
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1897.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. IX.

IN my last paper I spoke of the "fingers of a man's hand" —that of Professor Hommel—writing on the wall the approaching downfall of the school of Wellhausen and Kuenen. This time I have to speak of the handwriting of another German professor, who has added his "Tekel" to the "Mene" of Professor Hommel. I refer to Professor Harnack, who has gracefully and candidly confessed that the main position of the Tübingen school of New Testament criticism cannot be any longer maintained, in the face of unquestionable facts. Professor Sanday, in his comments on this very notable surrender, has very fairly remarked that Professor Harnack's admissions do not necessarily carry with them the abandonment of the positions at present held by Old Testament critics, because the cases of the Old and New Testament are not exactly parallel. Yet Professor Sanday will possibly forgive me for pointing out that one or two important aspects of the question appear to have escaped him. The circumstances with which the New and the Old Testament critics have to deal are doubtless very different. The former was written in a period of which we have abundant and accurate information. The latter carries us back ultimately into a period of cloudland and myth, such as the early history of every nation under heaven invariably is. Consequently, in the one case the myth or legend theory has a considerable amount of antecedent improbability against it, while, in the other case the conditions are reversed. Thus much must in all fairness be conceded. But what Professor Sanday has failed to observe is this: (1) that not only the conclusions, but the methods, of the German school are shown to be unsound by Professor Harnack's admissions, and that these

are the methods which are relied upon to establish the conclusions of the Old Testament criticism associated with the names of Kuenen and Wellhausen; (2) while the very fact that in Old Testament history we are dealing with a period of which we have very little authentic information outside the books which are being submitted to criticism ought of itself entirely to preclude that tone of confidence which German critics and their followers in England are so prone to adopt. It is absolutely unscientific to represent the conclusions of criticism alone as established truths. They may be right, or they may be wrong. But until reinforced by ascertained facts, they are at best only in the position of the researches of Leverrier and Adams, before Arago had pointed his telescope in the direction indicated, and found the star asserted to be there. The chief complaint which I, personally, am inclined to make against Professor Driver's "Introduction" is, not so much the suggestions that are made in it, as the fact that he represents the view he takes of Hebrew history as practically settled, because a few clever linguistic critics in England and abroad have agreed that it is so. I contend, on the other hand, that the question is not, and cannot be, settled upon the subjective grounds on which these unquestionably able men in their own department—which is not, be it remarked for the twentieth time, that of historical inquiry—have been content to rest it. Their conclusions are mere opinions—opinions entitled, no doubt, to respectful consideration, but still mere opinions. Established truths on scientific grounds they cannot be, until they are supported by undeniable historical testimony.

I have elsewhere[1] enumerated the points on which the Tübingen methods have failed in regard to the New Testament. I will briefly repeat them here, in order to illustrate the weak points in the theories I have been endeavouring to combat in the pages of the CHURCHMAN. First of all, the Tübingen school boldly denied, on *à priori* grounds, the genuineness, authenticity, and early date of nearly every book in the New Testament. Next, they insisted that the creed of the Christian Church was not contemporaneous with the author of the religion, but was a subsequent development. Thirdly, they maintained the existence of various parties in the Christian Church, and attributed the phenomena of the New Testament to the victory of one party, the Pauline, over all the others, and supposed that they had deduced the existence of these tendencies, and the victory of one of them over the rest, from the pages of the New Testament itself. These

[1] "Principles of Biblical Criticism," pp. 183-185.

theories, be it observed, are extremely similar to those laid down in the case of the Old Testament, and like them, rested on no basis of fact, but simply on the application of an extremely ingenious, minute and laborious criticism to the contents of the New Testament. This criticism was also remarkable for the largeness of the conclusions based upon very slender premisses. The results to which it led, it is now admitted, were wrong results. We are not, as Professor Sanday rightly reminds us, entitled thence to conclude that the conclusions of recent Old Testament critics are wrong also. But we are entitled to point out—as critics we should be much to blame if we did not point out—that the failure of certain methods of investigation in dealing with one set of facts justifies us in regarding with suspicion the results of these methods when dealing with another set of facts. The German school of investigators, since Professor Harnack's retreat, stand before us as partially, though not, of course, wholly, discredited. They have no right to complain if we demand a still more rigorous demonstration of the soundness of their positions than we should have been entitled to demand while the German criticism of the New Testament continued to hold its ground.

The course of our investigations now brings us to the genealogies in Genesis x. I have already, in my last paper, pointed out that there is a difference of about a thousand years between the subjective critic Professor Driver and the objective critic Professor Hommel as to the date of certain portions of this chapter. I proceed to discuss the assertion that chaps. ix. 28 to x. 7, and x. 20, 22, 23, 31, 32, are the work of P. The rest, with the exception of editorial additions (regarded by Kautzsch and Socin as consisting of vers. 9, 16, 17, 24), are said to belong to JE. Of the grounds for this singular manipulation of the materials here there is not much to be said. *Primâ facie*, it would appear to ordinary persons that when a historian inserts genealogies he would naturally insert bodily the document which contains them. The improbability of the patchwork theory is at its highest in a chapter such as chap. x. Professor Driver gives us no reasons for his anatomization of so interesting a document, beyond the fact that the critics are agreed on the point. If we refer to Wellhausen or Kuenen on the composition of the Hexateuch, we meet with nothing in the least degree resembling a scientific demonstration. These passages are assigned to various authors, not because a candid investigation of the phenomena of the chapter suggests such an arrangement, but because the assumptions of certain theorists require it. Once more, then, it is not the phenomena here which

suggest the theory, but the theory which demands this interpretation of the phenomena. The phenomena, so far as they suggest anything, suggest the very opposite of the theory. If any words in the Old Testament seem to breathe the atmosphere of high antiquity attributed to this passage by Professor Hommel, it would be the allusion to Nimrod in vers. 8, 9. Yet these are assigned by recent critics to a work composed in "the eighth or ninth century B.C." More recent criticism still, I understand, assigns vers. 8 and 9 to *different* periods. But did any author that ever was born jumble up his citations from various genealogies in such an incomprehensible way? And if he had, is there any critic that ever was born who would be able, by *à priori* methods, to detect it? Historical critics will not fail to be reminded of Gibbon's famous note: "Abu Rafe says he will be witness for this. But who will be witness for Abu Rafe?" There would seem to be absolutely no grounds for this assertion, beyond the fact that יָלַד is used here instead of הוֹלִיד, and that the former has been declared to be characteristic of JE, and the latter of P. Surely this is rather a slender foundation on which to rest an established conclusion. But I have already shown that this notion is extremely problematical.[1] I may go further. I may remark that if a principle such as this is sufficient to guide us to the various authors, we require a *third* contributor in vers. 1-7, and neither JE nor P. For we have here neither יָלַד nor הוֹלִיד, but "the sons of." Moreever, I may venture once more to ask for an explanation of the reasons for which the redactor shifts from one to the other of his authorities in ver. 8. They must have been going over the same ground. P has brought us to Cush, in vers. 6 and 7, as the son of Ham. Why does the redactor leave the one authority in ver. 8, and betake himself to another? His reasons have frequently been asked for. But they have never been given. Why not? Is it to be the unquestioned privilege of the higher criticism to pull the Old Testament Scriptures to pieces, to put the fragments together at will, to call its authors names (as Wellhausen does), to bring coarse charges of folly, incapacity, exaggeration, and forgery, against them, while it is the flattest blasphemy to ask any questions whatever about the sacred conclusions of some modern critics—to want to know the why and the wherefore of the matter on which they have dogmatized so freely? Is scientific inquiry denied the right of asking for a *rationale* of contemporary criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures—for an explanation of the reasons which induced

[1] CHURCHMAN for 1896, pp. 343, 344.

a redactor, whose existence, by the way, has never been proved, to use his authorities in so capricious a fashion? This question has often been asked, but no answer has been given. The time when an answer must be given may be delayed, but it will come at last.

Moreover, the whole character of the chapter is archaic. Were we dealing with any history but Scripture history, and even with Scripture history on any principle but the logic of foregone conclusions, we should catch at such an interesting early chronicle, and eagerly avail ourselves of the light it throws on primitive history. The language of ver. 9 is unquestionably archaic. The expression גִּבּוֹר צַיִד, for instance, has every mark of early antiquity. We meet frequently, it is true, with the well-known expression גִּבּוֹר חַיִל. But in it the latter substantive has an adjectival force. A mighty man of valour means a very valiant man; a hero of the chase, on the contrary, means an expert and successful hunter. גִּבּוֹר again, sometimes follows the noun as an adjective. But here it is the word which follows גִּבּוֹר which is the substantive. The words "a mighty man of [the] hunt" would have an archaic flavour in any language in the world. And then the passage has every appearance of being a quotation from some early poem or narrative handed down from times contemporaneous with, or not so very much later than, those of Nimrod himself. Ewald, who, though of course not infallible, was at least as good a Hebrew linguist as subsequent writers, has remarked on the hoar antiquity of some of these old quotations. We are not entitled to dismiss Ewald on the mere *ipse dixit* of later scholars. If there be anything we learn more certainly from the history of science than anything else, it is the evanescence of theories, and the duty of modesty in maintaining them.

Professor Hommel has told us that the genealogy of Gen. x. was based on political, not on ethnological considerations, and that it fits in with the period of Thothmes III., and with no other. This view seems exceedingly probable. Certainly, the information concerning the Philistines, that they originally were connected with Egypt, does not seem to be an idea of the days of the early Kings of Judah. If first published then, but handed down orally for a considerable time, we have surely a right to some information about the period when it actually did originate, and how these curious and interesting details reached the author who has first recorded it. On the supposition that the sources of Genesis are of pre-Mosaic origin, we have at least a reasonable explanation of the phenomena presented by this chapter. Let it not be forgotten that on the subjective theory we have no satisfactory explanation whatever, either of how the infor-

mation reached the writers of the two genealogies, or why the redactor jumbled up portions of each in so strange a manner. If we are told, as of course we may be told, that P was not recording, but inventing his facts, we have further a right to ask what he was inventing them for, and why his inventions were considered worthy of notice by the redactor. Professor Hommel, it is true, has been warned by Professor Cheyne in a recent article in the *Expositor*, which strikes one as somewhat amusing, that he (Professor Cheyne) will be compelled to withdraw his support from his brother professor if the latter is not more careful what he is about. Why Professor Hommel should have more reason for dreading the withdrawal of Professor Cheyne's countenance than Professor Cheyne that of Professor Hommel "doth not immediately appear," as Richard Hooker would have said. But I trust that Professor Hommel will not be deterred from prosecuting his researches by the threats of the subjective school. He may be guilty of "learned trifling." But so may other people. Whatever his methods, he at least draws his conclusions from facts, not from hypotheses. His conclusions may possibly be wrong. The history of science is a history of successive approximations to truth. Its path is strewn with the results of imperfect inductions. Yet at least there is progress when inductions are built on facts. But everyone acquainted with the history of science knows that it stood still for two thousand years while it rested on dogma. It postulated its "must be's," it formulated its propositions on which the "best authorities" were "agreed," it refused to allow those propositions to be questioned. It was not content patiently to accumulate facts, and modestly to wait until those facts were at length sufficient in number and in range to enable the investigator to extort from them the secret they had so long concealed.

There is not much more to be said about chap. x. But it may be noted that there are not wanting signs that chap. x. is by the same hand as the much-vexed chap. xiv. In these two chapters alone do we find the cities of the plain described as Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboiim.[1] If Zoar is omitted in chap. x. 19, chap. xix. 22 supplies the reason. If we ask why Sodom and Gomorrah only are mentioned elsewhere, the reply would naturally be that they were the two most important of the five cities. But the fact that so early as the

[1] This fact gives the critics a little trouble, therefore to some later ones it is an interpolation. I wonder why? No reason is given. This reasoning does not strike me as altogether mathematical. I wonder what Euclid would have thought of it?

time of Abraham these cities, with the exception of Zoar, were destroyed by a terrible volcanic catastrophe, to which the whole neighbourhood at the present time bears witness, would explain how it is that only the names of the two more important of the five cities were transmitted to later ages. The general historic credibility of the narrative in Genesis xix. is, as has just been said, evidenced by the physical characteristics of the country round the Dead Sea. But there are also other slight hints in the same direction which we must not allow ourselves to neglect. The occurrence of the names Admah and Zeboiim in chaps. x. 19 and xiv. 2 tends, on the principle just enunciated, to prove the antiquity of both narratives. The omission of Zoar in chap. x. 19 is an undesigned corroboration of the early origin of chap. xix. 22. The recent discoveries of archæologists in connection with chap. xiv. have somewhat "fluttered the Volscians," who, relying on the subjective criticism, conceived themselves to have sufficiently established the unhistoric character of Genesis xiv. To this subject, however, I hope to return. For the present, it will be sufficient to say that subjective criticism must in the future be a little more modest in its assertions on this point. Professor Sayce may have failed to establish his conclusions on the subject; but at least he has succeeded in throwing considerable doubt on those of his antagonists.

The dovetailing of ver. 21 between vers. 20 and 22, 23, rests upon the linguistic considerations above referred to, and the dogma that the words "after their families," etc., are characteristic of P. I need not repeat what I have before said in commenting upon chaps. iv. and v. I would only add that the eccentric treatment of his authorities again here, by the redactor, requires explanation. We have a right to ask *why* he has taken ver. 19 from JE, 20 from P, 21 from JE, and 22, 23 again from P.

Lastly, the most careless student can hardly fail to notice his extraordinary mode of dealing with those authorities in vers. 31, 32. Relying on the foregone conclusion that the phraseology of these verses is the phraseology of P, the subjective critics have assigned these verses to him. But in that case "these" are *not* the names of "the sons of Shem, after their families," and some others are. Is it likely that the redactor, after transcribing materials derived from some other source or sources, J, or E, or JE combined, let us suppose, would have summed up in this way from another author altogether—one whom he had not been following? Or, if it be contended that the two sources were here identical, how, it may be asked, have modern critics contrived to dis-

criminate between them?[1] These two last verses might very reasonably be the work of a redactor, and, had the subjective critics asserted that this was so, no one would have been hardy enough to contradict them. But they have insisted that these words are specially characteristic of P. Consequently we are driven to the conclusion that the redactor here is not in his preternaturally acute, but in his normally feeble and inconsequent, mood — a mood in which he saw nothing absurd in taking a considerable amount of his genealogical details from one author, and then adding the summary of details, which he had *not* given, from the pages of another.

