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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

VOL. XIV.

NEW SERIES

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1900

PREFACE.

THE possibilities before the English Church are at the present time so great that we are apt to be impatient of any influences, especially internal, which seem to hinder their realization. The tendencies which would take away the value of Holy Scripture, the obviously necessary basis of all Christianity, by discrediting its supernatural character and guidance; the tendencies which would depreciate the wonderful awakening of the sixteenth century, and annul the teaching which the Church has been receiving from that momentous epoch; the tendencies which would seize a more modern tradition, however excellent, and exalt it into a standard of faith and practice, instead of diligently consulting the earliest times and writers; the tendencies which would deny to Church institutions the principle of growth and adaptation which governs all forms of vigorous life; the tendencies which would confine the leaven of Christianity more or less to theological teaching and charitable work, and shut out its vitalizing forces from social movements and aspirations; all these are obstacles to the fuller and more healthy influence of the faith of Christ upon our times which distress and perplex our minds. But progress in all things, if it is to be sure, is necessarily slow; and the more these matters are discussed in a temperate and dispassionate spirit, the more certain we may be of truth prevailing in the end. It may not be in our own time, and our own contributions towards the result may be small; but if we exercise ourselves in the spirit of patience, forbearance, reasonableness, sincerity, candour, and freedom from prejudice and party spirit, if instead either of rashly meddling, or of folding our hands and waiting on Providence, we each do our duty firmly and fearlessly in all that sphere which is distinctly our own, we may be confident that we are, under God, performing our part in producing that happier state of things for which we are all looking.

The last year of the nineteenth century is now drawing to

a close. It has been a time of national sorrow and struggle, brightened by hope for peace and prosperity in the future. There are hopeful symptoms also for the English Church. The long patience of the Bishops with conscientious men whom a protracted period of unrestrained liberty of development in a direction contrary to English authority has at length landed in a difficult, if not an impossible position, seems to be meeting its reward in a greater spirit of compliance. The more militant members of the section which interprets Catholicism mainly by Romanism, are confronted with a serious protest from some of the ablest and most learned of their colleagues. The Bishop of London's powerful charge was received with respectful attention. The movement for direct lay representation in the councils of the Mother Church, adopted by so many of the Colonial Daughter Churches, has made some, if indefinite, progress. The political outlook for the Church, a relatively minor matter, is free from danger. The extreme poverty of the clergy is in the way of being to some extent mitigated by special funds. The great mass of the clergy themselves, especially in the towns, undisturbed by the thunderous clouds of party controversy, are devoting themselves to their duties, not only theological and ecclesiastical, but also in the educational, moral, and social spheres, with a zeal and self-sacrifice that is beyond all praise. The country itself has shown a spirit of unanimity, generosity, and sympathy for the admirable qualities of her soldiers which has largely tended to quell for the time ecclesiastical strife.

Under these circumstances, the conductors of such a review as the CHURCHMAN, devoted as it is to the dispassionate and accurate discussion of questions theological, religious, moral, social and literary in the light of Catholic Christianity as given by Holy Scripture, the Primitive Church, and the Reformation, venture to believe that their labours and aims have not been useless in the past, and that there is increasing scope for them in the future. They invite the co-operation of all who are interested in these momentous matters from the same point of view. They ask their friends and supporters to make the scheme of the Review more widely known. And they ask also their prayers that the blessing and guidance of the Almighty may guide and prosper all their efforts for the understanding and reception of His Kingdom among men.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1899.

ART. I.—ON THE RESUMPTION OF DIOCESAN SYNODS.

AS every so-called "crisis in the Church" matures and develops, one is repeatedly impressed with the impotency of the great bulk of the clergy to make their influence felt, or even their voice heard. The exactly opposite conditions prevailing in the Scottish National Establishment prevent any "crisis" from being either reached or declared there. Its organization, given a presbyterian basis, is unimpeachably perfect for its purpose. That is what makes that body practically unassailable by the civil power. No legislation touching the externals of its worship, the punishment of its "criminous clerks," or the constitution of its courts, is ever even mooted in the British Parliament. Aggressions which would lash the calm and serious population into frenzy if attempted there, may be deliberately perpetrated any Session in England, and regarded as a matter of course.

Why, then, is that great body of our clergy which is ever in closest touch with the popular masses, and is so largely credited individually with parochial powers, collectively so impotent that you may search history in vain for a parallel? The Lower House of each Convocation is supposed to embody their *placita;* but each is formulated on a basis derived from property in benefices, and derived from a time when the clergy voted separately their own taxes. Thus each remains antiquated. In the York Province some reforms under Archbishop Longley modified this, but insufficiently for modern requirements. But even given the large measure of reform which would make these bodies effectively representative, such reform would be inefficient without a vigorous machinery to mature, formulate, and maintain at an adequate

pressure an adequate volume of clerical opinion behind the reformed Convocations. These latter cannot represent more than exists, viz., clerical opinion in the nebulous, inert, and unconcentrated state merely. And until Bishops and clergy resume their oldest collective function, that of meeting to deliberate on all Church questions in their Diocesan Synods, in that it will remain. The analogue of this, which we have *not*, is exactly what the Scotch have in their so-called Provincial Synods. It is the (with us) missing link of vitalizing connection which should ensure the due circulation of opinion until it gathers head. Thus the English organization stands a perfect model of "how not to do it." For what have we? A series of ruri-decanal Chapters, each a small arc, as it were, or segment, of a wheel; but all detached, all in perfect severance each from other. Far in the distance lies, remote and again unconnected with these, the central body, the Convocation itself. Of course, the clergy proctors—suppose two for the archdeaconry—will have seats in some two out of the dozen or the score or more of these segmentary Chapters which the archdeaconry contains. But there is no collective body in which the clergy proctors of the diocese meet either each other or their representatives. The body in which they *should* meet is the Diocesan Synod, in which every priest and deacon, too, of the diocese has his place and voice. There they would keep touch of each other all round; and all, through the proctors, with the Lower House of Convocation; and through their Bishop with the Upper House. The Synod would supply that sustained connection, for lack of which our spiritual organization is exactly what a wheel would be without the spokes. The primary ruri-decanal fragments never coalesce. Their wisdom or unwisdom begins and ends for each in itself. It contributes nothing to the deliberations of the ultimate body. Each spends itself like a desert rivulet trickling away and lost in the sands, and never becoming an affluent to reinforce the great stream of opinion; while the consciousness of this inconsequential result reacts on the primary fragment, and also on the ultimate body. The former feel that whatever they think, say, or vote, has no determinative influence. The latter feels itself "up in the air," bereft of the solid backing which alone could give weight to its resolutions; and its own *gravamina* and *reformanda* are barely more than academic echoes. And this will surely remain, in spite of all other reforms of old machinery or tinkering of it by new, so long as this *gravamen gravaminum*, the suppression, viz., of the *vox cleri* in its oldest organ of expression, remains unredressed.

I say "its oldest," because the diocese is ever the initial unit of the whole Church. Out of it by division and sub-

division springs the parish, and by coalition the province and the exarchate. The primary idea of an organized spiritualty lies in the Bishop and clergy. The Bishop in Synod is thus the maximum of authority competent to it. When the lay voice has due weight in the selection and institution of each of these, then they become its organized representatives. The lay voice has wholly lost that due weight. It is confiscated and usurped by the intrusion of the Crown above and of patrons below. To recover that due weight, and restore a system in which the laity were consciously represented by Bishop and clergy, would require a revolution upheaving and displacing the usage of some twelve centuries. But this by the way only. The voice of the Bishop and clergy, the Church's oldest organ, remains, save in some two or three dioceses of each province, under the gag, by a mutual consent of Bishop and clergy to shirk their oldest duty. The resumption of this is the one Church reform which is absolutely within the competency of those whose functions it concerns. It would pave the way to, and keep an open door for, all others. No consent of Crown, Parliament, or Privy Council, is needed to effect it. Whereas there is not an item in the programme of the Church Reform League which is not liable to be thwarted by one or more of these embodiments of the secular state. That, I suppose, is the reason why that League and its leaders give this initial point of all Church reform a back place. Surely common-sense would suggest, "Do *first* what you can do for yourselves. See how far the inherent powers, *which you neglect*, will carry you; and then, and not before, you will have earned a title to be heard in your appeal for help from without." Instead of this, the *pièce de résistance* of the reformists is to formulate some co-operative organization of the laity. That may well come in its own place and time, when the clergy have recognized and resumed their own duties *first*. What the clergy who support the League are now doing is really to shirk their own oldest function, and to seek to devolve on the laity that duty, or a part of it, which is really theirs—that, viz., of forming a deliberative organ for the benefit of the whole Church. They are, from the worldly standpoint, "putting in the shot before the powder," a blunder sure to entail grievous consequences; from the spiritual, they are evading the primary function of that "office and work of a priest in the Church of God" to which they stand solemnly pledged, and to which they professed to have been called by the Holy Ghost.

Place the office of Bishop above presbyter as high as you will, you cannot place it higher than that of Apostle above presbyter; and we see from Acts xv. and xvi. 4 that the

relations of these last were based upon joint deliberation, and were embodied in a decree running in their joint names, and claiming the guidance of the Holy Ghost. What the Bishops practically now claim is the monarchical episcopate of the Middle Ages, excluding the clergy of the other orders from their share and voice in diocesan administration. That monarchical episcopate is the outcome of all the absolutisms which have darkened history—the Cæsarism of ancient Rome and the Papacy of mediæval, the Byzantinism of the East, the Norman tyranny and the Tudor prerogative among ourselves. All these have contributed to stilting up our Anglican Bishops into that "prelacy" which provoked the earliest reaction of the Puritans and issued in the Presbyterian secession. If that first wave of the deluge of separatists had been stayed, who can tell how much of the torrent which succeeded might have been spared? The fact was that our Reformation took over the three orders of ministry as it found them, and did nothing to readjust their relations *inter se*. The difficulties of the Elizabethan situation were enormous; but the result shows that an opportunity was missed. The Bishops *would* not convoke their Synods and throw themselves upon the support of their clergy. If they had done so, the turbulent minority would have given, no doubt, some trouble at the moment; but the freedom of open debate in every diocese would soon have shown their insignificance, and the weight of reason and moderation would have been on the side of order and authority. As it was, the Bishops preferred a policy of *sic volo sic jubeo*, became themselves the puppets of prerogative, and administered the Church through the Court of High Commission. Thence followed by consequence the overthrow of Crown and Altar together. Then the Restoration and the dregs of the Stuart dynasty led on to the Revolution of 1689; and in less than a generation from this latter date the Convocations ceased to sit for nearly a century and a half! It is doubtful whether it would have been possible to thus suppress the spiritualty, if Diocesan Synods had formed a norm of Church administration everywhere. To that suppression is mainly to be ascribed the last grand schism of the Wesleyans. But I suggest that that suppression itself was a corollary of the disuse of the Diocesan Synod; and that, if the revival of Convocational sessions had been followed at once, as it should have been, by the resumption of those Synods, we should have been spared the worst entanglements of the last half-century, and have seen the Convocations themselves reformed long ago.

Can anyone imagine Timothy or Titus discharging the duties entrusted to them by St. Paul, by holding a "Visitation" of the clergy of Asia or Crete, in which each of them

a solitary spokesman, addressed a silent assembly of presbyters —a chorus, as it were, of *personæ mutæ?* Will anyone produce a single instance which seems to favour the idea of a Bishop-choregus of silence?—the attitude best described by the words, from the "Rejected Addresses,"

> "I am a blessed Glendoveer;
> 'Tis mine to speak, and yours to hear."

Look through the Apostolic, sub-Apostolic, post-Apostolic, and later ages, until we reach the dislocation of all institutions which followed the break-up of the Western Empire; the attestation is everywhere the same. Our monarchical episcopate dates from this latter period of convulsion and confusion. At such periods only the stronger elements survive. The weaker ones are absorbed into them, or else perish and drift away in wreckage. That period yielded the prototype of the "blessed Glendoveer" in lawn sleeves, as we know him. He prevails to this day, in spite of all the evidence of the New Testament being dead against him; and that in a Church which yet professes before all things to ground itself on the teaching and examples of the New Testament and the purest ages. I beg to repeat on this behalf the challenge[1] of Bishop Jewel to the Romanists, the terms of which are too well known for me to need to repeat them here. Take the well-known declaration of St. Cyprian, that he had made it his rule "to do nothing *sine consilio vestro* [sc., *presbyterorum*] *et sine consensu plebis.*" I have seen the words quoted again and again recently in favour of some formulation of the lay voice in Church Councils, but never once as proving the status of the presbyterate, as forming the standing council of the Bishop. Take, again, what is a virtual echo of Cyprian's words, from the Fourth Council of Carthage: "*Irrita erit sententia episcopi nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur*" (Can. xxii.). Or go back to St. Paul's words to Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 13): "They that have served a good diaconate win for themselves a higher grade [*i.e.*, the presbyterate] and great boldness [παῤῥησίαν] in the faith," etc. I draw attention to the Greek word: it means "freedom of speech." If accorded on matters of "the faith," how is it possible to exclude it from matters of discipline and ritual? Yet our Bishops *act as if* they believed that it rests, by some Divine right, solely with them to decide whether the clergy are to be consulted at all, and if so, when. They cannot really believe this. The men who reject the Papacy as an unjustifiable absolutism cannot, I say, really believe that a secondary

[1] The proofs on which I rest will be found given in a pamphlet, "Excommunication of the Clergy," etc., published by Messrs. Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1883.

absolutism has been accorded to *them*, so as to extinguish the παῤῥησίαν aforesaid, and treat St. Paul's words as an open question. If they search the Scriptures, they will find that the Divine right lies on the other side. Those pastoral Epistles, from one of which this is quoted, abound with evidence that free discussion was the rule as between Timothy and his subordinate clergy. What else the purport of the numerous cautions against unwise logomachy? Yet in spite of this, our modern prelates treat the clergy, by the hundred and by the thousand, as men whose "mouths must be stopped," called to listen in silence to the utterances of superior wisdom. It is unhappily impossible to vindicate the nearly effaced rights of the presbytery without seeming to fling stones at the higher order. Of course, they share the blame of suppressing the Synod with the clergy who acquiesce in the suppression; but I am inclined to ascribe the greater sin to the clergy, who contentedly ignore the primary function of their sacred office. It is for them to demand their rightful share in Church government, of which share the Synod is the oldest embodiment. They are asking for no favour, starting no novelty, uttering no party "shibboleth." The plea is for a restoration of the oldest Catholic landmark of their order, and the restitution of rights more ancient than the New Testament itself in its collected form, which hang fixed on firm nails of precedent through all the ages down to the close, or nearly so, of the Middle Ages. The plea is for resuming a dropped branch of the Reformation itself. In the report of successive Royal Commissions under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., known as the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, sections 19 to 23 are devoted to directions for holding Diocesan Synods. That report sleeps deep in the dust of three centuries, and with it lie buried the constitutional rights of the spiritualty. But there is no one document which exhibits the animus of our Reformers so completely in regard to all points of administration. It was meant to be the governing code of the whole period since, subject, of course, to amendment all along. It was intended as a barrier against the encroachments of prerogative; therefore Tudor prerogative shelved and shunted it off the line of progress. It would have been as effective against Parliamentary absolutism now as against royal absolutism then. And it is owing to the suppression of all the guarantees which, had it become law, it would have maintained, that we are what we are—a Church without a code of her own, and hardly knowing where to pick the law which regulates her from the mass of antiquated canons and intrusive statutes. It contained elements, the loss of which we feel to this day in a lowered vitality and a reduced activity

of the whole spiritual estate; but no single item of that total loss is more deplorable than that of the continuous provision for the Diocesan Synod as a working institution. For lack of this, we have lost view of a primary principle which should govern all the relations of the clergy to nation, Crown, or Parliament, viz., that *their own consent is a pre-requisite to all Church legislation which is to bind them.* No prerogative of crosier or mitre rests on such clear and absolute grounds, alike of Divine appointment and natural equity, as that of the clerical body in every diocese to have a voice and a vote on all that concerns the duties of their office. This is a right before and above all canons, and out of this all canons rise and on this depend for their validity. I gravely doubt whether a Bishop, who suppresses that right, but more especially who refuses that concession when demanded by his clergy, has any claim on their canonical obedience. So far as in him lies that Bishop is maintaining the subversion and prostration of that which it is his duty to uphold; he is treating the imprescriptible rights of the presbyterate precisely as the Roman Curia has for centuries treated the rights of the episcopate. I hope this is plain speaking; and I claim the right to use it as part of that παῤῥησία which we inherit from the teaching of St. Paul. Among his most solemn valedictory words to the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus (Acts xx. 28) was the reminder that "the Holy Ghost had made them overseers" (ἐπισκόπους, which the Revised Version rightly renders "bishops"). And if "the gifts and the call of God are ἀμεταμέλητα (Rom. xi. 29), the same call of the Holy Ghost and the same qualifying gifts are ours at this day as then were theirs. When the same Apostle set Timothy over these same presbyters, he was set to superintend and guide their use of those gifts, not to thwart, or extinguish, or suspend their exercise. This last would be a "quenching of the Spirit" in His own chosen vessels. The power conferred on Timothy could not be greater than the Apostle's own, which he himself declares as "given to edification and not to destruction" (2 Cor. xiii. 10). The early Church harmonized these powers by the machinery of a Synod, with the Bishop (in the later individual sense) as its president. And this was so completely the accepted norm, that in a vacancy of that presidency the Synod administered the diocese until it was filled. The primary unit of all Church government being thus the diocese, and its primary governing organ being the Synod, any scheme of Church government which fails to include the free voice of the clergy in such Synod is inconsistent with every principle and precedent which the New Testament, followed by the sub-Apostolic and all the purer ages, has bequeathed to us. It was no novel rule of

action which Cyprian laid down, and which the contemporary Canon of Carthage (as cited above) embodied, but the genuine voice of the Church from the beginning. Why is that voice silenced now?

Is not Church history, and that of our Church in particular, full of testimony to the weight of the presbyteral voice on all questions affecting and directing Church life? There is no such monumental name since the Reformation as that of Richard Hooker, whose vast repertory of argument is neither antiquated nor exhausted. In the eighteenth century the most influential leaders of religious thought were William Law, author of the "Serious Call," and John Wesley. At its close, the Evangelical school of thought was led by Venn, Romaine, Cecil, Simeon, and their associates, of whom not one rose to the mitre. The chiefs of the Oxford Movement, Froude, Keble, Newman, Pusey, and their later exponents—Liddon and Dean Church—were all similarly below the line of high preferment. Go back before the Reformation, and the pioneer name of Wicliff stands out self-luminous. What a mass of useful influence made useless, let run to waste, or stagnating in holes and corners, throughout the order to which they all belonged, do these names suggest! What a reserve of forces never mobilized, and what fountains of counsel choked up by stony silence! The most deplorable fact is that, because they never meet, therefore no voice of warning and exhortation from among their own ranks can reach the clergy collectively; and the more they need rousing to the due sense of their primary duty, left in the abeyance of neglect for centuries (and more so since the Reformation even than before), the more impossible it becomes to rouse them. Each man lives with his head hid in the parochial hole, and drawn out once a year to croak for an afternoon in the ruri-decanal puddle. The governing organ is a loquacious oligarchy of Bishops, each heading (*exceptis excipiendis*) a democracy of dummies, whom he summons triennially to sit silent at his feet. This is what the πολλὴ παῤῥησία of the Apostolic presbytery has drifted into.

Here is a vital function suppressed, a primary organ congested—why waste remedies on the surface or the extremities? Restore its action, and that will, as the frame recovers tone, restore the rest. By the resumption of synodical action the Bishops themselves, in the first place, would be the greatest gainers. They would substitute a volumed weight of voice for an isolated utterance; they would substitute the maximum of authority competent to a diocese for a showy autocracy which veils an inherent weakness; they would wield the pastoral staff of Polycarp, of Irenæus, of Cyprian and Cornelius,

instead of holding out to their clergy the iron hand of the House of Commons in the velvet glove of the House of Lords.

How long will they prefer to go on engrossing the functions of organic unity? Do they not know that the laws of vertebration are against the assumption? Why sink back into a structure of the cephalopod or the jelly-fish type, when the Church has given us a nobler organism—the central column in the Bishop, with the lateral processes in the attached clergy, all sustaining and enfolding the pulmonary and circulatory structures on which life depends—the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the ceaseless beat of the untiring heart of love, while the Head above is Christ Himself? To this the faithful laity attach themselves as the members and extremities, in a frame "fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." For it is a mistake to suppose that the Synod involves the exclusion of the lay voice; indeed, its most complete norm, as shown in the pamphlet referred to in the note above, expressly provides for their inclusion, *deinde introducantur laici*, etc. I suppose, if any of the great early Bishops named could revisit the Church Militant, and measure this its Anglican branch by his own experience in the flesh, he would be astonished at finding Bishops everywhere, but their Synods hardly anywhere; the heads lively enough, but the rest a mere heap of *disjectæ membra Synaxis*, the great majority torpid, the rest quivering in convulsions. He might admonish us thus: "My brethren, all Church history since my time on earth shows no such spectacle as you exhibit, that of some twenty thousand presbyters deemed individually so worthy of trust as you, and yet collectively so impotent and helpless—for why? You have let go your oldest right and duty. You are a presbytery first—*τὸ πρεσβυτέριον* of the blessed Paul—and parish priests afterwards. The Synod is your normal state—no mere confluence of units before distinct, but the original expression of that unity of the body which is its essence. Solidarity, not dispersion, is the ideal of your office. The accident of local distribution has, in your conception of it, destroyed the essential idea. You act as if the second part of your commission had swallowed up the first; as if the 'preaching the Word and ministering . . . in the congregation' appointed to you were everything, and 'the office and work of priest in the Church of God,' beyond this, were nil." And in this your Bishops, our much-mistaken successors, uphold and encourage you, thereby weakening their own authority, which in their Synods should find its amplest expression."

By his isolation the Bishop, who should be the keystone of an arch, not a monolith erected on a pavement, weakens the

whole Church fabric which he should support. But there is a deeper source of weakness even than this in our modern episcopate. The Bishop is, in the eye of the world, the tool of the civil power. We all know of the Apostolic succession and Bishop Stubbs' genuine pedigree; but there comes in the bend-sinister of the ballot-box origin of our modern prelate. He is chosen and placed by the Prime Minister, who fluctuates with the popular majority, which depends on "the swing of the pendulum" at over six hundred polling centres. That is the grim fact which, in this sham-loving generation, nobody cares to enounce. I use my πολλῇ παῤῥησίᾳ to call attention to it. There is in the choice and posting of the prelate a conspicuous absence of every spiritual element whatever; nay, an ostentatious mockery of contempt waits, as we know, on every attempt to give the spiritual voice even a checking power *ex post facto*. This is the stupendous fact, in this day of "freedom of conscience" elsewhere all round, which gives the Pope and his satellites in England the weight of influence which they wield. The one thing which, under these circumstances, would strengthen episcopal authority at its weakest point would be for every Bishop to throw himself fully on all those Apostolic elements of spiritual life which the Synod includes, and gather them into his pastoral staff; to take his clergy frankly and fairly into partnership in the diocesan administration, and invite their united counsels for the good of the Church. This would go a long way to convert him, from a stepfather imposed by fiat of the civil power, into a spiritual Father in God; and would breathe into a diocese, where the Synod with full παῤῥησίᾳ of all members met yearly or half-yearly, the vigour of the renewed youth of the Church, the restored model of the Apostolic age.

Yet, further, if the comparatively few men now alleged as "troubling Israel" had to meet with equal frequency the full court of opinion amongst their brethren, they would *toties quoties* be virtually on trial before their peers for any eccentricities of preaching or practice laid to their charge. With such an institution flourishing in its vigour in every diocese, it would be next door to impossible that our present chapter of troubles could ever have arisen. Idle novelties would have been nipped in the bud by the wholesome frost of the sober-minded majority of moderation; or, so far as they have reason—and who shall say that, with our antiquated standards of rubric and canon, they are *all* mere unreason?—they would be winnowed, sifted, and recognized as wholesome. As it is, innovators have, at any rate, a *primâ-facie* case, against which episcopal autocracy shows a weak side. The secession of the more impatient and impulsive of our brethren is followed

by the growth of party spirit among those that remain. Men hoist the flag of faction and exchange shots in the columns of a newspaper, who might, within the Church's council-chamber, heal their differences in the balm of brotherhood. The individual of decided but one-sided views might derive from the voice of brethren in Synod that element of balance and temper of which he is now unjustly and mischievously deprived. For lack of this, men think their own thoughts apart, start on solitary or centrifugal orbits, and conceive antipathies and alienations, until, in proportion to their power of original thought, they become either party leaders or isolated and perhaps recalcitrant units.

Men who dislike being recalled to a forgotten standard of primary duty are always fertile in "practical difficulties." Strange indeed it would be if, where you have to dig out entire masses of men from the frozen ruts of centuries of prejudice and oblivion, there were not practical difficulties in the way. But some nine hundred clergy could meet under Bishop Borromeo of Milan for eleven or more years successively in the seventeenth century. How can such a thing, with our improved locomotion, raise any difficulty worth naming in England at this end of the nineteenth? Besides, the thing is done in Scotland before our eyes. There analogous institutions have prevailed for two centuries at least. Of course, if a diocese becomes so unwieldy, or in parts so congested, as to make gatherings difficult, that is a reason at once for dividing it, but none at all for depriving its presbytery of their rights. The same sort of argument, which would be scouted with contempt, if applied to the suppression of any civil franchise, is by some thought good enough for denying the clergy their primary right, older by centuries than the earliest germ of the rights of Englishmen as such.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

ART. II.—JAMES BONNELL.

THE Bishop of Salisbury in his book on the Holy Communion (*note*, p. 184) refers to an inhabitant of the city of Dublin at the close of the seventeenth century as "that excellent Irish Churchman." The individual thus spoken of was James Bonnell, Accountant-General of Ireland from 1684 to 1699, a name we suspect that few will recognise at the present day. James Bonnell, however, merits the high eulogium he has received at the hands of Dr. Wordsworth. We propose in this paper to give some account of his life and

the times he lived in, and revive the memory of one who in his day was remarkable for his piety and universal benevolence. Fortunately, a sketch of Bonnell's life was furnished a few years after his death by his friend William Hamilton, Archdeacon of Armagh. A third edition appeared in 1707, and the book was republished in later times.[1] The original edition bore the imprimatur of no less than three of the Irish Bishops who united in their expression of admiration and regard for the character of their deceased friend.

