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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1899.

ART. I.—UNITARIANISM.

PART II.

HISTORICALLY regarded, modern Unitarianism is not distantly related to certain lines of thought developed by the left wing of the Humanists at the epoch of the Reformation. The revival of classic studies, the culture of classic tastes, the reassertion of the authority of reason against the despotism of the Roman Curia, the emancipation of the individual from the bondage of ecclesiastical feudalism, and the reactionary rebellion of the soul thus emancipated from religious serfdom against all religious traditions and all religious authority of every kind—these and similar causes led the extreme Humanists of the sixteenth century to a position almost identical with that occupied by modern Unitarians. As Luther and Calvin revolted against the despotism of the Roman Curia, so these Humanists rebelled against the doctrines of Luther and Calvin; especially such doctrines as appeared to them either contrary to reason or ethically incomplete. There can be no doubt that Calvin's unhistorical view of the Bible, and Luther's exaggerated utterances concerning the valuelessness of works—utterances not intentionally though practically tantamount to Antinomianism—gave a strong impetus in the sixteenth century to speculations which subsequently developed into modern Unitarianism. The eminence ascribed to the writings of Servetus, particularly to his two treatises, *De Trinitatis Erroribus* and *Dialogorum de Trinitate Libri Duo*, are evidence of this impetus. Servetus was put to death by the authority of Calvin; but it was the cruel forensic theology of Calvin which made it possible in later years for the writings of Servetus to win a strong though undeserved influence. To-day many of the opinions and

sentiments promulgated by Servetus prevail in Geneva, once a city almost abjectly subservient to the dominion of Calvin. Very true are the words of the great Dr. Döllinger. "It was the rude and mechanical conception of the Atonement," he writes, "and the opposing of the Divine Persons . . . like parties in a law-suit, which by a natural reaction made Unitarians of the Puritan theologians and preachers."[1] In the many conversations I have had with Unitarians of various classes, I have found no stumbling-block so great to their minds, nothing so repugnant to their sense of justice or their yearning for a sweet reasonableness in religion, as the Genevan doctrine of the Atonement; and no key so readily opens the door for their return to the Church as the realization that the Church is not responsible for, and has never incorporated into her creeds, the ruthless Institutes of Calvin.

Following upon the Genevan doctrines, which in the age of the Commonwealth obtained a powerful and gloomy ascendancy in England, came the eighteenth century—the century of the sovereignty of unassisted and unspiritualized reason over religion. It was towards the close of this century of Latitudinarianism that modern Unitarianism established its foothold in England. Its first Apostles were Lardner and Priestley and Lindsey, the last of whom founded the first modern Unitarian congregation in England in the year A.D. 1773,[2] although from the beginning of the sixteenth century there had been many individual advocates and some martyrs of Unitarianism. "Under Edward VI. Joan Bocher, and a Dutchman named Van Parris, were burnt for their heresies concerning the Trinity; and two other heretics were burned on a similar charge, under James I. The life of Biddle was a continual martyrdom. His works were burned by the hangman, he was banished for a time to the Scilly Islands, fined and repeatedly imprisoned, and at last died in prison in 1662."[3] To repugn the received doctrine of the Trinity had been constituted at the beginning of the Stuart dynasty a capital offence.

But, as is usual, the persecution defeated the aims of the persecutors. Under its influence what at first had been mainly an intellectual speculation deepened into a conscientious principle. Suffering threw the halo of martyrdom around the sufferers, and some of the most powerful and most earnest minds of the age were attracted to a cause which

[1] "Church and Churches," p. 239, quoted in Curteis's "Bampton Lectures," p. 297.

[2] "Encycl. Brit.," vol. xiii., p. 671.

[3] Lecky's "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," vol. *i.*, p. 312.

hallowed freedom of religious speculation by beautiful and unmurmuring patience under suffering. A species of Unitarianism may be detected in the "Paradise Lost." It tinged the theology of Newton. It captured Whiston, one of the most learned theologians of his time, and professor of mathematics at Cambridge; while Lardner, who ultimately became one of its apostles, is still reckoned among the most powerful and persuasive apologists for Christianity.[1]

Thus, notwithstanding the publication in 1685 of such powerful defences of the orthodox faith as Bishop Bull's "Defensio Fidei Nicenæ," one of the most solid contributions ever made to Christian theology, Unitarianism continued to spread, began to gather itself into assemblies for worship; and so towards the close of the eighteenth century, in 1773, the first distinctly English congregation of Unitarians was formed. In 1792 Fox made an attempt to extend to Unitarians the Toleration Act of William III. which, in 1689, had secured freedom of public worship to all Protestant Trinitarians; but, owing to the opposition of Burke and Pitt, and the dread of Free Thought caused by the revolutionary movements in France, the efforts of Fox were defeated by 142 votes to 63. Meanwhile, in 1791, the Unitarian Book Society for the distribution of Unitarian literature was founded; and in 1806 the Unitarian Fund Society for promoting Unitarian mission work. Owing partly to the labours of these societies, partly also to the cessation of the panic caused by the French Revolution, and to the discovery that the great body of the Unitarians were not political anarchists, as well as to the steady growth of charity in the religious world, in the years 1812 and 1813 the Unitarians obtained in England a legal toleration for their opinions and worship; and at the present day they labour under no disabilities of any kind, civil, social, or religious.

The removal of these disabilities has greatly weakened both their political influence and their religious fervour. The days when they suffered persecution were the days of their power, and the days when disciples were largely added to them. Early in the nineteenth century, when Unitarianism was a form of religion condemned by the State, nearly the whole body of the old English Presbyterian congregations became Unitarian; and in 1844 the right of Unitarians to these old Presbyterian Chapels was legally secured to them by the Dissenters' Chapels Act. But since that date there has been no conspicuous accession to their numbers. Never, indeed, among the Latin races or in the realms of the Greek Church has

[1] *Cf.* Lecky, *ut supra.*

Unitarianism gained any real foothold. Transylvania, England, and America are the only countries in which Unitarian congregations have ever existed in any numbers and for any length of time; and in England to-day there are only 279 Unitarian congregations, with about 70,000 adherents, including in the list (*a*) all duly organized Unitarian, Free Christian, and other non-subscribing congregations and missions, (*b*) pioneer movements holding regular meetings for worship, (*c*) chapels and other places of worship closed at present, but not finally given up; in Ireland 39 congregations, "nearly all Presbyterian in constitution," in Wales 32, in Scotland 8. During the last forty years only 81 new congregations have been founded in England, 10 in Wales, 1 in Ireland, and 3 in Scotland. In Africa there is no definitely Unitarian congregation, in all Australia only 3, in Canada 4, and in New Zealand none. The largest sphere of modern Unitarianism is the United States of America, where there are about 450 Unitarian societies, with about 600,000 adherents, and about 500 ministers.[1] Yet a prominent Unitarian minister of Boston, which is the stronghold of Unitarianism in the United States, told me nearly twenty years ago: "The future of religion in America does not lie with the Unitarians"; and an able and very friendly writer has observed: "Not a few representatives of modern Unitarianism disclaim the name Unitarian as tending to perpetuate divisions which no longer exist; and but for their conscientious disapproval of theological formularies would probably join the larger liberal churches, whether established or dissenting, as indeed many do."[2]

What, then, we may ask, has been the strength of modern Unitarianism, which has enabled it, though in a restricted sphere, so deeply to endure; and what its weakness, which is now leading towards what appears to many observers an inevitable decay? Its strength has lain, first, in its devotion to the intellectual faculty in man, its cultivation of the reasoning powers, its love of letters, its culture of Hellenic tastes and arts, its hatred of ignorance and Philistinism and boorishness. Every Unitarian is an enthusiast, often a fanatic, in the cause of education. The educational laws of the last thirty years are a monument of their industry and determination. No religious body has established so many colleges and seminaries in connection with itself, and in relation to the fewness of its numbers, as have the Unitarians in Great

[1] These statistics are mainly taken from the "Essex Hall Year Book," 1899, the authentic Unitarian calendar.

[2] "Encycl. Brit.," vol. xxiii., p. 726.

Britain and America. The history of Manchester College affords an illustrious example of their devotion and zeal in the face of continuous difficulty and comparative failure. Manchester College was founded at Manchester in 1786, removed to York in 1803, restored to Manchester in 1840, transferred to London in 1853, removed to Oxford in 1889, adorned with new buildings in 1893; and yet to-day, notwithstanding the glory conferred on it by the learning and moral grandeur of Dr. Martineau, the lavish expenditure of money, and the splendid devotion of its supporters, does not count twenty students upon its roll. It is no wonder that such learned zeal and passionate love, a zeal which no difficulties can arrest and a love which no failures can chill, should have conferred upon its possessors a large and well-merited influence. Nor is their educational fervour confined to their own seminaries. The establishment of Victoria University, with its three affiliated colleges at Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds, is largely due to the generosity and enthusiasm of Unitarians. Moreover, the Unitarian press, both in England and America—whether in the form of books or magazines or newspapers—is eminent for its learning, its liberality, its enlightenment. The homes of Unitarians, whether among the rich or poor, are generally homes of singular refinement, good taste, and active interest in every intellectual movement of the day. Every modern Unitarian is a defender and apostle of intellectual freedom; and in this enthusiasm for rational inquiry, and liberty of thought, and the culture of the mind, lies the first source of Unitarian strength.

The second source lies in devotion to ethical principles. The allegiance which modern Unitarians withhold from creeds, they pay ungrudgingly to conscience. They hate theological dogmas, but they love righteous dealing. Their generosity and charitable benevolence to the sick and the poor are proverbial. The origination of our present system of hospital nursing and district nursing is mainly due to the fervid genius for charity of the venerable head of the great Unitarian family of the Rathbones of Liverpool. It is this devotion to the humanitarian principles of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus—the visiting the sick, the clothing of the naked, the reformation of prisons, the improvement of poor laws, the moralization of money, the enthusiasm for righteousness, the generosity displayed towards noble causes, the worship of ideals of duty and peace and love—which is the second source of the strength of modern Unitarianism.

And yet this very strength is also the secret spring of their weakness. In their enthusiasm for reason, and the development of man's intellectual nature, they do not allow for the

limitations of reason, and they altogether forget that reason is not conterminous with the whole province of man's inner life. They forget that the things above reason are not necessarily against reason, that the super-rational is not always irrational, and that to transcend reason is not equivalent to contradicting it. They forget that critical and familiar speculations regarding God are not the noblest, but rather sometimes are the most perilous, exercises of the human soul; and that all speculations regarding God, however humble and reverent, when not rooted in spiritual experience are necessarily unfruitful.

This extravagant exaltation of reason nearly proved fatal to Unitarianism very early in its career. The soul-refrigerating theology of Priestley—a combination of Locke's philosophy with the crudest rationalistic supernaturalism—threatened Unitarianism with death by the process of spiritual freezing in the infancy of its life. By his cold analytical criticisms Priestley had perverted religion into mere logic-chopping, and souls conscious of a Divine hunger soon began to find that they could not be satisfied with the feats of mere logic-chopping, however dexterous and brilliant. They yearned for real spiritual food, not for clever displays of intellectual gymnastics. And in their unsatisfied hunger, in their revolt against the icy rationalism of teachers like Priestley, many Unitarians lost all interest in their Unitarianism, or they swung by reaction to mysticism, or Irvingism, or Romanism, or else they interested themselves in electro-biology and mesmerism and a variety of mysterious psychological phenomena. Dr. Priestley and similar teachers having robbed Unitarianism of spirituality, not a few Unitarians became, by a natural rebound, credulous towards spiritualism.

It was at this crisis in the fate of modern Unitarianism that in America uprose Channing and Theodore Parker, and in England, Tayler and Thom and Martineau. These strong, sweet souls felt profoundly the need of some more heavenly nourishment than could be found in the hard and cold syllogisms of Priestley and Biddle and Socinus. "Socinians," writes Dr. Martineau, "seem to me to contrast unfavourably with their opponents, and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy (on the whole) of the true genius of Christianity. I am conscious that my deepest obligations as a learner, in almost every department, are to others than writers of my own creed. . . . In devotional literature and religious thought I find nothing of ours that does not pale before Augustine, Tauler, Pascal. And in the poetry of the Church, it is the Latin or the German hymns, or the lines of

Charles Wesley, that fasten on my memory, and make all else seem poor and cold."[1]

The influence of these new prophets and champions, particularly of the Revs. Dr. Channing, Dr. Thom, and Dr. Martineau, upon modern Unitarianism has been immense. The majestic solemnity and passionate, yet sublimely controlled, fervour of Dr. Channing's writings have mightily leavened Unitarian thought. The mystic beauty and deep devotion of Dr. Thom's sermons, the sweet tenderness of his whole personality, his love of the most spiritual hymns, have also wrought great results. The publication of the life and letters of the Rev. J. J. Tayler formed a kind of epoch in many Unitarian lives. Then, too, the writings of Emerson and Carlyle, notably the transcendentalism of the former, have had a powerful influence in shaping and elevating the present character of Unitarianism. Above all stands, as on a solitary summit, the grand and venerable figure of Dr. Martineau—the most learned, most philosophical, yet at the same time the most spiritual, of Unitarians. Under his leadership, Unitarianism has in recent years been deeply modified. It is no longer the cold, hard, analytical system of Priestley. Dr. Martineau's mild and benignant sway has developed among Unitarians less of ruthless logic, but more of holy love. "I am on the heterodox side in everything," was the hard, vain boast of Priestley. Very different is the sweet, simple attitude of the spiritually-minded Dr. Martineau. Those who have read Priestley's "Institutes," and Martineau's "Endeavours after a Christian Life," will readily perceive the vastness of the change which has passed over representative Unitarianism during the course of the nineteenth century. If the twentieth century should be fated to witness among Unitarians as great an advance beyond Dr. Martineau's position as Dr. Martineau has achieved beyond the position of his predecessors, if also during the same period the Church continues in her present pursuit of sound learning and spiritual enlightenment, Unitarianism, except perhaps in the breasts of isolated individuals, will probably in the next hundred years have ceased to exist.

Meanwhile the chief desideratum of Unitarianism is a greater Godwardness. Unitarianism is specifically a manward, not a Godward religion. This is its radical defect. It inclines too much towards making man the measure of God, too much towards bringing God down, like the Socinians, to the compass of man's reasoning capacity. Its difficulty with the Unity in Trinity is simply this: it cannot understand so

[1] Curteis's "Bampton Lectures," p. 299.

transcendent a truth. Because the ineffable and Triune God will not fit into any syllogism or system of arithmetic, Unitarianism hesitates to believe in His Trinity. Unitarianism is not yet content to rest in revelation, and bow before mystery, and adore the Unsearchable. It begins with an exaggerated estimate of everything appertaining to man—man's importance, man's innate moral capacity, man's intellectual comprehension—and it ends with a wholly irrational rationalism concerning God—His eternal Triune self-existence, His inconceivable immensity, His absolute sovereignty, His unapproachable holiness. This excessive manwardness not only vitiates the doctrine, it also chills the worship, of Unitarianism. Unitarian worship is sorely lacking in adoration. Its eye is always upon man; it does not lose itself in God. It does not burn and glow with the Presence of the Invisible. Prayer is considered chiefly valuable, not as effectual with God, but in its influence upon man. The Bible is not the heavenly lamp and guide of human reason; reason is the critic and judge of the Bible. The Sacraments are not regarded so much in the light of God's grace as of man's self-dedication. So in everything else, God is too little adored, man is too highly esteemed in Unitarianism.

In nothing is this manwardness of Unitarianism more evident than in its morality. When Unitarians speak of the ethical principle, they too frequently mean merely "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," or some similar principle to be wholly judged by its good effects upon humanity. Unitarians too seldom speak of ethics towards God. Nothing could be more beautiful than their strenuous endeavours to keep the "Second Commandment of the Law," if only they did not so often forget that the Second Commandment is not the First. But they too seldom realize that the worship and love of God should come before work and love for their fellow-men, and that the best charity towards his neighbour can only spring from man's devotion to the Maker and Saviour of mankind. The morality of Unitarianism is thus too often anthropocentric, and not theocentric.

And yet it is a very serious and solemn question whether any charity towards man can be truly moral which is either a rival of, or a substitute for, duty towards God. We all feel, for instance, that no generosity towards the outside world can atone for niggardliness at home. We all feel that no system of ethics can possibly be regarded as satisfactory which does not place filial duty before other duties, whether social or civil. Yet if the claims of earthly parenthood, which on any system of religion cannot be considered as anything more than instrumental and secondary parenthood, are confessedly so

strong, it is obvious that, on any system of morals, the claims of primary and actual parenthood are immeasurably stronger still. If, therefore, man be only secondarily the child of man, but primarily the child of God, then ethically man's first thought, first duty, first love, is due to God. By degrees this larger conception of morals as beginning with duty towards God is slowly leavening modern Unitarianism. It manifests itself in a profounder reverence, a richer and warmer worship, a less analytical and more synthetic treatment of the Bible, and a more sympathetic attitude towards spiritual religion.