J. J. Lias.

Art. II.—THE HISTORY OF THE WORDS OF ADMINISTRATION IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

THE history of the words in which the elements in the Holy Communion have from time to time been distributed to the faithful must always have an interest for Christian people. Three of the Evangelists, as well as St. Paul, have been careful to record the sacred words with which our Lord originally blessed and distributed the bread and wine. We can have no doubt that in their writings we possess, at least in substance, the very words used on the occasion. We take St. Paul's language in the First Epistle to the Corinthians as being the fullest, and also as being incorporated into our own Communion Office. "The Lord Jesus the same night on which He was betrayed took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is My body, which is [broken] for you: this do in remembrance of Me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 23-25). As to the question raised by some, Did our Lord repeat these words to each of the Apostles separately? we consider it a profitless inquiry. The probability is in favour of one solemn asseveration and blessing, and then a silent distribution. It is to be remembered that at the moment our Lord was at once Speaker, Giver, and Gift. There needed no repetition of the words; it was all too real and too overwhelming. When we pass on from the upper chamber into history, as given to us in the Acts of the

[1] My meaning is this, if I have not made it sufficiently clear in the text. The words "these are the generations," etc., if taken from P, would naturally follow the genealogy P had given. They would hardly be appended by any editor or redactor in the world, however abnormally eccentric, to a genealogy extracted from another author.

Apostles, we are absolutely without a clue. It is a remarkable fact that, for the time being, we lose all mention of the cup, the bread alone is mentioned; but if we were tempted to draw the conclusion that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was at the time only administered in one element, the Apostle St. Paul saves us from the danger, as he distinctly mentions the cup likewise. The probability is that "the breaking of the bread" was the generic name for the Sacrament, and covered the administration in both elements. When we pass out of the region of inspired history, the first reference we get to the administration of the Holy Communion is that given by Justin Martyr in his well-known account of the service, and here we are told nothing as to the form of words after which the elements were distributed. He tells us this only: "There is brought to the president by the brethren bread, and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the Universe, through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks . . . and when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen . . . and those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced" (Justin's "Apology," ch. lxv.: Administration of the Sacraments). In the next chapter (of the Eucharist) Justin virtually repeats himself. He speaks of "the prayer of His word," which seems to suggest a repetition of our Lord's words at the first distribution, but nothing more. The early Fathers who follow, in their references to the Holy Communion, throw no light on this particular question. Tertullian speaks of the "Amen," which probably followed some words of administration. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the chanter who invites them to receive, saying, "O taste and see how gracious the Lord is." He also speaks of the "Amen" after reception, likewise hinting at some form of words ("Catech. Mystag.," v. 20-22).

It is when we come to the "Apostolic Constitutions" that for the first time we meet with an express form of words in the administration: "Let the bishop minister the oblation (*προσφορὰν*), saying, 'the body of Christ,' and let him that receiveth say 'Amen'; and let the deacon hold the cup, and say as he administers, 'the blood of Christ,' 'the cup of life,' and let him that drinketh say 'Amen.'" The Liturgy of St. James neither in the Greek nor Syriac version gives any form of words. In the Liturgy of St. Mark the administration of the bread to the clergy is accompanied with the simple words "the holy body," and with the cup the words "the precious

blood of our Lord, and God, and Saviour." It is probable that the same formulas were repeated in the case of the communicating of the laity.

The Byzantine or St. Chrysostom's Liturgy is much more full and ornate. The priest, taking the holy bread, gives it to the deacon, who, saluting the priest's hand, says, "Impart to me, sir, the precious and holy body of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ." And the priest replies, "To N. is imparted the precious and holy and undefiled body of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of sins and life eternal." The rubric following directs the administration of the Sacrament to all who desire to communicate: "The servant of God partakes of the precious and holy body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for forgiveness of his sins and life eternal."

Coming to the Western Church, we find Gregory the Great using the form "Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu. Christi conservet animam tuam." For the communion of the laity the "Missa Illyrici" provides the words, "Corpus et sanguis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi prosit tibi in remissionem omnium peccatorum et ad vitam æternam."[1] Another form of words was provided for priests and deacons. "About the time of Charles the Great the following was a common formula: 'Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam æternam'" (Krazer, "De Liturgiis," quoted by Professor Cheetham in Smith's "Dict. Christ. Antiq.," vol. i., p. 415). According to the Ambrosian Rite, the priest said simply, "the body of Christ," and the communicant briefly responded, "Amen, it is the true" (body) (*id est verum*).

From this retrospect we gather that from the earliest times the elements were given to each communicant separately at the same time that the words of which we have illustration above were also spoken, and that at first the formula was of the simplest character.[2] Each communicant had thus the gift of grace pledged to him so far as the Church could outwardly do it. The words of delivery were spoken to each in the singular number. A strange and frightful exception to primitive usage is to be found in the action of Novatian, who, instead of using the well-known words, exacted a promise that the communicant would not forsake him and return to Cornelius, Bishop of

[1] Given in the Appendix to Cardinal Bona, "De Rebus Liturgicis," tom. iii., App., p. xxvii.

[2] The form at first seems to have been no more than this: "The body of Christ" and "the blood of Christ," to each of which the people subjoined "Amen"; or, as we have it in the Clementine Liturgy, "the body of Christ. Amen"; "the blood of Christ, the cup of life. Amen." (Bingham, book xv., chap. v., § 8.)

Rome.[1] In the Roman Missal, as in those of Salisbury, York and Hereford, there is no form for communicating the laity, nor, in fact, any form of distribution whatever; but it would be a mistake to conclude from this that no form of words was used. The present use in the Roman Catholic Church, we understand, is to say the same formula to the people as the priest uses in communicating himself and his brother priests, the pronoun being changed as required. We find Benedict XIV., in his treatise "De Sacro Sancto Missæ Sacrificio," saying, "Tum unicuique porriget sacramentum faciens cum eo signum crucis supra pyxidem et singulis dicit: Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam æternam. Amen." In the well-known devotional treatise of the Roman Catholic Church, "The Garden of the Soul" (p. 255), we find these words: "When the priest gives you the Blessed Sacrament, saying, The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul to life everlasting, Amen, receive it with a lively faith." The rule of the Church of Rome is also clearly ascertained from the canons of several of the councils. For example, the second canon of the Council of Rome requires: "Nulli autem laico aut feminæ Eucharistiam in manibus ponat, sed tantum in os ejus cum his verbis ponat: Corpus Domini et Sanguis prosit tibi ad remissionem peccatorum et ad vitam æternam" (Martene, "De Ritibus," lib. i. c. iv.).

We come now to the changes enacted in this matter at the Reformation, and we cannot feel sufficiently thankful for the clear and indisputable doctrine which they enshrined in our English formularies. From the first no doubt was left as to the object of the Holy Communion—it was for reception. No loophole was left for the future whereby celebrations of the Lord's Supper could be turned into solitary Masses to be said by the priest alone. In the first instance it was required that a certain number should be present and receive at each celebration, and next the words of distribution to be said to each communicant were distinctly set down. In this respect alone there was a clear gain on the mediæval missals. In the earliest order for the Communion, that of 1548, the direction to the celebrant runs as follows: "And when he doth deliver the Sacrament of the body of Christ, he shall say to every one these words following: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life.' And the priest delivering the Sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once, and no more, shall say:

[1] *ὅμοσόν μοι κατὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ μηδέποτέ με καταλιπεῖν καὶ επιστρέψαν πρὸς κορνήλιον. καὶ ὁ ἄθλιος ἄνθρωπος οὐ πρότερον γεύεται, εἰμὴ πρότερον αὐτῷ κατάρασαιτο.*—Euseb., "Eccl. Hist.," lib. vi., ch. xiii., p. 315.

'The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.'" This rubric was transferred into the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1549) with the change of the form "preserve thy body" in giving the bread, and "preserve thy soul" in giving the cup, into the one form "preserve thy body and soul." In the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1552) the form was altered in favour of the formulæ, "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving"; "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." The direction to say the words "to every one" is omitted in the second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., thus apparently permitting a distribution to "railsful" at a time without individualizing the communicants. At the next revision, 1603, the two forms were combined into one, but the individual obsignation was not provided for.

The reconstituted rubrics of 1661, which introduce the express words in the form of distribution "to any one," were probably the work of Archbishop Sancroft, at the time chaplain to Bishop Cosin. A copy of the Book of Common Prayer, annotated by Sancroft, is to be found in the Bodleian Library, with these words, "When he delivereth the Sacrament of the body of Christ to any one, he shall say," etc. "And when the minister delivereth the cup to any one, he shall say," etc. We may note from this the care that possessed our Reformers that the clergy in giving the Communion should use a set form of words, and that these words should be said to each communicant separately. If for a time, whether by oversight or otherwise, the rubric directing the saying of the formula of donation to each communicant individually was omitted, the Prayer-Book as it finally came forth from the hands of the revisers in the seventeenth century carefully preserves this feature. When we consider the circumstances under which the words "to any one" were introduced in 1661, it makes more plain the mind of the Church of England. In reply to objections, the Bishops said: "It is most requisite that the minister deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand and repeat the words in the singular number, for so much as it is the propriety of Sacraments to make particular obsignation to each believer, and it is our visible profession that by the grace of God Christ tasted death for every man."[1] Among the Bishops who sat on the Commission we find the names of Sanderson, Pearson, Sparrow, Sheldon, etc. One of the objections made against the Prayer-

[1] Report of the Commissioners, p. 126.

Book by the Lincoln ministers in 1605 was: "That the words of the institution are to be pronounced and repeated to every several communicant." The objections were republished in 1641. According to Baxter, it was to be left optional to the minister whether he was to deliver the bread and wine to the people in general, each one taking for himself, or to deliver them generally, or to put them into every one's hand.[1]

It may now be interesting to glance at the use of some of the Reformed Continental Churches in this matter. We find that in the office published by Luther in 1523 it seems to have been left an open question. The *Agnus Dei* might be sung during the Communion, or a prayer said from the canon of the Roman Mass, or the words of administration might be used: "Corpus Domini, etc., custodiat animam meam, vel tuam in vitam æternam, et sanguis, etc., custodiat," etc. Archbishop Herman's Liturgy (1543), has a direction that at the presentation of the "body" the pastor should say: "Take and eat to your salvation the body of your Lord, which was given for you"; and at the presentation of the cup: "Take and drink to your salvation the blood of our Lord, which was shed for your sins"; but there is nothing to point out whether these words were to be said severally to each communicant. The Liturgy of Calvin is equally indistinct as to any regulation of the kind. He seems at first to have required the words of institution, as given by St. Paul, to be recited to each communicant, and then to have had this use given up, as being a source of delay in the administration.[2] The change, however, may have had a doctrinal significance. In the Liturgy for the Use of Strangers in Strasburg, the words of donation are required to be said to each communicant separately, but in the corresponding Liturgy of Frankfort there is no such direction. The Liturgy of the English in Geneva (1556), recommended by Calvin, directs some suitable Scripture to be read during the Communion, and that the communicants should distribute the elements among themselves. An English copy of this Liturgy was printed in 1641, and presented to Parliament. Knox's Liturgy likewise directs the communicants to distribute the elements among themselves. This, we need scarcely say, is the universal use among the Presbyterian Churches of the present day. They receive

[1] "The Reformation of the Liturgy," p. 54. It is to be observed that, in the Visitation queries of the Bishops in the seventeenth century, particular inquiry is frequently made as to whether the words of distribution are said to each communicant separately. These queries are published at large in Crosthwaite's "Historical Inquiry," where much interesting information on the subject of this paper is to be found.

[2] "Epist.," vol. viii., p. 206.

the elements after they are sanctified by the Word of God, and prayer from the minister, who first communicates himself, and then hands them on, repeating the words: "Take, eat; this is our Lord's body which is broken for you; do it in remembrance of Him"; and so with the cup. We may say that among all Protestant Nonconformist bodies a very similar use prevails in the distribution of the elements. The directory for public worship has t his form: "I take this bread, and having given thanks, I break it and give it unto you. Take ye, eat ye. This is the body of Christ, which is broken for you. 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' I take this cup and give it unto you. This cup is the New Testament in the Blood of Christ, which is shed for the remission of the sins of many. Drink ye all of it." We say nothing here about the posture of receiving among Nonconformists, which is universally one of sitting, nor of the practice, in many of their churches, of the men and women communicating separately, as in the Swedish and Lutheran Churches generally. The conclusion to be drawn from the use in the Church of England is clearly set down by Hooker: "Seeing God by Sacraments doth apply in particular unto every man's person the grace which Himself hath provided for the benefit of all mankind, there is no cause why, administering the Sacraments, we should forbear to express that in our forms of speech which He by His Word and Gospel teacheth all to believe . . . whether Christ at His last supper did speak generally once to all, or to every one in particular, is a thing uncertain. His words . . . are no manifest proof that He spake but once unto all, which did then communicate, much less that we in speaking unto every communicant separately do amiss, although it were clear that we herein do otherwise than Christ did."[1] It remains to be said that in the Church of Ireland Book of Common Prayer there is a supplementary rubric that runs as follows: "When, by reason of numbers, it is inconvenient to address to each communicant separately the words appointed to be said on delivering the bread and the cup, the words may, with the consent of the Ordinary, be said once to as many as shall together kneel for receiving the Communion at the Holy Table: provided that the words shall be said separately to any communicant so desiring it."

J. A. Carr, LL.D.

---

[1] "Eccl. Pol.," bk. v. 68.

ART. III.—ENRICO DI CAMPELLO.

I AM indebted to the pleasant biography of Campello written by the Rev. Dr. Robertson, Chaplain to the Scotch Church in Venice, for the information with which this article begins. Dr. Robertson himself is an accomplished writer on many subjects connected with religion in Italy past and present. He is personally acquainted with Campello; is a good Italian scholar, and in touch with many classes of the people. To Scotch sagacity he joins a genial comprehensiveness which is something more than Scotch, and a genuine sympathy with the wonderful land in which he dwells. He has done substantial service to the cause of the Reformation by publishing this excellent biography of its Leader in Italy; and the book derives additional authority from the fact that Dr. Robertson has personally examined Campello's work, and testifies to it with fraternal warmth, though he is himself a minister of the Kirk, and therefore cannot be suspected of a bias towards Episcopacy or Old Catholicism.

Enrico di Campello was born at Rome in November, 1831. The family seat of the Campellos had long been at Spoleto; but social and political engagements brought them to Rome for the winters. The early years of Enrico were spent in easy affluence, at good schools, and amid surroundings of luxury and dignity which mark patricians even in Modern Rome. When he was seventeen years old the Revolution broke out, the Pope fled, and Enrico's father, who was a Liberal, obtained office under the temporary Government. When Pio Nono returned, he retained Campello as Director of the Post-Office, on the condition that he would give a son to the Church. The father promised, and Enrico was destined to the altar. After a vain resistance to the terms of the covenant between the Pope and his father, Enrico yielded, was hastily prepared by the Jesuits at Tivoli, and, having passed through the minor orders, was consecrated priest in 1855.