James Bonnell, like so many other deeply religious men who found their home in these countries in the seventeenth century, was a Protestant of foreign extraction. His ancestors lived in the Low Countries, from whence they fled at the outbreak of the Duke of Alva's dragonnades. Probably the name was originally Bonneille, as we find a David Bonneille in Norwich, "the son of an alien and merchant." A Thomas Bonnell fled from Holland at the close of the sixteenth century, and settled at Norwich, and became Mayor of the city. His life was published by Curl, the famous London bookseller satirized by Pope. His grandson, Samuel Bonnell, was a successful merchant doing business in Italy. He lived at Genoa where his son James was born in 1653. Samuel Bonnell amassed a considerable fortune, which was all expended on behalf of the Royalist cause.

When the Stuart dynasty was restored, Samuel Bonnell returned to England, and in recognition of his services received the lucrative post of Accountant-General in Ireland, with right of succession for his son.[2]

To this office James Bonnell succeeded on the death of his father and while still a minor. For many years the duties were discharged by deputies. Bonnell's early education was carefully looked after by his mother, who was a daughter of Thomas Sayer, also of Norwich. Having learned the rudiments in Dublin, he was sent in the first instance to the Grammar School of Trim, then under the care of Dr. Tenison, afterwards Bishop of Meath. Tenison took note of the strong religious tendencies of the boy, and afterwards spoke of "the sweetness of his humour" and "the good-nature of his disposition." His constant companion in these early school-days was an old-fashioned handbook of personal religion known as "The Practice of Piety," which he read every morning. While at Trim School he received his first Communion. When fourteen years of age young Bonnell was sent to a private

[1] An edition was published by Joseph Masters, Aldersgate Street in 1852.

[2] "Liber Munerum Hibernicorum," part ii., p. 137.

"philosophical" school at Nettlebed, Oxfordshire, kept by a Mr. Cole, who had formerly been Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. The purpose of his friends in sending him there was that he might escape the temptations incident to a large public school. Unfortunately this object was defeated, and Mr. Cole's school was found to be a nursery of vice. In later years Bonnell would say, "I cannot with comfort reflect upon the time spent in that place; in it were all the dangers and vices of the University without the advantages." By God's goodness he was preserved from falling into the evil practices he saw around him, and kept his innocency. Mr. Cole himself was not a bad man, but he failed to maintain discipline in his school. A few years later Bonnell was entered on the books of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, where he had as tutor the famous Dr. Calamy, the strong Puritan divine, who afterwards took a prominent part in assisting the Restoration. At Cambridge Bonnell persued a strictly religious life, observing all the fasts and holy-days of the Church, and preparing himself with great diligence for his Communions. On holy-days, he tells us, "if the weather were fair and calm, I would usually spend them in the fields, if otherwise in some empty chamber in the college; in the absence of my chamber-fellow in my own chamber, or in my study if he were there; but not so as to give him or any else the least suspicion of this practice all the time I was there." His secular studies were also pursued with great zeal, and he became a well-read scholar, especially versed in Hebrew and Greek and the French language. Later in life he commenced a translation of the works of Synesius. Having completed his University education, Bonnell became tutor in the family of Mr. Ralph Freeman, of Aspenden Hall, Hertfordshire. In the year 1678 he travelled with his pupil into Holland, and stayed for nearly a year at Nimeguen, after which time he returned to England. In 1684 he visited France, and at Lyons nursed his former pupil in a dangerous attack of small-pox. His influence over Mr. Freeman was entirely for good, and kept him, as he confesses "from running into many mischiefs he should hardly otherwise have avoided."

In his early years Bonnell had a delicate constitution, and many of the reflections created by his state of health are given by his biographer. His intense devotion led him to the prayer that the Divine grace "might be in his heart and tongue, in his looks and in his eyes, and shine bright in all his actions." All these years he was "a constant communicant; his self-examinations for the Sacrament were strict and severe." His biographer gives many samples of the

"Sacramental Meditations" he was in the habit of composing on these occasions.

The time at length arrived when it was necessary that Bonnell should take up the duties of his high office in Dublin, which had hitherto been discharged by deputy. Accordingly, at the close of 1684 he arrived in that city, and became *de facto* as well as *de jure* Accountant-General of Ireland. We may observe that on two occasions subsequently he had serious thoughts of resigning his official position and taking Orders in the Church. An offer was made by his friend and former pupil to buy an advowson for him, a step which he resolutely opposed as being entirely against his principles. His thoughts on the sacred ministry show how profoundly he recognised the responsibilities of the solemn office, and with what a mind he would have entered on them. He made two efforts to resign his public position and take Orders, and he tells us how they were both frustrated by circumstances over which he had no control—one of them the outbreak of the Revolution in 1688, and the other the state of his health. As his biographer points out, it was no worldly consideration that suggested the change, for the temporal advantages of his office were far greater than those he could have expected in a long time from any ecclesiastical preferment, and his station was besides "of sufficient dignity and credit."

Let us now try and get a picture of Dublin and its society when Bonnell took up his residence there in 1684. The city was a small one for its population and importance as the metropolis of Ireland. It extended but a little way round the castle, and was hemmed in on all sides by walls. Trinity College was still *juxta Dublin*, and the city was entered at some distance through Dames Gate. The principal churches lay clustered near each other. They were the cathedral of Christ Church and the churches of SS. Andrew, Nicholas, Michael, John the Evangelist, and Werburgh. The Custom House, where the Bonnells' office was situated, lay on the river-side close to Essex Bridge (then a new structure), and immediately below the castle. Here was the harbour of Dublin of those days. His private residence was in Smock Alley, now Essex Street West, a thoroughfare which led to Fishamble Street, and was then fashionable. This street a little later became the Drury Lane of Dublin, and here the chief theatre was situated. As far back as 1649 it was known as Cadogan's Alley, Captain William Cadogan, ancestor of the present Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, then living there. The principal business street was Skinners' Row, a narrow and gloomy passage which ran east and west to the south of the cathedral. It was so called from the extensive trade in hides

formerly carried on between Dublin and Bristol. Here stood the Tholsel, or Market House, a quadrangular building of hewn stone, containing the municipal courts, a "gilded" room, and the Exchange. Two statues, 8 feet high, stood in niches in front of the Tholsel representing Charles I. and II. The streets, which were "uneven, very dangerous, and dirty," were paved for the most part with rough cobble-stones from Wicklow. The city was lighted by lanterns and candles hung out from the citizens' windows, five inhabitants on each side of every street being required to hang out lanterns with candles "in such suitable places as the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs should direct."[1] The city was infested with idle and vagrant beggars, "liveing nusances," as the old chronicles called them. Begging was a profession, and all authorized beggars were required to wear badges; beggars appearing in the streets without them were subject to imprisonment or deportation. It is interesting to know that the Recorder of the city immediately before Bonnell came to reside in it was Sir Elisha Leighton, elder brother of the saintly Robert Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow. The Master of the Free School of Dublin (the school in which Ussher and the great Duke of Marlborough were educated) was at the time the Rev. Edward Wetenhall, D.D., who had resigned a canonry in Exeter to take up the school.[2] He was the author of a Greek and also a Latin Grammar, which were in much vogue both in English and Irish schools. Wetenhall, who was a great friend of Bonnell, afterwards became Bishop of Cork, and then Bishop of Kilmore. He was buried in Westminster Abbey. As Bishop of Kilmore he preached Bonnell's funeral sermon in St. John's Church before a large congregation. He prefaces the publication with the advertisement that it was drawn up and preached in much haste, "my dear friend's death being a great surprise to me, who was then but just come up from my home into the city, and very full of business."

Among the inhabitants of Dublin in Bonnell's time were large numbers of French Protestant refugees, who found a hospitable home in the city and became the most industrious and prosperous of the citizens. After a short residence they were admitted to the franchise. The burgess rolls of the day are full of such names as Blondeau, Latour, Bernard, Chaignau, Tabary, Guillaume, Chevalier, Rosseau, Martineau, etc. Among these Bonnell would naturally be an acceptable visitor and benefactor, being himself the descendant of refugee Pro-

[1] Gilbert's "Calendars of the City of Dublin." V., pp. 452-457.

[2] Bishop Reeves' Preface to Rev. W. G. Carroll's "Succession of Clergy in St. Bride's Parish, Dublin."

testants. In 1687 we find the benevolence of Dublin further illustrated by public subscriptions on behalf of Christians "held in slavery with the Turkes in Sally" (*i.e.*, Sallee, Morocco), a movement in which we may be sure Bonnell had his part.

There are intimations in Bonnell's "Remains" that there was another and a darker side to the picture. Dublin was not free from those vices which belong to all cities.. Bonnell took his part in counteracting the evil, and helped to establish and support various organizations for the moral and spiritual improvement of the community. Many of these institutions sprang up in Dublin about the year 1693. His biographer says: "They gave him great comfort and joy. He not only approved of the pious design, but did very much encourage and promote it. He pleaded their cause, writ letters in their defence, and was one of their most diligent and prudent directors. . . . He was likewise a zealous promoter of the societies for reformation of manners who apply themselves to the suppression of profaneness and vice; he was always present at their meetings, laid their design truly to heart, and thought much of them; he contributed liberally towards their necessary charge, and constantly prayed for their success."[1] Again we are told: "He was continually dispersing good books among young people, his clerks, and servants, and poor families; which he seconded with such constant instructions upon all fitting occasions, delivered with such kindness and concern as could not fail of making great impressions upon many of them."[2]

Among the literary men of Dublin in Bonnell's day were William Molyneux, the friend and correspondent of Locke, Secretary of the Philosophical Society of Dublin and author of many philosophical and scientific writings, and George Ashe, Provost of Trinity College. Ashe was tutor to Jonathan Swift, and reputed to be the clergyman who went through the form of marriage between Swift and Stella in the grounds of St. Patrick's Deanery; Dr. Foy, Fellow of Trinity College, and Rector of St. Bride's, who when only fifteen years of age gained a scholarship (a feat in these modern times repeated at Oxford by John Keble); Dr. King, Dean of St. Patrick's, and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, who wrote the Latin inscription on Bonnell's monument in St. John's Church; and Dudley Loftus, the learned Hebrew and Syriac scholar, who held the high office of Vicar-General and Judge of the Prerogative Court were also contemporaries. These and others like them formed a brilliant literary coterie in Dublin at the close of the seven-

[1] "Life and Character," p. 191. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

teenth century. "Many of the physicians of Dublin," says his biographer, "were likewise his intimate friends." Archdeacon Hamilton thus enlarges on his intellectual attainments: "He was master of the accomplishing as well as necessary parts of learning; had thoroughly digested the Greek and Roman authors, understood the French language perfectly well, and had made good progress in Hebrew. In philosophy and oratory he exceeded most of his contemporaries in the University, and applyed himself with good success to mathematics and music. In the course of his studies he read several of the Fathers . . . particularly Synesius. . . . He had a delicacy of thought and expression that is very rarely to be met with. . . . He had a nice taste both in men and books, and was very conversant in our best English divines. But he particularly admired Hooker, whom he used to commend as an author who writ with a primitive spirit, but modern judgment and correctness. . . . He was particularly fond of two authors, Kempis and Salles [St. Frances de Sales], and has left behind him a correct translation of the 'Introduction to a Devout Life' written by the latter."[1]

Bonnell is described by his biographer as "tall, well-shaped, and fair. His aspect was comely, and showed great sweetness mixed with life and sprightliness. There was a venerable gravity in his look, a natural modesty and sincere openness. But in the House of God his countenance had something in it that looked heavenly and seraphical. . . . His natural and acquired seriousness was tempered with a very engaging cheerfulness in conversation."[2]

The even tenor of Bonnell's life was sadly interrupted by the Revolution of 1688, which threw Dublin and the whole of Ireland into the utmost consternation. A second massacre was feared. Multitudes fled out of the country to England. Bonnell notes in his diary, under December 9: "Last Thursday the letter threatening a massacre of all the English on this day came to town, and people not receiving such satisfaction from the Lord Deputy as they expected, began to think of England, and multitudes flocked away. I went myself to Rings-end, thinking if there were any alarm I was nearer to take shipping." Eventually he made up his mind that it was his duty to stay in Ireland. It was a testimony to his high character and the esteem in which he was held, that, though a strong Protestant, he was not removed from his office when other high officials were dismissed by the Government of James II. A contemporary in his employment writes of him that he "was continually at the Custom House, because they

[1] "Life and Character," p. 80. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

could not be without his knowledge in the revenue." He adds that Bonnell spent most of his official income at this time in relieving the poor of the city, especially the distressed Protestant refugees.[1] The municipal government of the city had been entirely in the hands of the Protestant citizens. The King now required that the Roman Catholics should be admitted to the franchise without taking the oath of supremacy. The relation between the city and the Government became very strained. Sharp communications went on between Alderman Castleton, the Lord Mayor, and the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Lieutenant. A short time later the Earl of Tyrconnell endeavoured to abolish the charters of the city and destroy all civic privileges. He taxed the citizens in 6,000 pairs of shoes and 5,000 yards of gray cloth monthly.[2] The Papists threatened to burn Dublin if King James's army was defeated. Trinity College was turned into a garrison, and the Fellows and students expelled. The streets were chained up, and breastworks made at the entrance into each against the army of William III., in case it should attempt a landing.[3] As a measure of precaution, the plate of St. John's Church was buried, and not dug up again till 1690.

Archbishop King, in his "State of Irish Protestants under James," gives a graphic picture of the reign of terror. By order of Colonel Luttrell no Protestants were allowed to "walk or go in the streets from ten o'clock at night till five in the morning, and no greater number than five should meet and converse at any time."[4] The Archbishop's book throws a side-light on the condition of the Irish Church at the time (1690). It shows, among other things, that Irish Churchmen were not then averse to the use of the term "altar" for the Holy Table, and also were in the habit of saying daily prayers in their churches. Thus we read "the humble petition of Alexander Allen of Wexford, clergyman—That your petitioner being minister of the parish church of St. Iberius in the town of Wexford hath therein for several years past daily celebrated Divine service; complains of the rabble at the instigation of the Mayor breaking into his church and destroying all the pews and altar of the said church." Again, the minister of Trim, Mr. Prowd, complains of how the soldiers on Christmas

---

[1] Mason, in his "History of St. Patrick's Cathedral," tells us that several members of the French Protestant congregation who had been allowed to worship in the Lady Chapel had been seized along with their minister to be sent back to France. The cruel sentence failed to be executed in consequence of the victory at the Boyne.

[2] State Papers for 1690, p. 532.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

[4] "State of Irish Protestants," etc., pp. 123, 124.

night did "break and plunder our altar on which we had that day celebrated the Holy Communion."[1]

During all these excitements Bonnell continued bravely at his post. We do not find that he took any part in the political agitations of the day, but he joined with the rest of the citizens in expressing his joy at the results of the Revolution which placed William III. on the throne. The change was great indeed. All the parish churches had been closed by order of James II., and the Protestants denied the exercise of their religion in public. Several of the churches had been converted into prisons, and the clergy imprisoned. Bonnell saw in it a judgment for previous negligence as to Divine worship and their "irreverent, careless, undevout behaviour." The turn in the affairs of the kingdom created universal joy. Bonnell exclaims: "How did we see the Protestants on the great day of our Revolution, Thursday the third of July (a day ever to be remembered by us with all thankfulness; O had it been begun with visiting our churches, and presenting ourselves there to God our deliverer), congratulate and embrace one another as they met like persons alive from the dead! Like brothers and sisters meeting after a long absence, and going about from house to house to give each other joy of God's great mercy, inquiring of one another how they past the late days of distress and terror." He entirely condemned the acts of retaliation contemplated by the Protestants on their Roman Catholic neighbours. He writes: "Instead of breaking open our church doors this day with the first dawn of it, to praise Thy stupendous mercy to us, we ran together into herds, we met in crowds to arm ourselves as there were no way but this to keep the enemy from returning back upon us. When it was Thou alone, O Lord, who without any arms of ours hadst driven them from us."[2]

Bonnell's residence lay in St. John's parish. The church is no longer standing, and on its site has been built the Fishamble Street Mission Hall. It shared the same fate with St. Michael's, another of the ancient churches of Dublin, whose site is now occupied by the Synod House of the Church of Ireland. The church tower alone remains, and forms the nucleus of the new buildings. The original church of St. John's parish was erected in 1168, and the founder's name is on record—Giolla Michell. It was rebuilt in the sixteenth century by Arland Ussher, the father of Archbishop Ussher, several members of whose family lived in the parish. It was rebuilt again in 1682, when we learn "a consecration dinner"

[1] "State of Irish Protestants," etc., pp. 115, 116.
[2] "Life and Character," etc., pp. 60-65.

was given, at which the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Francis Marsh, was present. It was a small and mean building with a low roof: the walls were only twenty feet high. There were forty-two square pews on the ground-floor, each pew being occupied by several families. Here Bonnell worshipped, taking always a secluded seat. When the church was to be rebuilt, a petition of the ministers, churchwardens and parishioners was addressed to the Lord Lieutenant in Council to forbid the erection of butchers' and other stalls against the walls of the new church. The petition contains the almost incredible statement that "the very altar" of the old church had been constantly polluted with the refuse of the butchers' stalls, "to the great offence of the communicants."[1] Among the articles of furniture provided for the new church was a desk for "Bishop Jewell's Book" (the "Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ"), ordered to be placed by royal edict in all the churches, where it took a place almost on a level with the Bible.

Literally within a stone's-throw of St. John's Church stood the Cathedral of Christ Church. Here most probably Bonnell was often to be seen. His high official position would lead him to be present on state occasions. The cathedral is properly the Chapel Royal, and contains the viceregal pew called the "State." We have a contemporary account of how the Irish Court went to prayers in Bonnell's time. "When they go to church [*i.e.*, the Lord Lieutenant and Court] the streets from the Castle gate to the church door, as also the great aisle of the church to the foot of the stairs by which they ascend to the place where they sit, are lined with soldiers. They are preceded by the Pursuivants of the Council-Chamber, two Maces, and on State days by the King and Pursuivant at Arms, then Chaplains and Gentlemen of the Household, with Pages and Footmen, bare-headed. When they alight from their coach, in which commonly the Lord Chancellor and one of the Prime Nobility sit with them, the Sword of State is delivered to some Lord to carry before them. And in like manner they return back to the Castle, where the several courses at dinner are ushered in by kettle drums and trumpets. In these cavalcades the coach in which they ride is attended by a small squadron of horse, after which follow a long train of coaches that belong to the several Lords and Gentlemen who attend them." The writer follows them into the cathedral. "They sang an anthem with vocal and instrumental music, there being two pair of organs in Christ Church, of which one is a very noble one. When the minister ascended the pulpit, I

[1] Hughes' "St. John's Parish," pp. 25-30.

heard him with great attention and delight."[1] A contemporary local writer also tells us how the city magnates went to church on these occasions. The Lord Mayor "is waited upon by the Sheriffs, Masters, Wardens, and members of each company of the city in their formalities. In which manner attended, his Lordship waits on the State to church and from church in Castle-street until they pass by, and then follows the train of the State towards Christ Church, where the chief governor usually repairs, as far as near the end of Skinners'-row, and so turn off into the church, through a lane kept open to that purpose into the South door."[2]

John Dunton, quoted above, was an eccentric London bookseller who visited Dublin at the close of the seventeenth century in pursuit of his business. He established book auctions in several of the principal coffee-houses of the city, and in three or four public sales disposed of as much as £1,500 worth of stock. His lists show us what kind of books were in demand: Pool's "Annotations," Clark's Bible, Hammond "On the New Testament," "Book of Martyrs," Dupin's "Ecclesiastical History," Josephus, Locke "On the Human Mind," Seneca's "Morals," "Cook upon Littleton," Johnson's Works, Shakespeare's Works, Beaumont and Fletcher's Plays, Judge Hale's Works, and those of Boyle, Archbishop Ussher, Tillotson, Taylor, Patrick, Sprat, Barlow, Stillingfleet, Burrow, Sherlock, South, Charnock, Baxter, and the poets Cowley, Dryden, and Congreve. Dunton has curious things to tell us of the opposition he endured at the hands of a rival Scotch salesman of literary wares.

The Church of Ireland in Bonnell's time suffered severely from the abuse of pluralities, a fertile cause of defection from the Protestant Church and of large accessions to the Roman Catholic faith. The scattered flocks of the Established Church were utterly neglected by their absentee Rectors and Vicars. Take the case of two, at least, of Bonnell's clergymen. The Rev. Thomas Bladen, D.D., who was Rector of St. John's Church from 1660 to 1695, held in addition the following preferments: The deanery of Ardfert (county Kerry), the vicarage of Diamer and Gully in the Diocese of Meath, and also the rectory of Kilskyre and Killalon in the same Diocese. He lived in the rectory, 14, Fishamble Street, Dublin.[3] His successor, Dr. Scroggs, Fellow of Trinity College and Professor of Hebrew, apparently did not live long enough to enjoy the same wealth of ecclesiastical preferment. His record is a

---

[1] Dunton's "Conversation in Ireland," 1699, pp. 554, 555.
[2] "Calendar of Ancient (Dublin) Records." V., p. xxiii.
[3] Hughes' "History of St. John's Parish," pp. 56, 57.

good one. He put a stop to the abuse of providing drink and tobacco at the cost of the parish for vestry meetings, and he laid the foundation of the first parish schools opened in Dublin for the education of the children of the poor. He thus led the way for what was subsequently the rule all over Ireland, namely, the institution of schools in connection with the parish churches. Dr. Scroggs was succeeded in St. John's by Dr. Harrison (1696-1720), an ecclesiastic who in addition held the following preferments: The deanery of Clonmacnoise, a canonry in Kildare Cathedral, and the rectories of Ballraine and Killashee in the Diocese of Kildare. How could a Church flourish under the incubus of such abuses?

The "Life" of James Bonnell shows, among other things with regard to the Church in his time, how deep-seated was the repugnance to kneeling at the Lord's Table. It was a controversy that had never ceased to rage since Ussher's time. "The kneeling posture," says the Bishop of Salisbury, "was at one time a great matter of controversy and of deep feeling, as is shown by the declaration on kneeling still appended to the office." And in a note the Bishop refers to Bonnell's "Life," and adds: "The controversy as to sitting or kneeling was apparently still going on in the Church of Ireland when the 'Life' was published in 1743."[1] We are told by his biographer that this "unhappy controversy . . . was a great trouble to Bonnell. His great humility did then in a particular manner prompt him to fall low on his knees." Bonnell argued out this question for himself. He made a distinction between the soul that sat at the heavenly banquet and the body that knelt. "Were Christ indeed on earth, the Table He sat at we should expect (if we were favoured) to sit at too; . . . but now *He* sits not at this outward Table which is before us; why then should *we?* . . . 'Tis true on our Table the Holy Elements are impregnated with the materials of life; like the first framing of a living creature or an embryo before it is quickened. But they are quickened with spiritual life only upon the faith of each receiver which God hath appointed to be the recurring instrument or means of this Divine quickening. Then they become to us the deeds of glory and the assured conveyances of spiritual nourishment and immortal happiness. And as such they come to us from a higher Table, and while we are permitted to sit at that Table, well may we be content, and well does it become us to kneel outwardly in the church. While we sit with the Church Triumphant, well may we be content to kneel with the Church Militant."[2] We have glimpses of the same controversy in the

[1] The Holy Communion, pp. 145, 274, 275.
[2] "Life and Character," etc., pp. 165-167.

writings of John Dunton. He says: "I resolve to live and die in the communion of the Church of England, as believing that kneeling at the Holy Sacrament is the most becoming posture of all such as would humbly and devoutly commemorate the death of the Blessed Jesus. Our great Redeemer Himself kneeled down and prayed (Luke xxii. 41), and that for certain is the best pattern we can follow. If our blessed Lord so humbled Himself, the greatest men must not think much to come down so low—

"'Kneeling ne'er spoil'd silk stocking' (*Herbert*).

If it hurt the finery, it will make him the better Christian. Kneeling is a fit posture for all acts of devotion. The Eucharist is the highest act of worship, or, rather, it contains in it many other acts—prayer, praise, thanksgiving, and adoration."[1]

It is pleasant to think that at a time when there is not much evidence that religion flourished in Dublin, there lived in the city so devout a spirit as James Bonnell. His influence was altogether on the side of what made for good in the family, in the Church, and in the world. Reading his reflections and prayers, we are reminded of Thomas à Kempis, of Rutherford, and of a later Irish Churchman, Alexander Knox. Bonnell's devotion to the Sacrament was very intense. Beginning with a bi-monthly Communion, he found his spiritual life demanded more, and he was not contented without communicating weekly as well as on all holy-days. He also practised meditation with great regularity and exactness. His preparations for his Communions were earnest and devout. "It troubled him that he was often forced to be late at his office on Saturdays, lest his going to the Sacrament next day might have an ill effect upon his servants and tempt them to presume too far and approach the Lord's Table without sufficient preparation. . . . During the whole administration, so intense were his thoughts, so earnest were his prayers, that those who were near hardly ever beheld him without tears, which he concealed as much as he could by keeping close in the most private corner of the seat."[2] His devotions took the form of a devout thanksgiving to God for "giving him the sacrifice of His dear Son in the Blessed Sacrament." There is evidence from his biography that daily prayers were said twice in the Dublin churches in Bonnell's time; it was his own habit, we learn, to attend the public service of the Church "twice every day." "When once prayers began, he took no notice of any about him, and was always troubled at those

[1] "Conversation in Ireland," p. 530.
[2] "Life and Character," etc., pp. 164, 165.

unseasonable salutes wherein too many allow themselves in time of Divine service." He loved the fasts and feasts of the Church, "giving them devotions proper to them as much as his engagements in the world would allow—humiliation and repentance if days of sorrow, praises if days of joy." "Happy soul!" we find him exclaiming, "to whom each new week is welcome and known not, by the almanack or the outward face of the year, but by the grace it proposes to thy meditation and practice in its collect, while thou dost join with the whole Church in making this theme thy study and thy care; when each month is known to thee, not by the old heathen name it bears, but the blessed Saints it commemorates, welcoming with joy their holy festivals. . . . May my soul enter into your secrets and dwell with you in this sacred exercise! May I ever rejoice in this orderly revolution of time, ever be with you the children of the kingdom, the favourites of Heaven, the delights of my soul and heirs of eternity in all the happy periods of this revolution!"[1] He also prized the book of Common Prayer and set it up above all extemporary effusions. "Even his private prayers were a well-digested form." We get more than one insight into the nature of his private devotions. While undressing it was his habit to repeat the fourth Psalm. He also had forms of prayers: "Kneeling down before stepping into bed;" "at lying down;" "waking in the night;" "waking in the morning;" "when first getting out of bed, kneeling;" "while washing." The following is this last form of prayer: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquities and cleanse me from my sin. O wash me with Thy precious blood, O most gracious Lord Jesus, who hast loved us and washed us from our sins. Except Thou wash me I have no part in Thee. Thou hast made me sensible that I stand in need of Thy amazing condescension to be washt from the stains which I daily contract, that Thou mayest engage me to practise daily the same condescension to my Christian brethren." His habit was also to repeat on his knees the *Miserere* every Friday at noon.