In the past, Unitarianism has done glorious service to the Church in claiming for reason an honoured place in religion; it remains for the Church in the future to show Unitarianism that the sweetest of all forms of reasonableness is an intelligent reverence for Revelation. Unitarianism has also done grand service to the Church in emphasizing and bringing into prominence the humanitarian aspects and duties of Christianity; the great importance of righteousness in religion, of the claims of personal liberty as a moderating influence upon central authority, of the rights of conscience to be heard in the discussion of creeds, of the necessity of morals to the life of faith. It now remains for the Church to extend among Unitarians the primary claims of Godwardness in religion, to show that true Christian morals begin with duties to God, that the best way to serve man is first to serve God, that holiness is the highest form of righteousness, that he worketh best who prayeth best, that they who most love God also most love man, that where the Spirit of God is, there, and there only, is perfect liberty, and that all true dogmas, even the dogma of the Blessed Trinity, when vitally incorporated into human consciousness, are not mere functionless opinions, but the most effectual of all instruments for exalting and redeeming and hallowing humanity. JOHN W. DIGGLE.

ART. II.—MY "CHRONICLES OF MISERY."

SOME OLD RATE-BOOKS.

RATE-BOOKS are not generally considered interesting reading—in fact, we view them with disdain or ill-concealed dislike. The rate-collector is not a person whose acquaintance we wish to cultivate, at any rate in an official sense. We look upon rates as a necessary evil incident to our manners and customs, but not at all as affording us any

amusement or out of the way information. This may be true of the carefully ruled, lettered and indexed rate-books of to-day, but it was not always so; as you may find the loveliest flowers upon a bare and barren moor, or the sweetest of landscapes in some unfrequented valley, so there are some rare and curious facts inscribed in our old country rate-books—facts not to be learnt elsewhere and not to be ignored. Those old volumes have heard many a sigh, been bedewed by many a tear, and listened to many a good joke which made the Vestry join in uproarious merriment and signify unqualified assent. Character and custom are alike visible upon their pages, and there the generous and the niggardly, the rich and poor, the laborious and the idle, the successful and the unfortunate, present themselves without disguise to the public eye.

The ponderous volume that lies before me, and which no one would wish to carry further than they could help—for a massive family Bible is a plaything to it—bears upon the *outside* cover, which is of thick cardboard covered with thin yellow skin, the words, "Watton Overseers' Book, July, 1769," but *within* a far more suggestive appellation appears, "Town Book, alias *The Chronicles of Misery*, F. Hicks, 1769"; and no truer name could be found for the contents, for all manner of woes and misfortunes meet our eyes as we turn over the aged pages. Nevertheless, there is also a goodly flavour of parochial fun and caustic wit that makes the local hodge-podge by no means an unsavoury dish. At the very commencement of the book in carefully ruled columns is a "roll of honour" of the overseers who have served the parish from 1744 to 1802—men who have been brought in daily contact with the wants and sorrows and anxieties of their fellow-men in a very practical way—men by no means destitute of kindness and generosity, far beyond the majority of poor-law officers to-day if deeds and annals go for anything.

Now, the chief interest of these old books is that they tell us how country people managed their local affairs long before Poor Laws and Parish Councils, etc., were ever dreamt of. They represent to us a state of things which, although only a little more than a century old, yet is as utterly distinct from our present notions of local government as that of Russia or some other foreign State. If the locomotion, medical science, and social customs of our ancestors fill us with amazement and amusement, so must also their modes of conducting their parish affairs. Vestry meetings in those days must have been lively times, very different from the dry, formal affairs they afterwards became; everybody was profoundly interested in the amount of the rate to be levied, and no doubt everyone closely criticised the way the last had been spent. The most

sacred privacies of domestic life sometimes appear in a quite unseemly publicity in these parish accounts, and I fear that the poor women often suffered much in those days when "bags," and Dorcas meetings and mothers' meetings were unknown.

As the Church vestry was too small for the parishioners to gather in, they met at some inn in the town, and possibly the landlord was none the worse off for their company, not that we dare to surmise that the constantly recurring item of "beer," "small beer," in the overseers' accounts had reference to these occasions; still the fact is significant, for while the expenditure is a constant one, it is not large, and there is not the slightest indication of who ordered it or who drank it. But no one seems to have objected to it. So as the charges vary from 6s. to 8s., perhaps it was a parochial custom to drink the health of the overseers—a reminiscence of the older "drynkyns" of which we read in the "Town Book" in Queen Elizabeth's days. I fear the C.E.T.S. would not have been a popular institution with the Church people of those times, for they seem to have been unable either to cart coal or stack wood without the addition of "beer." But perhaps there is a reason for this: the life of the agricultural labourer then was indeed a hard one. It was all he could do by the hardest toil to earn enough to keep body and soul together, and the home-brewed beer was very different to what they get now. But what was the wine like? For in 1782 we find: "Paid for wine for Rich^{d}. Boreham, 6½d."!

There is nothing sadder to read than the evidences of desperate poverty which these old ledgers contain; the smallest help was most welcome. The words "in need," "no work," occur with awful frequency; and we can imagine what wages were paid them when we see under date 1778: "Paid Boreman and Chapman 9 days digging clay, 11s. 3d."

This just proves what an old woman in this parish, aged ninety-four years, has often told me—how her father slaved till he literally broke his heart and died suddenly at sixty, and yet they never had bread enough to eat, though the mother and children did all they could to help. It was quite usual then for children to go and earn their living at seven or eight, tending sheep, scaring crows, etc. Yet trouble and sickness evoked a great deal of kindness. Month after month do we find the same people receiving parish aid, though the amount was very small, never more than 2s. to 2s. 6d. a week. Small-pox, that constant scourge, made a vast difference to the rates. In 1781 it was so bad that a house was taken for the sufferers—what we should now call a temporary hospital; and we note, "To Phillys Major's wife attending

sm.-pox, £1 4s. 0d." "To small-pox house things sent, £1 0s. 6d." "To Ann Flatfoot and Mr. White for ditto, £2 18s. 0d." While the other additional expenses came to over £50, not including the rent of the "small-pox house," which was £2 10s., for the half year; and the rate was raised from the usual 2s. or 2s. 6d. to 6s. for the next half year. This was evidently a year of plague, but at other times the disease was only in abeyance, for nearly every half year sees some allusion to it. In 1774: "Paid for John Brame and family in y^e^ small-pox (more than I rec^d^.) for cleaning and whiting the house, £1 6s. 10d." In 1788: "Jessup's family for small-pox, £13 15s. 0d." These and similar pregnant facts which appear in wearisome reiteration in the pages of Church registers and rate-books of the last century, I commend to the unbiassed contemplation of our friends the anti-vaccinationists!

But we will now turn to a very different aspect of country life—not the sanitary, but the moral side of rural character and custom. These pages bear sad and continuous witness to the very low moral tone then prevalent in these places. The notes of sums of money paid to the overseers for the maintenance of illegitimate children are considerable and frequent. Let us take the following extracts as specimens from many similar ones.

May 16, 1774: "We do hereby acknowledge to have hereby rec^d^ of (3 men) the sum of one Hundred and sixteen Pounds and sixteen shillings as and for a compensation for the maintenance of their several bastard children, which said sum we hereby promise to pay and Dispose of as the majority of the parishioners of the parish of the Watton shall direct and appoint."

September 1, 1774: There is £60 acknowledged for the same purpose, and to be applied in the same way. Now, the way the good people of Watton decided to spend this money is of exceptional interest. They resolved, at a duly summoned vestry meeting, to apply this money "towards the *Building a Workhouse*, and it is agreed to borrow a further sum so as to make it up £200, which sum so borrowed is to be paid by a surplus in the rate at £10 each half year with the interest, until the whole sum so borrowed shall be discharged; and it is further agreed that every person that have a team and every farmer that have a team and £30 a year shall do towards the building the said house a day's work in carriage with their said teams *gratis*, and those whose teams are greater to do a day's work for every £30; and it is further agreed to have plans drawn by the workmen in the parish for the inspection of the parishioners at a future meeting, when

other regulations are to be agreed upon." This historic resolution is signed by a goodly band of "civic fathers," and gives us a most delightful glimpse of the prudence and forethought and generosity and shrewdness of these worthy townsfolk.

It would be profitless to take my readers all through the ups and downs of this workhouse scheme. I do not think it worked smoothly—at any rate, it moved slowly. Perhaps it was not convenient to lend the teams when wanted, or local jealousies and spites interfered with harmonious working; possibly Farmer Giles thought it "one o' them new-fangled notions." What did they want a workhouse for, when their parents did without it? And Farmer Jones "didn't believe his rating was fair, and he wouldn't lend his team till he was righted." Well, anyhow things progressed with great deliberation, and if it was not that in 1781 the parish paid 16s. for sweeping the workhouse chimneys, and £1 3s. to two persons for taking care of the establishment for one month, I should doubt if it was built till later, for it is only in 1785 we find £48 paid to the builder "on account"; so evidently the proposal did not excite much enthusiasm. Yet here we have the germ of the Poor Law, the outline of the present Local Government theory.

But although the parish did its best to meet its just debts and keep pace with local requirements, it was tremendously careful not to pay one penny that was needless, or that could be rightly demanded elsewhere. A very considerable sum was expended every year in getting and serving warrants for the maintenance of paupers belonging to other parishes; carriage hire, refreshments, clerks and lawyer's fees were dispensed with no niggardly hand, if some other person or parish could be made to "pay the piper." In October, 1775, I find a parish meeting solemnly orders the removal of a certain "Thomas Bryant, his father and family;" but apparently it was easier said than done. No other parish seemed to welcome them, so on November 4 the two overseers were ordered to go to Dereham, and lay the order for removal before two J.P.'s, and consult "a counsel learned in the law." I only hope they got rid of this unfortunate family, for the legal expenses of going to Dereham, etc., came to £3 5s. 10d. Financial arrangements then were sometimes quite formidable affairs; quite large sums of money were left in the overseers' hands at 3 per cent., and the accounts are most carefully kept and inspected. The explanations and discussions each half-year must have been most exciting, and the Committees of Ways and Means were largely attended (judging by the number of signatures) and anxiously expected. There were

disputes about stone and lime and timber, and how they should be sold and the proceeds divided between the tenants and the parish, and very wisely were they generally settled "to avoid litigation." The vestry quite realized law was expensive, if they had to pay for it and would gain nothing.

But if law was dear, medicine was apparently cheap. The parish doctor had for very many years his stated fee of £5 5s. per annum, "midwifery and fractures excepted," and to this is added the privilege (whatever that might be) of "hadging the poor who take a collection." As this "hadging" constantly appears in these books, it must have been similar to being on the pay-lists of the relieving officer. If, however, the medical man was hardly treated by the vestry, he made up for it, as far as he could, by charging liberally for the "exceptions," and births and accidents made no inconsiderable addition to his official honorarium. Insanity also, which was then not treated with any too much consideration, gave the doctor a little help as well, for we find in 1778: "Paid Dr. Reymer for attending Mary Avis at Bedlam, £3 14s. 2d." But beyond these necessary disbursements, there are many delightful indications of kindness and thoughtfulness, far too numerous for mention, such as: "Sitting up at night, 6d.;" "Rug for Freeman's wife, 6 shillings;" "Removing and setting up bed for Freeman, 2d." (this overseer is very particular not to give one penny of his own); "Fire in long illness, £1 13s. 6d.;" "To a woman for a scolt head, 5 shillings;" "Relieved a man taken ill in town, 6d." Countless are the alleviations to suffering and need, but a very keen eye was kept on the doctor; for in 1771 "it is agreed never to pay any Doctor's Bill which is not brought in within the year," and half a guinea is evidently paid under protest; and in 1786 it was decided to pay the doctor monthly, and not give any yearly salary.

Endless other incidentals helped to add to the burdens of the ratepayers. Letters were a constant expense, varying from 2d. to 1s. 4d., the postage being fixed in a very arbitrary and meaningless way. Funerals and coffins were extraordinarily cheap. The making of garments and mending of shoes, though separately far too inexpensive (scarcely better than present-day "sweating," in fact), amounted in the aggregate to a goodly sum. Winding up the parish clock came to about £2 a year. "Making the Window Tax" cost 10s. each time. And what a horrible and insanitary regulation this atrocious window tax was! What an amount of illness this want of air and light must have cost! Then the parish stocks needed repairs; and we may be quite sure the guardians of public morality took very good care these

"danger signals" on the road to ruin were in excellent order, and strong enough to keep in durance vile the luckless miscreant. At this period of the nation's history sparrow clubs were probably not much known of, but sparrows were, and their destruction became a matter of general interest and expense. In 1782 the bill for killing sparrows came to £1 14s. 6d., and again in 1787 to £2 7s. What swarms of wretched birds this sum must represent!

But the good townsfolk were troubled not only with plagues in the form of birds, but also of beasts and insects. Moles made high festival on the common land, to the detriment thereof; so that half a guinea was adjudged a proper retaining fee for some individual who seems to have been a sort of parochial mole-catcher. Still, sparrows and moles are ordinary and commonplace forms of field vermin; but we are rather staggered when we find this entry in 1788, so clearly and sharply written as to defy mistake: "To killing 22 coombs 1½ bushels Locusts at 1s. per Bushel, £4 9s. 1½d." And again, in the same half-year: "To cash paid Mr. T. Younge for killing Locusts, 28 B. &c., £1 15s. 7¾d." Now, I have no idea what insect the Norfolk farmer dignifies by this Oriental title, but I am told that there is a gorgeous large-winged fly, something of a "first cousin once removed" to a dragon-fly, which rejoices in this appellation amongst East Anglian rustics. But it is evident its voracity is quite on a par with its beauty, or these careful old people would never have spent such sums on its destruction. This curious entry never occurs again, and White's "Selborne," which is contemporaneous, speaks of no special insect plague that year; so probably it was local.

There is one remarkable piece of parish property mentioned under date 1785, namely, some parochial shoes! It stands thus: "A pair of Boots for the use of the parish when the grasses are cut, 10s. 6d." The grass in churchyards is long and tangled, heavy with the dew, and of luxuriant growth, while the man employed to cut it is generally far advanced in years, and selected for his need, and inability to do a heavier job; so here we see a touch of kindly thought. The genial old rustic with his "rheumatiz" is not to suffer if the vestry can help it. Rid of his own leaky clodhoppers, and arrayed in the stout parish boots, he can fearlessly face all churchyard damps. To what extent speculation was rife in those days we dare scarcely surmise, but it is always present under some form; so we do not wonder to find these thrifty bodies very careful over the half-yearly accounts, and very particular always to make a note that the parish money or stock is left in the overseers' hands at "3 per cent." That

allowed them (the overseers themselves) to get a reasonable picking. Whatever they did with the money there is no evidence to show; but as there was a most extraordinary and lively trade in "flags," numbering sometimes 30,000 at a time, and there is a charge for "cleaning the Flag house" and "grinding the flag cutters," I imagine that the common afforded a sort of peat, and this furnished an article of commerce, and perhaps the money in the hands of the overseers was invested in this business for the general good. There is one very curious addition to this prudent arrangement under date "Aprill the 19th, 1776," which runs thus: "And the ballance of the money in hand for the maintenance of the Bastard children, being One Hundred and thirty seven pounds, eight shillings & one penny shall be equally rec^{d} by Mr. John Ward & Francis Hicks, and they shall allow at the rate of three p. cent. during the time of their executing their office." Illegitimacy seems to have been a rather profitable source of parish income in those days—not, however, to its credit. Before we pass from the financial aspect of the parish, it is of considerable interest to note what was considered a reasonable sum for the maintenance of a pauper, and what diet was thought sufficient to keep one alive. I think we shall agree that no one would trouble the workhouse for his board if he could manage anyhow else.