Five years later he received from the Pope a canonry at St. Mary the Greater in Rome, a distinction unusual for a man of thirty. Instead of the pittance of bad Latin and bad philosophy, which suffices ordinarily for Italian priests, Campello brought to his work as canon a considerable learning. He was a Doctor of Divinity, he had a degree in Law, and was tinctured with the thoughts of the time through his lay education. He was as much superior in zeal as in ideas to his brother canons at St. Mary's. Already, as a priest, he had begun to work among the poor, the young and the outcast; he had even opened a Sunday-school and started a mission. These pious activities he continued and enlarged

when he became a Canon. His special taste led him to develop evening schools; but he was assiduous in prayer, in study, in preaching, and in the cure of souls. Evening schools, which Campello thirty years ago was fostering in Rome, have become, says Dr. Robertson, almost universal in Italy since that time. They are admirably conducted, and enthusiastically attended by all classes of the community. Campello's interest in them proves how clear was his insight into the needs of the people, and how prompt was his sympathy in meeting those needs.

But his brother canons viewed Campello and his work with that antipathy peculiar to lazy clericals. They keenly felt and resented the contrast between their own lives wasted in petty intrigue, frivolous pleasure, or fruitless formalism, and the life of Campello spent in doing good. In mockery of his plain dress and sad demeanour, they nicknamed him the Black Canon. They assailed his reputation and his work with calumnies. What these calumnies were precisely Dr. Robertson does not tell us. But we can easily imagine for ourselves in what light the ministrations of a devoted clergyman, eloquent and popular, and the son of a Liberal layman, might be represented by a chapter of reactionary priests. They at length succeeded in closing the school in the Via Tor de Specchj, on the Capitol, in which Campello took so deep an interest. This was a cruel wound, of which he complained in justly bitter indignation.

The Pope heard about it, and, to mark his sense of displeasure with the canons of St. Mary's, he translated Campello to a canonry at St. Peter's, the Metropolitan Church of Latin Christendom. This distinction was understood to point towards a Cardinal's hat; and Campello was thus at thirty-seven in view of the highest preferment but one which the Church of Rome can bestow.

The Pope had probably two ends in view in making Campello a Canon of St. Peter's. He wished to administer a sharp rebuke to his calumniators, and at the same time to remove Campello from immediate contact with the parochial life of the city, in the hope that his duties at St. Peter's would leave him no leisure for dabbling with dangerous plans for educating and improving the lower and middle classes.

The Pope was very much mistaken in his man. Yet the fact that Pius IX. conferred so high a dignity on Campello is quite sufficient to silence all his detractors.

The duties of the new canonry were little to his taste. He found the five hours' chanting of Latin offices every day very irksome. The exhibition of superb and fictitious relics to adoring crowds filled him with grief, and the grief was

augmented by the easy scepticism or the fatuous credulity of the higher clergy. Campello had the best possible opportunity for studying the Papacy at its head and source, and that at a time when the Papacy was passing through a crisis of no ordinary kind. Within two or three years of his elevation to St. Peter's, the Vatican Council was assembled, and the civil unity of Italy was consummated by King Victor Emmanuel's entrance into Rome. Both these events were certain to elicit the true essence of the Papal system. Campello learned from the assemblage of Bishops, dignitaries, and delegates in 1870 what Rome's ecclesiastical temper and policy was to be throughout the world; and by the Pope's attitude toward the new-born kingdom of Italy he could ascertain how Pope and King were likely to live together in the same city.

These two events completed the inward alienation of his heart from the Church of his baptism and of his ordination vows. That Church he found to be hopelessly out of tune with the aspirations of Italy, politically regenerated, and implacably hostile to modern civilization, free inquiry, and human progress.

One last effort did Campello make to reform the Church of Rome from within, an effort described by the Cardinals as a conspiracy, but an effort which, in fact, was nothing else than an attempt to make Rome dissolve herself spontaneously. It was, we think, his duty to make such an effort; other great and good men had done so before—Contarini, and Pole, and Erasmus, and above them all Savonarola. But as they had failed, so must Campello fail; and having failed, it was his duty to forsake the irreformable communion, and to initiate a genuine reformation on Scriptural and primitive principles. This is what he did. This is the head and front of his offending.

In 1878 he addressed to Cardinal Borromeo a dignified and temperate letter, stating the grounds of the convictions which compelled him to resign his canonry, to quit the Papal communion, and to plant the banner of reform in Italy. That letter should be read by all those who wish to do justice to a great and good man, and to understand this very remarkable movement. It is at once an apologia and a programme of the Catholic Reform. A period of keen and complex trial followed the secession. The voluntary exile tasted the bitterness of penury, obscurity, and neglect in the city where his father had been an official of the Government and himself a dignitary of the cathedral. At length the warm and gracious sympathy of Miss Mayor found him out. She busied herself to find him friends, helpers, and support. She intro-

duced him to the Church of England, and at length, after many cruel struggles, the work of reform was established at Arrone, with Count Campello at its head.

It is unnecessary to trace further the personal history of Enrico di Campello. Enough, I trust, has been said to show the integrity of his character and the sincerity of his conduct; enough, also, to show that the movement with which his name is associated is the result neither of precipitation nor of petulance. Indeed, Campello received every token of official favour from the Church of Rome; the Pope was his friend, and gave him no ordinary proofs of friendship. Although the Canons of St. Mary's, and afterwards some of the Cardinals, subjected him to mean and irritating annoyances, they could not inflict upon him external pains or penalties. All this is freely admitted by Campello himself. He did not leave the Church of Rome because he was poor and hoped to become rich as a Protestant. He did not leave her because of disappointed ambition. She did not directly extrude him by force or craft from her bosom; he voluntarily withdrew. No more conclusive demonstration of an unworldly purity of motive could be furnished or demanded. I surmise that two lines of influence at length converged upon the mind of Campello, and issued in the conviction that, if he wished to be loyal to Christ and to Italy, he must forsake the Church of Rome. In the first place, he discovered, by the stupid and selfish opposition of the Chapter of St. Mary's, that Latin clericalism was what it ever has been and ever will be—hostile to the temporal improvement of humanity. It may patronize a great artist, it may toy with a great writer, but it will never open the gates of knowledge and freedom to all sorts and conditions of men. Its true spirit was expressed by Newman when he was made a Cardinal and reminded Catholics that the Church was destined by God to keep the lower orders in their place. Campello, enlightened by the New Testament and guided by that deep love to his fellows which flows from evangelical humiliation and chastening of soul, judged very differently of the Church's office and work in the world. He was determined to be a helper of his brethren, a patriot, and a loyal subject. The Church that would not give free course to these holy aspirations was no Church for him.

Moreover, the theology of Rome, like her practice, was obsolete and corrupt; and in her theology, as in her practice, she hated to be reformed. Campello saw everywhere men hungering for the Bread of Life, in perplexity of reason, in darkness of conscience, dead in trespasses and sins.

To remedy these spiritual disorders, the Pope and the

priesthood commanded the repetition of prayers in a dead language, erected images of apocryphal saints, preached up pilgrimages to medicinal wells, and prescribed the adoration of ancient bones and holy coats. From such a spectacle the reverent and inquiring mind of Campello recoiled in terror and despair. That spectacle has made many a man abandon Christianity altogether. We thank God that a more gracious destiny conducted Enrico di Campello to Arrone and to Catholic Reform.

Every movement for a genuine reform of the Church must be Biblical, spiritual, and free to adapt itself to contemporary needs. These qualities signalized the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and have ever since coloured the development of the Churches of the Reformation. The presence of these qualities in a great religious movement distinguish it from a merely political revolution. As form is the adequate expression in externals of the essential idea of anything, so a Christian reformation is an attempt to restore the Church to its true form—the expression of its Divine idea.

The first necessity with every reformer has been to clearly ascertain this Divine idea of the Church. Accordingly, every reformer, from Tertullian to Campello, has laid special stress on the appeal to the New Testament as the indispensable and normal condition of any reform whatever. For Divine ideas respecting redemption are accessible to man only in the New Testament. It is this appeal which imparts the Biblical quality to Campello's work. As the Bible is its foundation, so is it the natural accompaniment of that work. And the Italian Reformers confidently appeal to the Scriptures of Truth, diligently study and industriously circulate them.

Spirituality is the sacred mark of a true reformation. Christianity is in all things spiritual—in worship (John iv. 23), in corporate and personal life (Phil. ii. 3), in work and instrumentality (1 Cor. xii. 11), in its hope for the future (Gal. v. 5), and even in its doctrine about the final form of the redeemed body (Rom. viii.; 1 Cor. xv.). How easy it was to forget or obscure the spirituality of Christ's religion, we see in the Epistle to the Galatians. Reformers have always found themselves under the necessity of recalling Christian men to spirituality from carnal and mundane views of Christ in His Church. Campello and his fellow-workers have been no exception to the rule. Closely allied with spirituality is that Christian freedom which in merely human accidents allows the unfettered play of individual local and temporary prepossessions. As soon as Campello escaped from the constrictions of the Papacy, he put in exercise this Christian freedom, by adapting his movement to the needs of Italians of the present day.

He conducted services in the native tongue; he published a liturgy and hymns in that tongue; he instituted classes, guilds, missions, modelled upon the methods created by the Evangelical revival. He let it be known that the body and the mind, as well as the soul, of a human creature are precious in their Maker's sight, and ought not to be neglected by those who minister in that Maker's name.

I will venture to specify three other features in this movement which, important in themselves, offer to English Churchmen points of special attraction. I have already drawn attention to the decisively national character of this movement, and I need not enlarge further upon it. But, in addition to the nationalism of the Italian Reformers, which presents so striking a parallel to the English Reformation in the sixteenth century, the form of government and of worship is studiously like our own. Campello believes in Bishops and in a liturgy. Whatever view we adopt concerning episcopacy in the abstract, there can be very little doubt that in Italy it is the best form of Church government. The Latin genius runs to monarchy. The immemorial practice of the Church in which Italians are bred has been episcopal. The Pope represents the principle of episcopacy with a splendour so imposing that centuries of misgovernment, of worldliness, have scarcely made it dim. Moreover, Campello wisely resolves to make no needless rupture with the past, and in all questions of polity he follows primitive practice. We trust that in the good providence of God Campello may speedily be consecrated the first Bishop of the Italian Reformed Communion.

A liturgy would seem even more necessary for Italians than even the episcopate. A people in whom is bred a taste for stately and classical forms of beauty must surely demand a form of prayer. They might get on without Bishops—at least, for a time—but without a Prayer-Book they could scarcely survive. This is not the place to review the Liturgy of the Eucharist published by the Synod at Arrone. It is a tentative sample of devotional forms which time will multiply and mature. Throughout it the officiating minister is styled a "presbyter;" the world "altar" is never used, except in verses quoted from the Psalms; there are no prayers for the dead, and no doctrine of sacrifice propitiatory for sins. I hope that whoever ponders the account just given of the Italian Reform movement must feel that it is genuine; that it has sprung from influences neither occasional nor transient, but such as perennially govern Christian thought and feeling, especially at epochs of crisis and change; and that at the same time it wears an aspect of sobriety and solidity. Nothing, of course,

will conciliate even the toleration of Rome. The Reformers can expect from her neither justice nor mercy; they know too well the meaning of the famous line:

Parcere devictis, et debellare superbos.

But it is strange and sad that in this country many, contented, almost proud, to ignore the life of Continental Protestantism, should never have heard Campello's name, while others mistrust him as a fanatic, and others, again, suppose him to be only one more of the abortive reformers in whom Italy has, alas! been too prolific. It is right, therefore, to conclude this article by an attempt to measure the ultimate value of Italian Catholic Reform, and to forecast the chances of its survival. During the last thirty years a very extraordinary movement in favour of a pure and primitive Christianity has sprung up with the Latin race. Germany indeed led the way in the old Catholic revolt, but Spain under Cabrera, France under Hyacinthe, Italy under Campello, have followed gallantly. It is true that old Catholicism is not precisely homogeneous; that it touches Waldensianism with the one hand and Dutch Jansenism with the other; that it is quite Protestant in Spain, largely Protestant in Italy, and scarcely Protestant in Germany. Yet if we comprehend that there is vital unity between the separate movements, we see that each has an importance greater than what is merely local. Each helps the other. The fortunes of each as they rise or fall cast a reflection upon the face of the whole.

The Reformers in Spain and Italy turned to England for help. This fact at once invests their cause with especial significance. They look to us for guidance, for sympathy, for spiritual and material support. We cannot say them nay. The claims of pure religion compel us to assent to their appeal. The ultimate victory of their work rests partly in our hands; we may not stand aloof and coldly speculate about their chances, when we may decide those chances in their favour.

I have endeavoured in the preceding pages to describe the features which distinguish the Reformation tendency in Italy as incorporated in the movement guided by Enrico di Campello. The principles of that movement possess all the vitality which is inherent in them, and which we in England have felt for three hundred years, not, indeed, without vicissitude and fluctuation, yet decisively and continuously. Those who are intelligently loyal to the Reformation settlement (to borrow a hackneyed, yet a happy, phrase) can feel no misgiving as to the ultimate triumph of those principles in Italy. The Reformers there are themselves sanguine that public opinion

will at length sustain them. They quote the example of Bonghi, who publicly testified in his open letter to the Pope to the need and the worth of Campello's Reformation. They expressed the hope that parishes will exercise their right of electing their own pastors in favour of candidates who support the Reform. If this hope be realized to any appreciable extent, the movement will gain a legal footing in the land from which it would not easily be dislodged.

If we survey the whole field of religion in Europe, we may discern, I think, that three great religious powers are striving for dominion over the human mind. Sacerdotalism, splendid, organized and vigilant, is competing on the one hand with a living, free and reformed Christianity founded on Scripture and the Primitive Church, and on the other with organic unbelief, inspired either by Voltaire and his successors, or by those materialists who profess to be disciples of Darwin.

It is probable that this great struggle has got to enter upon phases more acute than any which have preceded. There can be no doubt that the sympathies of the Italian Reformers and of all the more evangelical among the Old Catholics are with the opponents of priestcraft and infidelity. Chillingworth has long ago remarked that these two evils are always found together, and, indeed, the work of Campello ought to be regarded as an effort to rescue Italy from irreligion quite as much as a protest against Papal corruptions. In the interests, therefore, of Christianity considered as a whole, Christians should extend to the Reformers in Italy the right hand of fellowship, and this obligation appears to me to rest with unique and imperative stringency upon the members of the Church of England.

H. J. R. Marston.

Art. IV.—THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND YOUNG MEN'S SOCIETY, AND OTHER CHURCH SOCIETIES FOR THE WELFARE OF YOUNG MEN.

THE Church of England Young Men's Society was founded in 1843, one year before the foundation of the great organization known as the Young Men's Christian Association. It was therefore the first of its kind, and the parent of all.

The idea which the Society embodied was one which, if its originators had been equal to their task, would have made it, perhaps, the most useful Society which ever was founded under the auspices of the Church of England.

The present headquarters of the Society are at the Leopold

Rooms, Ludgate Circus, which form an institute or club for young men working in the City, and are furnished with every accessory, including a gymnasium, restaurant, library, billiard-room, lecture hall, class-rooms, studies, etc.

