critics he seemed to pass by the real points of the case.¹

Even the *Guardian*, one of the trustiest and ablest defenders of Mr. Gladstone, has condemned him.² "Though the proposed censure may not be deserved in the letter," says the *Guardian*, "it is amply deserved in the spirit. Ministers might have prevented what has happened in the Soudan, and they have not prevented it."

On the 12th Mr. Richard gave notice of his Disestablishment motion.

Mr. Bradlaugh once more, and again in vain, has gone through a form of administering the oath to himself, and signing a document at the table of the House of Commons. After several short speeches, and much waste of time, Sir Stafford Northcote's motion, similar to that before carried, was supported by 280 votes to 157. Mr. Gladstone, who has evidently in this matter lost control over the House, spoke with less effect than usual. This was on the 11th. Next day, the 12th, Mr. Bradlaugh having applied for the Chiltern Hundreds, motion was made for a new writ for Northampton.

In an article on "the next election" (and it seems to be as if it were agreed that a general election is not far off) the *Record* dwells on the unfairness of Mr. Gladstone's Church appointments.³

In the last number of the *British Quarterly Review* the Rev. I. Guinness Rogers, lauding the Prime Minister with un-

national treasures should be uselessly sacrificed. Yet he did not believe that since knights errant went forth to conquer unknown countries with their lances and their shields any such expedition as that of General Gordon had been undertaken."

¹ In the course of his speech before the adjournment of the debate on the 12th, Mr. E. Stanhope said: "He (Mr. Stanhope) was informed that General Gordon in the summer of last year offered to her Majesty's Government to go to the Soudan, and that her Majesty's Government telegraphed to him:—'The Government decides to accept your offer; wait for letter.' General Gordon waited for the letter, and in that letter he was told that the Government declined his services (laughter). Was there no inconsistency there?"

² Sinkat has fallen. On Sunday Tewfik Bey blew up the fortifications, spiked the guns, and made a sortie with the garrison. The whole 600 were massacred, and the town is now in possession of the Mahdi. No words of ours can express the shame which this news ought to excite in every Englishman. So long as we are occupying Egypt, even the cowards, who a week ago ran away before inferior numbers, fare better than the brave men whom we might have saved and did not.—*Guardian*, Feb. 13.

³ "He has swept aside all traditions of impartiality which might be supposed to attach to his office. He has ostentatiously, consistently, persistently advanced extreme High Churchmen to almost every office which has fallen vacant. While men like Dr. Bouitbee have been suffered to

stinted admiration, makes no complaint as regards the appointment of ultra-Churchmen. On the contrary, it is natural that Mr. Gladstone should appoint Ritualists, he seems to say, and (for the comfort of Nonconformists who are both Radical and anti-sacerdotalist) such appointments will only hasten the downfall of the Establishment.

On the 7th, at a "farewell" service held in Henry VII's Chapel, Westminster Abbey, an address was delivered by the Archbishop of York :

His Grace took for his text 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, contrasting the constraining force of the love of Christ to us with the material forces that are known to and can be estimated by modern science. He sketched the wonderful growth of the Australian colony from the year 1795, when there was but one spiritual person there, the convict chaplain, to the present time, when it contains mighty populations, large dioceses, and more than five hundred clergy of the Anglican Church alone. Dwelling in warm terms on the eminent qualifications of him who, at the request of the colonists, had been chosen for them, he affectionately bid Bishop Barry Godspeed in the great work to which he has been called.

Bishop Barry has sailed for Sydney.

In noting the death of Mr. J. H. Parker, the celebrated archaeologist, the Oxford correspondent of the *Record* says: "Mr. Parker and Mr. Green, the historian, have shown themselves remarkable exceptions to the general rule, that Oxford citizens hardly take full advantage of the University and the openings which it affords to them."

On the thirteenth appeared the following announcement :

Her Majesty has been pleased to grant the See of Chester, vacant by the resignation of Bishop Jacobson, to the Rev. Dr. Stubbs, Canon of St. Paul's, and Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford; and the new See of Southwell to the Rev. Dr. Ridding, Headmaster of Winchester College.

On the 1st was announced the sudden death of the Rev. Prebendary Boulton, LL.D., the Principal of the London College of Divinity. By all who had the pleasure and the privilege of knowing Dr. Boulton, the announcement was received with very deep regret. On the 7th, at a Memorial Service in the church which the late Principal was wont to attend, the Bishop of Liverpool preached a sermon. His lordship said :

No one could have been asked to fill the pulpit to-night who thought more highly of Dr. Boulton than I did, no one who feels more deeply

die, worn out by long years of unnoticed, unrequited work for the Church of England, Ritualistic clergymen like Canon Knox-Little have been preferred to places of honour and emolument, under circumstances which, to say the least, suggest that the encouragement thus given to lawbreaking and superstition was not undesigned. We do not recall any period during the present generation in which the Church patronage of the Government has been exercised, not only so entirely to the exclusion of Evangelicals, but also in a manner so directly inimical to the principles which Evangelicals profess. The result has been most untoward."—*Record*, Feb. 8.