In October, 1796, an agreement was entered into with a certain William Jessup, by which he was to board the paupers in the workhouse, and be paid at so much a head by the parish. The price agreed upon was "Nine shillings per Head per calander month," or 2s. 3d. per week—just imagine, less than 4d. a day to board an able-bodied person! There must have been very limited rations, we fear, specially as a footnote is added expressing the willingness of Mr. Jessup to throw in the washing! No compulsory baths, etc., then, we opine, but the parish is to pay 5s. a month for "making and mending," whatever that may mean. When we ask with a very justifiable curiosity what Mr. Jessup was going to provide for this munificent sum of 4d. a day, we find it carefully laid down, so that there was no mistake. For breakfast on Sundays, "Bread, Cheese, and Beer"; on every other day of the week, "Broth"; for dinner on Sundays, "Beef and Pudding"; the same on Thursdays; on Tuesdays, "Dumplings"; on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, "Milk Broth" (whatever kind of muddled-up food and drink was this?); on Saturdays, "Bread and Cheese"; for supper, bread and cheese always. This must have made Saturday a most uninviting day for meals, nothing but broth and bread and cheese all day; perhaps this was intended to make the paupers look forward with all the

greater eagerness to the sumptuous fare of Sunday. Teetotalism was not recognised. In return for his handsome pay, Mr. Jessup had to provide beer in the following quantities: "The Days they have Meat ½ Pt. Beer each; 1 Pt. Daily each man when no meat." But then the paupers had to work for the caterer, and were almost his bondslaves: "no person to be permitted to leave the House without the leave of the officers, the said Wm. Jessup to be entitled to all the earnings of the Paupers." Very few lazy people in the workhouse we imagine, but a great many very hungry ones. Such was an English workhouse just a hundred years ago.

But we must conclude these meditations on the joys and sorrows of old-time ratepayers, taking only one more extract which shows how these secluded corners of the kingdom were affected by the storm and stress of outside politics. It is in 1794, when England was in the bitter throes of a great struggle with France, and the convulsed condition of the country had necessitated the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, that "the powers that be" evidently thought that the demonstration on Guy Fawkes Day might tend to dangerous disturbance, so precautions were duly taken, and the sum of £4 6s. 2d. is paid for the expenses of constables to prevent the letting off of fireworks on that day, "By order of the Chief Constables, Churchwardens, and Magistrates," while at the same time the making of Militia lists is a perpetual source of expense. Thus we see how matters large and small, important or trivial, came alike to have their influence on the fortunes and prosperity of the country ratepayer. We see shining on these old pages many a bright light of kindness and generous thoughtfulness, while at the same time they are often stained by some very questionable and mean transactions. As we con them over we can see the character of the man reflected in his work, and the character of the period moulded by the nature of the man. We can see the germs of our present Local Government theories working in the national and parochial life, and developing into more active energy and power. We get a very clear picture of how our forefathers thought, and worked, and schemed in these bygone days, and we can but feel that if we have gained much in perfected organization and improved legislation, we have also lost somewhat in simplicity and self-reliance and individuality.

W. B. Russell-Caley.

ART. III.—THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST.

PART III. (*continued*).

WE have been contemplating the grand *opus operatum*—the stupendous sacrifice of the Incarnate Son of God, which rent the veil of the Temple, which shook the power of him that hath the power of death, which broke every barrier down, which opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

And before we proceed we must yet again pause for a moment, and ask, Where is this—this grand *opus operatum*—in the view of those who, in the seventeenth century, denied that the shedding of Christ's blood, . . . or His "giving Himself up unto God therein, was His sacrifice, or any part of it, but only somewhat required previously thereunto"—and held that His offering of Himself "is nothing but His appearance in heaven, and the presentation of Himself before the throne of God"? (See Owen, Works, vol. xxiii., p. 301; edit. Goold; see also Vol. xix., p. 196).

And, alas! must we not ask also, Where is this stupendous *opus operatum*, in all the grandeur of its glory, in the full glory of its Divine perfection—where is it in the theology which would teach our faith to see in the sacrifices of masses an oblation of Christ for the quick and the dead? But, further, must we not also ask, Is there no danger of some beclouding of the glory of this grand *opus operatum* in the teachings of a new theology which, albeit so fundamentally different, speaks in utterances which have such a striking resemblance to the language of these Socinians?[1] We have

[1] Schlichtingius had said, "Licet enim non sanguinem suum Christus Deo obluterit sed se ipsum; tamen sine sanguinis effusione offerre se ipsum non potuit neque debuit"—to which Owen justly replied: "The distinction between Christ offering His Blood and offering Himself to God . . . is coined on purpose to pervert the truth. For neither did Christ offer His Blood unto God but in offering of Himself, nor did He offer Himself unto God but in and by the shedding and offering of His Blood. . . . That 'He could not offer Himself without the antecedent effusion of His Blood' seems a kind concession, but it hath the same design with the preceding distinction. But in the offering of Himself He was θυσία, 'a slain sacrifice,' which was in and by the effusion of His Blood; in the very shedding of it, it was offered unto God" (Works, vol. xxiii., p. 377. See also vol. xix., p. 196).

In saying this, it will be found, I believe, that Dr. Owen was bearing witness to a truth attested not only by the Scriptures of truth, but scarcely less distinctly by a consensus of Christian teaching through the Ages. But the shedding of the Blood is not to be too literally understood.

recently been taught, "As, then, the shedding of the blood is not itself the consummation, but is the preliminary condition necessary for the consummation of the symbolic sacrifice under the Levitical law; so when we turn to the essential realities, though Calvary be the indispensable preliminary, yet is it not Calvary taken apart, not Calvary quite so directly as the eternal self-presentation in heaven of the risen and ascended Lord, which is the true consummation of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ" (Moberly's "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 246; see also pp. 254, 255).

It is not, of course, suggested for a moment that Professor Moberly has any intention of supporting Socinian views; and I entirely disclaim all contention about the use of words. But the context seems to me to make it impossible to suppose that by "the true consummation of the Sacrifice" he means only what[1] I should call the *application* of the sacrifice, and therefore I am unwillingly constrained to regard his view —so far as it gives a true sacrificial character to our Lord's sacerdotal work in heaven—as derogating from the true perfection of the Sacrifice of Calvary; and, so far, making unhappy approaches to Socinian teaching.

On the notion that the acceptable sacrifice consists not in the death, but in the offering "of the life which has passed through death, and been consecrated by dying" (p. 245), I may refer to my "Doctrine of the Death of Christ" (pp. 70-72, also pp. 19, 20).

We may thankfully recognise what there is to value and admire in the learned Professor's work; and we may be fully in accord with his desire to give prominence to the present sacerdotal function of Christ in the heavens, and that in closest connection with the true view of His finished sacrifice, with its everlasting and everliving results, and of the inexhaustible fulness of grace and blessing which, *in consequence*, He has in store for us. But for this very purpose we need to be very jealous in guarding the doctrine of the perfect work of sacrificial propitiation *finished in the past*.

Just so far as there is an ascription of propitiatory and continuous *sacrificial*—as distinct from sacerdotal—function to the office of Christ in heaven, just so far there must be a

[1] In this sense Aquinas seems to use the term "consummation of sacrifice" (see "Our One Priest," pp. 36, 50, 99). And in a like applicatory sense Dr. Owen speaks of the anniversary sacrifice being "consummated in the Holy of Holies" (Works, vol. xxii., p. 538; edit. Goold: *cf.* vol. xxiii., pp. 231, 232).

deduction from the perfection of the propitiation and expiation (understood in their strict sense) accomplished once for all on the cross, and so far also an approximation to the error of the Socinian scheme of doctrine, with its lack of that which alone meets the need of a soul convinced of sin, and conscious —however feebly—of its 10,000 talents' debt.

Let us not seem to imply that the great redeeming work of Christ is either out of sight or ineffective in the teaching of the Professor. That, we may be sure, would be a grievous injustice indeed. But with every desire to find matter of agreement rather than of difference, we feel sadly constrained to ask some such questions as these:

Where in this new theology is the crown of blessing and honour and glory which belongs to the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world once for all offered on the cross?

Where is the miracle-working view of the Son of Man lifted up on the tree, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life? Is it presumptuous to say that it hardly seems to be where it ought to be?

Where is the Divine miracle of free justification for the ungodly, through the work of Him who died for our sins, and whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood? Is it too much to say that there seems to be some bedimming of the light of this adorable miracle of grace?

Where, oh where, in this new theology, is there room for the full reality of atoning blood?

Where for the "one" and the "once" of the perfect oblation and the finished expiation?

Where for the truth that He hath made reconciliation in the body of His flesh through death?

Where for the true conviction of the soul standing in the silence of its guilt before God, and the "no condemnation," which is the believing soul's starting-point on its heavenly course of victory and life?

Where for the sound of the truth as taught by our great English Divine: "Let it be counted folly, or phrensy, or fury, or whatsoever. It is our wisdom and our comfort; we care for no other knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the righteousness of God"? (Hooker, Sermons, ii., § 6. Works, vol. iii., pp. 490, 491; edit. Keble).

And where, oh where, in this New Theology, shall we find room for the saying of one greater than Hooker: "I deter-

mined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified"?

And where for the word of One greater than St. Paul, who was heard to say upon the cross "It is finished"?[1]

We may well be asked to ponder on the utterance of one who wrote plain words, words easy to be understood, to show the fallacy contained in the earlier form of this subtle error—an error which tends, I fear, to take out of the Gospel of Christ both the offence and the power of the Cross.

In answer to the Socinians, Dr. Owen says:

"(1) This appearance of Christ in heaven is nowhere called His oblation, His sacrifice, or His offering of Himself. . . .

"(2) It no way answers the atonement that was made by the blood of the sacrifices at the altar. . . .

"(3) The supposition of it utterly overthrows the true nature of a proper and real sacrifice. . . .

"(4) It overthrows the nature of the priesthood of Christ" (Works, vol. xxiii., p. 301; edit. Goold).

So also, as against the Socinians, Bishop Pearson wrote: "It is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price; neither is it more certain that He died than that He bought us. . . . And the price which He paid was His blood. . . . Now as it was the blood of Christ, so it was a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction" ("On Creed: Art. X.," pp. 546, 547; edit. 1840). See especially Deylingius, "Observ. Sacr.," par. iv., p. 559, and Bp. Bull, Apol. pro harm., sect. I., § 9; Works, vol. iv., p. 320; Oxford, 1846.

So again it was well said: "As the Apostle shows—verses 12, 13—after this sacrifice offered, He had no more to do but to enter into glory. So absurd is that imagination of the Socinians, that He offered His expiatory sacrifice in heaven, that He did not, He could not, enter into glory until He had completely offered His sacrifice, the memorial whereof He

---

[1] I extract the following from the interpretation of a Roman Catholic divine: "Consummatum est sacrificium, quo solo Deus placari potuit. Denique omnia jam parata sunt, finem habet peccatum, jam orietur justitia sempiterna: finem habet lex, succedet Evangelium: jam redemptus est homo, et Deo reconciliatus. . . . Nunc per hanc consummationem certi effecti sumus, hospitium nostrum esse cœlum, si modo per fidem Christo inciti fuerimus. Ceterum consummata omnia dicebat esse Christus eo modo, quo agnus dicitur occisus ab exordio mundi: non quod tunc manifeste occidebatur, sed quod occisio Christi semel facta, sparsa est antrorsum usque ad ipsum Adam, et retrorsum spargetur usque ad consummationem sæculi . . . sic summus sacerdos noster sacrificium vespertinum consummavit" (Johan. Ferus, "In Evang. Johan.," fo. 470; Antw., 1562). See also Witsius, "Miscell. Sacr.," Lib. ii., Diss ii., § xciii., p. 513; and Owen's Works, vol. xxiii., p. 240; edit. Goold.

carried into the holy place" (Owen on Heb. x., 10; Works, vol. xxiii., p. 481; edit. Goold).

There is abundant evidence from Christian antiquity to the oblation of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice not in heaven, but upon the Cross,[1] and to the rending thereby of the Old Testament veil for the bringing in the better hope by the which we draw nigh unto God.[2]

Shall we wonder then that, through the *opus operatum* of this stupendous redemption, this Divine sacrifice for sins should be the transition from the Old Covenant to the New, and therein from the priesthood of the old to the priesthood of the new?

And is it not fitting that we should see in this new priesthood the Mediator of the New Covenant which was established upon better promises—promises which exclude for ever all future oblation for sins—promises in which it was declared: "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more"?

---

[1] Of the rending of the veil, Dr. Owen writes: "An evidence this is that the Lord Christ offered His great expiatory sacrifice in His death here on earth, a true and real Sacrifice. . . . Until that Sacrifice was offered the way could not be opened into the Holies; which it was immediately after His death, and signified by the rending of the veil" (Works, vol. xxiii., p. 240; edit. Goold).

[2] The nearest approach in the writings of Christian antiquity to the new teaching will perhaps be found in Ambrose. It is a passage often quoted: "Umbra in lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur et vitutus, nunc Christus offertur: sed offertur quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem, et offert se quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat: hîc in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit" ("De Officiis Min.," Lib. I., cap. xlviii., § 248, Op., tom. ii., p. 63; edit. Ben.; Paris, 1690). Similar language will also be found in his comment on Ps. xxxviii. (tom. i., p. 854). But in both passages the idea first suggested of sacrificial offering in heaven seems reduced to the notion of advocacy in virtue of sacrifice offered: "Ipse quidem nobis apud Patrem advocatus assistit." (See "Albertinus de Eucharistia," pp. 497, 498, and Morton, "On Eucharist," Book VI., chap. ix., sect. ii., p. 479, second edition.)

Waterland says: "He [Ambrose] uses the word *offer* in a lax sense for commemorating, or presenting to Divine consideration" (Works, vol. v., p. 286. See "Doctrine of Sacerdotium," p. 49, and "Our One Priest," pp. 9, 92). On the language of Œcumenius and Theophylact, see Westcott "On Heb.," p. 124.

"Nemo autem adeo cæcutit aut lippit, ut non videat inter 'offerri' proprium, quod per mortem in cruce semel peractum fuit, et inter 'offerri' improprium, quod nunc fiat in cœlis, per illam quam diximus comparationem, sive in terris per preces, et representationem aut obtestationem et commemorationem peragitur, meram (vocis) homonymiam (in re vero magnam differentiam) intercedere."—Calixtus, as quoted in Cosin's "Notes," Second Series, Works, vol. v., p. 350, A. C. L. See "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 96, 97, and "Our One Priest," p. 9.

Nevertheless, the distinction between these two very different senses of "offerre" has not always been clearly seen, and seems sometimes to have led the way to much confusion of thought.

I am afraid that the view here given of the date of Christ's sacerdotium may seem to some, at first sight, novel and startling, and bristling with difficulties.

It is not novel;[1] it need not be alarming. Its difficulties, I

---

[1] See my "Doctrine of Sacerdotium," pp. 74, 75. One who himself rejects this view tells us that "it is an ancient opinion . . . that Christ began to act as priest when He offered Himself on the cross" (Briggs, "The Messiah of the Apostles," p. 264).

So Athanasius: Πότε δε ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν γέγονεν, ἢ ὅτε προσενέγκας ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸ σῶμα; (Orat. II., "Contra Arianos," § 7, Op., tom. i., Part I., p. 375; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777).

So Fulgentius Rusp.: "Idem homo Christus est, qui pro nobis, et Pontifex factus est, dum semetipsum passioni obtulit . . . huic dicitur: *Tu est Sacerdos in æternum, secundum ordinem Melchizedech*" ("Ad Trasimundum R.," Lib. III., cap. xxx., "In Heptas Presulum," p. 476).

It is true, indeed, that in the works of the Greek fathers language is found which seems to indicate a strange inconsistency. This inconsistency shows itself in the most striking form in the words of Chrysostom.

It is the inconsistency of dating the *sacerdotium* of Christ sometimes to His birth, sometimes to His cross.

But the obvious, and, as it seems to me, the *only* explanation of such language is to be found in the fact that they recognised the natural and necessary qualification for priesthood in the Incarnation, while they also recognised that the *sacerdotium* was first entered upon by Christ, and officially conferred upon Him, when He offered His sacrifice on the cross.

So the Jews had been taught to expect that their Messiah (the "glorious One") though not a priest of the order of Aaron, should have an inherent power and right to "draw near" and enter the presence of Jehovah (see Jer. xxx. 21, and Dean Payne Smith's note there in "Speaker's Com.")—that is, should possess in His own nature the true qualification for the high priestly office; and this, it should be observed, in an instruction closely connected with the consequent prophecy of the "New Covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah" (ch. xxxi. 31), and the promise, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (v. 34); and this again, connected with a word following which carries our thoughts to the high priest's mitre, "Holy unto the Lord" (v. 40; see "Speaker's Com." *in loc.*, and Owen's Works, vol. xx., p. 96).

Chrysostom says: Ἱερεὺς δὲ γέγονεν, ὅτε τὴν σάρκα ἀνέλαβεν, ὅτε τὴν θυσίαν προσήγαγεν (Chrys., "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. vii., Hom. XIII., Op., tom. xii., p. 130; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735).

Compare the following: "Sacerdos propter carnem assumptam, propter victimam, quam pro nobis offerret a nobis acceptam" (Augustin, "Enar. in Ps. cix.," § 17, Op., tom. iv., Par. II., c. 1240; edit. Ben.; Paris, 1680).