There are, besides, ten small bedrooms for the accommodation of young men coming up to London for the first time, and which have proved of immense benefit to numbers. The Society also has branches both in the Metropolis and in the country; but the number of these is quite insignificant as compared with the theory of the Society, which is that there should be a branch at least in every large centre, as well as in the rural parishes. The aim of the Society has been to establish a network of institutions for young men throughout the country; to promote an interchange of membership between local branches, so that young men moving from place to place may not drift away; and to link together all such organizations by means of a common union with a strong centre in London.

The Society so far has not been able to realize that ideal, partly from causes which will be discussed later in this paper. It would be unjust to gauge the work accomplished by this Society, or to measure its usefulness as a handmaid of the Church, entirely by the number of its branches at any given period. The Society, as has been said, was the very first of its kind, and all similar organizations are imitators of it either directly or unconsciously.

The Society, however, did not make itself sufficiently well known, and it was not sufficiently in touch with the episcopate and with other important leaders in Church life. So little, indeed, was it at one time known, that some at least of the original founders of the Young Men's Friendly Society were unaware of its existence.

Leaving out of account the Christian Association and the various secular institutes which are everywhere springing up, in many of the large towns there now exist Church of England Institutes, whilst almost every parish strives on its own account to maintain some kind of a club either for boys or for men.

An inspection of old reports of the C.E.Y.M.S. shows that quite a number of these owe their existence originally to the efforts of the Society, although but a few of these remain in affiliation.

Whilst the C.E.Y.M.S. was rather too unobtrusively carrying on its work, other Church Societies of a somewhat similar nature became established. The first of these was the Young Men's Friendly Society, founded in 1880, and it was followed by the Men's Help Society and others; whilst during the

whole fifty years parochial institutes have been sporadically established in increasing numbers.

It is impossible to deny that the vigorous campaigns which these newer Societies have carried on have resulted in a wide extension of the field of operations, and have been of great service to the cause which all the Societies desire to promote. But it is also true that so long as these all remain separate, and more or less in competition, not one of them can ever became thoroughly successful, or be co-extensive with the Church of England, as every Church Society should be.

The isolation of the various clubs and institutes throughout the country is a source of weakness to the Church as a whole. But while so many claim to be a parent Society, it is hopeless to expect the various local institutions to combine. As one bewildered secretary writes: "I would be glad to affiliate the —— Institute if I knew which Society is really representative. But I have received applications from the Church of England Young Men's Society, the Young Men's Friendly, the Men's Help Society, the Church Lads' Brigade, and others; and I consider it only waste of parochial funds, etc."

To show how far the above-mentioned Societies do really clash, the objects of each are given below as stated in their official reports:

I. The Church of England Young Men's Society.

"This Society seeks to promote, *throughout the United Kingdom*, the welfare of young men, spiritually, socially, and intellectually, by means consistent with the *spirit* and *principles* of the Church of England, and to encourage them in active personal labours for the good of others."

Its methods have already been briefly described.

II. The Young Men's Friendly Society.

Object: To assist young men to lead Christian lives, and to help them by:

(*a*) Promoting purity, temperance, and general morality.

(*b*) Befriending young men leaving home or moving from one place to another, and protecting them from evil influence.

(*c*) Promoting thrift and independence, especially by encouraging young men to make provision against sickness, accident, and want, on sound principles.

(*d*) Promoting a healthy tone of literature and amusement among young men.

(*e*) Promoting co-operation amongst institutions existing for kindred objects.

III. The Men's Help Society.

The object of the Society to be to help men to lead Christian lives.

The object of the Society to be carried out by:

1. Banding men together for mutual help and encouragement.
2. (*a*) Devotional meetings.
   (*b*) Bible-classes.
   (*c*) Special services.
   (*d*) Temperance and White Cross meetings.
   (*e*) Pure literature.

Club-rooms, coffee-bars, lodging-houses, registries, penny banks, clothing clubs, sick and burial clubs, convalescent homes, social meetings, secular classes, lectures and addresses, help in sickness, emigration, or when out of employment, to be provided when required.

It will be seen at a glance that these three Church Societies exist for practically the same object, and that they also endeavour to carry out that object by very much the same means.

The chief differences which may be marked in each are the result rather of accident than of intention. *E.g.*, the C.E.Y.M.S., having its origin in the City of London, has a clientèle *for the most part* of clerks and young men engaged in business houses. The Men's Help Society, on the other hand, having been founded as the complement of the Women's Help Society, appeals, *for the most part*, to the working classes, and has a flourishing Soldiers' Department.

Thus the unit, or basis, of work in each is different. The unit of the C.E.Y.M.S. is an institute; and the pivot upon which all work moves is a club-house.

The unit of the Young Men's Friendly Society is a neighbourhood; and the pivot is the "Associate," who undertakes to befriend members commended to his care.

The Men's Help Society works principally on the parochial system; and its pivot is a "Worker" or a "Helper."

All these, it will be observed, seek also to affiliate, or to found, clubs and institutes.

In the event of an amalgamation of these Societies, it would doubtless be necessary to maintain these diverse methods, and to work them as different departments, so that all classes of the community may be catered for. But until these Societies do combine there can be no successful general scheme by which the forces scattered throughout the country can be unified and made the most of by the Church.

The weakness which is the result of the present multiplicity of Societies does not so much arise from the extra outlay upon offices, salaries and other expenses, as from the fact that there is no representative society. There can be no doubt that, if there were, its prestige would be such that its income would not be the mere total of the three existing Societies, but it would expand in geometrical proportions. Hundreds of parochial institutes would join in, and new institutes would be founded.

The advantages to local institutes of affiliation are not at present very obvious, and they are somewhat difficult to show, but they are very real. They may perhaps best be shown here by a reference to other organizations. What, for instance, does the parent Society of the Church of England Temperance Society do *directly* for its many branches, beyond receiving a fee and registering the branch? Although the centre does very little *directly* for each branch, the great influence wielded by the Society is due to the fact that its branches are numerous throughout the country and in close touch with the centre. The branches themselves flourish and receive public support, because they represent locally a great idea and a great organization. The result is that the wishes of the Society with regard to the Temperance Question have been a factor to be considered even in Cabinet Councils.

Another proof of the advantage of affiliation to individual institutes may be found in the movement for the affiliation of all the political clubs belonging to one party in the State. It is believed by the party managers that the arrangement will not only facilitate the interchange of membership, but that their cause will be advanced by such action.

But, as has been said, a confederation of the Church clubs and institutes, however desirable for the promotion of the moral and spiritual welfare of young men, is not possible whilst there are three separate Societies, each claiming to be the centre for federation.

The wastefulness and absurdity of three distinct Societies being supported to do one work becomes depressing when one thinks of the splendid opportunities which are each year being missed. Under present arrangements, only very partial success can attend the efforts of any one of these Societies. In the meanwhile the Church is losing numbers of her young men, who are attracted to Dissent through the channel of unsectarian young men's institutes. On the other hand, the lighter natures are attracted to the purely secular clubs, the billiard saloons, and similar places, and remain permanently beyond the influence of the Church, or, indeed, of any sort of Christianity.

In London, at least, there is certainly a demand for such

institutes as the Leopold Rooms. In several parts, large and most excellent residential clubs for young men, with bedrooms varying in price from seven and sixpence to fifteen shillings a week, have been built. Attached to them are gymnasia, restaurants, writing-rooms, etc., of quite a sumptuous character. These clubs are so well patronized that they are not only self-supporting, but yield a fair return on the capital invested. They are run, of course, on secular and commercial lines. However good these may be, and they are good, it will be a great pity if the Church of England, through unhappy divisions and the petty jealousies of small separate Societies, cannot take advantage of the present grand opportunity for exercising a healthy influence over the young men of this great city by means of residential clubs of her own established in every quarter.

W. M. FARQUHAR.

ART. V.—QUEEN AND PEOPLE.

THE eyes of all the world were turned to England ten years ago, and our busy little island was the object of universal admiration, and almost of envy. The jealousies of conflicting imperial destinies were for the moment put aside, and every country which we know shared in our rejoicings. What was the reason of this most pleasant concord of good feeling? What was the magic charm of Tuesday, June 21, 1887, which silenced so many international bickerings; which sent all the royal families of Europe smiling, happy and cordial into the historic shrine of the English people; which overpowered the voice of faction, which hushed the din of party; which forbade the revolutionists to lift a finger; which disarmed with irresistible gentleness the Fenian malice; which suddenly increased the number of our capital city from four to something like seven millions; which taught the innumerable crowds the lessons of courtesy and good-humour; which made the thousands of our soldiers and the thousands of our police who were keeping the order of the streets each a perfect example of patience and good-humour; which for that one day by some fortunate spell put an end to drunkenness; which prompted the heart of every citizen worthy of the name to see how much he could do to enable the poor, the aged, the children, the fatherless, and the widow, to share in the general gladness; which swelled every throat, and brought moisture to every eye, as, surrounded by the most powerful princes of the world, her kinsmen and friends, herself the ruler of the

world's widest and most prosperous Empire, Queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Empress of India, Sovereign of newer and greater Englands in the far South and East and West, which have been born and grown to maturity since she was crowned at Westminster, with the dignity of fifty years of sovereignty upon her woman's shoulders, with all the sorrows and anxieties of the fifty years of her unique and lonely position marked upon her face, her hair silvered by grief as much as by time, the kindly widowed mother drove slowly through the long-continued roar of her people's applause, to kneel once more in the place where first she received the responsibilities of her Empire?

It was not any great victory about which they were rejoicing. No splendid national achievement could have drawn them thus together. Not the most scientific of them was thinking about the progress of railroads, or the invention of electricity, or the extension of commerce, or the improvement in cotton-spinning, or the triumphs of free-trade. It was, if ever there was such a feeling, a purely personal impulse. It was one warm, enthusiastic sense of gratitude and love to the quiet, reserved, much-tried, much-enduring lady, noble in character, great in heart, with her firm and keen sense of duty, her tender woman's sympathies, her strong determination, her keen instinct for what is right, her high and self-denying character, her deep love of her people and her country, her plain good sense, her power of seeing the right thing at the right time, and her capacity for doing it, her blameless life and her great example. They could not, of course, all analyze the feelings which were in their hearts, but if they could have been questioned, it would have been found that this was the general sense of that unparalleled welcome which they gave to Queen Victoria.

It was a feeling of gratitude, because even the most ignorant knows that it has been a personal benefit to himself that his country has had so long so wise and good a ruler. It was an anxious time for patriotic statesmen sixty years ago.[1] The blind passions excited by the French Revolution had not yet exhausted themselves. English institutions seemed by no means secure. King George III., however good-natured and domestic, had brought great troubles upon the country by his interference with parties, and by his obstinacy and self-will; and in his old age he had roamed through his palace helplessly deranged, with long white beard and meaningless eyes. King George IV. was despised as a profligate sensualist. King William IV., notwithstanding his bluff good-humour,

[1] *Cp.* an article in the *Times*, June, 1887.

had shaken the reverence for the crown by his undignified eccentricities. When, after the long struggle of the great Reform Bill, the sceptre of Great Britain came to the hand of a young, solitary, inexperienced girl of eighteen, men wondered how she would be able to weather the storms which were lowering about her country. Such was then the state of the world that ten years after she ascended the throne not a capital of Europe, except our own, was without its revolution, not a crown but seemed to be falling from the head of its wearer. He who afterwards became the mighty Emperor of Germany was himself a refugee in London. And there were great elements of disturbance amongst ourselves. The populace of that day were to a large extent uneducated, and appeared to be ready for every violence. The long wars which this country had undertaken for the independence of Europe had left us impoverished and over-taxed. The introduction of machinery had disturbed the balance of capital and labour. The Chartists seemed ready to imitate the excesses of the French Revolution, and to destroy the whole fabric of society in the wild hope that something better might emerge. How was it that amidst all these contending forces of disorder English institutions and the English throne only grew in stability, and became more and more firmly planted in the affections of the people as the years went by? It was because there gradually came to be a feeling of calm confidence that, come what might, whatever might be the changing fortune of fluctuating party majorities, and the fate of this or that minister, there was at the helm of the State, at the central spring of the mighty machine of government, a quiet and inexhaustible fund of good sense and high principle and unselfish devotion to duty, under the benign influence of which things would always in the end come right. It gradually became known that the Queen, with unerring instinct, would always do what had to be done in the best way and at the best time, and would act with perfect good faith as a loyal, constitutional sovereign, who from her position must always have unrivalled and unbounded opportunities at hand for information and instruction in all the manifold intricacies of State and policy—unrivalled and unbounded materials for forming her judgment. And there grew up at the same time a conviction that the slight, girlish maiden—"*poor little me*," as she called herself—who had been called to so tremendous an exaltation, was a very noble woman, leading a pure, blameless and unselfish life, the most devoted of wives, the most careful of mothers, in the happiest of homes. This is how the whole tone of the people about the throne and the crown came to be altered; and in serene security as to their constitutional

freedom, the British nation was able—as no other nation was able—to expand its hereditary energies and activities in every variety of material, social, moral, and religious progress. And it was because it was brought home to them on June 21, ten years ago, as it will be on June 22 this year, that it was to the modest and solid qualities of her who for fifty years had given up her life with unswerving devotion to the public good, that the whole nation was filled with gratitude; and foreign peoples were sincere and unanimous in their homage and admiration; and outside the Abbey the millions shouted with tumultuous acclaim; and the hearts of the ten thousand within were thrilled with responsive consent when the anthem rose to heaven in the words of the Queen of Sheba to King Solomon, which might have been said to Queen Victoria by the queen from the sunny seas of the Pacific: "*Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee, to set thee on the throne of Israel: because the Lord loved Israel for ever, therefore made He thee king to do judgment and justice.*"

The bells of the memorable year of the Jubilee are still ringing in our ears, and we have not forgotten the inspiring and thrilling sight of a great people, united in love and loyalty to a most august and lovable sovereign, returning thanks on that auspicious June day in that most brilliant of summers for the unexampled mercies vouchsafed to them during the previous fifty years.

And now another decade has passed on swift and ceaseless wing; and the fact that the Queen has reigned longer than any of her predecessors, coupled with the completion of the sixtieth year of her occupation of the throne, has been a natural signal to the spontaneous feeling of the people that there should again be a united national thanksgiving.

It has been a wonderful time in English history. Take material interests first.[1] India, before governed by a Company, was transferred to the Crown in 1858. Since 1837, the territories of Scind, of the Sikhs, Tanjore, the sea-board Provinces of Burmah, the territories Sattara, Jhansi, Nagpur, and Oude were brought under English dominion. Since 1858, it has been necessary to add Upper Burmah and the Shan States, Manipur and Chitral, and to round off the North-West Provinces.

The growth of our vast Australian dominion has been contemporary with the reign. Only New South Wales and Tasmania had a separate colonial existence when the Queen ascended the throne. In 1837 the population of all Australia

[1] These facts are taken from a striking paper in *Whitaker's Almanack*, "The Record Reign."

was only a few thousands; now it is 3,400,000. In 1881 Fiji was annexed, and in 1884 British New Guinea.