It is well known that religious conversation is one of the most difficult of Christian attainments—to introduce the subject without appearing to force it. Bonnell had a great gift in this direction. He could speak without giving offence or appearing to take liberties. "He had a peculiar art," says his biographer, "of engaging company upon such subjects, and managed his part of such discourse with that modesty and prudence that there appeared nothing of artifice or design, nothing that aimed at magnifying himself or raising his own

[1] "Life and Character," etc., p. 184.

character. When he spoke of religion it was with a natural easiness, with calmness and humility, and he never soured such conversation with uncharitable reflections upon others who either differed from him in opinion or fell short of him in practice."[1] He watched the character of his own conversation strictly. There is a smack of Baconian sententiousness in the following observation: "If I converse with politicians and men of business, it makes me worldly; if with men of learning and wit, it makes me vain; if with fair persons, I am in danger of being sensual; if with great ones, of being proud."[2] Another difficult attainment is that of administering reproof, and here also Bonnell shone. When he reproved, "He did it not in a haughty imperious way, but with the prudent endearments and tenderness, as well as sincerity, of a friend; in such a manner as by his reproofs to oblige them and fix them faster to his friendship." He was a good causist, and we learn that the clergy "advised with him in their difficulties and doubts, particularly where any man's conscience was concerned, and always paid a great regard to his judgment."[3] He bewailed the differences between Christian men, and used to say that most differences "were chiefly in words." He "compared the quarrels of parties among Christians to engagements that happen in armies when they fall foul on their friends, thinking that they are enemies."[4] A charitable man himself, he thus urged generosity upon others: "Observe thy good humours, take thyself in thy fits of charity. Art thou disposed at any time to give largely? Do it out of hand lest the grace of God withdraw and thou growest cool in thy good purposes. No man ever repented of his charity, though it might seem to have been in excess."[5] He was the special friend of orphans and "poor housekeepers."

As Bonnell was going out of the world of Dublin life, another and a very different person was entering it. No greater contrast could be drawn than between the gentle, sweet-tempered, and spiritually-minded Accountant-General, and the cynical, materialistic-minded and misanthropic Jonathan Swift, shortly afterwards to be Dean of St. Patrick's. He had taken Orders, and was Vicar of Laracor, about twenty miles from the city. That Swift did not like Bonnell goes without saying, and he made fun of his "Exemplary Life and Character," when published. Some years ago Swift's copy of this book was disposed of by a second-hand bookseller in Dublin, and on the fly-leaf were found inscribed in the Dean's handwriting these lines:

---

[1] "Life and Character," p. 192. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 199, 200.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 234, 235. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 233. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 201.

Thus James Bonnell lived, plainly doth appear,
A Book so Thick, a copper plate so neat,
To prove his money, like his life, well spent;
They likewise here do Fix *his* monument,
Who as a mark upon his sacred dust
Obliged the Public with his pretty bust.
What's wanting to make the book worth minding,
Is easily Got—A pretty Binding.
Then surely none can doubt the book will sell,
James Bonnell lived and dyed so well.[1]

Bonnell married late in life Jane, daughter of Sir Albert Conyngham, Lieutenant-General of the Ordinance, who fought on the side of William at the Boyne.

The inscription on Bonnell's monument was from the pen of the learned Dr. King, Archbishop of Dublin, and was as follows:

P.M.S. Jacobi Bonnelij Armigeri, Cujus exuviæ unà cum patris et duorum filiorum Alberti et Samuelis juxta sitæ sunt. Regibus Carolo II^do^ Jacobo II^do^ et Guiliemo III^io^ erat Rationibus Generalibus in Hibernià temporibus licet incertis dominis fidus, ab omni factione immunis, nemini suspectus, omnibus charus. Natus est Novembris 14° 1653 patre Samuele qui propter suppetias Regiæ familiæ exulanti largiter exhibitas, officio Computatoris Generalis fisci Hibernici An° Dom. 1661 una cum filio remuneratus est. Avo Daniele Proavo Thomâ qui sub Duce Albano Religionis ergo Flandriâ patria suâ exul, Norvicum in Anglia profugit, ubi mox civis et demum Prætor. Pietate avitâ et pene congenitâ imo primævâ et Apostolica eruditione, prudentiâ, probitate comitate, et morum simplicitate conspicius. Mansuetudine, patientiâ et superomnia charitate insignis. Urbem hanc exemplo et præceptis meliorem, morte mæstam reliquit. Obijt Aprilis 28, 1699. Monumentum hoc ingentis doloris publici præsertim sui, exiguum pro meritis posuit Conjux mæstissima Jana e Coninghamorum gente.

The monument has long since disappeared.

A humble, sweet-tempered and sincere Christian, full of the enthusiasm of personal religion, a light shining in a dark place, a striking example of the power of the Divine Spirit to mould and influence human lives in the most unlikely atmospheres, James Bonnell stands alone, as far as we know, in the society of Dublin at the close of the seventeenth century, as a man who combined the intensely devotional spirit of Thomas à Kempis with the loyalty of a true Churchman. His name is one that deserves the feeble recognition and renewed attention we have endeavoured to give it in this paper.

J. A. Carr.

[1] See *Notes and Queries*, second series, vol. v., p. 207.

ART. III.—POPE LEO XIII. ON THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

THE Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the Study of Holy Scripture, issued in 1893, to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Communion, is a document fraught with important consequences to the claims of the Christian religion. Its chief purpose is, no doubt, to confirm the faith of the educated and thoughtful lay members of the Roman Church, whose minds may have been disturbed by the Rationalists and "the peremptory pronouncements of a certain newly-invented free science," in reference to the Divine Scriptures. These faithful souls were under the impression that their religion would be held and maintained independently of any book. "We believe and know," writes one of their prominent exponents, "that our holy religion, not being founded upon Biblical records, has nothing to fear from Biblical criticism."[1] They appealed accordingly, and very properly, to their infallible head for an authoritative declaration upon this important question, forgetting, however, that the matter had already been definitely decided at the Council of Trent. They have received their answer in the Encyclical Letter, and a quiet snubbing in addition in being reminded that "the Church has never required, nor does she now require, any stimulation from without" for "the protection and glory of God's Holy Word." They are told in the plainest language that "the God of all Providence . . . has bestowed upon man a splendid gift and safeguard, making known to him, by supernatural means, the hidden mysteries of His Divinity, His wisdom and His mercy," in a Divine revelation "contained both in unwritten tradition, and in written books, which are therefore called sacred and canonical because, being written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author." They are reminded that Holy Scripture is "the source" of innumerable benefits—"profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect; furnished to every good work." Their attention is drawn to the fact that the Founder of the Church "appealed to the Scriptures"—"this grand source of Catholic revelation"—to prove "His Divine mission" and character. "From them He cites instructions for His disciples and confirmation of His doctrine. . . . At the close of His life His utterances are from Holy Scripture, and it is the Scripture that He expounds to His disciples after His resurrection, until He ascends to the glory of His Father. Faithful to His pre-

[1] *Contemporary Review*, April, 1893: "The Pope and the Bible."

cepts, the Apostles . . . used with the greatest effect the sacred writings, in order to persuade the nations everywhere of the wisdom of Christianity, to conquer the obstinacy of the Jews, and to suppress the outbreak of heresy."

In the face of these declarations the members of the Roman Church must see that their faith is dependent on the truths contained in the Divine books, and that their religion is founded upon the supernatural revelation expressed in the canonical Scriptures, as God's "own oracles and words—a Letter written by our Heavenly Father, and transmitted by the sacred writers to the human race in its pilgrimage so far from its heavenly country."[1]

Whether the answer of the Papacy will prove satisfactory or not to those who have appealed to it remains to be seen; but to those outside the pale of the Roman fold—the inheritors of the principles of the Reformation—this Encyclical Letter, as far as its general aim is concerned, affords considerable gratification. Hitherto the latter have been under the impression that the value and authority of Holy Scripture were held of very secondary importance in the Roman Church, and that consequently no encouragement was given to its study and exposition. Probably such an impression resulted from the teaching of Roman Catholic theologians, held in great repute, who say that Holy Scripture was not calculated to teach the Gospel;[2] that "the Scripture is a nose of wax, a dead letter which kills, truly a shell without the nut, a leaden weight, a forest to serve as a refuge for brigands, a school for heretics;"[3] that "the excellence of the unwritten Word surpasses by far that of the Scriptures which the Apostles have left to us written on parchment. The Scripture does not contain clearly all the mysteries of religion, because it was not given for that purpose, nor to prescribe an absolute system of faith";[4] that "we shall endeavour to demonstrate that the Scriptures without the traditions are neither absolutely necessary nor are they sufficient."[5] But these writers, it may be urged, were individuals for whose utterances the Church ought not to be held responsible; nothing is authoritative unless it has the *imprimatur* of the Holy See, or of those delegated to grant such a privilege. This explanation, on the face of it, seems fair and reasonable, but it is scarcely sufficient to show that the impression under discussion is mistaken and erroneous. Not only is evidence wanting of any reproof, or repudiation of the

[1] Encyclical Letter, p. 4.
[2] Tournley, "Prælect. Theol. de Eccl. Christi," tom. i., p. 281.
[3] Lindanus, "Panoplia," book i., c. 22; book v., c. 4; book i., c. 6.
[4] Coster, "Enchiridion," c. 1.
[5] Bellarmine, "De Verbo Dei," lib. iv., c. 4.

teachers referred to, but the Holy See itself in the past has, on more than one occasion, given proofs of entire sympathy with them. The fourth rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, approved by Pope Pius IV., forbids the use of translations of the Scriptures, even when made by Catholic writers, without a faculty in writing granted by the Bishop or Inquisitor. "Whosoever," it says, "shall presume to read these Bibles, or have them in possession without such faculty, shall not be capable of receiving absolution of their sins unless they have first given up the Bibles to the Ordinary. . . . Moreover, regulars may not read or purchase the same without license had from their superiors." In 1713 A.D. Pope Clement XI. condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus* numerous propositions taken from the "Moral Reflections of Paschasius Quesnel upon the Books of the New Testament, in French," Paris, 1669; and "Christian Thoughts on the Texts of the Gospels," etc., by the same writer; Paris, 1693-94. Among these propositions were the following:

(*a*) "It is useful and necessary, at every time, in every place, and for every kind of persons, to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of Sacred Scripture.

(*b*) "The reading of Sacred Scripture is for all.

(*c*) "The Lord's Day ought to be sanctified by Christians with the readings of piety, and, above all, of the Holy Scriptures. It is damnable to wish to restrain a Christian from such reading.

(*d*) "To snatch the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to keep it closed to them, by taking from them that method of understanding it, is to shut the mouth of Christ against them.

(*e*) "To interdict to Christians the reading of Sacred Scriptures, especially of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of light to the sons of light, and to cause them to suffer a certain kind of excommunication."

These propositions the Bull condemned as "false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her practice, and contumelious not only to the Church, but also to the secular powers; seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy and savouring of heresy itself, and also abetting heretics and heresies, and also schism, erroneous, near akin to heresy, several times condemned, and finally heretical." After thus exhausting the dictionary for epithets, it proceeds to threaten ecclesiastical censures against anyone who should presume to "teach, defend, publish them conjointly or separately, or treat of them publicly or privately, even by way of disputing."

Pope Leo XII. also, in an Encyclical Letter to the Latin

Bishops, dated May 3, 1824, writes: "You are aware, venerable brethren, that a certain society, called the Bible Society, strolls with effrontery throughout the world; which society, contemning the traditions of the Holy Fathers, and contrary to the well-known decree of the Council of Trent, labours with all its might, and by every means, to translate—or, rather, to pervert—the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar language of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages may also occur with regard to others; to wit, that by a perverse interpretation the Gospel of Christ be turned into a human Gospel, or, what is still worse, the Gospel of the Devil. . . . In conformity with our Apostolic duty, we exhort you to turn away your flock, by all means, from these poisonous pastures. Reprove, beseech, be instant in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, that the faithful entrusted to you (adhering strictly to the rules of the Congregation of the Index) be persuaded, that if the sacred Scriptures be everywhere indiscriminately published, more evil than advantage will arise thence."

With such testimony before them—and much more might be adduced—non-Romanists have good grounds for their opinion of the low value hitherto set upon the study and use of Holy Scripture by the hierarchy of the Roman Church. The Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. comes, therefore, as an agreeable surprise. Without endorsing all that it contains, they are disposed at the outset to look upon it as a sign of important changes in the views of the Roman Curia in reference to the right place of God's Word in His Church. The high commendation bestowed upon the sacred books—a commendation supported by such patristic quotations as "an inexhaustible treasury of heavenly doctrine"; "an overflowing fountain of salvation"; "fertile pastures and beautiful gardens," etc.—the devout expressions of "gratitude to God for the communication to man of the words of His wisdom"; and the fatherly admonition "to approach the Sacred Writings with reverence and piety," are in themselves a revelation of better influences at work in the counsels of the Vatican.

Gratifying as the Letter may be to those of every denomination who retain their belief in the inspiration of the Bible, it contains, however, statements which ought not to pass unnoticed or unchallenged. Before referring to these in detail, it is necessary for the sake of clearness to distinguish the words "Church" and "Catholics," so frequently used in the document. The former word is manifestly used in the sense of the definition given by Silvester Mazzolini, called Prierias, Master of the Papal Palace under Pope Leo X., in his

reply to the theses of Luther on Indulgences, viz.: (1) The Universal Church was in its essence the assembly of all Christians; (2) virtually it was the Roman Church; (3) and the Roman Church was virtually the Pope.[1] Few will deny in these days this conclusion of Prierias, and therefore the "Church" in the Encyclical must be taken as a synonym for the Pope, or the particular communion of which he is the head. "Catholics" are referred to, of course, as individual, private members of the Roman obedience, for whose labours *per se* the "Church" can neither take credit nor blame.

Now, the Bible of which the Pope writes contains the Apocryphal books, and these, as well as the others, are said "to have been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and have God for their Author." It is also stated that "this belief has been perpetually held and professed by the Church."[2] Such an assertion as this, in the face of the well-known history of the formation of the Canon of Holy Scripture, is astounding. St. Jerome himself, the author of the Vulgate, which is pronounced as the "authentic version," wrote: "As the Church reads the books of Judith, and Tobit, and Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so also it reads Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus for the edification of the people, not for the authoritative confirmation of doctrine."[3]

Pope Gregory the Great apologized for quoting a passage from 1 Maccabees on the ground that the book was "put forth for the edification of the Church, though it was not canonical."[4] From those early days down to the Council of Trent a continuous succession of the most learned theologians in the Western Church maintained the distinction between the canonical books and those for ecclesiastical use. The list of these distinguished men closes with the names of Cardinal Ximenes, Sixtus Senensis, and Cardinal Cajetan.[5] It is therefore a fact beyond all question that, until the middle of the sixteenth century, the authoritative contents of the Bible were not matters of faith in the Latin Church. The Trentine Fathers, in a session comprising only about fifty-three representatives, among whom there was not one scholar distinguished for historical learning or special study of the subject, decreed, for the first time in Christian history, that the Apocryphal books were of "equal veneration" with the rest, and "as sacred and canonical." From this date only did

---

[1] Bishop Creighton's "History of the Papacy," vol. v., p. 70.
[2] Encyclical Letter, p. 3.
[3] "Pref. ad Libros Sol."
[4] In Tob. xix. 13.
[5] *Vide* Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i., p. 259.

the contents of the Bible become an absolute article of faith in the Roman Church.[1] Leaving out of consideration altogether the opinions of the great Fathers of the Eastern Church, it may be fairly asked, With what propriety can Pope Leo XIII. say that the belief in the inspiration of the Bible—as, of course, formulated at Trent—has "been perpetually held and professed by the Church"? Students of history will be glad to know when this profession of faith was made by the "Church" prior to the sixteenth century.

Exception may be justly taken also on historical grounds to the credit claimed in this Letter on behalf of the "Church" for her solicitous care of the Bible, her continuous encouragement of its study, and her desire to feed the flock from its saving words. It is enough to take one's breath away to read such assertions as the following: "By admirable laws and regulations, she [the Church] has always shown herself solicitous that the celestial treasure of the Sacred Books . . . should not lie neglected." "She has strictly commanded that her children shall be fed with the saving words of the Gospel at least on Sundays and solemn feasts. Moreover, it is owing to the wisdom and exertions of the Church that there has always been continued from century to century that cultivation of Holy Scripture which has been so remarkable and has borne such ample fruit."[2]

All this is a new revelation to readers of ecclesiastical history. The records of nearly sixteen centuries of the Christian era are blank with regard to any particular "solicitous care of the Bible" shown by the Roman Church. From her claim to be regarded as "the Mother of all Churches," it might have been taken, as a matter of course, that she would have been the first to take measures for the formation of the Canon of Holy Scripture, and thus show how jealously she guarded such a Divine treasure. But she cannot claim this credit. The first attempt to form a Canon of the Bible for Christian use was made at a small gathering of clergy from parts of Lydia and Phrygia, held at Laodicea about 363 A.D.[3] This example was followed at the Council of Carthage, 397 A.D., and to the decree passed on that occasion was appended the following note: "Let the transpontine [Roman] Church be consulted about the formation of that Canon." This action of the North African Bishops seems to have had little effect at Rome. The desired confirmation does not appear to have been obtained, neither were any steps taken to give to the

[1] Westcott, "The Bible in the Church," p. 256.
[2] Encyclical Letter, pp. 8, 9.
[3] Westcott's "Bible in the Church," p. 170.

Church in Italy what these two provincial Synods thought most necessary. So important was the question felt to be by the North African Christians that another Council at Carthage, in 419 A.D., discussed the subject again, and renewed the decree of its predecessor. Again a note was added: "Let this also be notified to our brother and fellow-priest Boniface, Bishop of Rome, or to other Bishops of those parts, for the purpose of confirming that Canon."[1] Rome apparently remained indifferent to these conciliar reminders. No "stimulation from without" could move her to follow the example of the Synods of Laodicea and Carthage, and she did nothing to *define* the contents of the Holy Book until the Council of Trent.

What has the Roman Church done, it may be asked, to preserve the versions of the Bible from textual corruption? Until the time of Pope Sixtus V., at the end of the sixteenth century, she did absolutely nothing to vindicate the statement of the Encyclical Letter, that "she has ever held fast and exercised profitably that guardianship conferred upon her by Almighty God *for the protection* and glory of His Holy Word."[2] From the days of St. Jerome three different Bibles circulated in the West, of which no one had paramount authority.[3] Jerome's improved version finally succeeded in displacing its competitors on its own merits, without any direct ecclesiastical authority; but the long contest with its rivals necessarily led to great corruptions of the text. Mixed texts were formed according to the taste or judgment of scribes, and the confusion was further increased by the changes which were sometimes introduced by those who had some knowledge of Greek.[4] Individual scholars, like Cassiodorus, were sensible of the growing corruption, and did what they could to check it; but private labour in those days was of little avail. Charlemagne eventually took the matter up, and entrusted the task of revising the Latin text to Alcuin. Into this revision errors gradually crept, and later attempts at correction were made by Lanfranc of Canterbury, and others. Individual schoolmen, especially in France, began in the thirteenth century to draw up the *Correctoria Biblica*. If there was a time in the history of the Papacy when the Curia could reasonably be expected to do something to amend the Vulgate text, it was in the days of Pope Leo X., when the Renaissance was in its full vigour. That Pontiff attracted to

[1] Westcott's "Bible in the Church," p. 189.
[2] Encyclical Letter, p. 12.
[3] Westcott's "Bible in the Church," p. 190.
[4] Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. iii., p. 1703.

Rome from all quarters men distinguished in art, poetry, philosophy, and scholarship, so that it might be the capital of the world in everything pertaining to culture as well as religion. Pagan literature received the smiles of his patronage. A Greek printing-press was introduced, and valuable libraries established. Scholars produced editions of Plato, Pindar, Theocritus, Tacitus, Annotations on Homer and Sophocles, and were rewarded with lavish bounty from the Vatican treasury; but not one of these, or any one of the scores of learned professors maintained at the Gymnasium, was encouraged to do anything for the correction of the Vulgate. This indifference to the claims of the guardianship of the Bible is all the more amazing from the fact that pious and learned men elsewhere, especially in Germany—as John of Goch, John of Wesel, Gregory of Heimburg—had long drawn the attention of the Church to the paramount importance of Scriptural study and emendation.[1]

The warning voice of the Reformation, its appeal to the Bible as the only rule of faith, failed to impress upon the Papacy the urgent duty of providing a standard version of the Sacred Book. It is true that individuals here and there made attempts to produce improved editions of the Sacred Text, but these private and independent efforts made confusion more confounded. Perhaps no better illustration can be given of the almost hopeless character of this task than the attempt made by Isidorus Clarius, Bishop of Foligno in Umbria. He printed a revision of the Vulgate in 1542, which contained more than *eight thousand* corrections. In his Preface he says that "he did not correct all, because, if he would have corrected every passage in his version scrupulously and exactly by the Text, he might have given offence to Catholick ears."[2] This honest confession of his did offend "Catholick ears," for his version was forthwith placed upon the Index. Eventually the prohibition was withdrawn on condition of excluding the Preface and Prolegomena.

The first attempt on the part of "the Head of the Church" to give to his people an authoritative version of the Vulgate was that of Sixtus V., in 1590. Though the credit of such an effort is rightly due to him, he cannot be said to have "exercised profitably the guardianship . . . for the protection and glory of God's Holy Word." His corrections were arbitrary, and in many respects in defiance of those who had been employed to report upon the text. Bellarmine complained that the Church had never incurred a greater danger

[1] Ullman's "Reformers before the Reformation."
[2] Du Pin, "Eccles. Hist.," vol. iii., p. 699.

on account of these alterations.[1] When Clement VIII. succeeded to the Papal chair two years later, the Vulgate again underwent a revision in which more than *two thousand* corrections were made. To this edition a Preface was added from the pen of Bellarmine, acknowledging that there were wrong readings left unchanged in it to avoid giving popular offence, and aiming to save the honour of Pope Sixtus by an excuse which had no foundation in fact.[2] Such are "the celebrated editions of the Vulgate" which Pope Leo XIII. now "recalls (to recollection) with pleasure"; witnesses of "the solicitude of the Apostolic office . . . not to suffer any attempt to defile or corrupt" "this grand source of Catholic revelation."[3]

The present Pontiff may be credited with the laudable desire to make the Bible "abundantly accessible to the flock of Jesus Christ," but this has not been the characteristic of the Apostolic office since the days of Pope Gregory IX. That Pope declared: "The not knowing the Scriptures by the testimony of Truth itself is the occasion of errors, and therefore, it is expedient for all men to read or hear them."[4] For many centuries past the fact is patent that the free circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular has been disallowed, or so restricted as practically to make them inaccessible to "the flock." Proofs have already been given in this article in support of this statement. No better illustration of its truth could be furnished than a paper in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1888, entitled "The Power behind the Pope." The writer described the noble attempt of a devout French Roman Catholic, M. Henri Lasserre, to publish an edition of the Gospels for the benefit of his countrymen, to whom, he says, "the Gospel, the most illustrious book in the world, is become an unknown book." Lasserre's enterprise, completed in 1886, received the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Paris, and the approval and benediction of Pope Leo XIII. Its success was wonderful, twenty-five editions in the space of twelve months, thus showing the eagerness of the people for Scriptural knowledge. Then, after a year's circulation, the Sacred Congregation placed this book upon the Index, and the same Pope who, twelve months before, sent "from the bottom of his heart his Apostolic benediction" to its author, prohibited it to be

---

[1] Bellarmine to Clement VIII.: "Novit beatitudo vestra cui se totamque ecclesiam discrimini commiserit Sixtus V. dum *juxta propriæ doctrinæ sensus* sacrorum bibliorum emendationem aggressus est; nec satis scio an gravius unquam periculum occurrerit" (Van Ess., p. 290).

[2] Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. iii., p. 1707.

[3] Encyclical Letter, pp. 4 and 11.

[4] Epist. ad Germ. Archiep. Constant. apud M. Paris.

published, read or retained under pain of anathema. How strange this decree, bearing date December 20, 1887, appears side by side with the professions of the Encyclical Letter, November 18, 1893. Who can reconcile their glaring and astounding contradictions?