So Cyril of Alexandria would seem sometimes to date the *sacerdotium* of Christ to His Incarnation, doubtless as thereby being possessed of all qualifications needed for its exercise: Τότε γέγονεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἀρχιερεὺς ἐλεήμων, καὶ πρός γε τούτῳ πιστός ("In Ep. ad Heb. ii. 14, *sqq.*," Op., tom. vii., c. 968; edit. Migne). So again he speaks as conceiving that His priestly office (as well as His apostolate) was conferred in the name "Jesus": Ὠνόμασται τότε καὶ Ἰησοῦς, διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἀγγέλου φωνῆς· τότε κεχρημάτικε καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεύς (*Ibid.*, c. 969). And again he speaks of His priestly office as the result of His being made like unto us; he

believe, will be found to melt away before a careful and candid consideration of the subject in all its bearings. Mark the words, "He taketh away the first that He may establish the second" (Heb. ix. 10). When was "the first," the ceremonial

---

regards Him as ἐν τάξει ἀρχιερατικῇ, διά τοι τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁμοίωσιν (x. 14, c. 988).

Yet this does not hinder his using elsewhere other language—language which must, I think, be understood as the recognition of the truth that Christ's authoritative investment with the sacerdotal office is to be dated to the cross: Σαρκὶ παθὼν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τότε κεχρημάτικεν ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεὺς (iv. 14, c. 972). And again: Ὁ δὲ κρείττων ἁμαρτίας ὑπάρχων ὡς Θεὸς, προσκεκόμικεν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ γέγονεν ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεὺς (vii. 27, c. 976).

So also he dates to the cross the passing from the Old Covenant (in which Aaron's sons were priests) to the New Covenant (in which the priesthood is Christ's). He says: Διὰ τοῦτο κατέληξαν μὲν οἱ τύποι, καὶ πέπαυται τῆς ἀρχαίας Διαθήκης τὸ ἀνόνητον ἐν σκιαῖς· γέγονε δὲ ἀναγκαίως ἐπεισαγωγὴ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ, μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν τάξει γεγονότος ἀρχιερατικῇ, διὰ τοι τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁμοίωσιν. Προσκεκόμικε γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ (x. 14, c. 988). And again: Γέγονε γὰρ ἡμῖν Χριστὸς ἱλασμὸς ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου (ix. 12, c. 985).

The same inconsistency will be found reproduced in the writings of Euthymius Zigabenus, whose words are thus rendered in the "Bibliotbea Maxima": "Quando factus est misericors, et fidelis Pontifex, nonne tunc, cum per omnia fratribus similis evasit? Tunc autem fuit ejusmodi, cum *homo factus* est. Et misericors effectus est, cum se *pro nobis offerens* misertus est nostri" (tom. xix., pp. 68, 69). "Tunc et confessionis nostræ Pontifex factus est, *offerens* Deo et Patri fidei nostræ confessionem, et *corpus proprium* tanquam immaculatam hostiam, ut eâ nos expiaret" (p. 112).

Theodoret, indeed, assuming that Melchizedek offered the bread and wine as a sacrifice to God, supposes that our Lord's priesthood after the order of Melchizedec had for its starting-point the Last Supper, when He brake the bread and gave the cup as the shed blood of the New Covenant (see his "Interp. in Ps. cix.," Op., tom. i., p. 1396; edit. Schulze, 1769). This was, no doubt, an innovation, but one which almost of necessity attached itself to the early-developed notion of a sacrificial oblation of the elements in the Lord's Supper. And it was only natural that others should follow in the same track. Thus, *e.g.*, Isychius (or Hesychius) of Jerusalem did not hesitate to say: "Ipse enim propriam carnem immolavit, ipse sui sacrificii pontifex in Sion factus est, quando sanguinis novi testamenti dabat calicem" ("In Bibliotheca Max.," tom. xii., p. 122; in Lev., Lib. v., cap. xvi.).

So also Suidas, although he uses the words ἐξήγαγεν αὐτῷ of Melchizedek in bis meeting with Abraham.

On this view see especially Jackson, "On Creed," Book IX., chap. x., Works, vol. viii., p. 242; Oxford, 1844.

It is needless to do more than refer to the view of those who (because Melchizedek is described, *in a mystery*, as having neither beginning of years nor end of days, and because the Son of God—to whom he was made like—was begotten from everlasting of the Father) would date the *sacerdotium* of Christ from eternity. See, *e.g.*, Eusebius, "Demonstratio Evang.," Lib. V., cap. iii., p. 223; Paris, 1628; and Ephraem Syrus, "In Gen.," cap. xxi., Op., tom. ii., p. 68; Ven., 1756, who says: "Unum enim est et singulare Christi regnum, et sacerdotium, quod utique nec usquam cœpit, nec unquam finietur." This view needed, of course, to

law of sacrifices, taken away, abrogated, made an end of? When was "the second," the voluntary coming to do the will of God (as revealed in the roll of the book) for the sanctification (*i.e.*, the acceptance as among the holy things[1]) of His people established? Surely there is no room for question as to the answer. The first was taken away when the second was established. And the second was established through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all (ἐφάπαξ).[2] What is the date of that ἐφάπαξ? Surely it is the date of the τετέλεσται of Calvary.[3] And must not then the passing away of the priesthood of Aaron—the priesthood which is abolished

---

be corrected by the truth that the Divine nature alone did not qualify for the priesthood. The One Mediator between God and men is the *man* Christ Jesus.

See also "Athanasii Opera," tom. i., Par. I., p. 377, and tom. ii., p. 512: Patavii, 1777.

It is well said: "Secundum quod Dominus natus ex Patre est, gignenti coæternus et æqualis, non est Sacerdos" (Prosper. Aquit., "In Ps. cix.." Op., p. 373). See also "Com. in Ep. ad Heb.," cap. v. in Bedæ Op., tom. vi., c. 783.

[1] See "Death of Christ," pp. 65-67.

[2] In connection with Ps. xl. 6, 7, 8 (if not as a comment upon it) should be read John iv. 34, in which the force of ἵνα should be noted. It points beyond the *present* doing of the Father's will to a future τελείωσις—a *finishing* of His work. Westcott observes (p. 75): "The original word (τελειώσω) is remarkable. It expresses not merely 'finishing,' 'bringing to an end,' but 'bringing to the true end,' 'perfecting.' It is characteristic of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Cf.* John xvii. 4; xix. 28, 30, which will lead to the conclusion that this τελείωσις is "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all," and so explain the words, "by which will we are sanctified." *Cf.* also τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι, Luke xiii. 32. See also Owen, "On Heb. v. 9," Works, vol. xxi., p. 534; edit. Goold.

Compare Gal. i. 4: Τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν . . . κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

Compare also the following: "Ecce venio in mundum per Incarnationis mysterium, in capite enim libri Levitici scriptum est de me, ut faciam voluntatem tuam, id est, moriar pro salute generis humani" (Remigius Antiss., "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. x., in "Bibl. Max.," tom. viii., p. 1107). See especially Witsius, "De Œconom. Fed.," Lib. II., cap. v., pp. 169, 170.

[3] Ἡ δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος θυσία ἅπαξ γενομένη τετελείωκε τὸ πᾶν, καὶ πιστὴ γέγονε μένουσα διὰ παντός.—Athan., Orat. II., "Contra Arianos," § 9, Op., tom. i., Par. I., p. 377; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777.

Τῇ γὰρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος θυσίᾳ, καὶ τέλος ἐπέθηκε τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς νόμῳ, καὶ ἀρχὴν ἔωῆς ἡμῖν ἐκαίνισεν.—Athan., "De Incarn., § 10, Op., tom. i., Par. I., p. 45; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777.

So an ancient writer explains "τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας" τουτέστι διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ θυσιάσας ("Hom. in Occursum Dom.," § 6, in Athan., Op., tom. ii., p. 358; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777).

Ποῖον ἐστὶ τὸ πρῶτον; αἱ θυσίαι. Ποῖον τὸ δεύτερον; τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς, τουτέστιν, ἡ διὰ σταυροῦ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ θυσία. Ἐκβάλλονται οὖν ἐκεῖναι, ἵνα σταθῇ καὶ βεβαιωθῇ ἡ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ σφαγῆς, προσφορὰ ἣν ἠθέλησεν ὁ Πατήρ.—Theophylact., "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. x. 10, Comm.; edit. Linsell; London, 1636; pp. 975, 976.

—the priesthood which had to do with "sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offerings for sin"—be dated to the same point of time? And must not, then, the establishment of the New Priesthood, which has to do with the "one offering whereby are perfected for ever those who are sanctified," be dated also to the same moment?[1]

---

[1] To conceive of anything like a *twofold* priesthood of Christ (in the first of which He offered Himself, while to the second belongs the royal throne) seems somewhat arbitrary. And I fail to see any sufficient warrant for the notion in Holy Scripture. But that in offering His sacrifice on the cross our Lord was doing a work, the type of which was prominent in the Levitical priesthood, and absent from the history of Melchizedek; while in sitting on His throne above He was occupying a position which was typified in the priesthood of Melchizedek, and had no place (unless, perhaps, we see a faint shadow of it in 1 Sam. i. 9; iv. 13) in the Levitical types (see Delitzsch, "On Heb. vii. 25," vol. i., p. 374)—is a truth about which there need be no question. And Bishop Westcott's language (p. 227) has, perhaps, been misunderstood, as meaning much more than this (see Briggs, "The Messiah of the Apostles," p. 265).

The Epistle, however, certainly recognises that the offering on the cross of the Sacrifice of the Cross was a priestly function (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 11, 14; x. 11, 12). And quite as certainly it assigns to our Lord no priestly function and no priestly character after any other order than the order of Melchizedek. Moreover, while it is true that Melchizedek is nowhere called *high priest*, it is also true that our Lord's *high-priesthood* is set before us distinctly as after the order of Melchizedek (see Heb. v. 10; vi. 20).

If this is so, the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek must date from the Cross—*i.e.*, from the death of Christ, which abolished all other sacrifices for sin, and brought to an end the covenant in which they (and their *sacerdotium*) had place.

But it is not inconsistent with this to maintain (with Westcott, p. 228) that on His ascension "the Lord entered on the fulness of His work as High Priest-King." See Waterland's Works, vol. v., p. 166.

This is sufficient answer to the arguments of Roman Catholic divines, who would have our Lord's sacrifice on the cross to be a sacrifice as of the order of Aaron, and the Supper to be a sacrifice after the order of Melchizedek. Cornelius à Lapide says: "In cruce cruentum obtulit sacrificium, quod proinde potius fuit secundum ordinem Aaron, quam Melchizedek: ergo talis fuit in ultima cœna, cum scilicet Eucharistiam sub specie panis et vini instar Melchizedek Deo obtulit" ("In Gen.," cap. xiv., Com., tom. i., p. 165; Lugd., 1840).

The interpretation which lies at the base of this strange argument which makes Melchizedek *offer to* God, instead of *bring forth* for Abraham (and his followers) the bread and wine, is refuted not only by the language of the narrative, but by the testimony of Rabbi Salomon, Josephus, and (according to the testimony of Jerome) the Jews in general (see Tertullian, Op., p. 185; edit. Rigaltius, 1689, and note there). A very learned Roman Catholic divine wrote (as against the argument of Maldonatus): "De veteribus patribus respondeo fateri me veteres doctores fere omnes ad sacerdotium Melchizedeci locum transtulisse, Cyprianum, Arnobium, Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Augustinum, Cypriani simium, et reliquos pene omnes, non ubique tamen, sed et ante eos non sic exposuere Justinus adversus Tryphonem, Justinumque

Christ enters heaven to sit down on His high-priestly throne. Was He no priest before His session? He enters heaven "by His own blood." Nay, He is raised from the dead in virtue of His blood shed. All is in virtue of His accepted sacrifice. And was that accepted sacrifice never *offered* before He sat down? And if it was offered, was it not offered by Himself? And was He not then a Priest to offer?[1]

Christ, our High Priest, entered the Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption for us[2] (*αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος*). When was that *αἰωνία λύτρωσις* obtained? If the mere words of the Greek admit of a doubt, the context (as it seems to me) removes all doubt.[3] For, in the 15th verse, we are told that it was "by means of death"—that death being "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament" (*ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων*)—that we are to receive the promise of eternal inheritance. We are to look back, then (as it seems to me), to the death of Christ

---

sequutus et imitatus Tertullianus. . . . Porro veterum expositio me non in magnam trahit admirationem, quos (bona eorum venia dictum velim) ubicunque panis et vini in scripturis inveniebant mentionem, locum fere ad Eucharistiam detorsisse, et hujus illa typum fuisse *σὺν πολλῇ παῤῥησίᾳ* scripsisse manifestum est" (P. Picherellus, Opuscula, Append., "De Missa," p. 347; Lugd. Bat., 1629. See also p. 349).

Yet the old error is now strangely revived on the ground that "the young men" had "made their repast before their encounter with the Priest-King" (see Neale and Littledale "On Psalms," vol. iii., p. 451).

The truer view had its survival as late as the time of Charlemagne. See Waterland, "Dist. of Sac.," § xi., Works, vol. v., p. 274; Oxford, 1843. For the first two and a half centuries there seems to be no mention of Melchizedek's sacrificing. See Waterland, vol. v., p. 167.

[1] "Bleek himself cannot withhold the acknowledgment that our author assigns a high-priestly character to our Lord's own oblation of Himself upon the cross previous to His entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, but thinks that he regarded this as merely an inauguration into the dignity of the heavenly high-priesthood. Hofmann very justly contends that it was more than that—that it was an essential part of His High Priest's work, performed in the outer court—that is, in this world."—Delitzsch, "On Heb. v. 9, 10," vol. i., p. 255, E. T.

On this point see Owen's Works, vol. xix., p. 202, *sqq.*

"Had He not been a high priest before that entrance, He would have perished for it; for the law was that none should so enter but the high priest. And not only so, but He was not, on pain of death . . . to enter into it, but only after He had, as a priest, slain and offered the expiatory sacrifice."—Owen, Works, vol. xix., p. 204; edit. Goold.

[2] "*Αἰωνία λύτρωσις*, expiatio est, cujus valor æternus est, neque iterari debet. *Λύτρωσις* autem eamdem, quam *λύτρον, ἀντίλυτρον, ἀπολύτρωσις* vim habet. . . . Philo vocem *ἱλασμὸς* pro *λυτρώσει* habet, p. 437 B, ac respondit Hebraicum כפר, Exod. xxi. 30, et Job. xxxiii. 24, מצאתי כפר, quod est ipsum *λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος* in textu."—Carpzovius, "In S. Pauli Ep. ad Heb. ex Philone." p. 412; Helmstadii, 1750.

[3] *Τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα τῆς ἁπάντων ζωῆς ἀντάλλαγμα δοὺς, εὑρατο τῷ κόσμῳ ταύτην*

as the priestly function, in virtue of which He is called to His high-priestly session. But on this point I must venture to refer to what I have written in "The Doctrine of the Death of Christ" (pp. 61, 62).

We arrive at the same conclusion from the earlier teaching of the Epistle. The Captain of our Salvation was to be made perfect "through sufferings" (*ἔπρεπε . . . διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι*, ii. 10). "Being made perfect, He became the Author of Eternal Salvation" (*τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο . . . αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου*,[1] v. 9) to all them that obey Him. Is not this the immediate consequent of His sufferings? And now let the reader mark well what follows: "Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchizedek" (*προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάζιν Μελχισεδέκ*, v. 10). Is there no clear testimony here to the date which, in the writer's view, is the starting-point of the Divine *sacerdotium*—the priesthood of the Son of God?[2] "The word of the oath which was after the law appointeth [as high priest] a Son" (vii. 28), who needs no more to offer sacrifice (*τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας*, vii. 27), but is now (in virtue of His One completed offering) made perfect for ever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον*, vii. 28).

And I need hardly say that this teaching stands in closest connection with the inspired teaching concerning the New Covenant. "For this cause He is the Mediator of the New Covenant." That New Covenant, like other covenants, is made with sacrifice. It is *διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*. That New Covenant is the covenant of remission. Its word of promise

---

τὴν αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν.—Cyril Alex., "In Ep. Heb. ix. 12," Op., tom. vii., c. 984; edit. Migne.

Προσενήνοχε δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οὐχ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα· καὶ διὰ τούτου τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνελήλυθεν, οὐχ ὡς οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐφάπαξ αἰώνιον λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. λύτρον γὰρ ἡμῶν γενόμενος, τῆς τοῦ θανάτου δυναστείας ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσεν.—Theodoret, "Ep. Heb.," cap. ix., Op., tom. iii., p. 600; Halæ, 1771.

So Cajetan: "Quia caremus participio activo præteriti temporis dicimus *inveniens*; intellige tamen quum invenit æternam redemptionem per proprium sanguinem" ("Ep. Pauli," etc., fo. 199, b.; Paris, 1540). See "Death of Christ," p. 61.