In 1841 the population of British North America was about one and a half millions; in 1891 it was nearly five millions—an increase of more than threefold.

In South Africa, in 1837, Capetown was our only possession. Natal was added in 1843, Basutoland in 1884, Bechuanaland in 1885, Zululand in 1887. In 1889 the British South Africa Company received a Royal Charter for developing British South Africa, according to treaty with other powers, from Mafeking to Tanganyika, an area of 750,000 square miles.

In East Africa the British East African Protectorate extends British influence over 468,000 square miles from the Eastern coast to the Congo State. Zanzibar has been a British Protectorate since 1890.

On the West Coast there is the Niger Coast Protectorate; and the Royal Niger Company received its charter in 1886.

In the British Islands, the population has increased from 26,709,436 in 1841, to 37,580,964 in 1891, the public revenue from £48,453,000 in 1837 to £100,000,000 in 1895; the imports and exports from £159,406,726 in 1840, to £702,522,065 in 1895. Such figures, it has been justly said, but faintly express the enormous expansion of our national wealth and national resources, for which we have to thank God.

In our political and social conditions the results of the Great Reform Bill, which admitted the middle classes to the Parliamentary franchise, were beginning to make themselves felt at the opening of the reign. In 1867 the working classes were also enabled to take their share in the government of the country. In 1884 the vote was also given to the enormous masses of the agricultural labourers.

It was only two years before the beginning of the reign that the government of the towns and boroughs was placed by the Municipal Reform Act in the hands of the inhabitants. In 1888 the inhabitants of the counties were empowered in the same way to manage their own affairs. In 1894 the same principle was applied to parishes. Since 1834, when the Poor Law Bill was passed, there has been a wonderful growth in the enlightenment and comprehensiveness of Poor Law administration.

In 1837 our railway and steamship communication was only in its infancy. Its development has worked simply a revolution in our means of travel and transit. It has bridged the Atlantic, and brought America nearer to England to-day than London was to Edinburgh before the work of Stephenson. It has created the Penny Post, the influence of which it is quite impossible either to estimate or to realize. The present

enormous ironclad navy has been entirely created during these sixty years. In the education of the working classes the Church was first in the field, and in 1839 the Committee of the Privy Council was created for helping her. Since then annual grants for this patriotic purpose have gone on steadily increasing, till they have reached £10,566,000. In 1870 Mr. Forster's great bill was passed for supplementing the efforts of the Church and the Nonconformists by Board Schools. In the last ten years the number of primary schools inspected has risen from 16,957, to 22,773, and the average attendance from 2,175,522 to 5,513,000.

In literature and science the Victorian era may be compared with any. In fiction, we have Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot. In poetry, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning. In history, we have Macaulay, Froude, Freeman, J. R. Green, Carlyle, Thirlwall, Grote, Finlay, Merivale, Arnold, Stanley. In philosophy, Mill, Hamilton, T. H. Green, Jowett, and Herbert Spencer. The pre-eminent characteristic of the period has been the extraordinary extension and development of popular and periodical literature, due to the removal of the taxes on knowledge, and to the enormous expansion and improvement of elementary education among the great masses of the people. In science, Darwin's theory of Evolution as the best working hypothesis has revolutionized the whole of biological study. In astronomy, we have the renowned names of Herschel and Adams. The extension of electrical knowledge by the discoveries of Wheatstone, Faraday, and Lord Kelvin, has opened a new world of possibilities. Chemistry has been systematized by the Atomic Theory of John Dalton. Huxley, Tyndall, and other notable scientists, by pressing on the public mind the supreme importance of scientific results and methods, have enhanced a most remarkable spread of scientific knowledge and education.

In commerce, manufacture and trade, the growth has been unparalleled. The advantage came to us through the invention of steam power, the establishment of free trade, the possession of immense stores of coal, our convenient position towards the United States and our indisputable maritime supremacy. England has been the workshop of the world, until our example has inspired other nations to work for themselves.

These material facts are worth recording on such an occasion as the present. And that the Church has extraordinary cause for thankfulness is abundantly obvious. The old revival of spiritual religion of the earlier part of the century, far from being checked, has continued quietly progressing, expanding, permeating the country, and fertilizing the nation

with an ever-broadening stream of progressive philanthropy. Side by side with it has sprung up the newer movement, transforming the old high and dry majority into a zealous and self-denying army of workers for the Church and the people. Evils have been removed: Bishop Blomfield's Pluralities put an end to intolerable scandals; the Church Discipline Act was greatly needed; the Ecclesiastical Commission has put the superfluous property of the Bishoprics and Chapters to new and noble uses; disabilities have been removed from Non-conformists; the grievance of Church Rates has been abolished; invidious and exclusive privileges—always a source of weakness and decay—have been abrogated. In 1837 there was but one training college for the clergy; now there are fifteen. The spiritual life of the clergy is cared for by the almost universal institution of quiet days, clerical meetings and retreats. Zeal for foreign missions has increased almost beyond belief. In 1837 the income of the Church Missionary Society was £83,446; now it is over £300,000. Great has also been the growth of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. There have sprung up, too, the South American Missionary Society, the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the Universities Mission, the Church of England Zenana Society, and many medical missions. In 1837 the Church Pastoral Aid Society had just been started, with an income of £8,000; it is now £62,841. The Additional Curates' Society, the Scripture Readers' Association, the Bishop of London's Fund, the East London Church Fund, the Clergy Pensions Institution, the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation, and other societies for the benefit of the needy amongst the ranks of the ministry, the School and College Mission Movement, have all grown up into vigorous and increasing life. Every diocese has now lay readers, and in sixteen of these there are organized Lay Helpers' Associations. Everywhere are deaconesses, mission-women, nurses and sisters. The clergy have advanced from 14,000 to 24,000. A million sterling a year has been spent on the building and restoration of churches. Eight new dioceses have been founded and voluntarily endowed: Manchester, St. Albans, Truro, Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, Wakefield, and (in a few months) Bristol. The office of Bishop-Suffragan has been revived; there are now fourteen, besides many assistant bishops. In 1837 there were only seven Colonial Bishops; there are now eighty-seven of these in the colonies and mission-fields, with five coadjutors. On elementary education the Church has spent many millions, and has now the greater number of the children of the country in its schools. The Church of England Temperance Society has become a power

in the nation, and the efforts of Dr. Barnardo (a lay reader of the Diocese of St. Albans) and the Waifs and Strays Society, have rescued countless children from misery and degradation.

What is the secret of the fact that the Queen has such unique command of the hearts of her people? It is because from the first she devoted herself to God and to duty. We thank God for the Queen's mother, who surrounded her from the first only with what was most wholesome and best, and taught her the grand lesson of unselfishness. We thank Him for the Queen's husband, whose exalted ideas of duty, whose spotless life, whose wise forethought, whose love for all things true and beautiful, have left, not only his wife and family, but this whole nation, in his everlasting debt, and permanently enriched us all by the perfect picture of Christian chivalry with which we became familiar. But the best influences may fail unless the inward determination corresponds, and it is because the Queen herself from the beginning set her face to serve God, and in all her ways to acknowledge Him, that her life, quiet as in many ways it has been, has been to us so inestimable a blessing. "*Many a child would boast*," she said to her governess, when at twelve years old she was told that she was next to the Crown, "*but they don't know the difficulty. There is much splendour, but there is much responsibility;*" and, putting her hand in the hand of her teacher, said with repeated emphasis, "*I will be good! I will be good!*" And when on that memorable morning she was awakened soon after five o'clock to be told by the Archbishop that she had become Queen, and, without stopping for formal preparation, but only throwing a shawl round her shoulders, she came down to meet the messengers of such momentous tidings, after a few moments of deep agitation, the first words she was able to utter were "*I ask your prayers on my behalf.*" So, we are told, they knelt down together, and the Archbishop prayed that to the girl of eighteen, to whom had been given the sovereignty of the most powerful nation of the earth, might also be given "*an understanding heart to judge so great a people.*" Very memorable, too, were her words when she paid her first visit to Parliament, for they have been so exactly fulfilled: "*I ascend the Throne,*" she said, "*with a deep sense of the responsibility which is imposed upon me; but I am supported by the consciousness of my own right intentions, and by my dependence upon the protection of Almighty God. It will be my care to strengthen our institutions, civil and ecclesiastical, by discreet improvement wherever improvement is required, and to do all in my power to compose and allay animosity and discord. Acting upon these principles, I shall upon all occasions look with confidence to the wisdom of*

Parliament and the affections of my people, which form the true support of the dignity of the Crown, and ensure the stability of the Constitution." Every act of her life, every public utterance which she has made, every page which she has written, has been an additional proof that never were words spoken with greater sincerity; never were promises more faithfully maintained. "*The King stood in his place and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord and to keep His commandments and His testimonies and His statutes with all his heart and with all his soul, to perform the words of the covenant which are written in this book.*" That was the text of the Archbishop's sermon at the coronation sixty years ago. Has it not been prophetic?

The feelings of the nation are not only those of gratitude, they are also those of warm, loving, personal affection. From the time when at her coronation she sprang forward from her throne to save an aged peer from falling as he came forward to pay his homage, her people have been witnesses of her innumerable acts of considerate kindness. The whole delight of her life has been to spread pleasure and happiness as widely as she possibly could. Far beyond those of most other people have been her gifts and her charities. Never has calamity befallen any section of her subjects but well-chosen words of sympathy have been sent from the Queen, and because they came straight from her heart have brought alleviation to the sufferers and the mourners. In victory and in reverse her soldiers have on every occasion received her cheering messages. In hospital and cottage, in the darkened house of the widow and the sorrowful, her kindly presence has never failed when she could be there. Not a member of her numerous household but has birthdays remembered by affectionate and carefully-suited gifts from the Royal mistress. And with the pleasant simplicity of entire confidence she has let her people into the inner sacredness of her home and her life, her joys and griefs, her occupations and her pleasures. It was the only way by which her subjects could become intimate with her, and intimacy she knew was the strongest bond which could unite them. There is a power in the natural truth, the homelike artlessness of the narrative, which is far more potent than the most dramatic and rhetorical effect. It shows the people the true, genuine, kindly nature of her whose station is by the nature of things so far removed from their own. They can remember, as they see her with her sons and daughters and descendants about her, the happy marriage, and the golden days of her early life; the bright associations which gathered round Osborne and Balmoral; the far-sighted plans which blossomed into the Great Exhibition; the trying times, so

nobly borne, of the Irish famine, the Russian war, the Indian mutiny, the cotton distress, the Indian famine, the terrible year of trouble when mother and husband were both removed from her side. "*I gave one last look,*" wrote the Queen, of that sudden and first great bereavement. "*My darling mother was sitting as she had done before, but was already white. O God! how awful, how mysterious! But what a blessed end! Her gentle spirit at rest, her sufferings over. But I—I, wretched child, who had lost the mother I so tenderly loved, from whom, for these forty-one years, I had never been parted, except for a few weeks, what was my case? My childhood, everything seemed to come upon me at once. I seemed to have lived through a life—to have become old. What I had dreaded and fought off the idea of for years had come and must be borne. The blessed future meeting and her peace and rest must henceforward be my comfort.*" And, when in a few months that still deeper and most unexpected anguish came, her subjects can remember how she had declared to her family that, though she felt crushed by the loss of one who had been her companion through life, she knew how much was expected of her, and she accordingly called on her children to give her their assistance in order that she might do her duty to them and to the country. These recollections and a thousand other endearing touches are in our minds; we think of the overwhelming weight of responsibility borne alone for six-and-thirty years; the unutterable loneliness of the position, where none must speak to her unless she speaks first; the wearying vexation and disappointment when party spirit prevented the affairs of the country from proceeding as she, in her high, neutral and impartial view, would have wished; the tragic death of the beloved daughter, who, with her great intellectual powers, her deep piety, and her lifelong unselfishness, was so strong a support to herself; the appalling suddenness of the removal of the dear youngest son, so tenderly cherished because so needing care, who had only lately been so happily married, and who seemed to be reproducing much of the thoughtfulness and usefulness of his father; the unexpected death of the grandson, next but one in succession to the throne; the loss, one by one, of generation after generation of those who had been her wisest and best advisers; her own clear faith and courage in bearing all her burdens unshaken, and in labouring daily and hourly with unceasing zeal and sympathy for the public good—all this is in our hearts as we see her grave face bright and beaming once more amongst the million expressions of the love by which her people repay her love for them, and we feel unconsciously that not in vain our English poet six-and-thirty years ago uttered the prayer:

"Break not, O woman's heart, but still endure;
Break not, for thou art royal, but endure,
Remembering all the beauty of that star
Which shone so clear beside thee, that ye made
One light together, but has past, and leaves
The crown a lonely splendour.

May all love,
His love unseen but felt, o'ershadow thee;
The love of all thy sons encompass thee;
The love of all thy daughters cherish thee;
Till God's love set thee at his side again."

The last impression is one of considerate sympathy with the Queen herself. Standing as she does permanently at the centre of Government, and passing on from minister to minister the traditions of public life, the more the Empire grows the greater become her responsibilities and cares. Her days are very laborious, and she works from morning till night in reading despatches, writing letters of business, in giving audiences, and in informing herself of what is being thought and done in the world about her. Her health has had many trials, and at her age every year brings its own increasing burden. It would be sad, indeed, if her subjects were too exacting in their demands upon her. After sixty years of zealous attention to their welfare, it would be only the thoughtless who could suppose that she will not of her own goodwill do all that her health and strength permit her to gratify their affectionate loyalty. The single wish which is in all our hearts this month is surely this: That one so true and good may continue as long as God wills to occupy the place which for sixty years she has to the great content of us all so worthily filled; that unclouded happiness may be hers, and that God will reward her single-hearted consecration to the good of her people by causing them to sink all their party spirit and faction and jealousies in united, unselfish labour for the peace and prosperity of every class of their fellow-subjects.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. VI.—THE POWER OF FAITH.

THE evidences of Divine power and love by which we are surrounded are so sure and unmistakable, that as years advance we can say with accumulated experience, "I know in whom I have believed."

The message of the Lord Jesus Christ, as it reaches the heart of each of us, not only across the nineteen centuries, but from the throne of God, in living communication to our own

thought, is so powerful and true, that, in spite of all the subtle imaginations and deftly-woven doubts of unbelievers, we cry with unutterable satisfaction from the very depths of our souls, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life!" Christ's Divine challenge comes to each in turn, to accept Him as the living revelation of Divine being, and none who ever took Him at His word, and trusted His calm unhesitating authority, has ever regretted his submission.

There is a power of faith that does not at first sight seem Divine: the trust of a child for its father, the trust of a soldier for his general, the trust of a scholar for his master, the trust of the politician for the leader, the trust of the disciple for the artist; the confidence which has been brought by past success, and which enables the orator to sway the great multitude; the confidence in skill, knowledge, and calculation, which inspires the mighty engineer to span vast depths and spaces, and to wield giant forces; the faith in a righteous cause, which nerves an army to march forth in grim seriousness, and risk life and limb in winning a brilliant victory.