Here, in Great Britain, where the Bible is so well known, it is both impracticable and impolitic to exercise the restrictions placed upon the vernacular use of the Sacred Book in Continental Roman Catholic countries, and so with us Romanists benefit in some degree from their environment. Their Scriptural fare, however, in the public services of the Church is of a very meagre kind indeed. "The saving words of the Gospel," with which they are commanded to be fed on Sundays and solemn feast-days, are read at High Mass, first in Latin and then in English, but the minister is under *no obligation* to give an exposition of the same. He *may* do so, if he pleases. At Low Mass the Gospel and Epistle are said in Latin only, and such is the practice, which is said to prevail at all Masses, in purely Roman Catholic countries. Bible readings, such as obtain in the Anglican Church, are privileges utterly unknown to lay worshippers, either in this country or elsewhere. It may therefore be said without offence that under the Roman system the laity have the least possible encouragement to feed in those "fertile pastures and beautiful gardens in which the flock of the Lord is marvellously refreshed and delighted."[1]

And are the Roman clergy themselves much better off? They have "the sacred psalmody," it is true, in Latin in the daily office, and in the same language the Breviary lessons to be read on special occasions; but what aids have been afforded them from the seat of authority for the pursuit of Biblical studies? The reference in the Encyclical Letter to the "chairs of Oriental literature in the Roman College, etc.,"[2] would lead the world to suppose that some aids to a better knowledge of Holy Scripture have issued from those learned professorships. But what are the facts? In spite of the revival of Greek learning, "the happy invention of the art of printing," the introduction of a Greek press at Rome under Leo X., and the long "established chairs of Oriental literature," it was not until 1858, when Cardinal Mai published his edition of the Vatican MS., that any Greek Testament was ever printed in Rome. As to the Hebrew Bible, no edition of it has been published there yet. Equally lax has the Vatican press been in providing commentaries. Those that exist have been printed elsewhere, and they are for the most part antiquated,

[1] Encyclical Letter, p. 7. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

costly, and fragmentary. "Apart from the large, costly, and now partly antiquated works of Cornelius à Lapide and Calmet, severally 200 and 150 years old, there are at this moment no full commentaries on the entire Bible accessible to the Roman clergy, and very few indeed on separate portions except Maldonatus and Estius, the great majority of such as do exist being German, while little is done in France, almost nothing in Italy, and quite nothing in Spain and Portugal, for Biblical study."[1]

The careful reader of the Encyclical may reasonably ask, Is there anything in its pages which shows that there is a desire on the part of the Pope to popularize the Bible? Is there a suggestion anywhere in it in favour of the removal of the restrictions which make the Sacred Writings comparatively unknown to the laity? An emphatic No is the only answer that can be given. Its words are addressed to the hierarchy, and are primarily intended for the clerical caste. Its directions for the study of Holy Scripture are manifestly given with a view to the preparation of candidates for the ministry, and they bear all the characteristics of a syllabus new and tentative. Even for this select and limited class the approach to Biblical study is guarded and fenced about by conditions of such a kind as to be practically prohibitive. "Care must be taken, then," says the Letter, "that beginners approach the study of the Bible well prepared and furnished. . . . The best preparation will be a conscientious application to philosophy and theology under the guidance of St. Thomas of Aquin, and a thorough training therein."[2] The "Angelic Doctor," therefore, is the approved key of access to the sacred pages of the Divine Word. But what this involves can only be understood by those conversant with the scholasticism of the Middle Ages. Some idea of the hopelessness of the task of "a thorough training" in such a system may be suggested from the bare fact that the Bible itself is a mere primer compared with the ponderous "Summa Theologiæ" of St. Thomas. Imagine "a beginner," desirous of slaking his thirst for Divine knowledge in "the ever-flowing fountain of salvation," conscientiously applying himself for a thorough training in the Thomist philosophy and theology! Turning to the prologue of the "Summa," as the first step in the process, he reads: "Seeing that the teacher of Catholic truth should instruct not only those advanced in knowledge, but that it is part of his duty to teach beginners (according to the words of the Apostle to the Corinthians, "even as unto babes in Christ, I have fed you with milk and

[1] Littledale, "Plain Reasons," etc., p. 90.
[2] Encyclical Letter, p. 21.

not with strong meat), it is our purpose in this book to treat of those things which pertain to the Christian religion, in a manner adapted to the instruction of beginners. For we have considered that novices in this learning have been very much hindered in [the study of] works written by others; partly, indeed, on account of the multiplication of useless questions, articles and arguments, and partly [for other reasons]. To avoid these and other difficulties, we shall endeavour, relying on Divine assistance, to treat of those things which belong to sacred learning, so far as the subject will admit, with brevity and clearness."

All this is exceedingly good and promising, and the ingenuous student expects to find before him a task *brief, clear,* and *childish in its simplicity.* With this idea he takes a glance at the body of the treatise. His eyes open wide at the sight of this "brief" compendium of theology covering no fewer than 1,150 *folio pages,* each containing 2,000 words! He is amazed at the "milk" provided by this wise Catholic teacher for the special sustenance of theological "babes," when he is told that he must first digest *forty-three* propositions concerning the nature of God, each of which embraced several distinct articles separately discussed and concluded in the *eighty-three folios* devoted to this branch of the subject; then *fifteen* similar propositions regarding the nature of *angels,* embracing articles such as these:

Whether an angel can be in more than one place at one and the same time?

Whether more angels than one can be in one and the same place at the same time?

Whether angels have local motion?

And whether, if they have, they pass through intermediate space?

Then he is told to master ten propositions regarding *the Creation,* consisting of an elaborate attempt to bring into harmony the six days' work with mediæval notions of astronomy. These are to be followed by *forty-five* propositions respecting the nature of *man* before and after the Fall, the mode by which it was preserved immortal by eating of the tree of life, the place where man was created before he was placed in paradise, etc. Then, having digested all these subtle propositions, stated "briefly and clearly" in 216 of the aforesaid folio pages, he, poor novice! is informed for his consolation and encouragement that he had now mastered *not quite one-fifth part* of this "first book" for beginners in theological study, and that these propositions, and more than five times as many, were to be regarded by him as the settled

doctrine of the Catholic Church![1] If such be the needful preparation for the study of the Bible, who can wonder if the Holy Scriptures remain for the future a sealed book to the majority of the Roman clergy, as it did in the days of the Schoolmen? Ample records exist to show how the system of St. Thomas Aquinas practically closed the sacred pages. The state of theological training and its results at Oxford University in the fifteenth century is described by one of its distinguished *alumni* at that time: "In the Universities they have ordained that no man shall look on the Scripture until he be noselled in heathen learning eight or nine years, and armed with false principles with which he is clean shut out of the understanding of the Scriptures. . . . And then when they be admitted to study divinity, because the Scripture is locked up with such false expositions and with false principles of natural philosophy that they cannot enter in, they go about the outside and dispute all their lives about words and vain opinions, pertaining as much unto the healing of a man's heel as health of his soul."[2] To the same effect speaks Folly in the satire of Erasmus: "These Schoolmen possess such learning and subtlety that I fancy that even the Apostles themselves would need another spirit if they had to engage with this new race of divines about questions. . . . With the greatest complacency divines go on spending night and day over their foolish studies, so that they never have any leisure left for the perusal of the Gospels, or the Epistles of St. Paul."[3] The same writer, in the preface to his *Novum Testamentum*, speaks of his work as opening again "the wells of Abraham, which the Scribes and Pharisees, those wicked and spiteful Philistines, had stopped and filled up with the earth of their false expositions."

To this deplorable condition of Biblical knowledge Pope Leo XIII. would lead his flock by placing them "under the guidance of St. Thomas of Aquin." An outsider of the Roman communion may be pardoned for thinking that the labour of writing the Encyclical Letter is not worth the candle, if its main scope and purpose be to make scholasticism the door of access to the sacred oracles. All the eloquent sentences in praise of the Inspired Volume, all the illustrations of its marvellous use, all the admonitions to its reverent study, can only be regarded as well-sounding phrases when contrasted with the manifest intention of fencing round the "inexhaustible treasury of heavenly doctrine" with an almost impassable

---

[1] Seebohm's "Oxford Reformers," p. 108.
[2] Tindale's "Practice of Prelates," p. 291 (Parker Society).
[3] "Praise of Folly."

Thomist bog. The conclusion is inevitable that, in the Roman Church of to-day, Holy Scripture does not occupy the commanding position it once held for more than twelve hundred years. The teaching of the Fathers of the first six centuries, though referred to with high commendation in the Pope's Letter, is more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

An excuse is suggested for such a practice by the assertion of the Encyclical that "it must be recognised that the Sacred Writings are wrapt in a certain religious obscurity, and that no one can enter into their interior without a guide."[1] Patristic testimony, on the other hand, is flatly contradictory to this statement. The Fathers say most distinctly that in the things pertaining to salvation the Scriptures need no interpreter. The witness of St. Chrysostom is sufficient: "The Apostles and prophets have made all the things they published manifest and clear, and they have expressed them to us, just like ordinary secular teachers, so that each person by himself, from his own private reading, can learn the things which are said."[2]

The suggested difficulties of Holy Scripture, the expressed necessity of special guidance, the commendation of a difficult and obsolete system of preparatory studies practicable only for a select class, leave, after a careful perusal of the Papal Letter, the conviction that there is not, after all, any new departure to be found in the Vatican counsels on the subject matter of the Manifesto, and that the Holy Book will remain as jealously guarded and restricted from lay use as it has been for some centuries past.

D. MORRIS.

ART. IV.—WORTHY RECEIVERS.

THE beautiful city of Corinth lay smiling between its azure seas. It was a large and important commercial town, spread at the feet of a gigantic rock, like the Rock of Dumbarton, 2,000 feet high, which formed its citadel. The ancient city, which was one of great beauty and splendour, had been destroyed in a former generation by the Roman general Mummius. For nearly a century it lay desolate; but a new Corinth had risen from the ashes of the old. Julius Cæsar, recognising the importance of the isthmus as a military and mercantile position, sent to it a colony of Italians, who were

[1] P. 16. [2] Hom. III. de Laz.

chiefly freedmen. The new establishment rapidly increased by the mere force of its position. Within a few years it grew, as Singapore has grown in our days—from nothing to an enormous city. The Greek merchants, who had fled on the Roman conquest to the island of Delos and the neighbouring coasts, returned to the home of their fathers. The Jews settled themselves in a place most convenient for the business of commerce and for communication with Jerusalem. The beautiful temples were restored. The city was again shining with marble and gold.

It was the first day of the week. The Christians who had been converted by St. Paul had, of course, no church in which to assemble. It was not for many generations afterwards, when the age of persecutions had ceased, that places of worship could be built. Nor was there a day of rest. The Jews, indeed, observed their Sabbath the day before; but for Gentile Christians there was no such day of rest until the edict of Constantine in the fourth century. But they held gatherings for common worship in each other's houses. There would be among them a few more prosperous middle-class men who would have rooms large enough to admit a sufficient number. Towards some such room, then, they were now making their way along the various streets. With their meeting for worship they combined the Greek national custom of a social meal in common. In that warm and delightful climate the Greeks were not in the habit of having more than one set meal in the day. The others were just short snatches for the satisfaction of hunger and the support of nature. The one chief meal they often ate in common, the members of several families together. This custom the Christians naturally retained, making their Christianity the basis of their union for eating together. This day you would see them carrying baskets of food towards their well-to-do brother's house. Those who were better off would have large baskets carried by slaves. Some would be so poor that they would have little or nothing to contribute.

The result was very different from what might have been expected by St. Paul after his prolonged stay in Corinth. It appears that the wealthier people brought much more than they wanted, in order to make a display and cause the poor people to feel their inferior position. It became a kind of picnic. There seems to have been a sort of eager, scrambling spirit about it all.[1] Some of them wanted to be first. Some of them wanted to have the best things. Some wanted to get most of the food and wine. Many of them ate too much.

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 20, etc.

Some actually became intoxicated. In the midst of it all they celebrated the Christian mysteries, the memorial of the death of Christ. Can anything be imagined more unlike the Lord's Supper? Can you possibly picture to yourselves anything more unlike our service of Holy Communion? Is there any any member of any congregation throughout the length and breadth of the Church of England, who could possibly be guilty of such blasphemous irreverence?

What was the natural consequence? Such persons, as St. Paul said, stood self-condemned. They ate and drank their own condemnation, not remembering that this assembly was in reality the Lord's Body—His Church. St. Paul says nothing about damnation. The word he uses means condemnation, judgment, decision—nothing more. He is not thinking in the least about the place of punishment or the Last Day—simple condemnation. Such people condemned their own conduct. Nothing could be simpler or plainer. St. Paul was thinking of nothing of the kind. What he meant was that if these riotous, disorderly communicants once thought about it, they could not help seeing that such conduct was indecent and scandalous. And then there were other results. What follows now if people eat too much, or drink to excess, even once? They are ill the next day. What follows if they form the habit of indulging in superfluous food, and in frequent intoxication? They are visited by all kinds of diseases of the digestion. They become a mass of diseases. Physicians will tell you that most of the diseases of society come from the pleasures of the table. So it is now with gluttons and drunkards, and so it was then. Many of them became weak and sickly, says St. Paul. It was the just and natural order of God's providence. It would require a miracle to prevent gluttons and drunkards from becoming weak and sickly. Perhaps God punished them besides; but that would be enough.

One consequence more there was. For this cause, says St. Paul, many sleep. That is his word for the absence of religious life. How could there be any spiritual vitality in people who behaved in such a scandalous and abominable manner, turning the very Supper of the Lord, as St. Paul pathetically calls it, that sacred, solemn, holy, touching festival, into a noisy and unseemly picnic? Of course they slept; of course there was no religious life in them at all.

"When ye come together into one place, THIS is not to eat the Lord's Supper! For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken! What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have

not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup For he that eateth and drinketh in this unworthy manner, eateth and drinketh his own condemnation, not seeing that he is in the midst of the Lord's Body, the assembly of His Church. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat wait for one another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together with condemnation."

There you have it all. That is the whole account of the matter. There is nothing behind. Take care, in any application of these words, that you do not merely take them by themselves, snipping off what was before and behind, without making any reference to the scrambling, unseemly, impious picnic of the Corinthians.

Now there is a serious contrast between the days of the early Church and our own—not in this matter, to which I shall again presently refer, but in the point of attendance at Holy Communion. Communion has fallen very much into neglect amongst modern Christians. In the early days, the Lord's Supper was the principal part of public worship every Sunday. Every Christian partook of it regularly. If he failed for three Sundays together to participate in the common pledge of union with Christ and with the brethren, then he was *ipso facto* excommunicated. With us it is just the reverse. It is only a very small minority in our modern congregations who remain to partake when the Holy Communion is celebrated and administered. The rest troop out of church at the close of morning prayer as if they had done their duty, and anything farther was no concern of theirs. Of course, some have communicated at the early service. But that accounts for a very few among the vast number of professing Christians. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, in his last Charge in St. Paul's as Bishop of London, to the clergy of his diocese, told them that in the previous year on Easter Day, the day of all others when the Prayer-Book insists on every baptized grown-up Christian coming anew to pledge his faith and loyalty to his Lord by receiving the emblems of salvation, as far as calculations could be made out, out of three and a half millions of people in the diocese, only 110,000 partook of the Lord's Supper in the churches of the Church of England. And yet, as I say, Easter Day is the one typical day of all

others when Christians are urged to avail themselves of that privilege.

Perhaps it is partly the fault of those who arranged, or still arrange, our services. Possibly the morning service is too long: possibly the attention and devotion of most people is exhausted before the point arrives for Communion.

Perhaps some persons shrink back from some vague notion that, if they are known to partake of Communion, they will be put on a moral pedestal where it will be difficult for them to remain, forgetting that there is nothing required of Communion people—as they are sometimes absurdly and disloyally called—which is not required from every professing Christian who wishes to be considered a living member of Christ; and that the only difference between these so-called Communion people and those who are not, is that the one set have found out for themselves the most direct means of grace and Divine help, and the others, alas! have not.

Perhaps, also, many persons have a lingering feeling of alarm at the very solemn denunciations in the Prayer-Book, adopted from the language of St. Paul to the Corinthians, addressed to outrageous offenders against public morality and decency if they should dare to present themselves, and so place themselves in the category of the disorderly communicants at Corinth. That adaptation of those words has been greatly misunderstood. It is with the last of these obstacles that I wish to deal in this paper.

Now, at the time when our present Communion Office was compiled from the old liturgies, the state of ungodliness and evil living brought on by the Dark Ages was exceedingly gross and exceedingly prevalent. And yet, remember, that all professing Christians were supposed to be communicants. The practice of the unreformed Church had made Communion extremely difficult. As a matter of fact, men for the most part communicated only once a year—at Easter. These difficulties were removed by the Reformation; and, for fear of sacrilege, our forefathers mentioned the reasons for abstaining from Communion in very plain terms, terms which astonish us by their nature. We should not have supposed that anybody coming under these few disgraceful heads would have thought of coming near the feast. These terms can apply to few, if any, of those who form our regular Christian congregations in these days. We are all aware that in our times, unfortunately, church-goers are only a minority of the population. Our regular Christian congregations rather need encouraging and stirring up to warmth, earnestness, zeal, and reality. Think of the list of people who were the only ones whom our forefathers wished to prevent from participation:

"Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of His Word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or *in any other grievous crime*, repent you of your sins, or else come not to that Holy Table."

I do not think that anyone in our modern congregations is likely to be a habitual blasphemer of God, a deliberate hinderer or slanderer of His Word, an adulterer, or living in black, malignant malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime. Sins you have. Sins we all have. The heart knoweth its own bitterness; and those sins of yours you bring to God for pardon at that glorious service when we specially plead the passion, death, and sacrifice of Christ.

It is against these notorious offenders whom the Prayer-Book wishes to keep away—the blasphemers of God, the hinderers or slanderers of His Word, the adulterers, the malicious, those whose hearts are full of bitter envy, or who are guilty of any other grievous crime—that our forefathers adopted the serious language of St. Paul to the Corinthians; not against the trembling sinner who comes to sue for pardon and relief. It is in reference to these notorious offenders, and the imminent danger of their presence, that they inserted these words:

"So is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own condemnation, not considering the Lord's Body; we kindle God's wrath against us; we provoke Him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death."

If any of us wish to behave as the Corinthians did, or if we come under the few, distinct, black and terrible heads of impossible receivers in the Prayer-Book, then we should be right in applying these words of St. Paul in some sort to ourselves. But not till then. The unworthy receivers St. Paul was thinking of were the impious gluttons and drunkards. The unworthy receivers the Prayer-Book was thinking of were the blasphemers, the slanderers of Scripture, the adulterers, and the like. But do not allow those words to be misunderstood. Do not tell the poor conscience-stricken sinner who longs to taste and see how gracious the Lord is that some mysterious visitation of disease is the punishment of all unworthiness alike. In that sense none of us are worthy. Christ our Lord has told us that disease does not come in that way, but as it came to the Corinthians, as it would have come to the notorious evil-livers at the time of the Reformation, by way of natural consequence of their evil-living. Do not allow the hesitating sinner to be told that, if he comes to the spiritual banquet of Christ's dying love, our Heavenly Father

is waiting to pounce upon him like a lion if he is not in a perfect condition, because Christ and St. Paul have told us that God is longing and yearning to receive us, and that we can never have any righteousness or worthiness of our own. In Christ's name do not let us misinterpret St. Paul's words to those riotous Corinthians, or our Prayer-Book's application of them to blasphemers and adulterers. The Communion was meant for sinners seeking pardon and grace, not for righteous persons who need no repentance.

Think of our Saviour. How it must distress Him to see such a fallacy prevailing amongst us, the very contrary of what He was always teaching! "Come unto Me, *all* ye that are weary and heavy laden," He said; not those who think they have made themselves perfect. When He allowed the poor harlot to wash His feet with her tears, and wipe them with the hairs of her head, He was not threatening to punish her with diseases because she was not worthy. When He was sitting in that upper room that evening in Jerusalem, that evening before He went out into the Garden of Gethsemane, and gave His disciples the bread and the wine which He had blessed, and said, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," and knew all the time that on that very evening they would all basely desert Him and flee, and some of them would even deny Him—do you think that at that moment He was wishing to punish them with diseases because they were not worthy? Read the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and you will see what He was thinking of. "Holy Father," He was saying, "keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me." "Let not your heart be troubled." "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you." "Ye are My friends." "I go to prepare a place for you." Yet they were not worthy receivers in the Pharisaic and mistaken sense of the word. That very night, a few short hours after they had received the bread from His holy hands, and had drunk from the cup after His holy lips had touched it, they all forsook Him and fled.

And besides that, what was Christ always saying about diseases and death? Why, He was always trying to teach His disciples that diseases were not the arbitrary punishment of sin. The man that was blind was not blind because of his own sin or the sin of his parents. The men on whom the Tower of Siloam fell were not sinners above other people, nor even the Galileans whom Pilate slew near the altar when the sacrifices were being performed. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." The tares are left with the wheat till the harvest. As a plain matter of fact, Christ teaches us that diseases and sundry

kinds of death do not come except very rarely as the direct punishment of unworthiness, but as the natural consequence of evil-doing, and usually in the natural course of God's providence.

No! the warning in the Prayer-Book which is most generally applicable to modern congregations is not that against the blasphemers, the slanderers of the Bible, the adulterers, and the like, who are not found in the small number of those who in these days attend church, but that equally solemn denunciation against those of the congregation who disregard the Eucharistic Feast:

"This He Himself hath commanded; which if ye shall neglect to do, consider with yourselves how great injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same; when ye wilfully abstain from the Lord's Table, and separate from your brethren, who come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food."

The Prayer-Book description of the Eucharist is that Christ "hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death, *to our great and endless comfort.*"

The requirements of the Prayer-Book are exceedingly broad, exceedingly simple, and applicable alike to all those who wish to be considered sincere Christians, however feeble and imperfect may be their endeavours:

"Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways; draw near with faith, and *take this holy Sacrament to your comfort.*"

The Prayer-Book strikes a deep penitent note of personal insufficiency throughout the whole service. What could be more humble and self-distrustful, what less suggestive of achieved worthiness and perfection, than the words of the General Confession? "We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed . . . the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable." What are the words of comfort which follow? "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden"; "God gave His only-begotten Son, that whoso believeth should not perish"; "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; "If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father."

And, again, what could be less self-reliant or more utterly dependent on God than the prayer of humble access? "We do not presume to come to this Thy Table trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We

are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table."

And even though we have received the pledges of God's love, the note of personal emptiness and self-depreciation is still the same: "Although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences."

Holy Communion is not a mystic rite for the initiated few; it is the great and constant means of grace for all needy and sin-stricken believers. Our Lord once for all described the attitude of our Heavenly Father towards even the most sinful of His sons, when they turn again to Him, in the inestimably precious parable of the Prodigal Son. "He arose and came to his Father. But when he was yet a great way off—when he was yet a great way off—his father saw him, and had compassion, and *ran*, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.' But before he could get out all the words he had prepared, the father was calling aloud to his servants, 'Bring forth the best robe and put it on him! Kill the fatted calf, and let us have such a feast and banquet as we never had before; let us eat and be merry! for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found!'"

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ERRATUM.—Page 639, "Massiglio, the author of the '*Defensa Paris*,'" should read "Massiglio, the author of the 'Defensor Pacis.'"

SWITZERLAND ONCE MORE.

August 19, 1899.

ONCE more I hear these mountain streams
Down-rushing from their icy throne,
The snow-drift thundering from the height,
The waterfall's enchanted moan;
Into the secret of the hills
I mark the glaciers wind their way,
Or pause to watch some fold of cloud
Flushed with the rose of dying day.

O splendours of this Alpine land,
Rejoicing tired heart and brain,
How oft have I, mid hours of toil,
Longed for your soothing peace again!
Far rambles over open fields,
The long bright walks among the pines,
The morning plunge in some blue lake,
The evening stroll beside the vines!

How sweet to feel, at day's cool prime,
The shy lights slowly gathering force,
Till all the spears of distant crags
Seem dipt in Morn's immortal source!
To wander on mid darkling glades,
And taste the savour of the Dawn,
Ere, one by one, from alp and dale
The shadows of the Night are drawn.

Far-famed, yon solitary peaks,
Like steadfast beacons raised to guard
These pastures dreaming many a mile
Beneath their stern unbending ward,
Rise diademed with peerless snows
That gaze for ever in God's face,
Rock-ribbed, ice-walled, and heaped about
With stones of ruin at their base.

Again I tread these scented paths
With silent lips and thoughtful mien,
While tinklings from the vagrant herds
Cross and recross the cloven ravine;
Here gather sweet forget-me-nots,
There press thro' spaces hung with dew,
Here pluck the gentian from his bed
And marvel at his lustrous hue.

With many a merry scuffle, white
With foam of onset, ever flash
The torrents, brawling as they go,
And down the wave-worn gullies dash:
Like steeds unbroken to the rein
At every check they madly rear,
Yet all day long within the clefts
Make ceaseless music in the ear.

Perchance my steps may lead me forth
To where, retired amid the glen,
Some gray moraine its length uprears
Beyond the scattered haunts of men;

Where icy balms of heaven are born
  Mid silent caverns, blue and deep,
Poised o'er the shining battlements
  That clasp the mountains' cloudy feet.

At times, when manhood's pulses stir
  With quickened zeal and vital glow,
I yearn to touch those crystal tracks
  Lying unseen in upper snow.
Ah! fair to scan, long leagues beneath,
  Each valley hushed in mystic trance,
The glory of the awakening hills,
  The calm too great for utterance.

And when at last Night casts her veil
  Of awful beauty o'er the world,
How phantom-strange the ridges gleam!
  The cloud-wreaths on their summits curled
How solemn in their sleep! Each spire
  Bathed in the moonlight coldly shines,
In hoary grandeur glimmering faint
  Far o'er the shadow-stricken pines.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Review.

Ecclesiastes: An Introduction to the Book; an Exegetical Analysis; and a Translation with Notes. By THOMAS TYLER, M.A. D. Nutt. Price 6s. A new edition.

THE large majority of commentaries, either on the Sacred Scriptures or the secular classics, are mere compilations, written to serve a passing need. Not so this most able and conscientious edition of Kohêleth. Mr. Tyler has evidently spared no pains to render his commentary valuable to the serious student; every page of it bears the impress of careful thought. Difficulties are not evaded, but met and faced; and there is an impression of original work about this book which is most refreshing.

Mr. Tyler published the first edition of his "Ecclesiastes" in 1874, and though the framework has not been disturbed, he has thoroughly revised and amended his work for this second edition. Briefly, the chief —and really notable—contribution which Mr. Tyler brings to the interpretation of Ecclesiastes is the consideration of the peculiar relations of Ecclesiastes to the post-Aristotelian philosophy. Admitting to the full the editor's ingenuity, I have been unable to accept his assertion of the direct influences either of Stoicism or Epicureanism upon the Hebrew writer. Mr. Tyler's "proofs" seem ineffectual; and I am glad to see that this view is supported by the writer of the article "Ecclesiastes" in

Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i., p. 639. (Compare Wenley, "Aspects of Pessimism," p. 38.) Mr. Tyler sees direct influences where only resemblances occur.

In § 5 of the Introduction, arguing on the assumption (it is nothing more) that Zeno and Epicurus have directly influenced Kohêleth, Tyler builds up his theory as to the date of the book, which seems to me to be put considerably too late; and to that opinion Dr. C. H. H. Wright apparently assents. Tyler is probably correct in saying that Kohêleth had studied the Book of Job thoroughly; but the remarks in § 9 on Psalm lxiii. and Ecclesiastes are surely fanciful. It may be true also that Ecclesiastes is not without traces of a Messianic hope; but can we really find such in ch. v. 6?

On p. 61 the editor argues ingeniously, perhaps convincingly, that Kohêleth = Philosophy, *i.e.*, a collective personification, an assembly of philosophers; while Solomon (who certainly did *not* write the book, as every scholar now admits) is introduced to us as the mouthpiece of speculative philosophy, in order to give the book a concrete unity (§ 13).

Notably acute is Tyler's explanation of the epilogue (on p. 82); and his remarks on the influence of the LXX. are important (compare § 18). The really weak spot in an admirable (though by no means always convincing) work is the English translation, which strikes me as often uncouth, and wanting in dignity and felicity of phrase. E. H. B.

Short Notices.

Instructions on the Revelation of St. John the Divine. By the Rev. Cresswell Strange, M.A. Longmans and Co. Price 6s. Pp. 330.