[1] The phrase *αἴτιος σωτηρίας* is used by Philo of the brazen serpent ("De Agric.," § 22, i. 315) and of Noah in relation to his sons. . . . Comp. Isa. xlv. 17: *Ἰσραὴλ σώζεται ὑπὸ κυρίου σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον.* See Westcott, "On Heb. v. 9," p. 129.

[2] "Observa ordinem. Christus primo est *εἰσακουσθεὶς*, deinde *τελειωθεὶς*, tandem *προσαγορευθεὶς Ἀρχιερεὺς κατα τὴν τάξιν* Μελχισεδέκ. Ante enim, quam sacrificium pro nobis—*i.e.*, se ipsum, Patri offerret, preces validissimas præmisit, doloresque maximos perpessus est: postea ipsum obtulit sacrificium, et officia sacerdotis ac sponsoris implevit: denique illum Deus sacerdotem nominavit ad similitudinem Melchisedecianæ dignitatis."—Carpzovii, "Sacræ Exercitationes," p. 237; Helmstadii, 1701.

is, "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." But remission cannot be (it is so taught, *as a rule*, by the law) apart from blood-shedding.[1] *Χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις.*[2] Mark well the Saviour's solemn words, "My Blood of the New Covenant, shed for many for the remission of sins." And where there is remission, there is no more offering for sins. Can there be a doubt, then, as to the date of this New Covenant? Can there, then, be a question as to when the Mediatorship and the Priesthood commences which is the Mediatorship and the high priesthood of this New Covenant in Christ's Blood?[3] That Priesthood can hardly be recognised and established before the Covenant. But neither can the Covenant be established and recognised before the priesthood. If the covenant depends on the sacrifice, and the sacrifice demands a *sacerdotium*, it is impossible that the date of entering on the priesthood should be deferred to the day of the entrance into the heavens.[4]

The Covenant of the law holds while man lives. But the law kills, and by death its holding power is broken; and so, by the death of Christ for us, there is a passing quite out from the Old Covenant into the New.

Death—the death of Christ for us—is the gate of transition from one dispensation to another. It is the end of the Old Covenant; it is the starting-point of the New Covenant.

This is the natural and obvious meaning of what we are

---

[1] Keil, and some other expositors, understand this term of the "*sprinkling* of the blood." But this is an unnatural interpretation. And Matt. xxvi. 28, *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, is fatal to it (*cf.* Luke xxii. 20). It is therefore rightly rejected by Delitzsch, Kurtz (p. 104), and others, who take it as signifying "shedding of blood, or slaying of a victim." "This," says Cremer rightly, "is the only true meaning" (Lex., p. 71). See "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," p. 62.

[2] Bengel says: "*Sine effusione sanguinis non fit remissio*; hoc axioma totidem verbis extat in Tr. Talmudico Joma. vid. imprimis Lev. xvii. 2." See also Bishop Saumarez Smith, "Blood of the New Covenant," pp. 35, 36, and "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," pp. 62-65.

[3] *Οὐκοῦν ἀφῆκεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ὅτε τὴν διαθήκην ἔδωκεν· εἰ τοίνυν ἀφῆκεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μιᾶς θυσίας, οὐκέτι χρεία δευτέρας.*—Chrysostom, in Cramer's "Catena," tom. vii., p. 234; Oxford, 1844.

[4] Ipsum autem Novum Testamentum, non nisi Christi sanguine et morte conscriptum vel confirmatum est. . . . Nempe Dominus noster plane quidem erat antequam pateretur, magnus pontifiex unctus sancto Spiritu et virtute, ab ipso initio conceptionis suæ, sed sacras vestes sacerdotii sui non induit, priusquam sacrificium ipse fieret, id est immortalitatis gloria non se vestivit, priusquam per passionem mortis, membra corruptibilia deponeret" (Rupertus Tuitiensis, "In Joan.," Lib. VII., Op., tom. iii., c. 524; edit. Migne).

"Although He was designed for ever, yet He was consecrated on the cross; there He entered upon His priestly office" (Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Doctor Dubitantium," Book II., c. iii., § 10; Works, vol. ix., p. 538; edit. Eden).

taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews. See chap. vii. 21, 22, 27, with viii. 6, 12; ix. 15, 17; x. 9, 10, 16, 18, 29; xii. 24; xiii. 20. And note especially chap. ii. 14, 15.

If these passages might—one of them, or each of them viewed separately—admit of another interpretation, the impression produced by the view of their combined teaching ought hardly to be regarded as doubtful.

But if any doubt yet remained, this is surely a case in which doubt should be removed, when light from other teachings of Holy Scripture is made to shine upon the ceremonial teaching of the old sacrificial service.

The law could not die, but the law could and did condemn to death, and with death its dominion ended. We, through the law condemned to death, do our dying in Christ's death. Then we are dead to the law, and are as free in respect of the covenant of the law as a woman is free when her husband is dead (Rom. vii. 2). The bond of the law, according to the law, is broken by death.

Christ, who has died for us, is for us the end of the law. The handwriting which was against us by the law, is taken out of the way, nailed to Christ's cross.[1] We who by the law were enemies, are reconciled by the Body of His flesh, through death—peace being made by the Blood of His cross. It is *then*, when He has made an end of sin, and reconciliation for iniquity, bringing in everlasting righteousness—then is the time "to anoint the Most Holy" (Daniel ix. 24). Then He becomes the Anointed indeed—the very Holy of Holies, the High Priest of the true most Holy Place, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

And so we pass through death into a new life—the new life, in the new atmosphere of the New Covenant, the Covenant in which we have Christ for our Mediator, and know that we have remission of our sins, because we have Christ for our High Priest, who by His One offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.[2] N. DIMOCK.

(To be concluded in our next).

---

[1] Προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ. "The aorist expresses the historical fact. . . . The thought expressed is similar to that in Gal. iii. 13. As Meyer observes: 'Since by the death of Christ on the cross the law which condemned men lost its penal authority, inasmuch as Christ by His death endured for men the curse of the law, and became the end of the law—hence in the fact that Christ as a ἱλαστήριον was nailed to the cross, the law itself was nailed thereon, whereby it ceased to be ἐν μέσῳ'" (Professor Abbott, "On Col. ii. 14," p. 257). See also Bishop Lightfoot, "Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul," pp. 301, 302.

[2] Jewish tradition bore witness to this great transition. See Schoettgen, "Horæ Heb.," De Mess., Lib. VII., cap. i., § 9, 10, tom. ii., pp. 611, 612;

Art. IV.—POPE PIUS IV. AND THE ELIZABETHAN PRAYER-BOOK.

Part II.

PARPAGLIA remained in Flanders for four months on this special business, and the probability is that the secret proposals were communicated to the Queen by some messenger; for the means of communication were then abundant. There are good grounds for believing also that they were told by the Papal Legate in France, the Cardinal of Lorraine, to our ambassador, Sir N. Throgmorton. We should remember that Sheres in his letter from Venice had warned Cecil of Parpaglia's visit to France, *en route* to Brussels, and, from evidence which I shall presently produce, it is certain that either Parpaglia divulged the substance of his mission to the Cardinal, or that the latter was commissioned, after the failure of the former's embassy, and also after a similar failure of another envoy, Abbot Martinengo, in the following year, to renew the Papal offers through the English ambassador.

These offers, of course, were shrouded with all the secrecy of diplomatic communications, and there were besides strong political reasons in England for not making them public at the time. They were widely known, however, before the year 1573, as may be inferred from a pamphlet published in that year, written in answer to Sanders's "De Visibili Ecclesiæ Monarchia," by Dr. Bartholomew Clerke, afterwards Dean of the Arches.[1] What they were is thus described by Camden: "The report goeth that the Pope gave his faith that he would disannul the sentence against her mother's marriage as unjust, confirm the English Liturgy by his authority, and grant the use of the Sacrament to the English under both kinds, so as she would join herself to the Romish Church, and acknowledge the primacy of the Chair of Rome;

Dresden, 1742. "Vetus Testamentum abrogari debuisse, antiqua est Judæorum fides. . . . Præcipua pars cultus Levitici consistebat in Sacrificiis, hæc vero temporibus Messiæ abolenda fuerunt. . . . Cessantibus sacrificiis cessabant quoque sacerdotes."

Nevertheless, it was held that the Day of Atonement could never be abolished—"Dies expiationis nunquam cessat, quia is peccata, tum levia, tum gravia expiat."

The Old Covenant was expected to give way to a New Covenant—"Lege veteri abolita Messias Legem novam stabilivit." "Dicitur etiam Doctrina Nova." "Dicitur etiam Fœdus novum" (pp. 619, 620).

And in this New Covenant the Messiah was to exercise the "munus sacerdotale" (pp. 298, 643, *sqq.*), and to be Himself the Sacrifice (pp. 645, 646).

[1] An extract from this pamphlet is given by Sir Roger Twysden, "Historical Vindications," p. 200; *vide* Strype's "Parker."

yea, and that certain thousand crowns were promised to those that should procure the same."[1] Now, within the last few years an important despatch has come to light, of which the chroniclers of the seventeenth century were ignorant, and supplies an incontrovertible basis for the statements of prominent men in England from the days of Dr. Clerke, in 1573, to Dr. Hook, Dean of Chichester, in our own time. This document is to be found in the Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, under the date June 21, 1571, and numbered 1813. It is a despatch from Walsingham, the English ambassador in France, to Lord Burleigh, at the time of the projected marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Anjou. In it Walsingham gives an outline of a conversation between himself and the Queen-mother, Catharine de Medicis, in which he had endeavoured to remove existing scruples to the use of the English Liturgy by the Duke. The crucial passage is:

"I showed her that sudden change was not required (the same being referred to God, whose office it is to change hearts), but only the forbearing of his Mass, and to content himself with the form of our prayers, whereof I showed her I had delivered a copy unto Mons. de Foix, which form of prayers, madam, quoth I, the Pope, as I am informed, would have by councell confirmed as Catholic, so the Queen, my mistress, would have acknowledged the same as received from him."

In the margin on the left-hand side, opposite the last thirteen words, is the following note: "An offer made by ye C. of Loreyne as Sir N. Throgmorton shewed me."

The despatch itself is in the scrambling handwriting of one of Walsingham's secretaries; but the signature and marginal note are in Walsingham's characteristic handwriting. The Cardinal of Lorraine was, as I have already said, the Papal Legate in France, and consequently in communication with the Bishop of Viterbo, the Papal ambassador there. The probable visit also of Parpaglia to these Roman dignitaries to which I have referred, is something more than a coincidence in the face of this revelation. The date at which the offer was made is not mentioned. It may, or may not, have been made during a conversation "with a learned Papist of great reputation," referred to by Sir N. Throgmorton in his letter to Cecil, December 28, 1561, already quoted, in which the question of tolerating the English Liturgy was discussed. If this be so, it fits in well with Heylin's statement: "Before which time (May, 1560) the Queen had caused the English Liturgy to be translated into Latin. . . . All which, as she was thought to

[1] Camden's "Annals," p. 34; first published in Latin, 1625.

do, to satisfie and instruct all Foreign Princes in the form and fashion of our Devotions; so did she so far satisfie the Pope then being, that he showed himself willing to confirm it by his Papal power."[1]

Whatever the speculation be as to the date of this communication, the fact remains, upon the authority of Walsingham, stated in an official document enrolled amongst the public records of the Government, that an offer in the Pope's name to confirm the English Prayer-Book was definitely made to Throgmorton, the English ambassador at the French Court, by the Papal Legate in France, the Cardinal of Lorraine.[2]

Confronted with this evidence, it is impossible for any reasonable person to relegate to the realms of fiction the common belief entertained by the contemporaries of Queen Elizabeth; the solemn assertion of Lord Coke at Norwich Assizes in 1606;[3] the absolute statement of the devout Bishop Andrewes in his reply to Bellarmine in 1609;[4] the testimony of Dr. Abbott, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, in his answer to the defence of Garnet in 1613; the record of the antiquary Camden, in 1625; the undoubted convictions of later divines and chroniclers—Bishop Bull,[5] Archbishop Bramhall,[6] Sir Roger Twysden,[7] Sir Richard Baker,[8] Fuller,[9] Heylin,[10] Burnet,[11] Dr. Hook[12]—that the Pope did make, through Parpaglia, the same offer as we now know he did through the Cardinal of Lorraine.

On the other side, all the evidence in support of a negative answer to the question raised in this paper is given by Canon Estcourt in his work on Anglican Ordinations.[13] Evidence as such it is not, for it consists only of cross-examination of opposing witnesses, bare denials, and groundless suspicions. There is no reference to Walsingham's letter from France to Burleigh. Possibly Canon Estcourt may not have seen it, though it is evident he consulted the original documents of this period in the Record Office, and, in my opinion, he places himself under suspicion in asserting, without qualification or proof, the statement that the rumour of the offer was "invented and used by Cecil and Walsingham to persuade

---

[1] "Ecclesia Restaurata," London, 1670; "The History of Queen Elizabeth," p. 131.

[2] *Cf. Guardian* newspaper, May 31, 1893, p. 875.

[3] "The Lord Coke's Charge," London, 1607.

[4] Andrewe's "Tortura Torti," p. 165, edit. Anglo-Catholic Library.

[5] Works, vol. ii., pp. 204-208. [6] Works, vol. ii., p. 85.

[7] "Historical Vindications." [8] Baker's "Chronicles," edit. 1679, p. 343.

[9] "Church History," vol. iv., pp. 308, 309.

[10] "History of the Reform.," vol. ii., p. 333. [11] Vol. ii., p. 834.

[12] "Lives of the Archbishops," vol. iv., p. 221.

[13] "The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed," p. 354, pub. 1873.

and entrap the unwary and timorous Catholics."[1] Why were these two names alone coupled? Had he seen Walsingham's letter?

Hutton's "Anglican Ministry," published five years after the issue of the Calendar of State Papers containing Walsingham's correspondence, is equally silent about this important document. It is quite unnecessary to follow step by step the process of cross-examination adopted by Canon Estcourt. The weakness of his position is manifest in his opening sentences. He appears like a drowning man catching at straws. He opens with a comparison of the story of the Papal offer with that of the Nag's Head, and from an analogy, which he afterwards shows to be false, sends them both into the cloudland of fable. "If the Nag's Head story," he says, "was not heard of for upwards of forty years after the date of the alleged transaction, no more was that of the Pope's offer."[2] And yet a few pages further on he, in contradiction to Dr. Abbott's statement that no one on the Roman Catholic side had ventured, either privately or publicly, to mutter a word against the common assertion, cites as a witness Parsons the Jesuit, writing in the year 1580, and in so doing gives himself completely away. "Wherfore," says Parsons, "that which hath bene geven out (as is sayde by some great men), that the Pope, by his letters to her Majestie, did offer to confirme the service of England, uppon condition that the title of Supremacie might be restored him againe, is impossible to be soe: soe that, if anye such letters came to hir Majestie's handes, they must needes be fayned and false."[3] Here, then, Canon Estcourt's opening statement, that the Papal offer was not heard of for upwards of forty years after the alleged transaction, is refuted by his own witness, Parsons, who also adds the important testimony that the fact now under discussion was authorized "by some great men" before the year 1580.

But Canon Estcourt shall decide the case against himself by his own rules of evidence. In the introductory chapter of his book he lays down certain principles which were to govern and determine his judgment in admitting or rejecting proofs of facts. Foremost amongst these is the following: "Documents enrolled amongst the public records of the kingdom, or issuing from any Government office, or from any Government official in his official capacity, may be received without question as evidence of the matters recorded, and also of other matters incidentally referred to therein, provided the authority under which the document is issued, either from

[1] "Anglican Ordinations," p. 365. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 354. [3] *Ibid*, p. 363.

official station or otherwise, is entitled to credit upon the point referred to."[1] Walsingham's letter complies with this premise, and Canon Estcourt's case must end in a verdict against himself.

In illustration of the way in which Roman Catholic partisans seek to disparage the testimony of those who are opposed to them upon this point, Lord Coke's Charge at Norwich Assizes, August 4, 1606, is a good example. He is reported to have said "that Pius Quintus, whome those of their side do account to have been a good Pope (though by false persuasions too much misled) before the time of his excommunication against Queen Elizabeth denounced, sent his letter unto her Majesty, in which he did allow the Bible and book of Divine Service, as it is now used amongst us, to be authentic, and not repugnant to truth. But that therein was contained enough necessary to salvation (though there was not in it so much as might conveniently be), and that he would also allow it unto us without changing any part; so as her Majesty would acknowledge to receive it from him the Pope (and by his allowance), which her Majesty denying to do, she was then presently excommunicated. And this is the truth concerning Pope Pius Quintus, as I have faith to God and men, as I have oftentimes heard it avowed by the late Queen, her own words; and I have conferred with some Lordes that were of great reckoning in the state, who had seen and read the letter which the Pope sent to that effect, as have been by me specified. And this upon my credit, as I am an honest man, is most true."