> Belief's fire once in us
> Makes of all else mere stuff to show itself!
> We penetrate our life with such a glow
> As fire lends wood and iron.
> Enthusiasm's the best thing, I repeat![1]

There seems a Divine element in well-placed confidence, and it declares itself as a law inevitably necessary to all great achievements.

> We see but half the causes of our deeds,
> Seeking them wholly in the outer life,
> And heedless of the encircling spirit-world,
> Which, though unseen, is felt—and sows in us
> All germs of pure and world-wide purposes.[2]

"Believe, and you will conquer!" said Mazzini.

If this be the case in ordinary matters, how infinitely greater is the truth when we come to the relation of the soul with God! How immeasurably stupid and self-contradictory is a halting, half-hearted faith in this the most important region of our lives! If our minds are at all inclined to listen to the voice of God, and recognise it, and obey it, how extraordinary it seems, when we consider the subject of the belief, that we should not give ourselves up to it wholly! In other things there may be room for hesitancy, but surely not here. We are having to do with God, the Almighty Being, the Self-existent, the Omnipotent, the Giver of all good things, in whom we live and move and have our being. That feeling of confidence, which is the secret of all successful action, is here

[1] Browning. [2] Lowell.

of a power infinitely momentous. It can put us in communication with the omnipotent God Himself, conform us to His will, make us His sons, and gladden us with His perfection and power.

"Great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt." That is the law of our spiritual life. Little faith, little light or strength; more faith, more light and strength; much faith, an abundant blessing of realization.

> Be bounteous in thy faith, for not misspent
> Is confidence unto the Father lent;
> Thy need is sown and rooted for His rain. . . .
> Work on! One day beyond all thought of praise
> A sunny joy will crown thee with its rays,
> Nor other than thy need thy recompense.

This does not, of course, mean that the more things we believe with docility, so much the better it will be for us. I have once heard that said with astonishing recklessness, but it is not in the least true. The grand primary truths which God has revealed to us are simple. If we accept His revelation, they are easy to be ascertained and to be understood as far as it is necessary and possible to our finite comprehension and limited understanding. They stand out from the Gospel in large, clear outlines, not to be mistaken. It is when men pass on to supplement these great truths with their own definitions, deductions, and additions that difficulties are needlessly increased and faith unnecessarily shaken. If we believe that we have God's voice in the words of His Son, His prophets and Apostles, then we are in no doubt as to the message; and the more heartily and unreservedly we trust it, the deeper and greater our blessing. If we believe we have that voice, the more unwilling we shall be to mix it with the voices of men, and to confuse its Divine accents with human discords and inventions.

> How much thy holy name hath been misused,
> Beginner of all good, all-mighty Faith!
> Some men thy blessed symbols have abused,
> Making them badge or secret shibboleth,
> For greed accepted, or for spite refused,
> Or just endured for fear of pain or death.

It is melancholy, indeed, when the good quality of faith is soured and wasted by being perverted to wrong and harmful objects, narrowing aims, foolish, barren notions, instead of being fed, nourished, enlarged, strengthened, braced, disciplined, utilized, fertilized, by being exercised only amongst the pure springs and the fresh breath of the calm, immovable, unchangeable mountains of eternal truth.

Too many Christians are content if they can feel that faith

has conquered sin, and given them a peaceful assurance. And thus they remain with their life stunted and maimed—no very forcible examples or inducements to others to come and follow Christ. Faith is not merely the apprehension of a creed intended to be a sort of religious framework, or to put to rest the doubts and misgivings which the soul cannot but feel about the surrounding eternity; it is to be infinitely more than this. It is the taking into the very central citadel of our being of principles and truths which are to supply every motive, to discipline every desire, to glorify every act, to penetrate every thought, to elevate every aspiration, to raise the whole mind and soul above the temporal transitory interests and concerns of the passing hour into the clear health-giving atmosphere of the Divine, the true, and the eternal.

> Faith is enlightened Hope: she is light, is the eye of affection,
> Dreams of the longings interprets, and carves their vision in marble.
> Faith is the sun of life, and her countenance shines like the Hebrew's,
> For she has looked upon God! the heaven on its stable foundation
> Draws she with chains to the earth.[1]

> Think not the Faith by which the just shall live
> Is a dead creed, a map correct of heaven;
> Far less a feeling fond and fugitive,
> A thoughtless gift, withdrawn as soon as given:
> It is an affirmation, and an act
> That bids Eternal Truth be present fact.[2]

A genuine Christian faith reminds us every moment that we are not mere creatures of the dust, born merely for toil or pleasure, or for the soulless occupations of the conventional life, but weaves for us a golden and sunlit existence in the atmosphere of God, raises us above the petty mortifications that vex the sons of this world, makes us, unworthy though we are in ourselves, centres of wholesomeness and fruitful action, and removes from us, by our communion with the Source of all Beauty and Perfection, all that disfigures and disgraces the unregenerate character of the natural man.

One of the results of such a faith is to make us buoyant with hope and joy. We are often told that this is a dismal, cheerless era in which we live, because men in general have become sceptics or agnostics, and have lost their faith. But in no age since first Christ rose again have the majority of men been genuine, spiritual Christians. The true members of Christ have always been a minority. What is meant is that this present era is specially intelligent, educated, and introspective, and is more aware of its own deficiencies, and more sensitive to them, than any previous time. The result is only what we should expect: the world sees that faith is the best

[1] Longfellow. [2] Hartley Coleridge.

thing, longs for it, but asks for impossible conditions of certainty and demonstration, mistakes the nature of faith, and so cannot get what it wants, and therefore is restless and melancholy. That is no reason at all why we should share its gloom. If we have faith at all, God can make it as full and abundant and free as the happy, jubilant faith of the early Christians. That is one of the essential qualities of the very idea of our Faith: God exists, God is omnipotent, God is love, God will give all we need if we ask for it in faith. It is of the essence of faith that it should be trustful as the faith of little children. "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." There is a beautiful and suggestive passage in the account of the ten plagues in the Book of Exodus: "There was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days: they saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days; but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." The same phenomenon will occur in the moral and religious world: the men of this age may impose conditions on faith which prevent them from seeing the light; but in the very midst of them, living in the same place, partaking of the same daily life, subject to the same laws, the true sons of God see the rays of the Sun of righteousness, and rejoice in their brilliance and their life-giving power. There is a similar passage, full of suggestive thought, in the life of Elisha: "When the servant of the man of God was risen early, and gone forth, behold an host compassed the city both with horses and chariots. And his servant said unto him, Alas, my master, how shall we do? And he answered, Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said: Lord, I pray Thee, open his eyes that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man and he saw; and behold! the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." It is only the eye of faith that can see the salvation of God. Once more, we have the profound words of St. John the Divine: "The light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not .... He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own, but His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." And again, there are the words of our Lord Himself: "The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but ye know Him: for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." The world says, "Apply the same rules to faith that you do to mechanics, and faith must disappear." But that is just the very point of

the mistake. The very idea of faith is that it supplies a guide in our lives in that very region where demonstration is impossible. It is proved by its own results. It is demonstrated by that deep inward spring of joy which can only come from the everlasting fountains of the unseen God.

Am I wrong to be always so happy? This world is full of grief,
Yet there is laughter of sunshine to see the crisp green in the leaf.
Daylight is ringing with song-birds, and brooklets are crooning by night—
And why should I make a shadow where God makes all so bright?
Earth may be wicked and weary, yet cannot I help being glad.
There is sunshine without and within me, and how should I mope or be sad?
God would not flood me with blessings, meaning me only to pine
Amid all the bounties and beauties He pours upon me and mine.
Therefore will I be grateful, and therefore will I rejoice:
My heart is singing within me! Sing on, O heart and voice![1]

When first Thy sweet and gracious eye
Vouchsafed, e'en in the midst of youth and night,
To look upon me who before did lie
Weltering in sin,
I felt a sugared, strange delight,
Passing all cordials made by any art,
Bedew, embalm, and over-run my heart,
And take it in.

Since that time many a bitter storm
My soul hath felt, e'en able to destroy
Had the malicious and ill-meaning harm
His swing and sway;
But still Thy sweet original joy
Sprung from Thine eye, did work within my soul,
And surging griefs, when they grew bold, control
And get the day.

If Thy first glance so powerful be,
A mirth but opened and sealed up again,
What wonders shall we feel when we shall see
Thy full-eyed love!
When Thou shall look us out of pain,
And one aspect of Thine spend in delight,
More than a thousand suns disburse in light
In heaven above![2]

Another result of such a genuine faith will be that it will make us, each according to the gift given to us, useful, helpful, encouraging to all about us. How we rejoice ourselves to meet such men and women! What a tower of strength to their generation were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, or Tyndale; or Bishop Butler, or John Wesley, or Charles Simeon, or William Wilberforce, or Dr. Arnold, or Bishop Lightfoot, or Lord Shaftesbury, or Charles Gordon! What delight their contemporaries had in them! How they cheered the weary,

[1] Walter Smith. [2] George Herbert.

confirmed the doubtful, and guided the strong! Where would they have been without their faith?

Servants of God! or sons
Shall I not call you? Because
Not as servants ye knew
Your Father's innermost mind.
His, who unwillingly sees
One of His little ones lost.
Yours is the praise, if mankind
Hath not as yet in its march
Fainted and fallen and died.

* * * * *

Then, in such hour of need
Of your fainting, dispirited race,
Ye like angels appear.
Radiant with ardour divine,
Beacons of hope ye appear:
Languor is not in your heart,
Weakness is not in your word,
Weariness not on your brow!
Ye alight in our van: at your voice
Pain, despair, flee away!
Ye move through the ranks, recall
The stragglers, refresh the outworn,
Praise, reinspire the brave.
Order, courage return!
Eyes rekindling and prayers
Follow your steps as ye go:
Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On to the bound of the waste,
On to the city of God![1]

It is enough to say that every movement and institution of philanthropy has come forth at the voice of Christ.

Such a faith spreads about us a glow of contentment, refinement and happiness which enkindles others also. Consecrating the beginning of the day with that sincere, reverent, united worship, to the influence of which even the careless cannot be altogether indifferent, closing it with that renewal of family trust and gratitude which Burns has touched with inimitable tenderness in his "Cottar's Saturday Night," the man of faith throughout the hours of toil or leisure is cheerful and serene. All the labours of life, all its innocent enjoyments, are transformed by their relation to the Eternal, and there is peace within and without.

We could speak much of the influence and importance of Faith in the vast responsible field of political life, the need of clear, unfaltering faith in municipal affairs, faith in sickness, faith in charitable work, faith in social and domestic life. But

[1] Matthew Arnold.

the sum of the matter is that in all these things we cannot trust too much in God, or expect too much from His power and goodness. Not enough of us have yet tried the faith that can remove mountains. Such a faith there is; we can but try to get near it. There are no limits to what it can do. "According to thy faith, so be it unto thee." I believe in the orphanage supported by prayer, so long as the faith is simple, earnest and genuine. I believe in the prayer of faith healing the sick, so long as the will is submissive and the faith persistent. I believe in great causes being won by absolute confidence in God. How else did Gordon single-handed quell rebellions, save an empire, crush slavery, and rule vast provinces with justice? How else did Wesley turn his hundreds of thousands to righteousness? I believe in the final triumph of good, and that we are called to hasten that day of glory. "Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go to the Father."

Therefore to whom turn I but to Thee, the ineffable Name?
Builder and Maker Thou of houses not made with hands!
What? have fear of change from Thee who art ever the same?
Doubt that Thy power can fill the heart that Thy power expands?
There shall never be one lost good! What was, shall live as before;
The evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound.
What was good shall be good, with for evil so much good more;
On the earth the broken arcs—in the heaven a perfect round.[1]

Oh, yet we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt and taints of blood;

That nothing walks with aimless feet,
That not one life shall be destroyed
Or cast as rubbish to the void
When God hath made the pile complete!

Behold, we know not anything!
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring!

The one supreme motto for life is: Believe! Believe God! Believe His Son! "All things are possible to him that believeth."

[1] Browning.

VIVAT VICTORIA.

LORD of all power and might,
Behold from Heaven's height
Our noble Queen.
Stablish her Empire-zone;
Protect our Monarch's throne;
Our strength in Thee alone:
God save the Queen.

Her vast dominions shield;
From war's red battlefield
Defend our Queen.
Low on our knees we bend;
Mercy with judgment blend;
Peace to the Nations send:
God save the Queen.

So shall Thy people raise
Songs of triumphal praise:
God save our Queen.
Victoria's reign increase,
And when her sway shall cease,
Grant her eternal peace:
God save the Queen.

W. S. S.

Review.

Christian Ethics. (Bampton Lectures for 1895.) By T. B. STRONG, M.A. Longmans. 1896.

AN interesting and suggestive, but not in the least an "epoch-making," work, will, we imagine, be the final verdict passed upon the Bampton Lectures for 1895. Not but what there are many noteworthy passages and comments scattered up and down these pages; but, somehow, the general impression is, in a sense, one of disappointment—possibly owing to the fact that these lectures on "Christian Ethics" were preceded by Mr. Illingworth's lectures on "Personality," a book which was a host in itself, and one of the most completely satisfying theological works produced of recent years in this country.

Mr. Strong has briefly, but excellently, summarized the position maintained in the lectures in the following words (Preface, p. xi): "The Christian theory of moral life is not merely a new formulation of the old experience, nor is it merely a restatement of the old truths with certain new virtues added, but it is a view of life based upon a radically different experience of facts. The reconciliation of the finite and Infinite—of man and God—which the Incarnation achieved was at most

a dream of the most enlightened Greek philosophers, and a hope to the most enlightened Jews. When it happened man was admitted, in proportion to the certainty of his faith in it, into a clear and decisive knowledge of the spiritual Divine order. The appearance of the Word of God in human flesh did not, indeed, explain itself fully in philosophic language, but it declared finally the fact that man's nature, however frail and limited it might be, is the scene of a spiritual history, and is explicable only in spiritual terms. The Christian ethic is the detailed presentation of this fact, in relation to the end of life and human nature, the theory of virtue, the idea of evil, and the general order of the universe as a whole."

The first chapter, entitled "Greek and Jew," is preliminary; it is not too much to say that this lecture, with its two added notes—the first dealing with ruling principles of life in classical days, the second with Judaism and the Law—is the most instructive of the series. Lecture II., "Christ and the Apostles," passes on to the consideration of ethics as modified by the rising influences of Christianity; Lecture III. discusses the theological virtues; Lecture IV. the cardinal virtues; Lecture V. the meaning of "Sin," on the ground that the fact of evil is one of the most obvious of ethical facts; Lecture VI. speaks of morality and reason, and finds in the Incarnation the typical expression of the Divine wisdom and love; Lecture VII.—an interesting but somewhat debatable one—takes for its topic the relation of Christian ethics to the Reformation; while the last lecture of all adverts to the question of Church discipline—a thorny but vital question in these days. The weak portions of the book are those chapters dealing with the theological and cardinal virtues; Mr. Strong, in his treatment of this aspect of his theme, sits far too closely to the dialectic of mediæval scholasticism.