ONE well versed in Biblical literature wrote that "more nonsense has been written upon the Book of Revelation than upon any other book of Holy Scripture." The opinion was severe, perhaps too severe, for holy thoughts and aspirations sometimes breathe and do good work in the world, even through very imperfect reasoning. However, it is a pleasure to welcome a book on the Apocalypse which is eminently sensible, and also full of useful practical teaching. In this respect Mr. Strange reminds us of the late Dean Vaughan's volume on the same subject. Here are a series of fifty-two Instructions, each of which has been preached as a sermon, in which the author clearly deals with the problems, and emphasizes the plain lessons of Revelation. He does this with two beliefs constantly before his mind: first (with Professor Milligan), that the book is an extended account of our Lord's discourse on the four last things; and, second, that its teaching is rather for all time than bound up in specific historic events. Throughout, Milligan, Schaff, Lee, and Fausset are consulted. The result is a really valuable collection of homiletic dissertations.

Wanderings West and East. By the Rev. E. Bartrum, D.D. Partridge and Co. Price 2s. 6d. Pp. 221.

Everybody travels nowadays. The number of those who go round the world and then write a book of travels increases every year. Dr. Bartrum was called by domestic duty to Canada and British Columbia, and thence made his way across the Pacific to Hong Kong, Japan, Ceylon, Egypt, and so to his country rectory in England. His mind is receptive, but dis-

criminating. He does not bore us with masses of information and conjecture; but he makes some excellent notes in simple and sprightly language on many interesting subjects. His hints on Canada and British Columbia will be useful to intending colonists; while his descriptions of Japanese life, of the Chinese character, and his notes on trees, plants, and natural features of the countries he traversed, are exceptionally concise and good.

High Aims at School. By the Rev. R. A. BYRDE, M.A., with Preface by Dr. JAMES of Rugby. Elliot Stock. Pp. 134.

Boys are not easy to preach to, but when once attracted are perhaps the most remunerative listeners. These sermons are just what sermons to boys should be—earnest, simple, practical, formative. Such subjects as "Home Duties," "Patience," "Purity of Heart," "Evil Influence," are well chosen, and discussed with admirable reality and force.

Scientific Temperance Addresses. By E. CRAWSHAW. C.E.T.S. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 98.

The effects of alcohol on the human body as a study in physiology are now well known to temperance lecturers. In the clearness of arrangement and illustration, this book compares favourably with others of the same character. It is also considerably fuller and more up-to-date than any we have previously seen. Herein it appears to possess a distinct advantage.

Footsteps to Peace. By W. WELBY PRYER. George Stoneman: London. Price 8d. Pp. 63.

The Spirit of Power. By the Rev. W. TALBOT HINDLEY. *Home Words* Office. Price 6d. Pp. 42.

Two little devotional manuals on the same lines as the teaching of the Keswick School. Those who accuse this school of mysticism should read such statements as these, which are throughout in close touch with the everyday things of life.

Charles Grant. By HENRY MORRIS. S.P.C.K. Pp. 63.

Charles Grant was a close friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton, and in the closing years of the eighteenth and first years of the nineteenth centuries he was associated with all the important religious enterprises in this country. No connected account of his life has been published before, and this book gives interesting glimpses of religious life and thought, with particulars of many good people who worked for God both in the India and the England of that day.

Sophia Cooke. By E. A. WALKER. Elliot Stock. Pp. 91.

Sophia Cooke laboured for forty-two years as a missionary in Singapore under the Society for Promoting Female Education in India and the East. Her devoted life was crowned by great success among the girls of her boarding-school, and is a touching proof of Christ's power to inspire service that is self-sacrificing and enduring.

Unseal the Book. By Mrs. ASHLEY CARUS-WILSON. R.T.S. Pp. 160.

To say that Mrs. Carus-Wilson was Miss Mary L. G. Petrie, B.A., before her marriage will be sufficient to recommend this book to Bible students. It consists mainly of papers published in several magazines, which are here collected and systematized. It deals with the right rendering, studying, storing, and practising of Holy Scripture. We commend the book heartily to Christian teachers.

Our Christian Year. By a TEACHER. Elliot Stock. Pp. 346.
Sunday Readings. By BEATRICE WAUGH. S.P.C.K. Pp. 192.

Both these books follow the Church's seasons, the former being intended for the elder scholars in Sunday-schools, and the latter for the

sick in hospitals. While there is, perhaps, nothing very striking about either, yet they are well suited for the purposes for which they were written; and many who have little time or training, and who yet are glad to teach in a Sunday-school or minister to the sick, will find here much excellent matter ready for their use.

My Tour in Palestine and Syria. By F. H. DEVERELL. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

The care and attention that have been bestowed upon this book are remarkable. Paper, type, and binding are excellent, and the illustrations, done from photographs, are charming from their clearness. The letter-press is a kind of diary recording the author's impressions on the spots he visited. Much interesting information may be gleaned from them, but we see no necessity for a violent tirade against the Government for not declaring war on behalf of Armenia.

Statutes and Songs. By the Rev. F. B. MEYER. London: James Nisbet and Co.

These are sermons, or, rather, sermon-notes, and give a good representation of Mr. Meyer's general style. We particularly like the second, "The night is far spent," on Rom. xiii. 11-14, but all are good.

Old Testament History for Schools. Part III. By the Rev. T. H. STOKOE, D.D. The Clarendon Press.

The importance of system and method in religious teaching in secondary schools is gradually becoming recognised. Manuals such as Dr. Stokoe's should be widely used. They contain almost every requirement for school use, and are practical, plain, and up-to-date. This, the third volume, deals with the period from the Disruption to the return from the Captivity, and is as good as its predecessors.

A Lost Art. By S. C. PENNEFATHER. London: *Home Words* Publishing Office.

These are a series of stories of the East End which have come under the observation of workers in the Mildmay Mission. They are deeply interesting, with an undercurrent of quiet pathos that should convince even the most careless reader of the needs of our outcast brethren, and the duties we owe to them. We wish a wide circulation for this little book.

The Month.

THE second trial of Captain Dreyfus ended at Rennes on Saturday, September 9, with a second verdict of guilty by five votes to two, instead of unanimously as in 1894. Extenuating circumstances were found, however, and the sentence was ten years' detention in a fortress. It is an amazing verdict, about which everything that can be said has already been given vent to, both for and against. The *cause célèbre* of the century is finished; but France has received a blow from which she may, perhaps, never recover. Nemesis follows in the wake of guilty nations as of guilty individuals. All through the civilized world outside France the verdict of the court-martial has created a feeling of shame and horror. We will not add more, save to express our sense, not only of the baseness of the crime, but also of our admiration for the patriot minority in France, who through all these bitter months have succoured

the cause of right and justice through evil report and good. Picquart and his noble confrères have won for themselves a name that will never die in the memories of men and women. Honour to them!

The news from the Transvaal is serious enough; but it is now pretty clear that England is all but unanimous on the questions involved in this awkward affair. We fancy that President Kruger might be glad to yield so far as he himself is concerned; but the majority of young Boers are thirsting for a brush with Britain, confident of success for their own arms. The memory of Majuba Hill has not faded out of the Boer mind; but, then, neither has it faded from the mind of England. And England will not tolerate being trifled with any longer on a matter that touches her honour, as well as the principles of justice and of right.

The ecclesiastical situation remains unchanged, though Dr. Sanday's pamphlet on the Archbishops' decision is causing some sensation. It is devoutly to be hoped that no ill-timed acts on the part of Churchmen, whether High or Low, will be allowed to interfere with the peace, won on constitutional lines, which we all so emphatically desire. But even peace can be purchased too dearly, if at the sacrifice of principles.

Lord Halifax's address to the E.C.U. has not approved itself to the conscience of loyal Churchmen. The following comment in a well-known London paper is worth reproducing, because it appears to us to voice the settled opinion of constitutionally-minded Churchmen throughout the land: "His lordship discusses at some length the grounds upon which the Archbishops gave their decision regarding lights and incense. This he has a perfect right to do; but we question whether he is equally justified in the advice which he extends to the Union on the manner in which the new admonitions are to be received. It appears to be not obscurely hinted that a positive disregard of the Bishops' authority in these matters would not arouse the president's implacable resentment. The point he insists on, however, is that, if obedience be rendered, it shall be made plain by clergy and laity that this 'compliance is yielded grudgingly and of necessity,' and that 'submission is made without prejudice to whatever future action may be thought wise and right.' It is perhaps superfluous to recall to Lord Halifax's mind the form for the Ordering of Priests in the English Prayer-Book, in which the candidate for holy orders takes a solemn vow very hard to reconcile with this 'grudging' obedience recommended by Lord Halifax. Let us quote a passage. The Bishop asks the candidates in the course of that office, 'Will you reverently obey your Ordinary and other chief ministers unto whom is committed the charge and government over you: following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their judgments?' To which the answer to be returned is, 'I will so do, the Lord being my helper.' There is nothing here about grudging and perfunctory obedience. The clergy have sworn, one and all, to obey 'with a glad mind.' But the president counsels more practical expressions of disobedience than a mere display of the sulks. He suggests that incense should still be used in the processions before the Communion service, but discontinued before the opening 'Our Father.' This course, he seems to think, would get behind the letter of the Archbishops' decision, and serve as a vigorous and unmistakable protest. We hope the English Church Union is not becoming infected with the morale of a certain section of that Roman Church to which it approximates so closely in doctrine and ritual. . . . English people as a rule do not like this sort of sharp practice; and we cannot think that Lord Halifax, in proposing

it, has consulted either his own dignity or the interest of the Church party to which he is so devotedly attached. A vigorous policy founded upon his suggestions would, we believe, lead to a tenfold increase of anarchy and confusion in the Established Church."

"It is a noteworthy sign of a growing sense among Irish Churchmen of the corporate character of a diocese that the first stone has been laid in Belfast of a cathedral intended to serve as the Mother Church of the united dioceses of Down, Connor, and Dromore. It is true that each of these dioceses has its own cathedral, but since their union in a single see there has existed the need of a central church as the seat of the Bishop's authority. That Belfast should have been chosen is a happy augury for the future of the Church of Ireland in that important centre of population, amongst whom the Bishop, let us hope, finds it more congenial to erect a new cathedral than to upset a parish church. Congregationalism is rampant in the city. The clergy live apart from an ecclesiastical centre, and their standard of Church life closely conforms to that of the Protestant sects by which they are surrounded. The cathedral, presenting a higher type of worship, and standing as the symbol of corporate unity, cannot fail to influence and elevate the tone of Belfast Churchmanship. For financial reasons, it will be built at a modest cost, and, for reasons which we fail to appreciate, the style chosen is the Byzantine of Southern France, and the plan that of the basilica in its general outline."—*Church Times.*

Nearly 150 workhouses have been booked for short missions by the Church Army Prison and Workhouse Mission Staff, and the society expects to have close upon 300 booked by the autumn. The reports received week by week from the chaplains and masters of the workhouses where these missions have already been conducted are very encouraging.

The Church of St. Michael Bassishaw, in Basinghall Street, is to come down, and the Common Council have bought the site for £36,000. This is at the rate of £7 a square foot.

"Professor Campbell reports that spectroscopic observations at the Lick Observatory have shown that the polar star is, in fact, a triple system—a binary with a revolution of about four days, moving round a third more distant star."—*Athenæum.*

The Bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Carr Glyn, whose ministry at St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington, is held in pleasant remembrance, is making his episcopal supervision a reality by visiting every parish in his diocese. The formidable nature of the task will be realized when it is stated that the diocese contains about 600 benefices, and that the acreage is 1,236,708. Some of Dr. Carr Glyn's predecessors have fallen far short of his ideal in this respect, for there are many parishes which he has already visited in which a Bishop has not set foot for half a century.

The annual income of the See of Winchester is £6,500, and Bishop Davidson has courageously avowed that this sum does not permit of him entertaining the clergy and churchwardens at luncheon, in view of the demands made upon him in connection with the needs of the diocese. In these days of agricultural depression, the calls on the purse of a Bishop are many and urgent; and when he has met them, his income, large though it appears on paper, has dwindled down to very modest proportions. Luncheons are capital things in their way, but there are other forms of truer hospitality.

The suggestion that York Minster should be restored does not seem to have been very enthusiastically taken up. Of the £50,000 which is needful, not £13,000 up to the present date has been subscribed. The fact that restoration is sometimes a distant relation to vandalism may account for these disappointing figures.

In a deeply-interesting account of Spurgeon's sermons, Mr. Arthur Mee says, in the *Puritan* for September: "Something like 100,000,000 have been sold at a penny, and quite double that number have been circulated in newspapers and other ways. The number of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons sold since 1855 exceeds the number of Bibles circulated since the beginning of the century." When it is borne in mind that the British and Foreign Bible Society print five tons of Bibles every day, it will be understood what this means.

The British Association held its annual meeting at Dover this year. Sir Michael Foster presided, and delivered his opening address on the evening of September 13. There was a very large attendance of members.

The shilling edition of Mr. Walsh's "Secret History of the Oxford Movement" will be ready immediately. New matter has been added, and it will be more complete and contain more information than any previous edition. One hundred thousand copies are being printed.

Clergymen interested in the proper management of our hospitals and infirmaries are invited to attend a conference to be held under the auspices of the Hospital Reform Association, at St. Martin's Town Hall on the 10th and 11th prox., to discuss: (1) "The Inquiry System," October 10, 4 p.m.; (2) "Payments by Patients," 8 p.m.; (3) "Provident Dispensaries," October 11, 4 p.m.

The Archdeacon of London, the Ven. William M. Sinclair, D.D., has been appointed chaplain to Mr. Alfred H. Bevan, Sheriff-elect.

The appointment of Chaplain-General of the Army will shortly be placed at Lord Lansdowne's disposal by the retirement, under the age clause, of Dr. Edghill.

An alteration has already been made in the Church Congress programme. On Tuesday, October 10, the preacher at Westminster Abbey will be the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, instead of the Archbishop of Armagh. On the following Friday there will be a thanksgiving service in St. Paul's Cathedral, the Bishop of London being the preacher. Sermons by special preachers will be given in St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey on October 8 and 15.

The Dean of Ripon, as Chairman of the Christian Conference Committee, announces that united meetings will be held on Monday, October 9, in St. Martin's Town Hall, Charing Cross, in connection with the Church Congress. The circular states that the Church Congress, having at present no power to admit any but those "in communion with the Church of England" to speak at its meetings, the committee of the Christian Conference have resolved on holding united meetings, as was done successfully at Bradford in 1898. They have chosen subjects either identical with those to be discussed at the congress, or germane to them, and hope that their discussions may not be without some influence on those of the congress.

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1899.

ART. I.—WILL ENGLAND BECOME (ROMAN) CATHOLIC?[1]

THE Anglican Church is at this moment passing through a crisis which profoundly agitates the country, and has a wide echo, not only in the press, but also in Parliament. The question interests Italy as well, because from this religious agitation in England not a few, especially in the Vatican circles, nourish a false hope that the English nation will return into the bosom of the "Catholic" Church. This hypothesis appears worthy of special examination, both because a signification which it does not possess has been attributed by the foreign press to the so-called "Catholic movement" in England, and also because I am convinced that the English people never have, and never will, separate themselves from that strong and robust Protestantism to which they have remained faithful for nearly four hundred years. I shall endeavour in the course of this brief article to present to my readers arguments in favour of my conviction, which is purely an objective one, as I also belong to the (Roman) Catholic Church. First, however, let me crave their indulgence for a foreigner who dares to write in a language which is not his.

Since the death of the lamented Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Manning, we have heard a great deal said about an extraordinary development of "Catholicism" in England. It is worthy of note that during the life of this illustrious prelate, when the Roman Church really was gaining sympathy amongst Englishmen, little was heard of such a fact. Cardinal Manning thoroughly knew his fellow-

[1] By Richard Bagot. Translated from the "Nuova Antologia," by Constance A. Radclyffe.

countrymen, and never deluded himself with the idea that their conversion to the "Catholic" faith was probable. Born a Protestant, educated in Protestant colleges, for many years a prominent ecclesiastic of the Anglican Church, he had every opportunity of studying English character. We may be allowed to presume, therefore, that Manning knew well how to distinguish between that toleration which the English people always grant to every form of religion—holding that each one should be free to select that road to Paradise which seems to him the best—and the inclination to embrace the Roman Catholic faith.

With Cardinal Manning there expired the real, genuine progress of the Roman Church in England, while there began an epoch of agitators and ecclesiastical harangues which Manning would never have encouraged. The truth is that Roman Catholicism in England, far from being a progressive movement, is, and has been for some years, stationary, if not retrograde. But the Catholic press, English as well as foreign, assures us that not a month passes without a considerable number of converts being received into the fold of the Roman Church, and every now and then some newspaper publishes an imposing list of these conversions. We read also of new churches being built, of monasteries and religious communities being founded—in a word, of a movement which would mean an extraordinary activity and growing development of the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain. It is true that no one has ever thought of denying the activity of the Roman Church in whatever situation it finds itself. But as to the development of "Catholicism" amongst my countrymen, I shall endeavour to show that it is nothing but a purely superficial movement, which does not act at all on the thought or on the real religious sentiment of the Anglo-Saxon race. Seeing the great "Catholic" churches of London and other English towns, so full of devotees of both sexes attending the functions of Roman worship, performed with a luxury and a pomp hardly to be seen even in Rome, it is very natural that a foreigner should be much impressed, and that after Mass he should feel persuaded that the triumph of "Catholicism" in England must be a matter of a few years at most. How should the foreigner know that perhaps three quarters of this crowd which he has seen attending the functions are not "Catholic" at all, nor have the smallest inclination to submit themselves to the spiritual authority of the Pope? Many go from curiosity, to enjoy the music and the spectacle, the diversions of an English Sunday being but few. And if we examine carefully these numerous conversions to "Catholicism" we shall find that the converts whose

personality could exercise the smallest influence on the thoughts of the people are very few. Amongst the recruits the Roman Catholic Church has made in England in the last five and twenty years one can hardly find a dozen prominent persons. Scientific, literary, political men, with one accord, saving some very rare exceptions, are conspicuous by their absence from the list of the converted; nor is it amongst them that "Catholicism" finds its new adherents. The greater part of the conversions take place amongst the small tradespeople and the women of the middle classes in the great towns.

Now, one quite understands that, as regarding only the form of religious faith about a human being, the soul of a beggar is worth as much as that of a Minister of State. But, setting aside sentiment, the *value* of a conversion depends essentially on the intellectual and social position of the individual convert. This value of a religious conversion is in a direct ratio to the positive influence which he could exercise over the minds or over the religious feelings of others. When Newman, Manning, Ward, and other great intellects of the same order forsook the Anglican Church and submitted themselves to the Roman Catholic Church, English Protestantism received a severe shock, and if Pusey had also renounced Anglicanism, and followed the example of his other colleagues in the Oxford Movement, he would have taken with him a great part of the Anglicans. Dr. Pusey, however, could never bring himself to take the last step, and contented himself with drawing the National Church out of the state of lethargy into which it had fallen, and giving it the principles of a pseudo-Catholicism without the Pope, which is known to-day by the name of Ritualism. From that period until now the recruits of Rome in England have been of very small importance as regards their personality, except in the case of two or three peers, whose conversion made some noise in the country, or of some Anglican ecclesiastic.

In what consists, then, these conversions to "Catholicism" in England? and why has it been so persistently asserted that England will end by being a "Catholic" nation for the second time in history? Those who have had an opportunity of studying the social life and the popular feeling of the nation will not find much difficulty in answering such questions. The Roman Catholic party in England has always remained, to a certain extent, foreign to the social life of the country, and I will endeavour to give the reasons. Up to nearly the half of this century the English "Catholics" still felt the effects of the anti-Catholic penal laws. The old "Catholic" families were only known by name, and hardly ever moved off their own properties, while the laws did not permit them to take

any part in the affairs of the country. Their sons were sent exclusively to school in "Catholic" colleges kept by priests, so that they grew up in a little world of their own, having nothing in common with real English life. In fact, it is only in these latter years that the "Catholic" authorities have permitted their youths to enter the public schools and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and this still under certain restrictions and conditions. In such a state of things, how was it possible that young "Catholics" should take their part in the life of their own country? They were looked on with coldness, and almost with aversion, by the great majority of their countrymen, and therefore they were compelled only to frequent the company of their co-religionists. It is, however, only fair to remark that this condition of Roman Catholic youths in England is now much improved, and it is permissible to hope that, with the inevitable progress of more liberal ideas, it will improve still more. These observations only apply to the upper classes. The truth is that it is difficult to find Roman Catholics of pure English blood amongst the lower classes, and this fact appears to me to deserve a little consideration, because in it lies an important point in my argument. The greater part of the inferior classes which belong to the Roman Catholic faith in England and Scotland are of Irish origin. This means that they do not belong at all to the Anglo-Saxon race, but to the Celtic one. Those who know the distinguishing characteristics of this race can judge if the "Catholic" Church can draw from it any great advantages to increase its propaganda amongst the English.

Let us now go on to examine more closely those conversions to the "Catholic" faith which undoubtedly do take place in England. The priests and the "Catholic" press assure us that these conversions occur very often, and that the number of English who abandon Protestantism is ever increasing. Let us admit that such is the case, and that all those who become "Catholics" always remain faithful to their new ideas—a supposition, however, which is not proved by facts. I do not think I shall be making a mistake when I affirm that almost 90 per cent. of these recruits in both sexes, with a notable preponderance of the feminine one, are persons of already advanced years. Amongst these we shall find not a few clergymen, already married, and fathers of Protestant families, who with a self-abnegation worthy of the highest praise have listened to the voice of their consciences, and have had the courage to sacrifice the goods of this world, from love of that Divine truth which they believe they have found in the Romish Church. We have also converts who become priests, and converted women who go into convents.

These naturally belong to a younger class of recruits. There remains, therefore, a very small proportion of those who could become parents of future Catholics. This fact suffices for the impartial observer of the so-called "Catholic movement" in England to deem it a barren one.

Let us now consider the position of Roman Catholicism in England as regards national feeling, and what are the visible signs of the good disposition of the English to submit themselves to the spiritual authority of the Bishop of Rome.

Certainly we cannot be surprised that the Roman Catholic party should be mistaken as to its true position in the United Kingdom. We must remember that a century has not yet elapsed since the Roman Catholics were subjected to a system of real persecution on the part of the English Government. Nor did all the blame rest on the Government. Under colour of religion, the Roman Catholic party never ceased to labour underhand in favour of the restoration of the Stuart dynasty and of the ancient faith, and in this anti-patriotic aim they were cleverly seconded by the secret agents of Rome. The fear the nation had of falling again under the yoke of the Papacy may be measured by the severity of the Acts of the English Parliament passed against Roman Catholics, and especially against the priests.

Now what have we seen in times nearer our own? The anti-Catholic persecutions have passed away like the fires which once consumed the martyrs of the two inimical faiths. The Romish Church is not only free in England, but even respected, and the Crown has no more loyal subjects than the English Roman Catholics; whilst the Roman Catholic clergy have known how to make themselves respected even by those who are decidedly contrary to the religion they preach. We cannot wonder, therefore, if the Roman Catholic party nourishes certain hopes for the future of the Romish Church in England when it compares the present with the past. However, the official statistics of the relative position of religious parties in the United Kingdom in no ways correspond to such hopes, and I affirm that English feeling towards Roman Catholicism has never changed. May I be allowed to add that if even (a purely hypothetical case) the Anglican Church was to become "Catholic" and Romish to-morrow, this would not mean that Roman Catholicism had taken hold of English religious feeling or that England had therefore been changed into a Roman Catholic nation. It is very natural that a person not being English should believe that the religious question should be limited in England to a struggle between Roman Catholicism on the one side and Anglicanism on the other. If the question was really on these issues, it would

be a great deal more simple than it really is to decide it. The Anglican Church already boasts of being Catholic and no longer Protestant, and the great High Church party which now has the command in the National Church designates Roman Catholicism as a Roman *schism*, and has never admitted that Catholicism is only to be found in the Romish Church. The haughty and dignified answers which the Anglican episcopate gave Leo XIII. when he addressed his celebrated letter to the English people, and when he pronounced himself in a sense contrary to the validity of Anglican ordinations, cannot have been forgotten. There is something to suit all tastes in the National English Church, and in this fact may be found its strength and its weakness. Do you wish for a Roman Catholic ritual? You will find it in one of the numerous Ritualistic churches, where, if the English language was not used instead of the Latin one, one might believe one had entered a Roman Catholic church by mistake. Do you wish for Protestant rites pure and simple? You have only to go across the street, and close to the Ritualistic church you will find the Protestant one you are seeking. As may be seen, the National Church provides for all.

But Roman Catholicism has not to fight against Anglicans only. The Anglican Church may be considered as the Church of the aristocracy and of the country folks. There still remain the multitudes who are perhaps most powerful in the democratic country England has become, who constitute the middle classes. An enormous proportion of these popular classes hate the Anglican Church almost as much as the Roman Catholic one, because in it it finds what pleases least of all—sacerdotalism. When Talleyrand, speaking cynically of the English, said: "Quelle drôle de nation, cent cinquante réligions et une seule sauce," the great French statesman was perfectly right. For it is true that there exists at the present moment in England 296 diverse forms of religion,[1] while unfortunately we do not hear of a similar increase in the number of sauces. Now if we leave out the National Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Hebrew religion, we shall still have the large number of 293 religions whose adherents represent an enormous part of the middle classes. The Roman Catholic propaganda is absolutely powerless before this formidable army of true Protestants, which is continually on the increase, not only in England, but in every part of the British Empire. The real obstacle to the progress of Roman Catholicism in England is to be found in the fact that it has to struggle not only against a State religion, but also against so many religious sects, divided amongst themselves in

[1] The large majority of these are so minute as not to be worth taking into account.—EDITOR.

appearance, but united in their implacable hatred of any system of sacerdotalism. These sects are all comprised under the designation of "Nonconformists"—that is, of those who will not conform to the National Church of the State.

That our readers may more easily understand the relative positions of the great religious parties in the United Kingdom, let us pass on to examine statistics, and let us see the position of the Roman Catholic party as opposed to the different forms of the traditional English Protestantism; we shall then be able to judge what truth there is in the asserted development and progress of the Romish Church amongst the English.