The pamphlet containing this charge was printed by one Pricket without permission or knowledge of Coke. The latter, in the Address to the Reader prefixed to the seventh part of his Reports, protested against this publication, and said that "it was not only published without his knowledge, but (besides the omission of divers principal matters) that there was not even one short sentence expressed in that sort and sense as he delivered it." (Libellum quendam, nescio an rudem et inconcinnum magis . . . quem sane contestor non solum me omnino insciente fuisse divulgatum, sed (omissis etiam ipsis potiisimis) ne unam quidem sententiolam eo sensu et significatione, prout dicta erat, fuisse enarratam.) It would not be complimentary to Canon Estcourt to assume that he was ignorant of this protest, and yet, ignoring it, he says that Coke "has certainly shaken all credit out of his story, not only by his error in the name of the Pope, but also by asserting that the offer was made in a letter";[2] and he

[1] "Anglican Ordinations," p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 356.

straightway dismisses him from the witness-box as a questionable "honest man." And he does this, too, in defiance of his own rules of weighing evidence. "Evidence," he says, "is not to be rejected on account of mere verbal error or misnomer, where the identity of the person referred to is sufficiently made out, either from the context or from other sources."[1] *Quintus* for *Quartus*, and allusion to a letter in such an unauthorized pamphlet, afford no grounds, even according to his own showing, for discrediting such a witness. Chamberlain's copy of the Pope's brief must not be forgotten, and Coke may be right in speaking of some lords who had seen the letter.

Others, bolder, but less discreet than the Canon, assert that Coke repudiated the publication as a forgery. Coke did nothing of the kind. He admitted the Norwich Charge as a matter of fact. What he denounced was its unauthorized publication and unskilful composition, both as to substance and style. It would seem, from subsequent passages, that he alluded to the garbled character of his Charge on law questions, not on matters of fact, as related by him, for he adds that "Readers learned in the laws would find not only gross errors and absurdities on law, but palpable mistakings on the very words of art, and the whole context of that rude and ragged style wholly dissonant (the subject being legal) from a lawyer's dialect." The statement of fact, solemnly uttered, is not affected by the defective publication. So thought Sir Roger Twysden, who, though he was acquainted with the Preface to the Reports referred to, adduces *this very Charge* and *this very passage* of Coke in confirmation of the Pope's proposal.[2]

In conclusion, this question may be pertinently asked: How is it that no Roman Catholic contemporary with the asserted fact is to be found denying it? The matter was publicly known years before Parsons, in 1580, declared, without any authority except his own private opinion, that it was "impossible to be so," and suggested the alternative of a forgery. At the time of the occurrence he was only a boy of sixteen, living in an out-of-the-way village in Somersetshire. Thence he proceeded to Balliol College, Oxford, where, professing the reformed religion, he eventually became "chaplain-fellow" of his college. His life at Oxford, if we are to credit his contemporary collegians, Dr. G. Abbott, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and Camden the antiquary, was not very respectable. The latter says: "He was a violent, fierce-natured man, and of a rough behaviour.

---

[1] "Anglican Ordinations," p. 9.
[2] "Historical Vindications," pp. 199-202.

He was expelled from college for his loose carriage with disgrace, and went over to the Papists." Roman Catholic writers may even be quoted in corroboration of Camden.[1] And this is the man whose mere *ipse dixit* is to be taken to overthrow the testimony of such dignitaries as Walsingham, Coke, Bishops Andrewes and Abbott, men of public notoriety, and in a position to know the truth! There were certainly men living when Parsons published his "Discours" at Douai who had been intimate with Parpaglia. Not one of these is forthcoming to deny the Papal offer. The Cardinal of Lorraine could have done so before his death in 1574; but a greater man than he survived till December 1, 1580, who was the ablest and most prominent man in the counsels of Pope Pius IV. This was Cardinal Morone. It is asserted in a letter of Sheres to Cecil from Venice, to which I have already referred, that Pope Pius IV. referred the question of Parpaglia's mission to a committee of five Cardinals, consisting of Tournon, Carpe, Morone, Trent, and St. Clement, and the embassy followed from their recommendation.[2]

Cardinal Tournon died in 1562. Excepting the date of the death of Morone in 1580, I have not been able to obtain that of the remainder. But the evidence of the renowned Morone would have been invaluable. Why was he silent, when "some great men," as Parsons wrote, had given out the Papal offer as a fact? Again, the well-known Jesuit Dr. Bellarmine, who certainly may be credited with a knowledge of many of the Vatican secrets of his day, allowed Bishop Andrewes, in 1609, to tell him in his reply, "Tortura Torti," that the offer of Pope Pius was an absolute fact, without a word of contradiction. Here was the opportunity of an eminent man of position to declare the story a fable, and he refused to avail himself of it.

In 1727 Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, and twenty French Bishops, in Council assembled, censured the two works of the Abbé Courayer, writing in defence of the validity of English Orders; and they did this, not on the ground of the subject-matter of those books, but because of the author's statements as to doctrine, ritual, and Church authority. Now, Courayer had asserted the Papal offer to Queen Elizabeth as a fact beyond doubt, and based an argument upon it. In the extracts of the censure given in the Appendix to Estcourt's "Anglican Ordinations" no allusion whatever is made to Courayer's historical statement; but in

---

[1] *Vide* Soames's "Elizabethan Religion in England."
[2] Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, May 11, 1560, No. 74.

the "Pastoral Instruction" afterwards issued by Cardinal de Noailles there is a reference to it in the following terms:

"The author is not afraid to state, and, upon the testimony of Cambden and some other Protestants, without any authentic proof, does not hesitate to maintain, as a fact of which no one can scarcely doubt, that Pius IV. offered to Elizabeth to approve the Book of Common Prayers, and consequently the Liturgy and Ordinal attached to it, if she was willing to submit to the authority of the Roman See.

"That Protestant writers should hazard statements so injurious to the Roman See is not a matter of surprise; but that a Catholic theologian should adopt them is a thing one cannot see without astonishment and offence" (*scandale*).[1]

The Cardinal, it is to be observed, does not venture to deny the fact stated by Courayer, or even imitate Parsons in expressing an opinion of its impossibility. The position he takes up is one of surprise that a Catholic theologian should foul his own nest.

If Canon Estcourt can do no better than end his historical investigation and criticism on the subject-matter of this paper in such words as, "In the present case there still remains some mystery. Although it is clear that Parpaglia had no audience of the Queen and never set foot on English ground, and therefore could not have made any proposals, yet it is not proved for certain that the Queen received no intimation of what proposals he was instructed to make,"[2] surely there can be no hesitation on the part of any unprejudiced mind, after considering the probabilities of the case, reviewing the positive evidence in its favour, weighing the argument from the silence of partisans, to come to the conclusion that Pope Pius IV. did offer to confirm the Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth.

APPENDIX I.

Invitation to Queen Elizabeth to Send to the Council of Trent.

Throgmorton to the Council.

"December 31, 1560 (833).—Understands that the Pope minds to send shortly an Abbot, who is brother to Count Martinengo, into England, by the advice of the Emperor and King of Spain, to persuade the Queen to accord and send to the Council: and that the Emperor undertakes to persuade the Princes Protestant to send their legations to the said Council" (Calendar of State Papers, Foreign).

---

[1] Estcourt, "Anglican Ordinations," Appendix XXXI.—*Vide* Appendix IV.

[2] "Anglican Ordinations," p. 369.

Throgmorton to the Queen.

"July 13, 1561 (304).—Of late the Bishop of Viterbo, the Pope's ambassador in France, came very suddenly to Throgmorton's lodging, and said to him that his master had given him in charge to declare to him the cause why the Abbot of Martinengo was lately sent; because, he not being admitted, she might perchance be ignorant or misinformed thereof. His legation was only to intimate to her the publication of the Council at Trent, like as he had given notice to all Christian Princes; all of whom had accepted the said Council, and were pleased to send their clergy thither in September next. He said that the Emperor had desired to have the continuation of the former Council removed. . . . The Bishop said that he would ask the writer, by way of communication, and not by way of his instruction, what prejudice could grow more to the Queen than to the Princes of Almaine, by admitting the Nuncio to audience as they did?

'Throgmorton answered that, however the Bishop's instructions bound him to tell him of this matter, his own were to have nothing to do with him, or with anything that came from his master."

State Papers, etc., reign of Queen Elizabeth (left by Burgleigh, edited by Murdin).

In "Memoria Mortuorum," at the end of vol. ii., under date July 14, 1561, is the following entry:

"Bishop of Viterbi, Nuncio of the Pope in France, laboureth with Sir Nich. Throgmorton to persuade the Queen Majesty to accept the Counsell of Trent."

It is worthy of note that in this "Memoria" Burghley has omitted reference to Parpaglia's mission, in 1560, but he inserts Martinengo's in the following year.

APPENDIX II.

John Sheres to Cecil.

"May 11, 1560 (74).—His present letter will convey few advices of moment only, as in his previous ones, of certain consults concerning the reconciling of the Queen and England to the obedience of the Church of Rome. Sheres has seen divers letters from some English at Rome, and others at home, who will stick that way when they see that the time shall serve them, to the effect that the Pope is persuaded that England may yet be won to the obedience of that Church. And as the writer can gather, they have used for their instrument and truchement the Abbot of S. Salute, who was of the household of our late Cardinal Pole. On these persuasions and promises the Pope appointed Cardinals Tournon, Carpe, Morone, Trent, and St. Clement, who have concluded that they thought meet His Holiness should solicit in the matter and send the Abbot of S. Salute to England to travail with the Queen and her Council, but chiefly to confer with the favourers, for there depends the fetch, for the furtherance of the same according to his instructions. . . . He goes to France to consult with some there, then to Flanders" (Calendar of State Papers, Foreign).

APPENDIX III.

On November 30, 1562, a debate arose in the Council of Trent on the relations of the Papacy to the Episcopate. One party, headed by Gerson and Henry of Ghent, and supported by the Spanish Bishops generally, asserted that jurisdiction was received in each case directly from God, and was only dependent upon the Pope for its lawful exercise. The

other party, composed of Italian prelates, regarded it as coming immediately from the Pope. An Irish Dominican, O'Hart, Bishop of Achonry, taking the Ultramontane side, spoke thus: "In England the King calls himself Head of the English Church, and creates Bishops, who are consecrated by three Bishops, and they say that they are true Bishops, as being from God. But we deny this, because they have not been acknowledged by the Roman Pontiff; and we say rightly, and by this one argument, and no other, we convict them; for they themselves show that they have been called, elected, and consecrated, sent." This and other arguments received the approbation of the Council. (Nam et in Anglia rex vocat se caput ecclesiæ Anglicæ, et creat episcopos, qui consecrantur a tribus episcopis, aiuntque se veros episcopos, qui sunt a Deo; nos vero id negamus, quia non sunt a Pontifice Romano adsciti; et recte dicimus, hâcque tantum ratione illos convincimus, non aliâ: nam et ipsi ostendunt se fuisse vocatos, electos, et consecratos, missos. Le Plat, "Monum. Conc. Trid." *Vide* pp. 576-579.) *Cf.* Bishop Forbes's "Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 718.

It should be noted that this Irish Bishop, though speaking four years after the accession of Elizabeth, refers to the King. As there had been no King in England for many years, the probability is that he alludes to the sovereign power; possibly, also, he might have an objection to recognise the position of Elizabeth by calling her *Regina*.

APPENDIX IV.

"L'Auteur n'en est point effrayé, et sur le témoinage de Cambden, et de quelques autres Protestans, sans aucune preuve authentique, il n'hésite pas de soutenir, comme un fait dont on ne peut presque pas douter, que Pie IV. offrit à Elizabeth d'approuver le Livre des Communes Prières, et par conséquent la Liturgie et l'Ordinal qui en sont des suites, si elle vouloit se remettre sous l'obéissance du Saint Siège.

"Que des écrivains Protestans hazardent des faits si injurieux au Saint Siège, il n'y a pas lieu d'en être surpris; mais qu'un Théologien Catholique les adopte, c'est ce qu'on n'a pû voir sans étonnement et sans scandale" (Estcourt's "Anglican Ordinations," Appendix XXXI.).

D. MORRIS.

ART. V.—NONCONFORMISTS AND EPISCOPACY.

AT the Lambeth Conference of 1897 the Bishops reaffirmed the resolutions of 1888 on the subject of Home Reunion, and they added:

"It may be well for us to state why we are unable to concede more.

"We believe that we have been Providentially entrusted with our part of the Catholic and Apostolic inheritance bequeathed by our Lord, and that not only for ourselves, but for the millions who speak our language in every land—possibly for humanity at large. Nearly a century ago the Anglican Church might have seemed to many almost entirely insulated, an institution, in Lord Macaulay's language, 'almost as purely local as the Court of Common Pleas.' Yet

at that time an eminent Roman Catholic (Count Joseph de Maistre) declared his conviction that the English Church was endowed with a quality analogous to that possessed by chemical *intermedes* of combining irreconcilable substances.

"This quality of our Church we cannot forget and dare not annul. We feel we should not be justified in placing 'new barriers between ourselves and the ancient historical Churches.' Nor, in a different direction, do we believe in mere rhetorical calls to unity. Nor would we surrender in return for questionable benefits the very elements of the peculiar strength and attractiveness of our own system—its quiet adherence to truth, its abstinence from needless innovation, its backbone of historical continuity. We cannot barter away any part of our God-given trust, because we feel that such action would involve an amount of future loss and forfeiture which we cannot estimate at the moment.

"For these and other reasons we cannot concede any part of our essential principles."

They had something encouraging to say on each of the first three bases. As to the fourth, they wrote:

"The historic Episcopate not unnaturally raises graver difficulties. Yet, in America many of our Presbyterian brethren appear to have been not unwilling to remember that in England in 1660 their forefathers would have been prepared to accept Episcopacy with such recognition of the laity as now exists in the United States and in the Irish and in many of the colonial Churches. We naturally turn to the Established Church of Scotland, which approached us at the beginning of the present Conference with a greeting so gracious and so tender. That body has amongst its sons not a few who are deeply studying the question of the three Orders in their due and proper relation."

In speaking further of a probable development in the desire for reconciliation they said:

"In this renewed spirit of unity we trust that our beloved Church will have a large share. We speak as brothers to these Christian brothers who are separated from us. We can assure them that we fail not in love and respect for them. We acknowledge with a full heart the fruits of the Holy Ghost produced by their lives and labours. We remember the fact, so glorious for them, that in the evil days they kept up the standard at once of family virtue, and of the life hidden with Christ in God. We can never forget that lessons of holiness and love have been written upon undying pages by members of their communions, and that the lips of many of their teachers have been touched with heavenly fire. We desire to know them better—to join with them in works of

charity. We are more than willing to help to prevent needless collisions, or unwise duplication of labour. We know that many among them are praying, like many of ourselves, that the time may be near for the fulfilment of our Master's prayer that 'they all may be one.' Surely in the unseen world there is a pulsation of joy among the redeemed; some mysterious word has gone forth among them that Christ's army still on earth, long broken into fragments by bitter dissensions, is stirred by a Divine impulse to regain the loving brotherhood of the Church's youth. May we labour on in the deathless hope that, while in the past, unity without truth has been destructive, and truth without unity feeble, now in our day truth and unity combined may be strong enough to subdue the world to Christ; and the muse of the Church's history may no longer be hate, but love! May He grant us (in Bishop Jeremy Taylor's words) 'uniting principles, reconciled hearts, and an external communion in His own good season'!

"Time ripens, thought softens, love has a tender subtlety of interpretation. Controversy in the past has been too much the grave of Charity. We have much to confess and not a little to learn."

They did not minimize the difficulties:

"When we come to consider the practical steps which are to be taken towards reunion, we feel bound to express our conviction as to the magnitude and difficulty of the work which lies before us; a work which can only be accomplished by earnest, and, so far as possible, united, prayer to our Heavenly Father for the help of the Holy Spirit that we may be delivered from all hatred and prejudice, from everything that can hinder us from seeing His holy will, or prevent us from accomplishing His divine purpose."