Nothing can be more certain than Mr. Strong's contention that with Christianity there came in a new view of human nature. The Christian ideal, with its touch of ennobling asceticism, differs not only in kind, but in degree, from both the Jewish and highest Pagan ideals, the one with its insistence (never to be eliminated or forgotten) upon the majestic and unapproachable character of the Divine holiness, the other upon its practical negation of all certainty in the knowledge of God. It is in the *law* that the true spirit of Judaism lies; while the ideals even of the most complete system of Greek thought are logically based on *despair*. Hence the comparative failure of both Jewish and Greek ideals, owing to their externality and aloofness from the emotions of the human heart. Both lacked, in a sense, an energy of inspiration. But whereas from the Jewish ideal can never be detached its moral significance, the ideals of Pagan philosophy were constructed only for the academy and the school and therefore exercised little influence on the bulk of the people. The ancient philosophers had agreed to recognise two opposing principles—right and wrong; and in a vague way man had a notion of what was right, what wrong, in the particular cases. Now, Christ came to teach men with clear definiteness, not merely that certain acts were right or wrong, but also to implant in the human consciousness an energizing principle of life, a Divine criterion whereby we might be able to weigh action, and know with assurance what was, and what was not, in accord with the mind and will of God.

The close connection of the emotions with the virtues is another point in Christian morality upon which Mr. Strong justly lays stress. That this is one of the foundation truths of the Christian religion we have no right to dispute, in view of the immense emphasis laid, both by St. Paul and St. John, upon the prominence of love in the revealed economy of God. It is this which, more than anything else, so completely differentiates Christian ethics from all ethnic moralities, how noble soever they may

be. Truly the love of God—which admits of a twofold signification, viz., our love to God, as well as His love to us—is the most stupendous regulative power in the world.

Mr. Strong, in the course of his work, throws out one highly suggestive thought as regards the Sermon on the Mount, though it is not one which we can regard as more than tentative. After pointing out (in note on Lecture II.) that the worship of Jehovah after the Captivity was continuous both with the prophetic preaching and the previous practice, and that it was the glory of Judaism that it led directly to the new order, its fault being that the new order had not come, the lecturer indicates that in the Sermon on the Mount the moment of transition had arrived. Indeed, we might, borrowing an expression from contemporary science, fearlessly assert that its utterance marked the psychological moment in the religious education of the race. But Mr. Strong also implies that the Sermon is in no sense a finished outline of Christian teaching, or yet a complete breach with legalism, but rather a full statement of the full meaning of the law. But this does not appear by any means certain.

In conclusion, we should like to call the attention of theologians to the admirable excursuses on πίστις, and the uses of the word "virtue," which occur in the course of this work, the study of which has been to us a constant source of no small interest.

E. H. B.

Short Notices.

Westminster Abbey. By Dean Farrar. Illustrated by Herbert Railton. Isbister.

An exquisite little book—perfectly finished alike in text, illustrations, and binding. No visitor to Westminster Abbey ought to be there without it.

Greek Lyric Poets. Translated by F. Brooks, M.A. London: Nutt. 1896.

"The contents of the book will be found," says the translator, "to deal with most of the chief subjects of human interest—life, death, fate, religion, national glory, war, politics, love and feasting, the sport of the athlete, and the poet's art" (Preface, p. v). We can only add that the translation of these gems of the Greek lyrical genius is excellently done, and that the get-up of the book is most tasteful. It is very satisfactory to find the Greek text accompanying the translation throughout the work. There are no notes, but on each poet that is represented here a few appropriate words are said by way of introduction.

Poems and Other Verses. By H. A. R. J. Pp. 200. Published by T. Fisher Unwin. Price 7s. 6d.

The writer has a fluent pen, and his method is often easy and graceful. He is perhaps more successful in his lighter efforts than when he tries more ambitious flights. The *First Love Song*, *An American Tragedy in a Nutshell*, *A Postscript*, and several others are both witty and original. The verses *To Althea*, which open the book, are musical and expressive. Altogether the volume is distinctly above the average, and will doubtless have many pleased readers.

A Song of Jubilee. By H. A. R. J. Pp. 32. Elliot Stock. Price 1s.

The amount of verse—good, bad, and indifferent—which the Diamond Jubilee has inspired must be extremely gratifying to Her Majesty. We

are glad to be able to place the above verses in the first category. A skilful adaptation of various metres to the different themes is shown while several of the passages have considerable stateliness and movement.

Ecclesiastical Vestments. By. R. A. S. MACALLISTER. Pp. 270. Price 4s. 6d. Elliot Stock.

This is a volume of the Camden Library, and it is interesting, learned and impartial. The gradual development of ecclesiastical garments, from the extreme conservatism of the clergy when fashions were changing, is very interesting. With regard to the mitre, the writer tells us that Menard, after a careful study of ancient liturgies, came to the conclusion that it was not in use in the Church prior to the year 1000. The earliest genuine representation of a bishop's head-dress is that of St. Dunstan in the British Museum MSS. He wears a low cap. All the painted windows and frescoes in modern churches in the style of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, representing St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the other great Fathers of the Church with mitres, are simply anachronisms.

Vox Liturgiæ Anglicanæ. By the Rev. N. DIMOCK. Pp. 139. Elliot Stock.

This learned and temperate work consists of six papers reprinted from the CHURCHMAN, on the Eucharistic Controversy. The facts are so carefully marshalled, and the tone is so reasonable and modest, that the most extreme ritualist would be able to read it with pleasure, though it would not support his own conclusions. It will be a valuable help to all students in discussing this thorny question.

Philippian Studies. By Principal MOULE. Pp. 265. Price 5s. Hodder and Stoughton.

These twelve studies on the most beautiful of all St. Paul's epistles from the hand of one who is recognised by the whole University of Cambridge as an eminent spiritual teacher, is an important addition to devotional literature. Fresh from the college chapel and the college lecture-hall, they will bring new light and suggestive thought into many a clerical study in town and country. The papers are not long, and would be useful for reading at family gatherings on Sunday.

Church Reform in Spain and Portugal. By Dr. NOYES. Pp. 192. Price 2s. 6d. Cassell and Co.

Those who value the Reformation in England cannot fail to be interested in the germs of a corresponding movement which is going on in Spain and Portugal. It seems a genuine and spontaneous effort, and likely to be permanent in character. It is quite a mistake to suppose that it was artificially planted and watered by the late Archbishop of Dublin. It had grown to large dimensions before his attention was called to it; and it was some time before he could be persuaded that his duty lay in befriending it, as the primate of a neighbouring province of the Christian Church across the Bay of Biscay. The matter will be much discussed when the Lambeth Conference meets, and Dr. Noyes, Chaplain of the Embassy at Paris, has done well in providing this capital handbook.

The Church of England. A History for the People. Vol. I. By the DEAN OF GLOUCESTER. Pp. 471. Price 6s. Cassell and Co.

This delightful work, of which we have already noticed the first number, has now reached the end of the first volume. The Dean writes in an easy, pleasant, flowing style, and has a happy skill in avoiding too much dry antiquarianism, while always following the best authorities. The illustrations and maps greatly assist the interest, and the type and size are an additional attraction. By the way, it is an anachronism in

this volume to put the Bishops in mitres: the mitre was unknown before the eleventh century. This most readable, fair and impartial work ought to succeed in spreading a wide knowledge of the history of the Church of Christ in these islands.

Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten drei Jahrhunderte. By Professor BONWETSCH, of Göttingen. Pp. 309. Price 18s. Leipsic.

The Emperor of Germany is bringing out a magnificent edition of the Early Greek Fathers. The first volume that has appeared is Hippolytus. No more complete edition of this very interesting writer, or one in better type, has appeared. It has a Latin translation and German notes.

The Royal Diamond Reign. Four hymns for congregational use on Thanksgiving Day. Two of them are written by the Rev. A. J. Soden. They are capital hymns, with well-selected, popular, rolling tunes, and are to be obtained from Wright and Co., Beverley.

MAGAZINES.

We had occasion recently to speak very cordially of a new and very excellent publication of the R.T.S. called *Sunday Hours for Boys and Girls.* The price of this magazine is sixpence, and it is really surprising that so much sterling value can be provided for so small a sum; but even sixpence is beyond the means of some to whom such a magazine would be a delight, and to meet such cases *Sunday Hours* has a *penny* monthly number, called *The Boys' Sunday Monthly*, which is quite as good in its way as its more expensive parent.

Blackwood's, as may always be expected of it, provides a splendid succession of papers on various subjects, each of which possesses some attractive feature for the reader. Mr. Frederick Greenwood, in a thoughtful and interesting article on "Half a Century of the Newspaper Press," gives his reasons for believing that the influence of the press on Governments is a waning influence. While it is certain that the newspaper press must always, in so far as it represents the opinions of the public, have considerable weight with statesmen, it is quite conceivable that such influence should be limited.

The Quiver for May contains, amongst other instructive and interesting matter, a forcible paper on "The Child-Marriage Iniquity of India." Reform in this, as in the case of other customs peculiar to that great division of our Empire, is distressingly slow, but it must come eventually with the spread of enlightenment.

There has been much Napoleonic literature of late, but we have been greatly interested by the *Cornhill Magazine* article on "Napoleon's Opinion of England and the English." On one point, at least, he had good cause to change the opinion of our country and people with which he began his military career: he frequently expressed contempt for England as a military power.

We have also received the following magazines: *Good Words, Sunday Magazine, The Leisure Hour, The Critical Review, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The Evangelical Churchman, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, The Fireside, Sunday at Home, The Girl's Own Paper, The Boy's Own Paper, Sunday Hours, The Church Worker, The Church Monthly, The Church Missionary Gleaner, Light in the Home, Awake, India's Women, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Golden Sunbeams, Little Folks, Our Little Dots, The Child's Companion, Boys' and Girl's Companion, The Children's World, Daybreak, Day of Days, Dawn of Day, Home Words, Hand and Heart*, and *Church and People.*

The Month.

The Financial Position of Cambridge University.

In February of this year, a meeting attended by all the principal officers of Cambridge University, as well as by representatives of the several colleges, was held at Trinity College to consider the financial condition and requirements of the University. The outcome of this meeting was the formation of a committee to draw up a statement and to circulate it. This statement has now been issued, together with a covering letter from the Duke of Devonshire, the Chancellor of the University. The document gives a complete and succinct account of the whole position. It states at the outset that the University, far from possessing amply sufficient means to meet all its requirements, has reached a point at which its efficiency as a national seat of learning is seriously endangered, unless new endowments to a very considerable amount are forthcoming.

The sources of revenue available to the University are, broadly speaking, of a threefold character. In the first place there are the capitation taxes, matriculation, examination, and degree fees. The sum obtainable from these is necessarily fluctuating. It amounted in 1896 to £39,366. The fees can hardly be made to yield a larger return, because only lately they have been raised to a limit beyond which it is unadvisable to go without endangering the total receipts. The second source of income is that of contributions levied by statute on the corporate income, internal trust-funds, and the tuition fees of the seventeen colleges. But, instead of this being a steadily increasing augmentation to the University chest, during the past fifteen years the divisible revenue of the colleges has fallen off by 34 per cent. Last year these contributions amounted to £16,577. Very little additional income, at any rate in the immediate future, can be expected from this source. Thirdly, there are the endowments derived mainly from tithe and agricultural rents. In consequence of the depreciation of agricultural values, which has continued now for so many years, the income from endowments has seriously diminished, and is still falling. The last year's instalment amounted only to £6,694.

The University provides the main part of the stipends for a staff of professors, readers, lecturers, demonstrators, and other educational officers numbering some 120 persons. It also maintains the University Library, certain special libraries, the schools for divinity, for literary subjects, eight museums, eight laboratories, the Botanical Gardens, and the Observatory. In all these directions there is great need for addition and expansion. Within the last generation the number of students has doubled, and is at present about 3,000; while the advance of learning, especially in the field of natural science, demands a greater number of teachers, together with ample accommodation and equipment. The stipends of many of the existing professorships are quite inadequate, while at least fifteen new readerships are urgently needed. Additional buildings, enlargements, and fresh appliances are requisite in many departments. Two new sites have been already secured, but there is no money available for building. The University Library, the school of law, the departments of classics, history, philosophy, modern and mediæval languages, Oriental languages, and music, all need new or extended accommodation. The foundation of several special libraries is urgently required. The executive officers need rooms for board and syndicate meetings. In nearly every department of natural science there is immediate necessity

for reconstruction or enlargement. The schools of botany, zoology, pathology, physics, engineering, physiology, medicine and surgery, are all overcrowded, and in many cases require considerable additions to their equipment as well. There is no suitable museum for the valuable antiquarian and ethnological collections belonging to the University.

Such is a brief re-statement of this important circular, which, although it does not emanate from the Senate, is of unquestionable authority. The facts should create a solid impression. During late years benefactions for the general work of the University have practically ceased. Although this circular does not make what would be called a direct appeal, it is much to be desired that it will prepare the way for a considerable inflow of generous gifts from the wealthy friends of education, worthy alike of the example of the past, of the object to be aided, and of the greatness of the need.

The May Meetings.

It would be difficult to over-estimate the value of these annual gatherings of the great religious societies. It is not that their good effects are immediately and unmistakably apparent. The sums of money collected at them are generally not large, while the results of the speeches in accurate and remembered information would possibly look meagre if submitted to the prosaic test of formal examination. But the sense of unity realized in the coming together of large numbers of those interested in a common object is a permanent force, which remains with each individual, intensifying and deepening interest long after the actual occasion has been forgotten. Such gatherings also serve as an excellent advertisement, leading to the addition of new members and fresh supporters. Further than this, the impression made upon the general public of the dimensions and earnestness of Christian work cannot fail to have an influence more useful perhaps than many sermons.

This year was the ninety-eighth anniversary of the C.M.S., and its various services and meetings were as largely attended and as interesting as ever. The Bishop of Ripon preached an admirable sermon from the text, "Behold, all souls are Mine." It would be impossible to sum up the excellent speeches, so rich with the experience, the toils, the successes, and the disappointments of work in the foreign missionary field. The Archbishop of Canterbury made a most sympathetic chairman. In the general review which was read by the secretary it was stated that the year began with a deficit of £17,000, that the expenditure of the year has been £297,261, that a total of £314,329 was required to be met, while the net sum available was £219,271, leaving an adverse balance on the year of £23,058. This deficit is to be reduced from certain reserve funds to the extent of £14,000, leaving about £9,000 still required from the society's friends in the country.