this day what a heavy loss he is to his many friends, to the Church of Christ at large, to the Church of England in particular, and above all to the Theological College, over which he presided with such masterly ability and for so many years. I knew him from the beginning of his career at Highbury, and have watched his course with unflagging interest as one who was occupying a very trying position, and carrying out with singular success a great experiment. I never changed the opinion that I formed of him from the very first, that he was the right man in the right place. What shall I say of him? On this occasion a man must speak as he found him, and I will speak with boldness of what I saw in him. I always found him sound in the faith, grasping firmly the grand doctrines of the Gospel with an unwavering hand—not putting the first things second and the second things first, not exaggerating single points at the expense of others, but a well-balanced, well-proportioned theologian, drawing all his creed from the Scriptures. I always found him a man of a holy and consistent life, who seemed to be always about his Master's business with a single eye, a kind of "one thing I do" about all his demeanour.

For ourselves, we had a very high respect for Dr. Boulton. He was a warm-hearted friend, a theologian of great ability, a hard-worker, courteous and unassuming, a counsellor of great judgment and discretion. There was about him a refreshing breadth and catholicity of temper; but in regard to leading principles, his grip and grasp were unmistakable. His book on the Articles is an excellent one. His historical work ("History of the Church of England, Pre-Reformation Period") we strongly recommended when it was published. To *THE CHURCHMAN* he contributed three very readable papers, fresh and full, on St. Augustine and the study of the Bible.

Mr. McCormick, Vicar of Hull, we gladly note, has been made a Prebendary of York, and Dr. Blakeney, Vicar of Sheffield, is now Archdeacon.

Dr. Henderson has been appointed to the Deanery of Carlisle.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, in his annual Pastoral Letter, said:

The sum that has resulted from that Meeting, in Bristol, concerning the restoration of the See, amounting to nearly £15,000, clearly shows that the city is in earnest, and that if an Act of Parliament is secured, the remaining sum will in due time be forthcoming. There seems reason to hope that a measure will be introduced this session by the Government, and that whatever other Church legislation may be proposed, there will be at least one Bill which Churchmen of all shades of opinion may regard with satisfaction. Whether there will be any other measures that will secure a similar approval may now be considered as particularly doubtful.

When we wrote in the last *CHURCHMAN*, touching St. Peter's, London Docks, that no intimation had been made as to the Bishop's intentions, we supposed that his lordship would wait a day or two until the judgment in the Miles Platting case had been pronounced. Mr. Wainwright, however, was instituted, and the illegal ritual, it is said, still remains.

In the suit *Heywood v. Bishop of Manchester*, an important point of Ecclesiastical Law has been happily settled. The Bishop refused to institute Mr. Cowgill; and Sir Percival Heywood's action (or that of the E. C. U.) has been dismissed with costs.¹ This is, perhaps, the heaviest blow which the Ritualist party has received for twenty years. It places the Bishop of London apparently in a painful position.

The Bishop of Manchester has presented to the Rectory of St. John's, Miles Platting,² void by the deprivation of the Rev. F. S. Green, the Rev. T. T. Evans, who is described as a moderate High Churchman.

In a sermon at Oldham, Bishop Fraser said that if he were to briefly summarize the perils which seemed especially to beset Christianity and the National Church of this land at the present time, he should class them into three, namely:—(1) Perils from the spread of scepticism and infidelity; (2) perils from externalism supplanting true spiritual religion; (3) perils from lawlessness and divisions within the Church.

The death of Mr. Thomas Chenery, after a short illness, has

¹ The concluding paragraphs of Mr. Baron Pollock's judgment ran thus:—"It is impossible to arrive at this conclusion without noticing that it leads to the result that a bishop may refuse a clerk presented to him upon grounds relating to acts of ritual, which, had they arisen in the case of a beneficed clergyman, according at least to modern practice, would have been dealt with in the first instance by motion and not by deprivation. This, however, cannot affect the jurisdiction of the Bishop, although it is an argument for the exercise by him of due caution; whereas, to hold that the Bishop had no jurisdiction would be to decide that, however extreme in form or determined in purpose past offences against ritual might be, the Bishop could not refuse, but must admit, although it might be obvious that in accordance with the solemnly expressed intention of the clerk, he would probably, if not certainly, continue a course which must lead to deprivation—a decision which, in my judgment, would be repugnant to reason and unfair alike to the patron, the presentee, and the parishioners.