In repeating the recommendation of Conferences with Dissenters, they added:

"We consider, however, that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves *originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession.*"

It cannot be said that much has been done in the direction so urged by the Lambeth Conferences of 1888 and 1897, at any rate by the authorities of the Church of England. The resolutions of 1888 were, I believe, considered by the Congregational Union. But as it appeared to them that the four

bases had to be accepted by them before any conference was possible at all, they naturally enough found themselves unable to get any further, and nothing came of the matter. If the advice of the Bishops could have been taken, and committees appointed on each side to discuss the bases, it would have been more hopeful. The Church, of course, knows well enough the importance and meaning of the fourth basis, but to the Dissenters it is new ground, and what we need is to understand their objections, and to give them our reasons. If you state your case in bald terms to somebody who disagrees from you, on a point on which you know he disagrees, and take no opportunity of setting forth your reasons, not only is no agreement possible, but not even any approach to an agreement. In discussing the bases, the Church could not, by the wildest imagination, be accused of treating any of them as open questions; she would simply be listening to the objections of the Dissenters, and considering how far those objections could be removed. And it must never be forgotten that the Bishops do not set before themselves the hope of effecting a complete reconciliation all at once; what they say is this: We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly *conference* with any of those who desire intercommunion with us *in a more or less perfect form.* We lay down conditions, not on which such a conference may take place—they do not say a word about that: conference is, of course, a purely preliminary stage—but on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion, and according to our conviction, possible. It is a thousand pities that this very important distinction was not before the Congregational Union.

But an important movement was begun by Dr. Lunn, a Methodist clergyman, in 1892, by holding holiday conferences at Grindelwald and Lucerne during five successive summers. They were at first a good deal sneered at, but many leading men, both among Churchmen and Dissenters, took part in them, and some declarations and speeches were made of considerable interest. For the Dissenters themselves the movement has had an important issue in the federation of the various bodies in a Free Church Council, and the issue of a common catechism which has the approval alike of Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists.

Mr. Price-Hughes, the President of the Methodist Conference for this year, made a declaration in favour of Episcopacy, and subsequently set on foot a movement for adopting the principle in Methodism. He did not carry his object, but he had a very large following. This is what he said at Grindelwald, speaking of ordination:

"There is a great difficulty here, because, as far as I know,

our Congregational and Baptist brethren do not believe in ordination in the sense in which Methodists and Presbyterians believe in it. The difficulty of these brethren was stated by Dr. Glover this afternoon. I am not in a position to say what they would do: but personally I feel that the presence of a Bishop would not interfere with the validity of my orders, and if it would be a comfort or conciliation to those more susceptible than ourselves, in the spirit in which the Apostle Paul made concessions which his own conscience did not need, I should regard it as one of those points on which, without sacrifice of principles, we might agree.

"I personally see no insuperable objection whatever to some such compromise as was suggested to us this morning; certainly there is no objection to the Litany, and I believe in the statement of Episcopacy as found in Bishop Lightfoot's famous essay. As far as I know, Episcopacy existed in the Christian Church at least from the time of the Apostle John, and I have not the least doubt, from a careful study of this particular question, that the Episcopal system is much more effectual for aggressive purposes than any other. The authority of some representative minister, duly and properly chosen, who has the right of initiative, is of immense advantage in carrying on a war into the enemy's country."

Similar language was used by Dr. Stevenson, an ex-President of the Methodist Conference:

"He did not claim to represent anybody but himself, but for himself he must say he strongly believed in the Episcopal system of Church government, and had done so for years. He believed it to be most in accordance with Christian usage from primitive times, and, on the whole, most in accord with the practical requirements of the present moment. At the present there were 25,000,000 in the Methodist Churches, and of those at least 20,000,000 were under Episcopal government. That was a fact well worth consideration. Without pledging himself to exact figures, he thought that of the total number of Methodists four-fifths accepted in one form or another the Episcopal form of government. In America the office existed in name as well as in fact; the bishops were elected for life, and were set apart for their office by a solemn form of consecration, although they were recognised as not differing from presbyters in order. There was considerable reason to believe that John Wesley desired a similar form of Church government in England. It might be confidently stated that he would have created such a system but for his strong desire to avoid any manifest separation from the Church of England."

Of course, in quoting this language I do not mean to express

approbation of the form of Methodist Episcopacy in America; I only mean to quote this as Methodist testimony to the principle of Episcopacy.

And again, in 1893, Mr. Price-Hughes said at Grindelwald:

"For his part, he entirely agreed with Père Hyacinthe and Professor Lias that the Episcopacy was a *sine qua non* of Reunion. If the Episcopacy was not necessary for the *esse* of the Church, it was for its *bene esse*, and he held that his Nonconformist brethren, if any progress was to be made, must make the concession. They had no right to expect that the ancient Episcopal Church should make all the concessions.

"But it might be said, 'What Episcopacy?' Père Hyacinthe said the historic Episcopacy. Personally, he did not know why people should shudder at the word 'historic.' He believed with Bishop Lightfoot that it had existed since the Apostle John; and if not, it certainly had existed as an almost exclusive form of Church government from the second to the sixteenth century, and if that was not an ancient and long-enduring institution, he did not know what was. There was a passage in Père Hyacinthe's speech to which he attached immense importance; Père Hyacinthe, when he referred to the historic Episcopate, suggested that they should accept it as a fact and not as a dogma. That removed the whole difficulty from the conscientious Protestant mind.

"In like manner absolute organic reunion would be impossible if it was demanded that all should accept the same view of the sacraments. They must carefully distinguish between faith and dogma, and he could not find a better definition of faith than Père Hyacinthe had given, namely, that faith is that which we find in the Bible, and especially that which we derive from the lips of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. All who honestly accept the divinity of our Lord accept the Nicene Creed when they really understand it. That creed was formulated *ex necessitate* because it was absolutely necessary to express truth for the purpose of refuting error. Arius, Nestorius, and others introduced heresies, and for the purpose of warding off such deadly delusions it was absolutely necessary to express the Christian faith in the Nicene Creed. But that was not the positive statement of faith; the positive statement was in the *ipsissima verba* of the Scripture itself. Here Mr. Hughes interpolated the belief that the Lambeth proposals were most generous, liberal, Christian, and that they had never yet received sufficient recognition from British Nonconformists, either in their ecclesiastical assemblies or at the Grindelwald Conference. He did not know what some of his brethren expected, but he knew that if the Anglican Church had been prepared to make

anything like those concessions in the time of Charles II. there would have been no dissent in England."

Again, in September, 1893, Mr. Price-Hughes said:

"I agree with some of our Anglican brethren, that the overtures of the Lambeth Conference have not been received as courteously and as heartily as they might and should have been. They were entitled, I think, to a more generous response. I think Mr. Berry was mistaken in his interpretation of the proposals as being intended to foreclose discussion, and I call attention to the fact that Dr. Mackennal, who speaks with unique authority on behalf of his denomination, responded at once to the statement of Mr. Vernon Smith by saying that if Mr. Smith could secure from the Archbishop of Canterbury, for instance, an authoritative declaration confirming his interpretation of the proposals, then there would be a very different response from the Congregationalists. The only difficulty in connection with the four propositions is what is called the historic Episcopate, whatever that may be. Personally, as I said last year, I am entirely in favour of Episcopacy, and should have no difficulty in accepting it. Of course, I mean Episcopacy of the kind described by Père Hyacinthe — scriptural, primitive, democratic, where the Bishops are elected by the people. The appointment of a Bishop, as a centre of visible unity, is quite compatible with a very simple creed, and with every variety of Presbyterian and Congregational organization within that comprehensive and elastic unity. I cannot resist the force of the argument of the Bishop of Worcester, that for fifteen centuries the whole Christian Church was Episcopalian, and I hold that we Nonconformists must make that concession. We have no right to expect that all the concessions must come from the other side. We can make these concessions without compromising any principle, either ecclesiastical or theological."

I do not again mean to say that a good deal was not said at Grindelwald and Lucerne with which we could not agree, but there was enough, certainly, to encourage us to follow out the advice of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, that *the constituted authorities of the various branches of our communion should themselves originate conferences with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession.*

I will quote, also, from an article in the *Guardian*, December 21, 1892, which points out some obvious tendencies. The writer regards the Grindelwald Conference as an expression of the "self-weariness" (!) of Dissenters. He says that "to some Churchmen the whole thing was painful, and may

well be forgotten, save and except as a somewhat dramatic setting forth of a quiet and almost unconscious drift of modern Dissent at home. Towards that drift all loyal Churchmen ought to give instant and earnest heed, for it may need the sympathetic and yet firm attention of the Church much sooner than some even of the leaders of the Church seem to think. The English Dissenters, with a few Presbyterians over the Border, are falling into line with Church worship and Church work in a most wonderful manner. This movement is almost entirely unconscious, and it is, therefore, so much the more remarkable. It is no sudden spasm or effort; it is the growth of years, and its evolution still continues. Could some of the Dissenters of the last century look in upon their children to-day, they would be more astounded than pleased. The old square chapel, with high pulpit, big galleries, and dwelling-house windows, with large family-pews downstairs, and the 'table-pew' for the singers, have all gone into the limbo of forgetfulness; and to-day the Gothic *church*, with high-pitched roof, stained-glass windows, arches, and columns, with no galleries, and with organ-chamber, choir-stalls, font, and, in some instances, altar-table, have taken their place. The old order has indeed changed, and the change has been a revolution, and is not yet ended.

"A smilar drift towards Church methods of worship has set in. Organs have ousted the 'table-pew choir.' No deacon now 'lines' out the hymn. Chanting has been introduced, with Introits, Anthems, Psalms, and Amens. The 'worship' has grown until it occupies nearly two-thirds of the morning service, and the sermon has declined in length, though not in culture, taste, or literary finish. But a much more serious drift is seen in regard to the sacraments in the modern Dissenting chapel. Up in Scotland some noted Presbyterians have begun to set the Eucharist in its rightful place in worship. Nearer home the Methodist Conference reaffirmed the solemn duty of Baptism as the one entrance into the Church. Congregationalists have not yet followed on that line, but the present dissatisfaction with the position of Baptism in their communion points to the beginning of a movement for which Dr. Dale's suppressed chapter upon Baptism, in the *Congregational Church Manual*, prepared the way. That chapter, if it had any meaning—and all that Dr. Dale writes is full of meaning—was, as the late Dr. Allon said, sacramental. The same is true of Dr. Dale's chapter in the same book upon the Eucharist. Strong language was used therein—too strong for that time, but most significant as to the trend of the deepest and most scholarly thought in the Congregational body. Dr. Dale wrote as only a man who

believes that the Eucharist is more than a 'memorial' could write. And what Dr. Dale thinks to-day his younger brethren, apt learners at his feet, will think to-morrow. It is not too much to say that amongst Dissenters worship is growing in reverence, devotion, and beauty, and in that worship the great Sacrament is slowly taking its rightful place.

"But, further, the drift into line with the Church is evident in other directions. On all hands the parochial system, peculiar in England to the Church, is winning the sympathy of Dissenters and stimulating them to practical imitation. At the Free Church Congress at Manchester this was clearly in evidence. The advocates of the parochial system may not just now quite realize what it means for Congregationalism; they will see that soon enough. But, in yet another direction we see how wonderfully the Dissenters are falling unconsciously into line with the Church. They think and speak of Episcopacy in a way enough to make their fathers shiver in their coffins. Episcopacy they admit was first, is primitive, and, in a modified sense, historic. Years ago the Bishop seemed like some monstrous mountain of difficulty for ever blocking the way of return to the Church. To-day, the Dissenting leaders are disposed to accept the Episcopate as primitive and Scriptural. The stone is indeed rolled out of the way. I will give one other illustration of the drift into Church lines. Writing about the Congress of the seven denominations at Manchester, a well-known Dissenting journal says: 'The great feature in the session . . . was the affirmation of the visible unity of the Church of Christ'! To some members of the Congress this was a surprise, but it came with dominant impressiveness. And so, deepening, broadening, yet drifting in one direction and one direction only, the tendency of Dissent is towards Church lines in worship, in work, in a better conception of the Church and the Sacraments, while the old prejudice against the 'parish' and the Bishop is dying a natural death."

I do not myself believe that anything like even formal intercommunion of a less perfect kind is within the possibilities of our generation. I believe that the traditional associations of Independents and Baptists are too deeply seated to render them willing to think of the adoption of an Episcopacy, however modified. Dr. Parker stated this very strongly in a paper in a Round Table Conference in the *Review of the Churches.*

But I would conclude by asking the Nonconformist leaders to remember that the Reformers, in the countries of Europe outside England where the Reformation prevailed, departed from Episcopacy with great reluctance.

The Augsburg Confession says: "We would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical government if the Bishops would only cease to exercise cruelty upon our churches." Melancthon wrote to Luther: "I know not with what face we can refuse Bishops if they will suffer us to have purity of doctrine." In another place he says: "Luther did always judge as I do." Calvin wrote: "Bishops have invented no other form of governing the Church but such as the Lord hath prescribed by His own Word." After describing the character of a truly Christian Bishop, he adds: "I should account those men deserving of every the severest anathema who do not submit themselves reverently and with all obedience to such a hierarchy." Bucer wrote: "We see by the constant practice of the Church, even from the time of the Apostles, how it hath pleased the Holy Ghost that among the ministers to whom the government of the Church is especially committed one individual should have the chief management of the churches and of the whole ministry, and should in that management take precedence of all his brethren. For which reason the title of Bishop is employed to designate a chief spiritual governor."

Beza always warmly commended the English Church polity. "If," said he, "there be any who altogether reject Episcopal jurisdiction (a thing I can hardly be persuaded of), God forbid that anyone in his senses should give way to the madness of such men!" I could quote similar opinions from the reformers of Poland, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and Scotland; from Grotius and from the Synod of Dort. In modern times the Methodists have adopted a kind of Episcopacy in America. They are discussing a similar proposal in England. I do not mean that these forms would approve themselves to full Episcopal National Churches; but they illustrate the fact, shown by the opinions which I have quoted, that the aversion of Nonconformists for the Episcopal form of government has been exaggerated. What drove them from Episcopacy was the cruelty and wickedness of the Catholic Bishops abroad and in Scotland at the time of the Reformation; the attitude they were compelled to adopt has become a time-honoured tradition.

I sincerely trust that discussions on this and other subjects will be initiated by the Bishops, in accordance with the urgent recommendations of the Lambeth Conference of 1897.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Review.

RECENT GIFFORD LECTURES.

Religion in Greek Literature.[1] By Rev. Professor LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D. Longmans. Price 15s.

Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics.[2] By the late W. WALLACE, M.A., LL.D. Edited by EDWARD CAIRD, Master of Balliol. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Price 14s.

BOTH these works are remarkable contributions to the science of religious thought; both of them have been written by men who, in their own provinces, are past-masters in the history of philosophy; both of them permanently enrich our knowledge, and illumine the general field of serious labour applied to unravelling the skein of human thinking.

Professor Campbell, after a long lifetime spent in elucidating Greek literature, notably in the department of philosophy, retired from the Chair of Greek at St. Andrews about four or five years ago. His editions of the "Theætetus" of Plato, and of the "Sophistes" and "Politicus" of the same great master of Greek thought, have achieved a wide notoriety among Platonic scholars; while his edition of the "Republic" (partly in conjunction with Jowett), published a few years ago, was welcomed as the first English edition of that dialogue. That fact is not, in itself, creditable to the enterprise of English scholarship; but Dr. Campbell's edition did a vast deal to wipe out the reproach. It is less as a minute literary critic that Dr. Campbell has achieved celebrity, than as a tracker-out of Thought's less obvious footprints, as a weaver-together of its ravelled strands, and as a fully-equipped expounder of Platonic dialectics.

Since his retirement, however, Dr. Campbell has not been content to rest "upon his oars," as the present interesting volume abundantly manifests. He has, we think, achieved a notable success in the discussion he has here given of Greek religious thought as displayed in the remnants of Greek literature still preserved. He has told us in his preface that, mindful of the fact that recent researches into the culture of prehistoric times have tended to obscure the abiding interest of the age of classical literature in Greece, he has (while careful to carry out the intention of the Gifford bequest) "sought to emphasize the element of religious feeling and reflection which pervades that literature, and is a possession which forms part of the inalienable heritage of mankind."

The book is somewhat prolix, it must be admitted, but this defect is inherent in a book composed of "lectures" previously delivered to an audience, upon whom important truths require to be impressed by constant repetition. And, after all, this "defect," from a purely literary point of view, has its compensations, too. The book, however, is seriously defective in one aspect; full as it is in the earlier chapters, we find a quite inadequate discussion of Greek religion in its later stages. We believe, indeed, that Dr. Campbell was fully justified in assigning larger space to Plato than to Aristotle; but can we justify so readily the exclusion of Plotinus (to name him alone)? Yet Plotinus is a name to conjure with; and his influence on modern philosophy, through Hegel, is greater perhaps than most people imagine. Personally, we could have spared one or two of the earlier chapters in this book, in order to make way for a less hurried and imperfect treatment of Neo-Platonism.

Yet, when all is said, Professor Campbell's work will recommend itself

[1] Gifford Lectures for 1894-95. [2] *Ibid.*

to every careful student of Greek literature, for whom the pages of the masters of Greek thought will become invested with fresh interest, under its writer's careful guidance.