Let us begin with the National Church of the State. This numbers in England two archiepiscopal seats, with a clergy calculated at 27,000 persons; and the number of churches in which the Anglican rites are celebrated was, in the year 1891, more than 14,500, a number which will have been much increased during the last eight years. The National Church enjoys an annual income of about £7,250,000, or 181,250,000 francs. In 1891, the Nonconformist churches of England and Wales numbered 27,253, and the number of their ministers amounted to 10,057. These figures do not include the different Nonconformist[1] parties in Scotland, the number of whose adherents would not be less than 3,000,000 people. The annual income of these religious bodies reaches an enormous sum, but it is not possible to collect the statistics. The Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales in the year 1896 numbered 1,500,000 adherents, and in the month of December of the same year there were 1,456 Catholic churches and chapels, with 2,686 priests. In Scotland, in 1896, the Roman Catholic Church had 2 archbishops, 4 bishops, 404 priests, and 349 churches, chapels, and religious institutions. The total of the Roman Catholic population was calculated to be 365,000 souls. It must, however, be noted that the great majority of the Roman Catholics in Scotland are Irish immigrants. Of the marriages celebrated in England in the year 1894, 68·6 per cent. were according to Anglican rites, 11·9 according to the rites of the different Nonconformist churches, 14·8 before the civil authorities, 4·2 according to Roman Catholic rites, and 0·5 according to the Hebrew rites. The reader will understand that these statistics of marriages are most important, because the real progress of a religion in a civil State can be ascertained from such figures. The conversions of individuals who from one cause or another are excluded from marriage remain without permanent effects on the race, and therefore do not deserve to be considered as

[1] "Nonconformist" is here evidently intended to include the Established Presbyterian Kirk, which does not conform to the Church of England, but has no hostility to it.—EDITOR.

signs of the progress of a religion. It has been proved that of the conversions to Roman Catholicism a considerable proportion takes place amongst people who are already of mature age, or amongst those who dedicate themselves afterwards to religion, and remain, therefore, debarred from marriage. The small proportion of Roman Catholic marriages in comparison with those of the Anglicans and Nonconformists is an irrefutable proof of the weak position of the Roman Catholic religion in England. One observation deserves to be made before we leave this subject of marriages amongst Roman Catholics. Up to a few years ago, when a Roman Catholic married a person belonging to a different religion, the Romish Church contented itself with insisting that the sons born of the marriage should follow the religion of the father. For instance, if the father was Roman Catholic and the mother Protestant, the sons were to be educated in the Roman Catholic faith, and the daughters in that of their mother, and *vice versâ*. Nowadays, profiting by the greater tolerance accorded to the Roman Catholic religion in England, the Romish Church demands that where there is a "mixed" marriage between Roman Catholics and Protestants, all the children born of the marriage should be brought up in the Roman Catholic faith. The reader may judge if such an example of clerical intolerance is not hurtful to the interests of the Roman Catholic religion.

But let us continue our statistics. The total number of the Roman Catholic population in Great Britain and Ireland was calculated in the year 1891 as 5,640,891. To this total, however, Ireland alone contributed 3,547,307. It is worthy of note that in Ireland also, a Roman Catholic country, during the ten years from 1881 to 1891, it has been ascertained that there has been a diminution of 10·4 per cent. in the Roman Catholic population. But we need not occupy ourselves with Irish statistics, because Roman Catholicism has always been the dominant religion of the Celtic race, and therefore can only be looked upon as the hereditary faith of the Irish people. Putting aside, then, the Irish Roman Catholic population, there remains a number of 2,093,604 souls which represent the amount of the Roman Catholic population of Great Britain—that is, of England, Scotland, and Wales—in the year 1891. Let us suppose that these figures have been increased during the last eight years, and that the conversions to Roman Catholicism have amounted to 120,000 souls more during that period—a number that is very improbable; we should then have a population of about 2,200,000 Roman Catholics in Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland. The total number of the population of Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland, was in the year 1896 about 35,000,000. The popula-

tion increases each year in an extraordinary proportion, but from the statistics it is most clearly shown that an analogous increase in the number of Roman Catholics does not take place. I do not indeed understand how, in the face of such statistics, the Roman Catholic authorities in England can deceive themselves, nor with what object they make the Vatican believe that the Romish Church there is making such strides. If we carefully examine the small increase in the number of English "Catholics" verified in the last eight years, we shall see that the Roman Catholic movement, far from being progressive, is retrogressive. This is all the more worthy of notice, because of all the religious parties in England that of the Roman Catholics is the one that most distinguishes itself by the activity of its propaganda, the enthusiasm and zeal of its clergy, and by the munificence of its laity in helping with money every undertaking which can promote the interests of its faith. The Roman Catholic clergy and laity in England unite in one supreme aim and object, that of working for the glory and the triumph of the Holy Roman Church. The Roman Catholic laity, though very poor as compared with the Protestants, offer us a splendid example of generosity and charity which is really extraordinary; nor do I think that in any Roman Catholic country we can find a clergy so worthy of respect and admiration as that of the Roman Catholics in Great Britain. It is a pity that the same cannot be said of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland. One cannot question that if it had not been for the sad example given us by that unfortunate island, where the great majority of the people are under the superstitious and ignorant rule of its priests, Roman Catholicism might have attained amongst us English much more favourable results than is at present the case.

To really appreciate the true attitude of the majority of my countrymen towards the Romish Church, we must study English history, and that not only since the Protestant reformation in 1532, but from the time of the assassination of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket, in his own cathedral in 1170. But the field is too vast a one for me in this brief article to follow the struggle between the monarchy and the English people and the Papacy. From the time of the Norman sovereigns to the year 1532 English history reveals to us a continually growing irritation of the nation against the intolerable abuses and the unjust ways by which the Papacy endeavoured to hold the kingdom of England in a state of vassalage. The Protestant movement in Germany gave the last spur to that profound desire which had for centuries burnt in the heart of the English nation to free

itself from Rome; and though it is impossible not to blame the so-called Reformers for the barbarous and sacrilegious acts which they committed in order to obtain the religious and political liberty so necessary for the social and intellectual progress of the race, still we cannot deny that, hardly had the authority of the Papacy ceased in England, than the English nation began to enter that liberal pathway which has ended in carrying it to its present position amongst the other nations of the world. The political intrigues and the insatiable ambition of the Papacy in the Middle Ages were a perpetual menace for England. What sort of combination was it when, during the reign of Mary Tudor, a fervent Roman Catholic, and determined to eradicate Protestantism in her kingdom, the English nation, hardly reconciled to the Papacy by the furies of the fires of Smithfield, was threatened with the danger of becoming a dependency of the Roman Catholic majesty of Spain? And some years later, when, fortunately for England, the great Elizabeth wore the English crown, what sort of a combination was it that made Spain, with the political and spiritual consent of the Pope, send her fleet to the British coasts in the vain hope of mortally wounding the proud English Protestantism and the glorious Sovereign who knew so well how to lead it? Was it also by a mere combination that King James II., a creature of the Jesuits, sought to submit the kingdom anew to the Papal dominion, and was compelled to fly to foreign parts? To form a just appreciation of the horror that the English of that time had of Roman Catholicism, I think one should be born of that race. A foreigner would have a difficulty in understanding the affection and the sentiments of loyalty that the English had for the Stuart dynasty. Yet the fear of Rome, and the horror of finding themselves again exposed to the political intrigues of the Papacy, acted in such a powerful manner on the popular feeling that the English did not hesitate to turn off their legitimate and ancient royal house and to call in a foreign prince, whose Protestantism was to save the nation from the Roman Catholicism they so much dreaded and hated. Is it credible that the English people would easily forget the lessons taught them by so many centuries of their past history? I really do not know what symptoms of such lightness my race can have given to justify such a suspicion with regard to it. And if the lessons of the past were not sufficient, those of our present times are not wanting. The English people, as Protestants, can draw instruction from the present condition of Roman Catholic nations.

Without entering at length into questions which are, to say the least, of a certain delicacy, we must admit the fact that

England is almost the only nation whose internal situation is free from those difficulties and those religious-political embarrassments which seem the inheritance, not only of those States who have Roman Catholicism for their dominant religion, but also of those in which the same religion, though not that of the State, has assumed sufficient proportions to be able to influence political parties; and without entering more thoroughly into this argument, I will confine myself to quoting a single example of the sort which exclusively regards England. Is it not a fact that the only internal difficulty of this sort that England has had in recent times, and which threatened to become a real rebellion of one part of the United Kingdom against the English Crown and constitution, was encouraged, from purely political motives, by the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland? Well, as everyone knows, the Irish population in the centre and south of the island—in those regions, that is, which are disaffected and malcontented—is almost entirely Roman Catholic, whilst all the north of the island, where the Protestants are in a majority, and where the Roman Catholic priests are not in command, has always remained loyal and content. I may be told, in reply, that this state of things is more to be attributed to the difference of race than to the domination of the Roman Catholic religion. But in this objection, which I have often heard, there seems to me very little logic, for the reason that similar things occur in other States where the population consists of one race only. Justice demands that we should remember how, after a silence too much prolonged, the Vatican decided to call to order the Irish clergy, so that they should cease from a state of things which would certainly not have helped the progress of Roman Catholicism in England. It is not likely, however, that the people will forget from what source arose the difficulties and the sad episodes of which Ireland for many years has been the stage; nor that it can forget that the Irish Roman Catholic clergy, whose authority over its people is unlimited, instead of using it to pacify excited souls, did all in its power to foment the discord, even to the point of instigating the population to commit the most terrible crimes, and that notwithstanding the remonstrances of the head of the Church.

Now, whilst statistics prove that Roman Catholicism in England is in a stationary state, with a tendency to diminish, the international Roman Catholic press and the clergy assure us that it goes on increasing. How, then, can we reconcile such different assertions? That the spiritual part of Roman Catholicism has made a noteworthy progress during the last fifty years is an undeniable fact. The development of the Oxford Movement resulted in the Anglican Church trans-

forming itself into an imitation Roman Catholic Church.[1] There is not a function of the Romish Church which is not copied by the Anglicans of the Ritualistic party.

"So it is true that Roman Catholicism is becoming popular amongst the English," the Italian readers will say. But nothing of the sort. There is no Roman Catholicism without the Pope, and in the Anglican churches everyone is at liberty to make himself a Pope. If a great part of the Anglican Church has imitated the spiritual and dogmatic part of the Romish Church, it has, on the other hand, left all the political entirely on one side, and has manufactured in these last forty years a so-called Catholic Church which does very well without the Pope, and does not wish to hear any mention of him. The authorities of the Romish Church in England, as well as the Vatican, look on this "pseudo-Catholicism" with contempt, it may be, but also with a certain amount of satisfaction; for they think that the Ritualists are playing their game in accustoming the English public to receive those dogmas and doctrines which really belong to the Roman Papacy. This supposition is, however, another illusion which will one day be seen to be vain. We may study an interesting example of the English feeling towards real Roman Catholicism at this very moment. In 1898 some religious agitators by profession protested against the Romish ritual adopted in many Anglican Churches, which, according to them, was illegal and contrary to the doctrines of the National Church. Indignation meetings were held everywhere to protest against the ritualistic priests, who were called traitors and Romanists in disguise. The authority of the Anglican bishops, and finally of Parliament itself, was invoked to suppress these abuses in the State Church. At first this agitation had no other effect than to fill the empty pockets of those who had promoted it; but all of a sudden the thing was transported to the higher political spheres, and suddenly changed its aspect.

The leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons, Sir William Vernon Harcourt, wrote to the *Times* some fulminating letters against the ministers of the National Church, who preached in their churches the doctrines of Rome. This religious escapade of the Liberal leader was a matter of general wonder in political circles, and still more so amongst the Liberals themselves, who did not show themselves at all inclined to follow their chief on a road which might end goodness knows where. Those who knew the eminent statesman did not believe he was inspired only by religious zeal, and his action was generally looked upon as a means of

[1] It must be remembered that the writer is a Roman Catholic.

pleasing public opinion. But seeing himself abandoned by his lieutenants, who did not wish to join this rabid Protestantism, Harcourt wrote to Morley, giving in his resignation and retiring from the presidency of his political party.[1]

And here we find the interesting point in this "anti-Catholic" agitation, because in it we shall see an example of the true national feeling. Hardly had the English people become aware that political men were occupying themselves with the ritualism of the Anglican Church, when a unanimous voice made itself heard in the country. A universal outcry ensued, not so much against the ritual, nor against the "Catholic" doctrines preached in Anglican Churches, but against the danger of the introduction of the Confessional. The higher clergy of the National Church, the Ministers of State, the Peers and Members of Parliament without distinction of parties, the entire Nonconformist body, and the English press, all raised their voices in a cry of protest against that system of obligatory confession which the Roman Church insists upon, and which is now urged also in the ritualistic Anglican Churches.

The Anglican Church does not forbid its members to confess; indeed, in special cases, and for sick people, it recommends confession to a minister of religion. What the National Church will not tolerate is that confession should be considered in any sense as a regular duty, and that the Sacraments should be refused to those who do not like to confess. Every English party and sect are in perfect agreement in condemning regular confession as an intolerable abuse of the moral and spiritual liberty of the individual, and as a usurpation on the part of the priests of powers which belong only to God. It is not necessary that I should enter into the arguments which almost the whole people adduce against this exclusively Roman Catholic institution. It is sufficient to say that, with the natural exception of the Roman Catholics who speak the English language, confession is abhorred as a menace to liberty, and danger for family life; a system which weakens and enervates the moral part of the individual—an act of humiliation, in short, not worthy of man, and contrary to the will of God, whose pardon, the English say, can be obtained without the intervention of the priest. Let us be clearly understood. The right of everyone to confess is not denied even by the most fanatical Protestant; and who would dare deny this consolation to a suffering soul which asks for it? What the English do not tolerate, nor ever will, is that the priests will have the right to insist, as a regular duty, on auricular confession. Public opinion, therefore, which remained almost apathetic as long as the Protestant agitators

[1] This is not quite an accurate account, but probably the view suggests itself naturally to Roman Catholics.—EDITOR.

only fulminated against Anglican ritual, showed itself as anything but indifferent when it began to realize that the Romish system of habitual confession was really at work in not a few Anglican churches and institutes. The excitement of the people, without distinction of class, on this question of the Confessional in the National Church was thorough and lasting, and the Government, though very much averse to interfering in matters of religion, found itself obliged to present to Parliament a Bill on the subject, if it was only not to offend that powerful political machine called in England the "Nonconformist conscience," or the party of Protestants independent of the State Church. The events which have recently taken place in England show clearly that there is a limit to the tolerance of the Roman Catholic religion, and that not even the Anglican can go beyond that limit without the English people rising in indignation against it. Unfortunately for the Roman Catholic party's hopes, this robust Protestantism makes itself felt exactly when doctrines are treated of which are integral and indivisible parts of the Roman Church, such as, for example, the supremacy of the Pope and habitual confession. If the Anglican Church is, as is undoubtedly the case, powerless to introduce the Confessional into English religious life, how can the Roman Catholics flatter themselves that they would be allowed to introduce it? And it is not to be supposed either that the Roman Church would make concessions to English prejudices on the subject of confession. The system of obligatory confession is too powerful a weapon, both spiritually and politically, for the Roman Church to dispense with it, even to get possession of schismatic England.

There are many other dogmatic and political questions, not to say social ones, which will always form insuperable obstacles to the conversion of my country to Roman Catholicism. I have not alluded to these dogmatic questions, because my intention in this article was to demonstrate to my Italian readers the true position of Roman Catholicism in England, and to offer to them arguments and official statistics which, to my mind, prove in an impartial manner that the persistent voice which the "Catholic" international press raises, in accord with the English Roman Catholic party, is born of illusions founded on absolutely erroneous impressions as to the political and religious opinions and sentiments of the vast majority of my countrymen. I leave, therefore, dogmatic questions to bigots and theologians, confining myself to one single observation, and that is: the English have now learned how to manufacture Catholicism at home, and that if the manufactured article is not in the least genuine, at any rate it costs England less dear than would the real.

Before, however, concluding this article, I must briefly notice a question which, while it is in Italy a matter of fact, which has been disposed of, still exists in England in the ambitious dreams of the high clergy and the Catholic press and laity. I allude to the question, really dead and buried thirty years ago, of the temporal power of the Papacy. As is well known, the English Catholic party is, for the most part, highly "intransigent," and a fierce enemy of Italian Unity. This attitude of English Catholics would not deserve to be remembered here, if it were not that in it is found yet another reason why Roman Catholicism will never gain the sympathy and confidence of the nation. England saluted the fall of the temporal power of the Papacy with real enthusiasm; and it would have been curious had it not been so, because it had never experienced anything but hurt from the Papacy as a foreign State, except, perhaps, when Pius VII. refused to associate himself with the attempts of Napoleon Buonaparte, who tried to constitute a Continental league to annihilate it. There still live in the hearts of the English people, and especially amongst the country-people, the traditions of the times in which the Pope was feared, not only because he was the head of the Church, but still more because he was always to be found among the ranks of the enemies of England.

One cannot understand why the Roman Catholic party should have thought it opportune to take every occasion to show itself so enthusiastic for a deceased foreign sovereignty, of which the English have certainly no pleasing national traditions. The English Roman Catholics, however, never fail to consider the Pope as a pretender to a foreign throne, without reflecting that the position of liberty which the Roman Church enjoys in England is really owing to the fact that the head of this Church is no longer the head of a territorial State, and that the Roman Catholic religion can therefore be freely exercised in England equally with the other 295 religions practised there without the English having to fear being drawn into political or diplomatic imbroglios on its account. So, for the reasons I have stated, and for many others into which I could not enter, I think we must make answer to the question, "Will England become Roman Catholic?" with the simple word "Never!" Another question arises in my mind, and that is, if it would be for the benefit of my nation to abandon Protestantism for the Holy Roman faith? I answer it to myself by another question: "Is it not, perhaps, possible that Christian faith maintains itself alive by the diversity of opinions, and that religion, like commerce, requires competition not to die?"

Art. II.—THE EDUCATION OF GIRLS.

MUCH has been written about the education of children during the first seven or eight years of their life. It has been said that during these years the character is determined for life. If parents fail in their duty at this early stage, it is not from want of guidance. Time and growing experience may modify what is known as the "Kindergarten System," but the underlying principles are based on the rock of eternal truth, and cannot be shaken.

It is therefore unnecessary to dwell upon the scheme of carefully elaborated "gifts," games, and occupations by which Froebel has indicated to parents and educators an excellent method of cultivating the growing physical and mental activities of the child. It may be objected that the system is too artificial, and that "Nature-study" is not sufficiently prominent in his curriculum; but a constant appeal to Nature is implied in its principles, and the educator is at liberty to fill up what seems to be lacking.

It has been well said by the late Mr. Thring, headmaster of Uppingham, in his "Education and School" (p. 22), that the succeeding ten years—from eight to eighteen—"are the years of preparation and practice which determine, as they are used or abused, the position of each nation in the scale of creation." He adds: "The mighty ten years that change the face of the world are passed at school, and all experience proves that, with few exceptions, the after-life is cast in the same mould as the life at school was cast in."

It has been decided, with a fair amount of unanimity, what we may expect in the way of literary attainment when the years of school life have come to an end. We have evolved a highly complex system of examinations by which parents are able to test the value of the instruction for which they have paid so long. If *instruction* and *education* were synonymous, there would be little more to be said, supposing that all were agreed in fixing a reasonable standard of proficiency. But as the two words differ widely, and have, as it were, no common measure, there results some confusion of ideas, for it is admitted that a man or woman may be highly instructed and yet badly educated, or *vice versâ*.

Let others pronounce upon what seems to be the best system of education for boys, a point on which the writer can claim to have no experience; she will confine herself to remarks on a subject on which uncertainty seems to exist, and to which she has devoted her time and thought for the last quarter of a century—the education of girls.

That has been a stirring period in the history of women. It has been an era of revolutionary excitement and activity. Three systems have been on trial—home education; education in public day-schools, known as High Schools; and education in boarding-schools.

There is much to be said in favour of home education—that is, education by the father or mother, or a governess to whom they delegate the task, during the earlier years of a girl's life. Careful habits and refined manners can be unconsciously acquired, and the instruction can be more directly fitted to the individual child's capacity; but, on the other hand, the tendency to desultory reading, slipshod work, and general inaccuracy is so great that, as a matter of fact, girls thus brought up are at a great disadvantage when they go to school. If they never go to school at all, they usually enter upon life unarmed for the conflict. If such girls, when grown to womanhood, are not, in the course of nature, transferred from the protecting arms of their parents to those of a husband, they are, as a rule, destined to a life of misery. Trained as they have been to find their happiness chiefly in the exercise of their affections, they cannot "battle with the world," as people say, and they shrink from association with strangers.

Education at what is known as a "select" boarding-school differs but little in its results from education at home. The conditions of home life are repeated on a somewhat modified scale, with the addition of special facilities for acquiring accomplishments such as music, painting, and foreign languages. Time is rarely made for studies of a disciplinary nature, and the view is but little enlarged where the numbers are not greatly in excess of a large family party.

Between thirty and forty years ago two great women, on somewhat different lines, mapped out a wider system. Miss Beale, as principal of the Ladies' College, Cheltenham, developed the idea of a great central college, surrounded by approved boarding-houses for the residence of pupils. This system has many advantages. The college affords an education on the most comprehensive scale, and a kind of home life can be maintained in the boarding-house. There is, however, the drawback of a divided allegiance. It may happen that the head of a boarding-house compares unfavourably with the more widely-cultured teachers and lecturers in college. There may be divergence of aim in the dual life which is liable to neutralize the results of either half. The system, which is a triumphant success under a great leader, has in it the elements of weakness.

At about the same date as the Ladies' College was started

at Cheltenham, the late Miss Buss, in the North London Collegiate School, may be said to have originated the great public day school for girls. How that system has developed, and how signally it has revolutionized the education of women, is known to all. A quarter of a century ago the pioneers of the movement for the higher education of women found as much difficulty in passing the then lately-instituted Cambridge Higher Local Examinations for Women as their successors, the fair girl graduates of the present day do, in winning honours in a Tripos. Such are the advantages of a good start and methodical training from the first.

The day-school system, however, exacts sacrifices from parents which many are either unwilling or unable to make. The practice of keeping girls at home, and yet letting them attend a day-school, seems to be less popular than it was a few years ago. The presence of daughters has to be reckoned with at times, when they are rather in the way. Their hours for meals and study interfere with the convenience of the rest of the household. Owing to the strain put upon the resources of middle-class families to provide sufficient supervision out of school hours for girls in large towns, a decided reaction has taken place against a natural, and in many ways healthful, arrangement.

To combine the advantages of the great public day-school and the boarding-school seems to be the tendency of the hour. One witnesses the extinction of one small boarding-school after another. The rush of life in a great school, the facilities for specialized teaching, where the staff is large, the organized games, turn the scale against the "select school" so much patronized in former days. Large boarding-schools for girls have existed in England for a century under Protestant auspices, while they have always been numerous where a conventual education is given. In this country they were till lately, as a rule, orphanages or class-schools for the daughters of officers or of the clergy, etc. They were generally foundation or subscription schools, and were originally, at least, conducted with more economy than was quite consistent with comfort. The large boarding-school, nevertheless, offers peculiar opportunities for training, and the tide of popularity seems to be turning in its favour. Assuming that it may be inconvenient to educate a girl at home or at a day-school, there are distinct advantages in placing her in surroundings that will develop and strengthen character.

It may be useful to offer a few hints as to the choice of a school. First, it is a matter of great importance that the locality fixed upon should be healthy, if possible combining the benefits of sea-air with the neighbourhood of country

walks. It should not be too far from the stir of a town, though isolated from its noise and publicity. The house itself should be spacious; if possible, dignified in appearance. In addition to airy class-rooms and dormitories, it should contain a large, well-lighted recreation-room. This room may be utilized for choral singing or calisthenic classes, but should mainly serve as a place where relaxation can be taken at a spare hour and on wet days. It is most important that there should be a sick-house or sanatorium, to which a pupil may be sent at the first sign of indisposition, or even when slightly tired or overstrained. There should be a playing-field, where, with due moderation, girls may enjoy the rapture of vigorous motion, and may learn by co-operation in games the grand lesson of self-effacement. Hockey and stool-ball are in every way admirable games for girls; and although cricket has to be shorn of some of its glories to render it equally suitable, yet "King Willow" is educationally preferable to the more selfish lawn-tennis, which, nevertheless, deserves a place in the programme. Lastly, there should be a large garden. A school without a garden is unfurnished with the most indispensable of classrooms. How much more may be learnt at first hand from observation of the tree overhead or the flower at one's feet than from the finest diagrams in the best-equipped lecture-room! There is a growing sense that too much has been made of literary culture, and that the study of nature has been unduly neglected in the past. But, given the externals of play-room, playground, garden, and sick-house, there is a whole world of requirements to be sought for where we would place our girls with an easy mind.

The *tone* of the school should be sincerely, but unostentatiously, religious. There must be an atmosphere of reality and sincerity as distinct from ritualistic formality. The atmosphere should be morally bracing, and free from sickly sentimentalism. There should be an enthusiasm for work. The hours of whole-hearted play should prepare the way for earnest study. The faults called into existence by idleness and vacuity cannot flourish in such a soil.

There should also be the pleasant variety of an occasional entertainment, to prevent the sense of routine from becoming monotonous. The regular studies should at intervals be broken by happy evenings, enlivened with music, dancing, and simple scenic representations.

In such a school the action and reaction of elder upon younger girls, the *esprit de corps* engendered by the traditions of the place, form in themselves a school of manners and of morals. It may sometimes happen that, whether from slowness of development or defective early training, a pupil may

pass through school life with little apparent benefit. In all but a few cases, however, the effects of a good school will sooner or later manifest themselves. The majority will make a good start in art, literature, science, classics, and mathematics, and will leave with sufficient appetite for learning to make them desire to go on further. A few, gifted by nature, will make conspicuous progress, and be prepared to go on to the higher work of a University.

It is a great benefit to girls who may have a somewhat restricted life to start with a wide circle of congenial acquaintances. The idiosyncrasies which in a narrow environment become eccentricities are less liable to become obtrusive. Angles get rubbed down without any wound to sensitiveness. The give-and-take of a large school prepares a girl to show a wise consideration for others which does not always distinguish the gentler sex.

The writer has thus attempted to sketch in brief outline the tendency of different methods of education. It is to be deplored that some parents have not fully awakened to the knowledge that changed conditions of life demand a different kind of preparation from that which prevailed for girls a generation ago. Girls need a much more scientific knowledge even of domestic matters than sufficed for their mothers; but the further development of a subject so important must be dealt with in a separate paper.

C. M. BIRRELL.

ART. III.—MATTER AND SPIRIT.[1]

THIS is an exceedingly interesting book. Like the author's well-known Bampton Lectures on "Personality"—to which, as he says, "it is in some sense a sequel"—it is so thoroughly well written and so admirably arranged, that it is a delight rather than a labour to read. In this respect it is a great contrast to many works upon philosophical subjects. Such books are too often written in a style which seems to have been almost designedly chosen to warn off the general reader, who is often driven to confess that, in order to understand their meaning, he must first study the language in which they are written, because that language, in far too many instances, is certainly not his own. This, we believe, is one reason why

[1] "Divine Immanence," an Essay on the Spiritual Significance of Matter, by J. R. Illingworth, M.A. (author of "Personality, Human and Divine"). London: Macmillan and Co., 1898.

so many people fight shy of philosophical reading altogether. But Mr. Illingworth's book is an example of how a somewhat difficult subject, and one which it requires some mental effort to understand, may yet be made positively attractive. Then, besides being regarded as unattractive, philosophical study is often regarded as "unpractical." It seems to dwell entirely in the region of theory, and to deal with ideas whose bearing upon the practical conduct of everyday life it is difficult to perceive. But if anyone wishes to see how the study of a philosophical subject may be really attractive, and how a knowledge of metaphysics and psychology bears most practically upon the everyday conduct of everyday life, we commend to such the volume before us.