"I have certainly abstained from saying anything that may be supposed to express an opinion as to the views entertained by Mr. Cowgill or as to his conduct in carrying them out; but I would add, in conclusion, what is strictly pertinent to the legal question before me, that however much a difference of opinion upon matters of mere ritual is to be regretted, and however much it might be thought desirable that the rules by which the discipline of the Church in such matters is governed should be wider and more elastic, still, while they exist it is of the highest importance that they should be dealt with fairly, that the proper rules of construction should be applied to them, and finally that the logical results should be loyally carried out. The verdict and judgment will be therefore for the defendant (the Bishop) with costs."

² Manchester Clerical Society, which numbers over a hundred members, at its Annual Meeting, recently, passed a Resolution congratulating the Bishop upon the issue of the Miles Platting trial, and directed a copy of the Resolution to be forwarded to his lordship.

been announced. From the time of taking his degree, Mr. Cherrery has been engaged on the *Times*. A judicious and very able editor, he was not a Delane; but he was a ripe scholar, a man of flexible and versatile capacity.

The death of Cetewayo relieves the Government of one South African difficulty.

The anniversary meetings of the Church Missionary Society, at Oxford, have been of a most encouraging character. An interesting meeting of the Church Pastoral Aid Fund has been held at Liverpool.

The Dean of Canterbury has written in the *Record* concerning the South Eastern College, Ramsgate. Generous gifts are much needed. £7,000 are needed at once. We earnestly trust the honoured Dean's appeal will speedily prove successful.

The Bishop of Liverpool's able article in the *Contemporary* on the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission will have weight with many. His lordship's speech at the Liverpool Diocesan Conference was imperfectly reported in the newspapers. The learned article in the *Edinburgh Review* is "dead against" the Report. A second edition of Sir E. Beckett's pamphlet is now being circulated.

The reports of the proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury are not before us in time for notice in the present CHURCHMAN. We notice, however, with great regret, that the Report of the Joint Committee suggests Readers; while the question of the Diaconate has been shelved entirely. To permit lay-readers to officiate in the parish church, as said the Bishop of Winchester, requires grave consideration. The remarks of the Bishops of Chichester, St. Asaph, and London, were wisely conservative. A Committee to consider the subject of A Provincial House of Laymen has been appointed. The Lower House has been requested to take into consideration the Report on the Ecclesiastical Courts. There is no intention of introducing a measure into Parliament this session; the Prelates have decided, as we expected, to wait. A most unfortunate point, in regard to the Recommendations of the Blue-book, is this: the Lower House of Convocation (of Canterbury), which really has had a large share in shaping, or, at least, in laying down the principles for them, is the weakest portion of the Church's machinery, and has no influence over the great body of loyal, practical, and thoughtful Churchmen.

INDEX TO VOL. IX.

PAGE	PAGE
A Day at Eisenach, by Dean Howson, D.D.	295, 369
Biblical Aspects of the Ministry of Women, by the Dean of Chester	9
"Chinese Gordon"	437
Dean Colet, by Canon Pennington	414
Dean Burgon's "Revision Revised," by the Rev. C. H. Waller	443
Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown, The, by Canon Taylor, D.D.	378
Force, Matter, and Energy, by W. R. Browne, Esq., M. Inst. C.E.	321
Infallibility, by Archdeacon Whately	197
Mr. Richard, M.P., and the National Church, by Rev. Joseph Foxley	114
Martin Luther, by W. M. Colles, Esq., Barrister-at-law	128
My Journey in Africa, by Rev. J. Hannington, F.R.G.S., F.L.S.	161, 282, 333
National Education, by Stanley Leighton, Esq., M.P.	268
Our Lord's Present Work as the High Priest of His Church, by Archdeacon Perowne	179, 257, 355
Our Support of Foreign Missions, by Canon Scott Robertson	276
Personal Recollections of California, by Rev. G. W. Weldon	18
Protestantism on the Continent, by Rev. F. Pigou, D.D.	401
Rural Deans, by Canon Trevor	31
Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners, On the, by a Layman	81, 206
Report on the Ecclesiastical Courts, by Chancellor Monk, M.P.	241
Social Science, Part IV., by Dr. Ogle	38
S. T. Coleridge, by Canon Bell, D.D.	93
The Church and the Army, by Dr. Robinson (late Scots Guards)	425
The Supply of Clergy, by Rev. E. R. Bernard	1
The Scriptural Argument against the new Marriage Law, by Canon Trevor	344
The Bishop of St. David's on the Church in Wales	450
Weather Forecasts, by Rev. G. T. Ryves, F. R. Met. Soc.	189
REVIEWS :—	
Six Months in the Ranks	64
The Hebrew Psalter	69
Dr. Wace's The Gospel and its Witnesses	146
Apostolic Succession	219
The Church and the Ornaments Rubric	301
Heth and Moab	387
Glimpses through the Veil	389
Luther's Primary Principles	458
"When ye pray"	462
The Golden Decade of a Favoured Town	466
SHORT NOTICES OF BOOKS :—73,	
149, 226, 303, 391, 469.	
THE MONTH :—78, 157, 234, 319,	
398, 472.	