Dr. Wallace's book we turn to with some misgivings. It is not easy to review a posthumous work in any circumstances; specially difficult is it when we know that its pages have never received their author's revision. There is, therefore, a lack of coherence and completeness about this book as a whole, which stands in contrast to other publications (*e.g.*, the Kant) of Wallace, issued during his lifetime. There is this, however, to remember: these lectures and fragments of lectures have not been printed till approved by Dr. Edward Caird, perhaps the most competent man in Europe to pass judgment on such work. Not only so, Dr. Caird has contributed an introductory notice both of Wallace as man and writer. It is not too much to say that no more luminous piece of writing has ever been published within the narrow limits of forty octavo pages. It is a most masterly review in every way—just, in fact, what one might expect from the Master of Balliol.

We have, perhaps, dwelt too much on the fragmentary nature of these "Essays"; nevertheless, after every allowance is made, we could ill spare them. They contain, too, no inadequate expression of Wallace's own view of the relation of philosophy to theology, despite the fact that he who would desire ampler discussion of the purely philosophical questions involved must seek for it within the pages of Wallace's Introductions to Hegel's "Logic" and the "Philosophy of Mind."

Dr. Caird insists—most justly—upon the admirable literary qualities of Wallace's best work. The native shrewdness of expression, the keenness of phrase, the felicity of diction, are all noticeable—as much perhaps in the "Logic" as anywhere. *Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit.* He had the unique power of making philosophic thoughts *stick*, and this by virtue of his decisiveness of expression quite as much as by the incisiveness of his thought. These qualities crop up in these lectures, in which there is often an undeniable "spontaneity and freshness."

The Gifford Lectures proper deal (as their title implies) with the relations of natural theology to ethics; they are twelve in number. Then follow nine discussions—"Essays in Moral Philosophy" they are called—chosen from unpublished papers, after which are reprinted four valuable critical essays. These, having seen the light in Wallace's lifetime, are presumably cast into the form in which he wished them to stand.

Had we space at our command, it would obviously be interesting to venture on certain criticisms in connection with Wallace's philosophical standpoint, which was, in the main, consistently idealistic, albeit at times there seems to be a tendency towards eclecticism both in an ethical and philosophical regard. It would be instructive to compare, for example, Wallace's chapter entitled "Greek Origins of Religion" with Dr. Campbell's earlier chapters where they deal with a like problem; so, too, to compare Wallace's critique upon Mr. A. J. Balfour's "Foundations of Belief" with a critique on that same much-discussed book in Dr. Fairbairn's recent work on "Catholicism." In which matter, *nobis judicibus*, the latter writer declares himself a safer logician and finer critic than even the late Professor of Moral Philosophy at Oxford.

But at least we have said enough, in reference to both these volumes of Gifford Lectures, to demonstrate our appreciation of their contents, and to call the attention of students to the innumerable points of interest they involve.

E. H. Blakeney.

Short Notices.

Laying Foundations; Brief Essays for the People. By the Rev. G. C. Williamson. London: J. Kensit.

THE author is an association Secretary of the C.M.S., and his little book is introduced by a preface from the pen of Canon McCormick. The essays are intended as simple and plain discussions on topics of ecclesiastical interest, and are especially designed for the middle classes. They should eminently fulfil the author's intention, and are splendidly robust and practical. Written from a strong Protestant standpoint, they yet convey the truth as the writer conceives it, in a friendly and conciliatory tone.

The Gospel of Common-sense. By Stephen Claye. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co.

There is no doubt that these little essays are written from the heart by a man of deep religious instinct. But, to quote his own words, he "ranks among those who no longer consider it an honour to be classed as a Christian." With whatever interest, therefore, his theories may be read, it is only natural that contradictions spring to the mind at almost every line. Neither do we think the author's case is always stated so temperately as to command attention. Is this fair to say of the great Jewish nation: "For dirt, selfishness, sensuality, prevarication, and the capacity for corruption, the Jew has few equals"? (p. 47). Mr. Claye would be welcomed on the staff of *La Patrie.*

Christ's Daily Orders. By Rev. A. E. Humphreys, M.A. London: The Church Newspaper Co.

These are brief meditations selected from each day's New Testament evening lesson, and intended for private devotions or family prayers.

Holy Communion, with Meditations and Prayers. By the Bishop of Hull. London: S.P.C.K.

Dr. Blunt follows the familiar plan of interspersing the different parts of the Communion Service with prayers and meditations. The little volume is certainly a worthy companion to the many excellent manuals that are now in use. We fancy, however, that it may prove rather diffuse and protracted for use in church. As a means of study at home it is quite praiseworthy.

Convalescence: A Book for Convalescents. By the Rev. S. C. Lowry. London: Skeffington and Sons.

This attractive little book is designed for the days of returning health. The author's experience in a well-known health resort has eminently qualified him for such an undertaking. Clear type, cheerful tone, and spiritual treatment, combine to make a charming and useful volume that we are sure will be welcomed by many.

Methods of Soul-Culture. By the Rev. J. A. Clapperton, M.A. London: Religious Tract Society.

A very searching and comprehensive help towards analysis of character, based chiefly upon the Socratic method of asking questions, and enriched by many apposite quotations and anecdotes. The author's own reflections are singularly lucid and helpful. The difficulty lies in getting thoughtless people to read such books; no one could peruse this one carefully and earnestly without being the better for it.

Here and Hereafter. By the Rev. G. W. BUTLER, M.A. London: S. W. Partridge and Co.

A solemn and deeply spiritual meditation upon the first part of the narrative of the Rich Man and Lazarus. To the mind of the writer heaven and hell are such realities that his earnestness and conviction infuse every word of his exposition.

The Son of Man. By the Rev. Prebendary HARRY JONES. London: S.P.C.K.

Sober and forceful teaching on some of the aspects of Christ's human character which are occasionally overlooked, *e.g.*, His thrift, homeliness, newness. Prebendary Harry Jones insists well upon the necessity for modern Christianity to conform to the character of the Master. "Endurance, not indulgence, is the leading note of Christianity" (p. 53).

The Month.

THE great event of the month has been the C.M.S. centenary celebration. There is hardly a paper of importance, religious or secular, that has not made reference to this event—which, it may without exaggeration be said, marks an epoch in Church History. The centenary proceedings began on Sunday, April 9, when special sermons were preached in a large number of London churches. Monday, the 10th, in the official programme described as "a day for prayer and thanksgiving," began with a service at St. Bride's, and closed with a remarkable service in St. Paul's Cathedral, where an immense congregation assembled to hear the Primate. The stewards at that service were supplied by the C.M.S. Younger Clergy Union. A considerable number of Bishops were present.

The meetings proper began on Tuesday, a day set apart for reviewing C.M.S. missions in general. The gathering at Exeter Hall was presided over by Lord Kinnaird, in the unavoidable absence (through illness) of the great Bishop of Durham, Dr. Westcott. The afternoon meeting, presided over by Dr. Eden, Bishop of Wakefield, was even more crowded than the morning one. At the evening meeting, when the lectures were illustrated by dissolving views, there was an immense gathering; the Bishop of Winchester took the chair.

"Centenary day" was actually celebrated on Wednesday, at 11 a.m., in Exeter Hall, with the President of the C.M.S., Sir John Kennaway, in the chair. Congratulatory letters and telegrams were read from (among others) Lord Salisbury, the Lord Chancellor, Prince Oscar of Sweden, and Lord Roberts of Kandahar. The Chairman was supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Northbrook, Sir Richard Temple, and several of the Bishops.

On April 12, vast numbers of people poured into Queen's Hall (open to the general public), and a huge concourse of men made their way to Exeter Hall, the overflow betaking themselves to Langham Place, where the venerable Bishop of Liverpool occupied the chair. Great enthusiasm was displayed everywhere; and it is with great satisfaction that we learn that Colonel Williams, M.P., Treasurer of the C.M.S., was able to announce, at the close of the meeting in Queen's Hall, that the centenary contributions had then amounted to £55,000.

Amid various troubles, political and religious, crises in the Church at home, ominous mutterings among the nations abroad, and much uneasiness as well as ill-feeling in too many directions, it is satisfactory to be able

to speak of the great work of world-evangelization which the Church Missionary Society has been, and is, carrying forward. Faithfulness to simple Christian principles has brought its divinely promised reward.

The following resolution was passed by the House of Commons (by 198 to 16) on Tuesday, April 11: "That this House deplores the spirit of lawlessness shown by certain members of the Church of England, and confidently hopes that the Ministers of the Crown will not recommend any clergyman for ecclesiastical preferment unless they are satisfied that he will loyally obey the Bishops and the Prayer-Book, and that he will obey the law as declared by the Courts which have jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical."

Sir Arthur Charles has accepted the offer by the Archbishop of Canterbury of the appointment to the Judgeship of the Court of Arches. The acceptance of the offer was confirmed on Saturday by an announcement of the Primate. The post carries with it the Judgeship of the Chancery Court of York Province, the offer of the latter position being made formally by the Archbishop of York upon the acceptance of the principal ecclesiastical appointment. The *Daily News* says: "Sir Arthur Charles is a learned lawyer, a Conservative in politics, and a High Churchman in religion."

Dr. Waller's successor at Highbury is to be the Rev. A. W. Greenup, Rector of Alburgh, Norfolk, who has a good University record, has published some theological work, and is very well spoken of.

The next full meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences will be held on May 16 and 17 at the National Society's house, Westminster. The subjects for discussion will include "The Archbishops' Bill," "Tithe Rating," and "A Joint Assembly of the Houses of Convocation and the Houses of Laymen." Names of newly-elected members should be sent at once to Mr. G. H. F. Nye, at the National Society's house, Westminster.

Church Army.

The Asylum for the Houseless Poor in Banner Street, St. Luke's, has, at the request of the Asylum committee, been taken over by the Church Army for an experimental period of six months. The asylum has been in existence for eighty years, and last year no fewer than 31,526 nights' lodgings and 71,000 rations of bread were supplied to houseless and destitute men and women.

The Church Army Council are anxious to undertake religious and educational work in connection with show people attending fairs, gipsies, and other van dwellers, and Sir John Gorst has written to the hon. chief secretary of the society (Rev. W. Carlile) expressing the warmest good wishes of the Education Department in the proposal. The obstacle in the way at present is the impossibility of obtaining an efficient and reliable motor van. The Council are hoping, however, that it may be found possible to devise some means for the education and religious instruction of van-dwellers and their children.

Appeals, Donations, and Bequests.

The committee of the Factory Girls' Country Holiday Fund—an excellent institution—in sending us their Annual Report for 1898, are making an urgent appeal for funds wherewith to continue their present work among the London factory girls. Cooped up as they are for nearly

the whole year within the four walls of gloomy factory buildings, these poor girls must revel in a breath of country air in a degree which we simply cannot understand.

> "They who can wander at will where the works of the Lord are revealed
> Little guess what joy's to be got from a cowslip out of the field."

In 1888, when this benevolent institution was started, only thirty-nine girls were sent away for a brief holiday; in 1898 the number had risen to 1,724. The annual meeting will be held on May 4, at 3.15 p.m., at the Charterhouse, E.C., when the Master of the Charterhouse will preside. The secretary to the committee of this fund is Miss Mary Canney, St. Peter's Rectory, Saffron Hill, E.C.

Archdeacon Sheringham, one of the joint treasurers of the restoration fund, appeals to the Churchmen of England for help to renew the decayed roof and sodden walls of the noble Abbey of Tewkesbury. Already £1,700 has been expended, but the sum of £1,200 is still required to preserve the finest church in England from impending disaster. There is no debt, but the church stands in a small and poor town, and outside help is necessary if the Abbey is to be rescued from decay. Donations should be sent to Archdeacon Sheringham, The College Green, Gloucester.

A meeting of the council of the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund was held in the Church House on Friday, at which the sum of £25,000 was distributed in block grants to the following affiliated dioceses for allocation and distribution: Canterbury, £400; York, £1,100; Winchester, £150; Bangor, £350; Bath and Wells, £1,300; Bristol, £500; Carlisle, £700; Chichester, £300; Exeter, £1,000; Gloucester, £700; Hereford, £1,000; Lichfield, £1,150; Lincoln, £1,650; Landaff, £900; Manchester, £250; Newcastle, £200; Norwich, £2,100; Oxford, £900; Peterborough, £1,200; Ripon, £700; Rochester, £850; St. Albans, £1,600; St. Asaph, £500; St. David's, £1,500; Salisbury, £1,050; Southwell, £900; Truro, £600; Wakefield, £450; Worcester, £900; Sodor and Man, £100.

The diocese of London sent £647 to the Central fund, but did not ask for a block grant.

The promises towards the £100,000 appealed for for the Leeds Church Extension Scheme amount to over £30,000. Messrs. Beckitt and Co., the bankers, have headed the list of subscriptions with £2,500 to extend over five years, a legacy of £2,000 comes from the will of the late Mr. E. G. Jepson, and £1,000 each has been given by the Lord Mayor of Leeds (Alderman Harding), the Kirkstall Forge Company, Messrs. Joshua Tetley and Sons, Mr. James E. Maude, Messrs. S. Lawson and Sons, Miss March, and Miss Carrie March. Lord Grimthorpe is subscribing £150 annually. Several sites for new churches have been secured, and it is proposed to add thirty to the number of parochial clergy in the city, the scheme extending over ten years.

The affairs of the people of Armenia are so truly deplorable, the scarcity of food is so great, that the Duke of Westminster is making an urgent appeal for £20,000—*for the purchase of seed-corn alone.* The record of the sufferings of these sorely-tried Armenians is appalling.

Literary Notes.

An important volume of essays on the History and Doctrine of the Church of England is expected to be published very shortly by Messrs. Blackwood. Contributions have been promised by Dean Farrar, Dr. Wace,

the Rev. Principal H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Canon Meyrick, Dr. C. H. H. Wright (Bampton lecturer for 1878), Rev. R. E. Bartlett (Bampton lecturer for 1888), Rev. H. J. Marston, Principal Drury, Chancellor P. V. Smith, Mr. M. Barlow, and Mr. E. H. Blakeney.

In view of present controversies the book will, no doubt, be sure to attract attention.

A new quarterly theological review will appear in October. Professors Ince, Sanday, Driver, Swete, Moberly, and Ryle are among the committee responsible for the journal.

LITERARY ANNOUNCEMENTS.

The following are a few selected titles of books from the Publishers' Spring Publishing Lists; a complete list (extending to twelve closely printed columns) was published in the *Academy* of March 11:

Macmillan: "France." By J. E. C. BODLEY. Cheap edition.
"Rubáiyát of Omar Kayyám." Fitzgerald's version. (*Golden Treasury* series.)
Methuen: "St. Paul, the Master Builder." By Rev. W. LOCK, D.D.
Longmans: "Life of Danton." By A. H. BEESLY, M.A.
"Myth, Ritual, Religion." By ANDREW LANG. Revised edition. (*Silver Library.*)
"England in the Age of Wycliffe." By G. M. TREVELYAN, B.A.
"The Reformation Settlement." By Canon MACCOLL.
Murray: "Asiatic Studies." By Sir A. LYALL. New and enlarged edition, in two vols.
Cassell: "The Life of W. E. Gladstone." Edited by Sir WEMYSS REID.
Fisher Unwin: "Modern Spain." By MARTIN A. S. HUME.
Cambridge Press: "Introduction to the Septuagint." By Rev. Professor SWETE, D.D.
"Herôndas—The Mimes." By W. HEADLAM, M.A.
"Sophocles—The Fragments." By Dr. JEBB.
Clarendon Press: "Eusebius—Preparatio Evangelica." Edited by Dr. GIFFORD.
"Introduction to Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V." By Dean F. PAGET.
Sonnenschein: "Short History of Free Thought." By J. M. ROBERTSON.
"Phenomenology of the Spirit." By G. W. F. HEGEL. Translated by J. B. Baillie.
T. and T. Clark: "A Dictionary of the Bible," vol. ii. Edited by Rev. J. HASTINGS, D.D. [We hope to notice this instalment of an important work fully, on its appearance.]
Duckworth: "Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy." By Sir F. POLLOCK.

SOME NEW BOOKS.

A History of British India. By Sir W. W. HUNTER. Vol. i.—introductory (to be completed in five vols.). Longmans. 18s.
History of the New World, called America. Book II., Aboriginal America (continued). By EDWARD J. PAYNE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 14s.
Palæography of Greek Papyri. By F. G. KENYON, M.A. Same publishers. 10s. 6d.
Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Vol. ix., St. Hilary of Poictiers, John of Damascus; vol. xiii., Gregory the Great. Parker and Co.
The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Rev. G. MILLIGAN. T. and T. Clark. Price 6s.