The book deals with subjects in which most people who think at all are really interested. But, as a rule, the subjects are studied apart. Here we are taught to study them in combination, to see the relationship between them and their mutual effect upon each other. The range and diversity of these various subjects are both admirably expressed in the following sentences from the preface: "The world, after all, is a fact; sun, moon, and stars are real; men and women live and love; the moral law is strong; in a word, the universe exists, and some positive account of it must needs be true; . . . one love amid all our discords unites the modern world; we all of us love nature in our several ways . . . the wonder of its processes, the glory of its aspect, the contrast of its calmness to the coil of human care . . . with this feeling for nature comes an increased susceptibility to those spiritual emotions which the presence of nature inspires . . . we, for whom history has happened, can never again revert to a mere religion of nature . . . we have learned from nature itself that the law of life is evolution. . . . Religion, like other things, must have become increasingly articulate with the process of the years, its development more definite . . . and the plea of this essay is that the Incarnation is the congruous climax of such development" (pp. i-iii). In short, (1) we all of us love and study nature (the material world) in its manifold parts and aspects; (2) we all of us profess some religious belief. In different ways we are conscious of, and acknowledge the existence of, influences, powers, and forces which are not material, but we fail to see "the nature of the relation between matter and spirit." To elucidate the nature of this relationship is the object of Mr. Illingworth's essay.

But, besides its general interest, the question is one of special importance at the present time, and we believe that, as a help towards the solution of a present controversy, this book may be particularly useful. In the ecclesiastical world

just now the ever-recurring controversy as to how far in worship the introduction of the material is a help or a hindrance to the realization of the spiritual—to what extent we are justified in trying to clothe spiritual ideas in material forms, or how far material ceremonies may be helpful in conveying spiritual truths—may be said to have reached an acute stage.

Mr. Illingworth's treatment of this difficult subject strikes us as at once broad-minded and discreet. Take, for example, the following sentences: "When we review the life and teaching of Christ, we see at once upon what condition this ministry of matter takes place; what it is that makes it religious, and not superstitious; progressive, and not retrograde. The condition is that matter be always subordinate to spirit" (p. 136). And again: "We see that the immemorial union of matter and spirit in religion was emphatically sanctioned by the practice and precept of Christ; while the complete subordination of the former to the latter was declared to be the condition of its legitimacy—the sole condition on which the functions of either could be duly fulfilled" (p. 138). If this condition was remembered we should hear far less of ritual controversies and of acrid disputes upon ceremonial observances.

The book consists of five chapters and two appendices. In the first chapter the subject of the investigation is admirably stated; it is, in short, "the Nature of the Relation between Spirit and Matter." The author is careful to give a clear definition of both these terms: "spirit" he defines as that which "thinks and moves and wills"; "matter is what moves in space." Very early in this chapter we come upon one of those explanations of common religious phrases which Mr. Illingworth has a faculty for translating into everyday language, and for showing their bearing upon everyday life. These "illustrations and explanations," plentifully scattered throughout the book, are one of its principal charms. The definition we allude to is found on p. 6, where we read: "Spiritual life consists in the free selection and conscious pursuit of the various objects of knowledge, affection, or practical endeavour which we are thus (by self-consciousness) able to present to ourselves." And again: "Spirit . . . is much more than a metaphysical abstraction; it is ethical and emotional as well. Its power of self-determination enables it to act from a sense of duty, to obey a moral law, and in so doing become good" (p. 7). If we read these words in connection with the second appendix ("On Freewill"), we can see how our own spiritual life depends in large measure on ourselves, on our past conduct, on the self-discipline—the

true means of obtaining freedom or the power of self-determination—which we have exercised.

In this first chapter Mr. Illingworth admirably states the conclusion of his principal thesis—the dependence of spirit upon matter—as follows:

"When, therefore, we find that the material world . . . is in countless ways adapted to further spiritual life, it is hard to resist the conclusion that matter exists for this very end, and that all its ingenuity of intricate arrangement is meant to serve the purpose which, in fact, it so admirably serves. If matter lay at our feet as a thing to be employed or neglected at will, the case would be different, and we might then regard its use as accidental. But its fusion with spirit is, in fact, far too intimate, its correlation too exact, to admit of any such idea. It is obviously part and parcel of the same system with spirit, and if so must, we argue, be qualified throughout by the final causality which is spirit's goal" (p. 14).

Chapter II. is upon the Religious Influence of the Material World. This the author regards as one of the most striking "uses of matter to spirit." In this chapter we have a collection of the evidence of the influence of nature upon the religious life gathered from a very wide survey of literature, ranging from the Egyptian "Book of the Dead," the Vedas, the Zend Avesta, Greek, Roman, and Christian writers (both early and medieval), the Renaissance scholars, later theologians (as Zwingli, Fénelon, and Law), to modern literature in such different examples as Shelley, Byron, and Wordsworth. The result of this wide survey is thus admirably summed up:

"Here we have evidence that nature—the material world with its sights and sounds—has exerted throughout all ages a profound religious influence on the thoughts and affections of men. . . . The influence in question is independent of any theological interpretation . . . a mystic emotion, more fundamental than the varieties of creed—a primary, permanent, world-wide agent in the education of the human soul. Thus, matter has, as a fact, from the very dawn of human history, ministered to the religious development of spirit" (p. 48).

The next two chapters deal with Divine Immanence in Nature and Divine Immanence in Man. In the former Mr. Illingworth shows that the experience adduced in Chapter II. must be accounted for, and unless it "can be discredited it must be recognised as weighty evidence of a spiritual reality behind material things. . . . It can only be discredited either by proof that it is an illusion, or by proof that the faculties which feel it are unworthy of trust" (p. 50). An investigation of the first hypothesis leads to an interesting

study of the terms "real" and "reality." We must not follow the argument here in detail, but must content ourselves with giving the author's conclusion: "However little we may have reflected upon it, personality is, as a matter of fact, our tacitly acknowledged standard of reality. . . . What affects me personally, and thereby becomes part of myself, is real for me; while what affects me most persistently and most powerfully is most real" (p. 53). The question raised by the second hypothesis is that of the trustworthiness or untrustworthiness of our emotions. "It is too often assumed that the emotions, as contrasted with the intellect, are untrustworthy guides to truth; and many even of those who think otherwise still allow the emotions to be called irrational, as though belief in them were an act of faith, in some sort needing an apology" (p. 56). Mr. Illingworth clearly shows that "this sharp distinction between feeling and understanding" is untrue to fact. Knowledge really starts with personal experience—"the experience of a person who both thinks and feels." Our knowledge of nature is really both scientific and "sensible," the one is no more *real* than the other; thus the influence of nature upon us is its influence upon the whole of our personality, and is personally felt. If, then, "this influence cannot be discredited, it points to a spiritual presence in nature." Next we must consider the relation of this spiritual presence to nature, and how this relation is to be interpreted. This, of course, is one of the pivots of the argument. We are reminded that modern science has proved the unity of nature; remembering this, the problem is at once narrowed and simplified, for considerations implying dualism or polytheism need not be considered. The author then proceeds to show that the analogy from human personality, our knowledge and experience of ourselves (where we find spirit and matter in combination), is our only key to the solution of the problem as to how the Spirit which guides the system of things is related to the material order. From our own personal experience we find that spirit "has two different relations to matter—that of transcendence and immanence"; these two relations, "though logically distinct," "are not actually separate," but "two points of view from which the single action of our one personality may be regarded."

It is at this point of the argument that the general reader —one untrained to notice the niceties of philosophical language and thought—will need to exercise caution. The thought of Divine Immanence at first sight seems perilously near to Pantheism; and have we not heard of "Christian Pantheism" and "Christian Pantheists"? though the terms in themselves surely involve a contradiction. The condition of transcendence,

in addition to that of immanence of spirit, must by no means be lost sight of. Before the chapter closes Mr. Illingworth shows clearly that this double relationship—of transcendence *plus* immanence—excludes Pantheism, which is mere immanence; Deism, which is mere transcendence; and the modern theory of "Monism," which would imply mere identity.

In Chapter IV. we pass to Divine Immanence in Man. This thought is shown to follow necessarily from the preceding one, for "if God is immanent in nature, He must also be immanent in man, since man is a part of nature." This argument might have seemed sufficient to establish this further position, but the author prefers to proceed somewhat independently. He notices two faculties of whose possession man shows evidence, the first being that of conscience, the second being inspiration. We should like to have dwelt at length upon this portion of the book, for the treatment of both subjects is exceedingly instructive; but we must refrain.

Mr. Illingworth next shows how "our spiritual character reacts upon the material instrument of its realization, moulding the brain and nervous system, and thence the entire bodily organism, into gradual accordance with itself, till the expression of the eye, the lines of the face, the tones of the voice, the touch of the hand, the movements, and manners, and gracious demeanour, all reveal with increasing clearness the nature of the spirit that has made them what they are. Thus the interior beauty of holiness comes by degrees to be a visible thing, and through His action upon our spirit God is made manifest in our flesh" (p. 77). From this he concludes that, "in proportion as we are enabled to recognise this progressive manifestation of God in matter, we are prepared to find it culminate in His actual Incarnation, the climax of His immanence in the world." Thus the Incarnation is shown to be the climax—may we not say the necessary and natural climax?—of the interpretation of the universe which has been pursued.

In the rest of this chapter the arguments for and the objections against the Incarnation are most carefully considered. Two points seem to call for special notice: (1) The author believes that the primary evidence for the Incarnation is spiritual; "the Incarnation is primarily and essentially a spiritual fact, and no conceivable amount of evidence that was merely material could prove it . . . the personality of Jesus Christ is its own self-evidence. . . . He appeals to His character to substantiate His claim; bids men look at Him and recognise that He must be what He says. . . . Such an appeal is directly addressed to the spiritual insight of His hearers, and can only succeed where that insight exists. It was

rejected as a matter of course by those who did not know goodness when they saw it" (p. 87). (2) Instead of regarding miracles as supporting the Incarnation, it is far more true to regard them as the natural outcome of a unique Personality in a unique position; "they flow naturally from a Person who, despite His obvious humanity, impresses us throughout as being at home in two worlds" (p. 89).

This fourth chapter may be considered as the central and culminating point of the discussion; what precedes it may be regarded as preparatory to it, and what follows as describing the results of the acceptance of its teaching, namely, that the Incarnation is the crowning example of Divine Immanence in the world. In the next three chapters the author deals with some of these results, and shows the effects of his theism upon our Ideas of Miracles (Chapter V.), the Sacraments (Chapter VI.), and the Trinity (Chapter VII.). Space forbids us examining more than one of these. In view of present controversies we will choose the second, that entitled The Incarnation and Sacraments.

In this chapter, as in the whole book, we are struck with the writer's spirit and method. The spirit is "Catholic" in the best sense of the term; it shows a breadth of sympathy and a power of appreciation of the good in systems and modes of thought with which as a whole he cannot agree: his method here, as elsewhere, is wonderfully clear.

The chapter opens by showing that matter has a religious influence upon man in two ways; besides its direct influence, there is an influence arising from the reaction upon it of the human mind. As an illustration he considers two flowers, one growing in a field, full of life and scent and beauty, the other dried between the pages of a book; "though the former may give us 'thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears,' the latter may be linked with tender memories of bygone love, which invest it with greater power over our personal life. So, beside the general religious impression which the beauty and wonder of the world creates, we find special associations of spiritual import gathered round particular material things; and matter has thus what may be called a secondary, as well as a primary, connection with religion" (p. 125).

These two effects of matter are seen in the early history and early stages of religion as those of "myth" and of "ritual or cultus." The growth and development of cultus is next investigated, and it is shown that throughout pre-Christian history—in the Old Testament, as well as in other religious systems—"the phases of man's spiritual life are closely connected with material forms."

This connection is not "simply and solely superstitious."

For the principle of evolution, when truly interpreted, implies that the lower form implicitly contains the higher. "Many of the instincts of primitive man were truer than the explanations of them which he attempted to give. His judgments were better than his reasons." The savage localizes the gods and spirits, who he believes act upon him; this action "at a certain stage of culture is a psychological necessity, if Divine presence and Divine action are to be realized at all."

But besides the relation of the gods to men, there is also the relation of men to the gods; "this, again, if it is real, must issue in physical action. Thus, the partaking in the tribal communion, the offering of sacrifice with its prescribed ritual . . . constitute the practical religion of an early race; . . . these were the necessary means by which spiritual life first came to recognise itself" (p. 129).

Mr. Illingworth's next point is one which we think needs specially careful consideration, because here, necessarily, the dividing line which separates the good from evil, the true from the false, must be finely drawn. But the teaching is of the greatest importance, and especially helpful in our reading of the early history of the chosen people.

"It is a mistake," he says, "to regard the association of religious belief and practice with material things as inevitably superstitious or irrational: for it is founded on a psychological necessity, from which there is no possibility of escape, in a world where spirit can only be realized through matter. Such association is, of course, a fruitful parent of superstition, when its underlying religion degenerates . . . nor is it always possible, in a given case, to say where superstition began and progress ended . . ." (p. 130).

Mr. Illingworth now reminds us of his definition of "reality" as "permanent relation to a person or persons"; whence he concludes that "if a particular person realizes the Divine presence (which we believe to be latent everywhere) with exceptional vividness in a particular place, does not this constitute an actual manifestation of God to that person in that place? For in what sense can it be said that God is not really present, when we apprehend His presence to such good purpose that the whole of our subsequent conduct is coloured by the fact?" (p. 131).

As an illustration of this teaching the historic life of Christ is carefully reviewed, and we are asked to notice how Christ's human body was "an integral element in His life and work," how "He controls its appetites under temptation, goes about when weary doing good, foresees yet faces suffering . . . these things do not merely show, they actually make His human character." Thus, from the example of Christ Himself we

see that "the bodily organism . . . is an essential ingredient in the progressive development of holy personality" (p. 134).

Christ's attitude towards nature and the external world, His use of symbolical language and symbolical action are then examined. Lastly, we come to the two Sacraments which Christ ordained, "selecting as their media the two simplest, most symbolical, most universal, religious rites, the sacred ablution and the sacred feast, both familiar to the world . . . and having their place under all kinds of religion, He raised and re-enacted them in their purest forms to be thenceforward means of union with Himself: and thus gave final recognition to the law we have traced by which matter is made ministrant to spiritual life" (p. 136).

But what of the effects of Christ's teaching on this subject —the attempts to realize it as seen in Christian history, that is, in "the sacramental system to which Baptism and the Eucharist gave rise"? Mr. Illingworth plainly states that "this (sacramental system) was not, of course, as elaborate at first as in process of time it came to be." We fully agree with him when he says that "from the very first, the material elements of these two Sacraments were intimately connected in the Christian consciousness with the grace which they conveyed." But he is, we are glad to notice, most careful to point out that while by the early Christians "water and bread and wine were raised to a position of new dignity as vehicles of a spiritual benediction upon man," yet "the entire dependence of their value upon the spirit with which they were linked is at the same time clearly and emphatically maintained" (p. 141).

The influence of the ritual connected with the ancient heathen mysteries, and, especially in the case of the Lord's Supper, the gradual appropriation of much of this ritual, is a subject upon which more exact knowledge and more careful and dispassionate treatment is much to be desired at the present time. Still, of the main facts there is not much doubt; and when Mr. Illingworth speaks of this being a "raising the old-world ritual to a higher and holier use," we fear he takes far too high a view of its effects and consequences. He seems to have forgotten his own condition of its legitimacy, viz., "the complete subordination of matter to spirit." Speaking of this assimilation of various parts of Pagan and Jewish ritual by the Church, he says: "It is, of course, easy, from a modern point of view, to regard this process as retrogressive." But was it not just this in large measure? To quote his own words, "all religion, as it becomes popular, is apt to be degraded, and the Christian Sacraments were undoubtedly degraded in their popular use."

We want no stronger testimony than that. Those who had been used to the ritual of the mysteries probably craved for a far more "sensible" religion than that of the very earliest Christians. The material is far more easy to grasp than the spiritual, though, to grasp the spiritual at all, a *measure* of the material (as sanctioned by Christ Himself) may be very helpful, if not absolutely necessary. Yet we know the awful danger of resting in the perception of the material alone, and of forgetting its transcendence by the spiritual. We quite agree with Mr. Illingworth that under present conditions there is a ministry through the material; we go so far as to admit, with him, that "the growth of the sacramental system was a historical necessity," though we much prefer to put the same thought somewhat differently, and say that with our greater knowledge of the marvellous complexity and adaptability of the material world there must of necessity be a growth in the breadth and diversity of the application of the sacramental idea. We learn to see the effect of the influence of the Divine Spirit upon us through material channels in many more instances, and in ways of ever greater diversity.

But, while we cannot accept this part of the treatment of his subject without strong qualification, we are thankful to notice that he seems to see the necessity of repeated insistence upon the two conditions whereby the influence of matter in connection with religion is legitimate and productive of good. (1) The effect of the material upon us depends on our feelings towards it; in other words, the benefit of the sacramental method is due to the reaction upon it of the Divine Spirit acting through the human spirit. (2) The absolute necessity of complete subordination of the material to the spiritual.

The first of these conditions seems to be that which Evangelical Churchmen are always urging with regard to the Real Presence. We agree with Mr. Illingworth when he says that "the separation of subject and object is easier in language than in fact." But we have entirely misread his whole argument unless we may conclude that he teaches that the religious effect of the material is due to a perceptive and appreciative power—surely a *spiritual* power—in ourselves. This power is, indeed, nothing else than an influence of the Divine Spirit upon our spirit, and is ours by *faith*—the essential means of our enjoyment of that communication, of our possession of that communion.

The second condition must govern all our use of the material in religion, as it certainly governed Christ's employment of it. We must remember those whose perception may never pass beyond the material, and who may be, if permitted, only too well content to rest there. By a too lavish and unrestrained

use of the "sensible" they may actually be prevented from apprehending the spiritual which transcends it.

There are many other parts of this deeply interesting book to which we should have liked to call attention. Especially should we have liked to examine the excellent appendices on "Personal Identity" and "Freewill," the final pages of the latter being among the most admirable pieces of practical ethical writing and teaching we have seen for a long time past; but we have already outrun our space, and very possibly the patience of our readers.

We heartily commend this book as a thoughtful and reverent effort towards the solution of problems which lie very near us all.

W. Edward Chadwick.

Art. IV.—THE ALBIGENSES.

Part III.

Leaving now the evidence which has been submitted elucidating the Albigensian and Waldensian doctrines and practices, we turn to the history of their suppression. A convenient starting-point is afforded us in the Council of Tours (A.D. 1163), at which it was ordered, under Canon 4, that the heretics, *in partibus Tolosæ*, were to be placed under anathema; that no one should deal with them, or receive them; and that when arrested they were to be brought before "Catholic" princes and deprived of their goods. But resolutions are one thing, action upon them is another, and practically those against whom the canon was directed remained undisturbed. Its harmlessness acted rather as an incentive, and as Roger Hoveden says, "The Arian heresy spread so rapidly that the King of France, and his 'man' the King of England, sent Peter Chrysogonus (Cardinal, Legate, and a Cistercian), Henry of Clairvaux, Archbishops and Bishops," into the infected district, "in order that by their preaching they might convert the heretics to the Christian faith"; while Raymond, Count of Toulouse, Raymond, Count of Castranuovo, and others, were appointed by the said Kings to aid the Commissioners in the work of conversion. Henry of Clairvaux declares in a letter which he addressed "to the Catholic world" that, if they had deferred their visit for three years, scarcely one person would have remained orthodox. But imposing as was the personnel of this commission, its sole result was the condemnation and excommunication of

two insignificant Albigenses, Raymond and Bernard by name. Something more systematic was determined upon by Pope Lucius III.; for in the first year of his pontificate (A.D. 1181) he issued a decree that all receivers and defenders of heretics were to suffer the same punishment as the heretics themselves. If a clergyman, he was to be deprived of all the privileges of his Order, and handed over for punishment to the secular arm, unless, immediately after his arrest, he returned freely and fully into the unity of the "Catholic Church," publicly confessed his error, and made due satisfaction. If a layman, he was to be delivered to the secular power for punishment, unless he publicly recanted. This decree was to be published on all the great festivals by all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, under penalty of suspension for three years. "Every bishop, in person, or by his archdeacon as deputy, shall, twice or thrice in a year, go through every parish in which it is reported that heretics reside; he shall summon three or four good men and true, or if expedient, all the people, and compel them to swear that they would report to the bishop or archdeacon any heretics, and those who frequented secret meetings, or sever themselves from the society of the faithful." All counts, barons, etc., were enjoined to do their utmost to suppress infidelity. Such was the plan of the campaign; but a plan it remained. Lucius himself was too much engaged in his conflict with Frederick Barbarossa, while those to whom the task was committed were either deeply involved, by themselves or by their relations, in heretical opinions, or else had no inclination to exchange the luxury and repose of their palaces for the hardships and dangers of religious strife. These elaborate, but spasmodic, efforts were mere flashes in the pan, and, so far from daunting the sectaries, were regarded by them as so many exposures of their enemies' weakness, and emboldened the more timid amongst them to declare themselves in their true colours. The leader of the heretics at that time, named Peter Mauran, was summoned to appear before a Council held at Toulouse.

So greatly, however, did the Commissioners "fear the people," that only after descending to flattery could they induce Peter to present himself before them. The sentence passed upon him was that he was to be deprived of all his possessions, to present himself during a period of eighty days at different churches in Toulouse, with bare shoulders, there to be chastized, and to go to Jerusalem for three years. But it is quite uncertain whether this sentence was actually carried out. Robert de Monte, a contemporary chronicler, declares that the Commission was utterly ineffective; and Roger Hoveden confesses that the Legate and his companions were

hooted through the streets with cries of "Apostates! Heretics! Hypocrites!" This is further confirmed by William of Puy Laurens. He tells us, in his "Chronicle," that he purposes to relate only those things which he had seen and heard. In his preface he states: "The chaplains (*capellani*) were held in such contempt by the laity that their name was as much a byword and a reproach as the name of Jew. Thus, just as it was said, 'I would rather be a Jew than do this or that'; so it was also said, 'I would rather be a chaplain.'" The clergy, if they appeared in the public streets, had to hide the tonsure. Knights no longer presented for ordination their own sons, but those of their vassals. "The heretics have filled the land, as if the Lord has ordained now as He did in the primitive Church, 'how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called'" (1 Cor. i. 27, 28). Emboldened by numbers, and by the support of the aristocracy, the Albigenses publicly buried those who, while alive, had had the ceremony of heretication performed over them. Not always could the Legate venture upon putting a heretic upon his trial, but had to content himself with a disputation as between equals. Thus, at a disputation held at Pamiers, the sister of Bernard Roger, Count of Foix, openly defended the Albigensian opinions, and was scolded by Brother Stephen, one of the Cistercian mission, who told her that such speech ill-became her, and that she should rather mind her distaff. Sometimes the discussion was carried on in writing, as at Mont Royal in 1207, between Peter of Castelnau, Radulf and others, as champions of the Roman side, and Arnala and Willabert, of the Albigensian side. William of Puy Laurens says he had not been able to see the papers, as they were alleged to have been destroyed in the war.

All contemporary writers agree that the private lives and official practices of the clergy were scandalous. Benefices were kept vacant, and their emoluments appropriated by the patrons. The simoniac Bishop of Toulouse was succeeded by Fulk the troubadour. Their Christianity was merely a refined heathenism of an Oriental character. The clergy sought for money, not to distribute it amongst the poor, or to spend it in other good works, but to adorn and beautify their houses, or to administer to their pleasures. Was it to be wondered at that the Albigensian heresy made such headway when morality was pitted against orthodoxy? The several Counts, too, found more congenial occupation in warring against one another than in uniting to eradicate opinions which were largely aboriginal.

It was not until the strongest of all Popes, Innocent III.,

ascended the pontifical throne that the work of suppression was taken in hand at all seriously. He wrote (A.D. 1199) an urgent letter to the Archbishop of Auch, and a few months later he issued a mandate upon the subject to all the great prelates of the South of France, to all princes, counts, barons, and all Christian people. Two legates, Rainer and Guy, were despatched into the country, and the temporal power was cited to support them. Letter and mandate and legate were received with equal indifference. But Innocent was not the man to be denied. He replaced Rainer and Guy by two other legates, Peter and Radulf, to be joined later on by Arnald D'Amauri. The Archbishop of Narbonne was severely censured for remissness, and the King of France was called to the aid of the Church. By this time, however, so strong was the hold that these obnoxious opinions had upon the Albigenses, that the legates found their expulsion by no means an easy task. The King of France came not, nor sent "to the help of the Lord"; the whole of Southern France was disturbed by the private wars of the nobles; the clergy were either apathetic, or those who were zealous had, by their malpractices, lost all influence over the popular mind. The obvious policy, therefore, of the legates was to attempt to make peace amongst the nobles, and then to unite them against the heretics. Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and the most influential of the nobles, refused the terms of peace proposed by Peter and Radulf. He saw that the safety of the people lay in the mutual hostilities of their rulers. He had been brought up from his cradle amongst the heretics, and was favourably disposed towards them. Peter of Vaux-Sarnai says that the Count was secretly a heretic himself, and had once hired a fool to mock the Bishop in church. The prospects of the mission, therefore, were very gloomy and hopeless, when there came to the aid of the Church, all unexpectedly, two events which eventually crowned the efforts of "the faithful" with inglorious success.