The annual meeting of the C.P.A.S., a society which may be said to occupy in the home field a place corresponding to the C.M.S. in the foreign field, was this year of an exceedingly useful character, and should do much towards strengthening the Society's influence among evangelical churchpeople throughout the country. The large attendance of clergy was particularly noticeable. In the abstract of the report which was read, the secretary stated that during the sixty-two years of its existence the Society had expended some £2,630,100 upon missionary work in poor parishes in this country. The income of the past year was £58,456, which was £4,725 less than the previous year; but the decrease was mainly due to the falling off of legacies, these being £4,326 less than the former year. The Legacy Adjustment Fund would meet this deficit, but the Society could not take up fresh work without an increased income. No less than

sixty new grants had been made during the past twelve months, while the total number of grants was 897 as against 867 of the previous year. The expansion represented by Auxiliaries, the Ladies' Home Mission Union, the Volunteers, and the Recruits was very cheering. The Bishop of Newcastle gave a characteristic address, in which, as an avowedly no-party Bishop, he welcomed the distinctively Evangelical constructive mission work of the Society. The clergymen who followed told with vivid truthfulness the stories of their terrible needy parishes, and the invaluable help given by the Society. The Bishop of London preached the annual sermon.

Among other meetings may be mentioned that of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which seeks to send the Scriptures throughout the world in every language and to every people. Very remarkable was the attendance, representing all sections of Protestant Christianity in the land, gathered together under the chairmanship of the Earl of Harrowby. We have room here for only one notable point culled from the many excellent speeches. Since 1804 the Society has issued 151,000,000 copies of the Holy Scriptures. Yet there is still great scope for its labours, since the population of the British Empire alone is estimated at not less than 311,000,000 souls. At the meeting of the Colonial and Continental Church Society the secretary had the pleasant intelligence to give that the income had exceeded that of the former year by upwards of £1,900. The ninety-eighth annual meeting of the R.T.S. teemed with instruction, and both the report and the speeches showed what numerous and invaluable publications upon every useful and interesting subject were issued by its means. The total expenditure of the year was £148,449. The report of the Jews' Society manifests an advance of over £1,000 from its auxiliaries, but there is a net deficit of £5,055 on the total receipts of the year. The South American Missionary Society has made steady progress. Last year the receipts of the Missions to Seamen Society were the largest it has ever received, amounting in all to £38,291. The Lord's Day Observance Society has maintained its valuable and much-needed work, in spite of opposition in some quarters and neglect in others. The forty-eighth anniversary of the Irish Church Missions Society was well attended ; the financial statement, however, disclosed a deficit of £6,077, caused largely by the failure of legacies.

The Ecclesiastical Insurance Office (Limited) held its tenth annual meeting at the offices, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, on May 14, Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode in the chair. The income from premiums amounted to £24,736, an increase of £3,435 ; the investments were £58,602, showing an increase of £3,785 in the year, and being more than double the paid-up capital ; while the total expenditure was again a moderate percentage of the income. In consequence of this general prosperity, £3,735 was added to the Reserve Fund, bringing it up to £26,142, or more than a full year's premium income, and £3,500 was distributed as grants. Of this sum, £1,500 was divided among the Clergy Pensions Institution, the National Society, and the Incorporated Church Building Society, £1,500 was allotted to the dioceses, and £500 to the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund. This makes a total of £17,000 allotted in grants from surplus profits, including £500 to the Clergy Distress Fund.

La Société Évangélique de France.

The Protestants of France are a comparatively small body to-day ; the terrible persecutions under Louis XIV. were so fatally successful that at the present time, after more than a hundred years of toleration, they only number a little over half a million of the forty millions of France. But though they are so few, they are active in good works ; their foreign

missions on the Zambesi, the Congo, and the Senegal, some of the deadliest posts held by the great missionary army, prove their zeal. At home, four or five different societies are at work combating Romanism on the one hand and Infidelity on the other. Of these La Société Évangélique de France, founded in 1833, is the oldest. During the sixty-four years of its existence it has laboured steadily at the work of evangelization, founding fresh pastorates, establishing Sunday-schools, sending evangelists and colporteurs through the length and breadth of the land, to instruct the people and to carry the Scriptures to them.

Its labours have been abundantly blessed; whole communities have renounced Popery and begged for further instruction. Proofs of love to Christ, and desire to serve Him, have been manifest in individuals, and have again and again gladdened the hearts of the workers.

The following instance may give some idea of the Society's work, and its results. An evangelist was stationed in a town in central France, in which there was not a single Protestant, nor any Protestant agency for many miles round. His first meetings were enlivened by stone-throwing, letting off crackers, and so on. When order was established, the audience frequently consisted of his wife alone, "Auditoire," as he said, "naturellement très sympathetique, mais un peu restreint." In God's good time, however, a poor drunkard's heart was reached; he believed, and has been a pillar of the little church which gradually grew up in the place. He brought in his brother-in-law and family, his wife and three of his children. When his wife died, he placed over her grave a monument surmounted by an open Bible, on the pages of which he has engraved Ps. xxiii. and xxiv. In front he has contrived a little case, in which he places a written text, which he changes from time to time; and at the back of the tombstone he has placed a box, containing an open large-type New Testament, the leaves of which he regularly turns. One day on this mission of faith and love he saw a woman weeping beside a grave, and learned that she was a mother who had lost her only son. "But," she said, "I go often to read in that book;" and she expressed a wish to have this "book," a wish most readily gratified by the colporteur.

But the Société Évangélique has been weakened by the very zeal which has led to the formation of other societies; its funds have been lessened, the committee have been obliged reluctantly to close some of their stations and discharge some workers; and yet they are oppressed by a debt which threatens the very existence of the Society. Will not the Christians of England send speedy help to avert such a calamity? "Thou shalt love *thy neighbour*" is the Master's command; and our French Protestant brethren are our nearest neighbours, and in sore need of our help. Shall we not help them?

Slavery in East Africa.

Bishop Tucker has written a searching criticism on the Parliamentary paper recently issued respecting slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. He styles it altogether disappointing and inadequate. In the first place, it affords no legal necessity for the liberation of women. A Mohammedan may have as many concubines as he likes according to the Sheria. He may claim all his women slaves as concubines, and under the new measure not one of these could be liberated unless their master so willed. At the present time nine-tenths of the women of Zanzibar are slaves. In the second place, the freedom accorded to male slaves is limited in a manner which must lead to serious abuses. Measures are to be taken to prohibit the liberated slave community from leaving the islands. This is to prevent a labour famine, and the consequent ruin of Arab owners. So these owners are not only to receive compensation, they are to be empowered to create that semi-servile class which, as all experience shows,

has ever proved the absolute impediment to the growth of a class of free labour. Thirdly, the area covered by the Parliamentary paper has reference only to the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, and leaves untouched the remaining half of the Sultanate of Zanzibar, namely, the Mombasa portion and the mainland. Not only is abolitionist legislation even more urgent in the latter part of the Sultanate than in the former, but the responsibility of Great Britain there is also much greater. In the islands we are only the protecting Power. In Mombasa and on the mainland we are the executive Power, and farm this territory irrespective of the Sultan. It is painful to find, after the numberless pledges given in the House of Commons, that British officers will still be obliged to seize runaway slaves in the latter district and compel them to return to the tender mercies of their owners; and this, not in the name of the Sultan of Zanzibar, but in the name of Queen Victoria. Doubtless there are still many difficulties to be met before this old and deep-seated disease can be effectually cured. But the nature of the case is such that humanity demands something more than good intentions on the part of Her Majesty's Government. The sore will not be healed by surface dealing and partial prescription. It must be cut out.

The Fire in Paris.

On the afternoon of May 4 a disaster of the most terrible description occurred in Paris. A charity bazaar was in progress in the Rue Jean Goujon. The *élite* of Parisian Roman Catholic Society, native and cosmopolitan, was present, actively engaged in buying and selling for the benefit of the poor and needy. Suddenly, when the bazaar, which was a picturesque representation in timber and painted canvas of a street in mediæval Paris, was at its height, a fearful rumour of fire was whispered among the gay and fashionable throng. Through some defect in a cinematograph, flame had leaped from it, and had kindled some draperies near. In a moment a dreadful stampede commenced through the solitary means of exit, in which many were crushed to death. Some broke through the thin boarding at the rear of the building, and were pulled up through a small window into an adjoining house. The fire spread with the rapidity of lightning. In a few minutes the slight fabric fell in a blazing mass upon the unhappy victims. More than one hundred and twenty persons, many of them being ladies of rank and distinction belonging to the old French nobility, perished in this appalling catastrophe. The work of identification was in most cases extremely difficult, so charred and mangled were the bodies. Among the victims was her Royal Highness the Duchesse d'Alençon, youngest sister of the Empress of Austria, the Baronne de St. Didier, the Marquise Costa de Beauregard, the Comtesses de Greffulhe, Nicolay, Saint Ange, and other titled persons. Since the destruction of the Opéra Comique in 1887, Paris has not had so grievous a tragedy. The whole city has been thrown into gloom, and messages of sincere condolence have been forwarded from all parts of the world. Nor can the consequences of the disaster be said to have ended. Among the victims of the fire must be counted the brilliant Duc d'Aumale, who has died at Zucco, in Sicily, from shock caused by the news of the death of his relative, the Duchesse d'Alençon. The Duc was the fourth son of Louis Philippe, and was the most accomplished and popular member of the House of Orleans.

The War.

Towards the end of April the strained relations between Greece and Turkey respecting Crete, which had so long continued resulted, in an outbreak of war on the Thessalian frontier. The Turks entered Greek territory from Elassona, a town situated on the Xerias, which is a tribu-

tary of the river Teneios. Slowly but surely the Turks, under Edhem Pasha, forced their way through the Meluna Pass, beating back the Greeks from point to point. Meluna, Nezeros, Reveni, Mati, Turnavo, Larissa, Velestino, Pharsala, Domoko, in turn marked the victorious progress of the Turkish forces. The opposition which Greece was able to give was but fragmentary and uncertain. She has thus learned by bitter experience the worthlessness of the advice given by those who have lately flattered her unbounded vanity, and stimulated her visionary cupidity. Knowing now her utter weakness, she may perhaps be induced to heed the sober counsels of those who, while having no mind to allow the Turk to oppress or misrule, yet are not willing to permit Greece to set Eastern Europe in a blaze in order to gratify her quixotic dreams of annexation and conquest. Accordingly, Greece has at length promised to withdraw her troops from Crete, and has placed herself in the hands of the Powers, with the request that they will take charge of her interests. The Porte has now been requested to cease from hostilities, and terms of peace are being discussed.

THE JUBILEE SERVICES.

A special "Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God, to be used in all Churches and Chapels in England and Wales, and in the town of Berwick-on-Tweed, upon Sunday, the 20th day of June, 1897," has been issued by authority, and published by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen. It commences with a sentence from 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 3. The Proper Psalms are xx., ci., cxxi. The Proper Lessons are Josh. i. to v. 10, or Prov. viii. to v. 17; and Rom. xiii. to v. 11, or Rev. xxi. 22 to xxii. 4. There are some special Suffrages, a special Collect to be used after the Collect for the Day both in Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Communion Service, while two more are given to be used instead of the Prayers for the Queen and for the Royal Family, or in the Litany after the Prayer "We humbly beseech Thee." The Epistle is 1 St. Peter ii. 11, ff., and the Gospel St. Matt. xxii. 16, ff. After the General Thanksgiving a Special Thanksgiving will be said in acknowledgment of the Divine blessing during Her Majesty's reign of sixty years.

The Synodsmen of Dublin, Glendalough, and Kildare, to the number of some six hundred, both clerical and lay, have met to elect an Archbishop of Dublin. It was found upon scrutiny that no name would receive the requisite two-thirds majority. Accordingly, the names of the Bishop of Meath and of Archdeacon Scott, Vicar of Bray, were sent to the bench of Bishops for their final decision. On Wednesday, May 19, nine Bishops met at St. Stephen's Green, and by common consent elected Dr. Peacocke, Lord Bishop of Meath, to the vacant Archbishopric. The new Archbishop graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1857. His university career was very distinguished. He was Senior Moderator in History and English Literature, Political Economy Prizeman and Senior Prizeman in Divinity. In 1858 he was ordained to the curacy of Kilkenny. He became subsequently Rector of St. George's, Dublin, Rector of Monktown, Prebendary and Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, member of the General Synod and Diocesan Council, and Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Dublin. At one time he was Secretary of the Hibernian Association of the C.M.S. In 1894 he became Professor of Pastoral Theology at Trinity College, Dublin.

The Church Parliamentary Committee has appointed a sub-committee to collect evidence respecting the local taxations of the clergy, with a view to bringing it under the notice of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. Exact returns are asked concerning the amount and nature of

all assets, deductions, and necessary outgoings, together with full particulars of local taxation.

In the Archdeaconry of Middlesex Prebendary Villiers gained 162 votes for the vacant proctorship in Convocation, while Prebendary Kitto polled 95. In the Archdeaconry of London the voting was: Prebendary Villiers 99, Prebendary Kitto 91. Prebendary Villiers accordingly secured a majority of 75 votes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed in Convocation his belief that the Diocese forms the best area for the formation of Associations to distribute the aid under the Voluntary Schools Act.

The Bishops of the Northern Province have appointed a committee to inquire into the question of Fasting Communion, in the light of Church discipline and Church custom.

Upon the motion of Major Rasch, the House of Commons has agreed, by 85 votes to 24, to limit the duration of ordinary members' speeches to a quarter of an hour, and of Front Bench men to an hour.

On Sunday, April 25, a third child was born to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York. This is the first girl in the family of the Duke of York, which now consists of two sons and a daughter.

The opposition to the Necessitous Board Schools Bills has completely collapsed. The second reading was carried by 122 votes to 41.

Mr. Athelstan Riley has decided to retire from the London School Board.

GIFTS AND BEQUESTS.

Under the will of the Rev. Rowland Muckleston £10,000 for the poor clergy of the Archdeaconry of Hereford; £2,000 for the Hereford Infirmary; £1,000 for the Eye and Ear Hospital; £1,000 for the Parish Schools, and £1,000 for the poor of the parish of Dynedor.

A gift of £1,000 towards the restoration of Gedney Parish Church, by the Rev. J. W. Bellamy, D.D.

Obituary.

THE Very Rev. Edward Meyrick Goulburn, formerly Dean of Norwich, died at Tunbridge Wells on May 3, from syncope. He was born in 1818, and was the son of Serjeant Goulburn, Q.C. Educated at Eton and Balliol, he took a First in Classics in 1839, and was elected to a Fellowship at Merton in 1841. He was ordained in 1842, and for some time was Vicar of Holywell, Oxford, until 1850. He then became Headmaster of Rugby, in succession to the Dean of Carlisle, afterwards Archbishop Tait, where he remained seven years. He was then appointed Incumbent of Quebec Chapel, and soon afterwards went to St. John's, Paddington. In 1866 he became Dean of Norwich, retiring in 1889 to Tunbridge Wells. He was the author of numerous widely-read books of devotion. Among them may be mentioned "Thoughts on Personal Religion," "The Collects of the Day," "Three Counsels of the Divine Master," etc.