The first event to which we refer was the visit of Diego and Dominic. Either in 1204 or 1207, and either at Narbonne or Montpellier (the evidence for date and place being contradictory and well-balanced), the legates fell in with these two men, one of whom was destined to leave the impress of his personality for all time upon the Roman Church. Diego and Dominic, Bishop and Prior of Ozma respectively, were returning from Denmark, whither they had been sent on matters matrimonial by the King of Castile. Passing through the South of France, they were astounded at the hold "Manicheism" had upon the country. Perhaps upon the principle that "lookers-on see most of the game," the legates, utterly

disheartened with their failures, consulted the new arrivals, and begged their advice. But so far from receiving any sympathy, they were severely rebuked for their mode of life. How could they expect to succeed, surrounded by such pomp and luxury? "By their fruits ye shall know them." Let them emulate the austerity and poverty of the heretics. Let them endure hardness as good soldiers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Let them approach more nearly to the simplicity of the Apostles, whose successors they were. Diego and Dominic set the example, and the Legates followed. Dominic had, when at Ozma, been accustomed to renounce the seclusion of the Priory, and come forth and preach, "giving up," as Jordan says, "Rachel for Leah"—that is, the speculative life for the practical. Preaching seemed to Diego *the* weapon that was needed to use against the sectaries; and acting upon this opinion, he set out for Rome to gain the Pope's permission to his renouncing his bishopric and devoting the rest of his life to preaching against heresy. The first request was refused, the second granted in part. He was allowed to return to France *for a time*, and assault the strongholds of Satan with the artillery of eloquence. Gathering together a company of thirty Cistercian monks, Diego and Dominic went everywhere, reproving, rebuking, exhorting. From this eventually sprang the famous Dominican Order. But it is worth observing here that while the actual *work* of founding that Order belongs to Dominic, the *idea* of such an Order must be fathered upon Diego. For as he and his company traversed the country from one end to the other, it became evident that the whole attack required cohesion and organization. Bishops, legates, preachers, were all acting separately, every man doing that which was right in his own eyes—no plan, no principle, no discipline. To Diego must be given the credit of the *idea* of forming a definite Order of preachers, going forth under the immediate authority of the Pope, and independent of all other domination, ecclesiastical or secular, to proclaim the faith of the Church, to dispel all ignorance and refute all heresy, not as a temporary but a permanent body, not only for Toulouse and the Albigenses, but for all the world—*the* weapon upon which the Church could depend for offence and defence in matters of faith; a society within the Church, under perfect discipline, thoroughly instructed for the work it had to do, and moving everywhere as one man.

Ten years elapsed, however, before such an Order was launched upon Europe. Meanwhile Diego and his companions went about preaching. After two years Diego returned to his Diocese of Ozma, and Dominic succeeded him

as leader of the preachers—"vexillifer," as William of Puy Laurens styles him. But the "vexillifer," or standard-bearer, though he did most of the fighting, and led the forces, was not the General as well, two posts which had been combined in Diego. To this latter post was appointed Bernard Guido, Abbot of Vaux-Sarnai, and afterwards Bishop of Carcassone. "Unity is strength"; and in order to obtain that unity which his predecessor had desired, Bernard Guido summoned to the Church of St. Stephen at Toulouse the *Curia regalis*, the *consules Tolosani*, and all the clergy and people, and exacted from them the following comprehensive oath: "We, Ugo Gerald, Doctor of Laws and Knight of our Lord the King of France, holding the place of Seneschal of Toulouse and Albigesium, and Uvo, Doctor of Laws, Judge of our Lord the King at Toulouse, and John de Turre, keeper of the arms of our Lord the King, and Peter Gaurand, Lawyer, holding the place of Vicar of Toulouse, swear by these holy Gospels of God that the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Roman Church we will keep and cause to be kept, and will defend the same with all our might against all. Item: That we will persecute, arrest, and cause to be arrested the heretics—*credentes, fautores, receptores*—whenever we can, and will accuse and denounce them to the Church and the Inquisitors, wheresoever we may know them to be. Item: That we will not commit any bailiwick, administration, or public office to anyone of the aforesaid pestiferous persons, nor those suspected or reported to be heretical, nor to anyone who has been by reason of the crime of heresy disqualified from performing any public office; nor will we receive any of the aforesaid, nor knowingly have them in our family or company or service or counsels; and if by chance we should in ignorance act otherwise, after it has been brought to our notice, we will immediately expel them, and in these and in other ways which belong to the office of the Inquisition, be obedient to God, the Roman Church, and the Inquisitors. So help us God and these holy Gospels of God."

One prelate, at any rate, immediately gave good proof of his sincerity. Fulk, Bishop of Toulouse, once a troubadour, assisted Dominic in the foundation of a small monastery at Prouille, near Fanjeaux (*Fanum Jovis*) "for the reception of certain noble ladies whose parents, through stress of poverty, were about to hand them over to the care of the heretics" (Guido's Chronicle in Martene and Durand, vol. vi.).

Humbert tells us that one day after Dominic had finished his sermon, nine matrons threw themselves at his feet, begging him to tell them what was the truth, as hitherto they had followed "the good men," but were now shaken in their faith.

These formed the nucleus of another monastery, and Dominic intrusted to them the instruction of children in the tenets of the Roman Church. For nearly ten years we now lose sight of Dominic. The voice of the preacher was soon to be overpowered by the thunders of war. His work during all these years is summed up in a sentence of Humbert's: "The blessed Dominic remained for ten years practically alone, with few adherents, with no possessions, upholding the Catholic faith throughout Narbonne, Carcassone and Fanjeaux, enduring much distress, insult and obloquy."

It has been asserted that Dominic was never a persecutor, that he never used force to put down heresy, and therefore cannot be charged with being the founder of the Inquisition. We have, however, already seen the spirit of the times, and we have a right to demand direct evidence that he stood apart from that spirit and was an exception. It has been said that only once did he depart from the policy of persuasion, and that was when he prayed, "Lord, stretch forth Thy hand, that by tribulation and vexation they may have understanding." But Dominic, it may legitimately be inferred from the character of the times, would do his best to practise what he prayed. Dominic was a Spaniard, and the Spanish disposition does not incline to the side of mercy. He must have taken an active part in exacting that oath of persecution from prince, prelate, and people at Toulouse. And the question is finally answered by the following decree which he issued at this time. "By the authority of the Lord Abbot of Citeaux, legate of the Apostolic See, who has laid this office upon me, we have reconciled the bearer of these presents, Pontius Roger, who has turned from the sect of the heretics, God being gracious unto him; and we demand, in virtue of his oath to the prelate, that on three Sundays and three festivals, he shall be led, naked, except for drawers, from the entrance of his house (or village) to the church, and *scourged* by the priest." He was to abstain from flesh, eggs and cheese always, except at Easter, Whitsun and Christmas; to wear the "religious" garments and the crosses. Moreover, he decreed that those that were obdurate were to be burnt; and this punishment was actually inflicted upon Guraud of Castelnuovo, "digna recipiens stipendia meritorum." The subsequent horrors of the Inquisition, it is true, cannot be paralleled by the like in these early days. They must, nevertheless, be regarded as natural developments of its first principles and practices; and Dominic, in this matter of coercion, was like the habit of his Order—neither wholly black nor wholly white, but more black than white.

It was not, however, either by preaching or persecution that

the tide eventually turned in favour of Rome. It was "a fortunate accident." The blood of a martyr, whether in a good or bad cause, is often the seed of the Church; and so it proved in this instance. The people became daily more and more exasperated by this prolonged and persistent interference with their religious and civil liberty; and it was not to be expected from those times that blood might be shed on one side without some retaliation from the other. At length an event occurred which, for the horror it excited, can only be compared with that aroused by the murder of Becket some forty years before. In A.D. 1208 Peter the legate was assassinated on the banks of the Rhone by one of Raymond's soldiers. Baronius declares that Raymond "*subornavit* perditissimos satellites qui legatum Rhodanum trajecturum hasta transfodere." But contemporary evidence does not confirm this statement. The Anonymous Chronicler acquits Raymond of all complicity, and says that the deed was committed *in a moment of irritation* by one of Raymond's suite when discussing with the legate some point of doctrine; and that Raymond, had he caught the murderer, would have punished him. Peter of Vaux-Sarnai, whose bias is obvious on every page, says that Raymond received the murderer after the crime, whereas the "anonymous" historian asserts that he fled to his own home. William of Puy Laurens speaks more guardedly. The legate passed away to God per "gladios impiorum, cujus rei *suspicione* Comes non caruit." Innocent struck while the iron was hot. It was an opportunity which that keen statesman was not likely to let slip. Before the horror and indignation of Europe cooled, the Pope, without trial or explanation, launched his bolt of excommunication against Raymond and the actual murderer, as well as against all who had in any way aided and abetted him, or should hereafter receive and protect him. As for Raymond in particular, Innocent charges him with having laid snares for the murdered servant of God, received the actual murderer with the greatest cordiality, and rewarded him with many gifts. But he can go no further than "*presumitur* esse reus," and that he (Raymond) had acted thus "*sicut asseritur*." Nevertheless, this sentence is to be published everywhere with bells and candles. Moreover, "since, according to the canonical sanctions of the holy Fathers, faith need not be kept with him who keeps not faith with God, all who have made with Raymond any promise, alliance, or bond whatsoever, are absolved from all obligations, and it is further permitted to any Catholic, saving the rights of the principal lord, not only to persecute the said Raymond, but to occupy and retain his land until he should repent and make restitution." Special letters were also sent

to Philip, King of France, either to go himself, or at least send his son Louis, to the aid of the Church. Philip replied that he had "two great and grievous lions" on either side of him, viz., Otto the Emperor, and John, King of England; that for the present he dare not leave France, nor spare his son, but he had no objections to his barons going. Innocent disregarded these excuses, and retorted with a *general* letter "to all prelates, counts, barons, and the whole people in the Kingdom of France, urging them to at once avenge the insult done to the Crucified, and promising them forgiveness of all their sins, "dummodo contriti essent pariter et confessi." There was thus let loose upon some of the fairest provinces of la belle France, at the instigation of the "Vicar of Christ," a bloody war that lasted for half a century, and only expired through sheer exhaustion of the combatants. It came at a time when unhappily the mind of man was direfully ripe for such occupation. It afforded an outlet, nearer home than the Holy Land, for the crusading spirit of the age. The Kings of France were slowly but surely curtailing the independence of the nobles, and extending the boundaries of the kingdom from ocean to river, from channel to mountain. Philip was more than willing that his nobles should weaken themselves in battle-fields which drew their minds and strength away from their home interests; while he intervened only when he feared one or the other was getting too strong in these southern provinces. The Church had never been more powerful, nor its creed more compact. Against these repressive forces, from within and from without, were arrayed the rooted conviction that the Roman Church did not represent the Church of Christ and His Apostles either in doctrines or ceremonies; indignation at the arrogance and contempt for the dissoluteness of the clergy; a desire for Scriptural truth, quickened but not satisfied by the translation into the vulgar tongue of some parts of the Bible; and a traditional resentment against all interference from outsiders in matters civil or religious. It was a struggle for supremacy between *lex* or *lux.*

H. J. WARNER.

ART. V.—THE "BENEDICITE."

THIS old canticle, which appears in the Book of Common Prayer, and is occasionally "said or sung" instead of the *Te Deum* at morning service, is one of the least understood, and perhaps one of the least valued, portions of our Liturgy. And this is not to be wondered at; for it breathes an odour of times strangely different from our own, and of a Christian culture in some respects greatly unlike that of the Western world. It is taken from the Apocrypha, and appears to be Greek, probably Alexandrine, in origin, and, like the history of Susanna and the history of Bel and the Dragon, is an uncanonical addition to the third chapter of the Book of Daniel. The title "Benedicite, Omnia Opera," is given to it because in the Latin version it begins with these words. It is also called "The Song of the Three Children," from being sung, it is said, by Ananias, Mishael, and Azarias in "the burning fiery furnace" into which they were cast, by order of Nebuchadnezzar, for their steadfast adherence to the Lord their God.

The exact date of its composition is as uncertain as the exact date of the Septuagint itself, but it is probably not much older than the Septuagint; and it is contained in that version, as well as in the version of Theodotion, besides being found in the old Latin and the Vulgate.

The *Benedicite* was sung as a hymn in the later Jewish Church, and from their liturgies was adopted into the Christian worship in public devotion from very early times. St. Augustine tells us it was used in his time on the solemn festivals of the Church. Athanasius directs virgins to use it in their private devotions. Cyprian quotes it as part of the Word of God, as does Ruffinus, who severely inveighs against St. Jerome for doubting its Divine authority. The fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) says it was used in the Church all over the world, and therefore orders it to be sung by the clergy of Spain and Gallicia every Lord's Day and on the festivals of the martyrs, under pain of excommunication; and Chrysostom, who lived more than two centuries before this Council, makes the same observation, and testifies that it was sung in all places throughout the world, and predicts that it will continue to be sung in future generations.

So it has come down to us; but we too often regard it more as a literary curiosity than as an appropriate expression of praise to the Almighty Creator. It is indeed conceived in the loftiest style of poetry, and no cultured intellect can be insensible to its merits as an artistic composition; but we must not forget that for us its chief merit consists in its uncom-

promising protest against idolatry, and its noble vindication of the simplicity of the true religion. It is the practical comment of a grateful heart on the thought, so finely expressed by Tennyson:

> For so the whole round world is every way
> Bound by gold chains about the feet of God;

or, as Bacon has it: "According to the allegory of the poets . . . the highest link of Nature's chain must needs be tied to the foot of Jupiter's chair." This was what commended the *Benedicite* to Charles Kingsley, for whom the old canticle had a special charm, and who loved again and again to call attention to it on these grounds as "the very crown and flower of the Old Testament." If the song was so intended —namely, as a witness against idolatry, and as a testimony in favour of true religion—it is indeed, as Dean Stanley pointed out, a fruitful and inspiring thought that this supreme denial of the gods of Babylon, the gods of sun and moon and earth and sea, was expressed not by a mere contradiction, but by a positive appeal to all that is beautiful and holy and great in Nature and man to join in the perpetual praise and exaltation of the Supreme Source of all beauty, strength and power. "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise Him and magnify Him for ever."

It has been remarked that the canticle is a paraphrastic explanation of Psa. cxlviii., "and is so like it in words and sense," says Wheatley, "that whosoever despiseth this reproacheth that part of the canonical writings." In the psalm, which exhibits the wide compass as well as the nationality of the Hebrew worship, all creation is summoned to unite in the praise of the Creator: "Praise ye the Lord. Praise ye Him all His angels. Praise Him sun and moon. Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons and all deeps: fire and hail, snow and vapours, stormy wind fulfilling His word; mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars, beasts and all cattle . . . kings of the earth and all people, both young men and maidens, old men and children; let them praise the name of the Lord." And these are the sentiments set forth with wider expansion in the "Song of the Three Children." Wordsworth speaks of "two voices":

> One is of the sea,
> One of the mountains;

but here are a hundred voices, from earth and from heaven, all joined together, "as the sound of many waters," in one sublime and far-reaching diapason of praise to God.

We greatly admire this magnificent hymn, which has come to us surrounded with such venerable associations, and is so

penetrated with rich poetic and religious meaning. As we read it we are borne back in spirit to freer and more inspiring thought, and a purity of religious feeling that belong only to the ante-Nicene days of the Church. Then dogma was fresh and vital; a large and animated courage and a deep impassioned earnestness ruled the hearts of men; the sharp lines of the Christian creeds were not drawn; God and man were not antagonized; the Incarnation had not dwindled to a theory; and everywhere men saw the workings of the Divine mind.

In reading this old Greek canticle we are often reminded of the poet Wordsworth. The spirit of his poetry harmonizes well with the spirit of the canticle. And the words of the ancient poet, "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord!" recall familiar verses of the modern poet whose master vision was of God in Nature. It is Wordsworth's central doctrine—and we read him in vain unless we understand it—that Nature is not lifeless, but that every varied movement of her vast tides is a separate thought of God, the Preserver as well as the Creator; that His power is in her, and that through all her processes the Eternal is ever making Himself known. Perhaps the most characteristic and prevailing principle of his poetry, like that of the old Greek theology, is the doctrine of the immanence of God, as distinct from all legal and mechanical views of God's relation to His universe. Carried too far, the doctrine might indeed become pantheistic, and so defective on its ethical side; but ignored altogether, our conception of the Deity would necessarily be that of a great Mechanician who had constructed a universe from which He had withdrawn Himself to some distant heaven, or of an ingenious Artificer who had made a huge lifeless machine, the crank of which He kept perpetually turning from afar. That was the conception of Western orthodoxy, but it is one that we, in these sympathetic days, are rapidly getting away from, and the doctrine of the immanence of God is again taking its true place as the central and controlling doctrine of our system, and is colouring all our thought.

In Wordsworth we see everywhere the Divine Presence—"The Soul of all the worlds"—guiding, controlling, modifying, actively overruling all earthly life and all the forces of Nature:

> The Being that is in the clouds and air,
> That is in the green leaves and among the groves,
> Maintains a deep and reverential care
> For the unoffending creatures whom He loves.

And he sings how he has felt in Nature:

> A Presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime

> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
> A motion and a spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.

Nature, as the Greeks taught long ago, is not to be regarded as a mere mathematical puzzle, whose mystery is solved when we talk about laws and forces; it is a τὸ ζῶον, a living organism, through which God by His Spirit manifests Himself to man as a vital Principle and all-sustaining Force. It is the same Spirit which gives to the myriad forms of vegetable life their wonderful variety and beauty, and to animal life its manifold power and strength, binding all orders of terrestrial beings together by making them partakers of the one life which quickens and sustains all things. This is the teaching of Wordsworth, and this is the teaching of the *Benedicite*.

In our day there is a growing reverence for Nature as a manifestation of Divine thought, and therefore a growing sympathy with the spirit of this great hymn, and to Wordsworth must be ascribed much of this sympathy and reverence. A prophet of God, he saw the light of the Eternal's countenance shining clear upon the face of Nature, and he showed it unto men. He taught them to recognise a Divineness in Nature which they had not seen, or had seen but dimly, before.

> The outward shows of sky and earth,
> Of hill and valley he has viewed;

but

> Impulses of deeper birth
> Have come to him in solitude;

and these he has revealed to us in his own "bright, solemn, and serene" way. And if earnest and reverent men are perplexed with doubts and questionings to-day, it is only in virtue of their growing sense of the greatness and nearness of God, not from any irreverent wish to detract from His glory, much less to dethrone Him as the Ruler of the universe. The cry of the age is for "more life and fuller." We want to feel the heart-throbs of God in all His universe, to have, as Christ had, fellowship with rocks and trees and birds and flowers, and know, as He knew, that to one all-pervading life "the whole creation" witnesses, and to

> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off Divine event,

it "moves." The "flower in the crannied wall" is a "vision of Him who reigns" as truly as

> The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills, and the plains.

And this is the teaching of the Bible. "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead."

The *Benedicite* is in wonderful harmony with the scientific spirit of our generation. Each new student of the mysteries of Nature brings us more and more marvellous revelations of her greatness. We know more—much more—about God in Nature, His power, His wisdom, and His beneficence, than our fathers did, and therefore we can say more intelligently than they: "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever!" May we unite with Nature and her works in ascribing praise to God! "O that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and for His wonderful works to the children of men!" "All Thy works shall praise Thee, O Lord, and Thy saints shall bless Thee!"[1]

WILLIAM COWAN.

ART. VI.—THE DIOCESE OF LONDON: THE WEST AND THE CITY.[2]

WHAT might not a Diocese like London achieve for the kingdom of God and for English Christianity, if it were wholly united, wholly coherent, vital in every part, and properly equipped! In London is the centre of every movement, political, commercial, philanthropic and religious. The influence of London is felt to the extremities not only of the kingdom, but of the empire. The responsibility of working in London is overwhelming.

[1] The uncanonical absurdity of singing this glorious pæan of praise during Advent and Lent is merely owing to a slip of the compilers of the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. They thought there should be an alternative to the *Te Deum* for these seasons, and directed the use of the *Benedicite*. When, however, three years after, they produced the perfected Prayer-Book (the Second of Edward VI., A.D. 1552) they had discovered their mistake, and realized that the *Benedicite* was reserved for the most jubilant and joyful occasions in the Early Church, and they therefore omitted this direction. The Tractarians, in their zeal for the First Prayer-Book, resumed this mistake, which had been corrected during the previous 300 years, and had been in force less than three years, It has now become a point of honour to commit this solecism every Sunday in Advent and Lent, and the unhappy *Benedicite* is dressed up in all kinds of gloomy chants in the vain hope of making its wild jubilation suitable to these solemn seasons.

[2] I make no apology for putting this statement of facts in a more permanent and accessible form than the reports of the Church Congress.

The Diocese is unique in the history of Christendom. The population, according to the census of 1891, was 3,251,475; it is now nearly 4,000,000. The nearest population to its own in this country is that of the Diocese of Manchester, which has 2,644,822; Rochester has 1,938,000; York, 1,447,000; Liverpool, 1,207,000; and St. Albans, 1,006,000. Not merely to provide for the spiritual wants of such inconceivable numbers, but to stir them to a sense of homogeneous unity, of Christian brotherhood, of mutual knowledge and dependence and realized solidarity, is indeed a gigantic task.

It must be remembered that the Diocese, huge as it is, has been very much restricted. It is now, with a trifling exception, conterminous with the county of Middlesex. The Metropolitan area of London itself is vastly larger. That prodigious part of London which is south of the River Thames is mainly in the composite Diocese of Rochester; some of it in that of Winchester; a small portion in that of Canterbury. The teeming populations east of the River Lea, which makes the border between the counties of Middlesex and Essex, are in the Diocese of St. Albans.

The size of the Diocese has fluctuated greatly in the present century.

In 1832, besides the City of London and the County of Middlesex, it comprised the whole county of Essex, the two Archdeacons of which had stalls in St. Paul's Cathedral; 50 parishes in Hertfordshire, and 4 in Bucks, all of which were in the Archdeaconry of Middlesex.

In 1837, when the County of Bucks was transferred from the Diocese of Lincoln to that of Oxford, the Bucks parishes were withdrawn from the Diocese of London.

In 1845 the Diocese received an enormous increase: the parishes of Charlton, Lee, Lewisham, Greenwich, Woolwich, Eltham, Plumstead and Deptford were transferred to it from the Diocese of Rochester. The idea seems, then, to have been to make the Diocese the same as the Metropolitan area. But the policy was not maintained, and in 1863 these were returned with thanks to Rochester.

In the same year, 1845, the Archbishop of Canterbury gave to the Diocese of London from his own Diocese the parishes of St. Mary Newington, Barnes, Putney, Mortlake, and Wimbledon. These were not given up to Rochester till 1877, at the time that I was resident chaplain to Bishop Jackson.

In the same year, 1845, the Diocese of London received the greater part of South London from the Diocese of Winchester, that is, the great parishes of Southwark, Battersea, Bermondsey, Camberwell, Clapham, Lambeth, Rotherhithe, Streatham, Tooting-Graveney, Wandsworth and Merton.

London was compensated for these enormous additions by the transference of the County of Essex and the 50 London parishes of Hertfordshire to the long-suffering Diocese of Rochester, which for several generations has been the plaything of ecclesiastical politicians.

The idea of making the Diocese of London contain all the urban Metropolitan population was still further emphasized by keeping the 10 parishes now known as London-over-the-border, which are such a terrible burden to the Bishop of St. Albans—Barking, Great and Little Ilford, East and West Ham, Leyton, Walthamstow, Wanstead, Woodford and Chingford. In 1863 the Metropolitan idea had been given up, for these parishes were handed back again, as usual, to Rochester.

It is very unlikely that the limits of the Diocese of London will again be disturbed, as after all these fluctuations and changes of policy, it has now settled down into a comparatively compact area, conterminous with a county, bounded on two sides by rivers, and for the rest by ancient county dividing-lines. The only reason for altering it would be the old canonical rule of one Bishop to one city. This might be carried out either by placing the whole Metropolitan area, with its 5,000,000, under the Bishop of London, with ten or twelve suffragans, supported in the constitutional and legal manner by adequate benefices or canonries; or, what has long seemed to me the better plan, by erecting the Metropolitan area into a province, making the Bishop of London a third Archbishop, and carrying out the canonical principle by raising each of the new municipalities of London to the status of a bishopric. In either case much waste of labour and money would be saved, and many anomalies would be avoided, by having one set of institutions for the total Metropolitan area, with St. Paul's Cathedral as the obvious and visible centre of the whole.

Some such scheme seems to have been at one time the policy of the authorities. Personally, I have advocated it ever since I have had anything to do with the Diocese; but it seems to me, for many reasons, extremely unlikely to be adopted.

Turning to the Diocese of London as it exists, we find that it is divided into two Archdeaconries, which meet at Temple Bar—that of London and that of Middlesex. The first comprises the City, the East End, and a large part of the North; the other, that of Middlesex, the whole of the West End and the country districts. In 1891 the Archdeaconry of London contained about 1,442,000 souls, that of Middlesex 1,807,000: each of these is now larger than any Diocese except Manchester and Rochester.

The Bishop of London is assisted by three suffragans and two assistant-bishops—Marlborough for the West, Islington for the North, Stepney for the East; for the West-central District the eminent late Metropolitan of Australia; and for North Europe, Bishop Wilkinson. The names of Stepney and North Europe remind me that the peculiarities of the Diocese of London are not exhausted; every British subject in foreign parts was at one time, and is very likely now, regarded in law as sailing from the Parish of Stepney, and every child born on the high seas is registered in that parish. This principle gave the Bishop of London jurisdiction over every member of the Church of England outside the British Islands. The Diocese of London is the mother of the whole Colonial Church. From the foundation of the American Colonies in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, until the consecration of Bishop Seabury little more than a century ago, the United States of America were part of the Diocese of London. The shelves of the Porteus Library at Fulham Palace have rows of volumes of documents and correspondence relating to that administration. For the same reason the numerous congregations of English people scattered throughout Northern and Central Europe are under the same episcopal rule.

My object is to speak about the City and the West.[1] About the City very little need be said. It has in its midst St. Paul's Cathedral, where the three chief services are attended every Sunday by great throngs, amounting to not much less than 7,000 during the course of the day. On week-days every morning service is attended by about 100, every afternoon by 400, every Saturday afternoon by 800. In addition to these, there is a multiplicity of services, great and small, daily, or at special seasons, or annual, which make St. Paul's a really vital element in the life of the Diocese. With our present staff of assistants, clerical and lay, St. Paul's could not do more; on many occasions St. Paul's itself is too small for the crowds who wish to attend. Besides St. Paul's, the City has no less than 56 churches for a resident population of not much more than 20,000; this gives an average of less than 400 persons to each church, even if they all belonged to the Church of England, and were all of age and condition to attend. It must be remembered, however, that a million of people enter the City every week-day for their business, and that some of these do attend mid-day lectures at City churches. The problem is exceedingly difficult because, while 10 would probably be enough for the population, the great majority of the churches are of such antiquarian and historical interest

[1] I wrote about the Archdeaconry of London in a previous paper.

that they could not be destroyed. There are 8 or 9 which are of little value: with the rest, much might be done in the way of uniting and specialization. It must be remembered that the wealthier City benefices are mulcted for the benefit of poor parishes in other parts of the Diocese.

But the interests of the western half of London claim a much larger proportion of attention. Here we find 378 parishes, and a population of nearly 2,000,000. About 30 of these are small country parishes which present no difficulty. The larger number of them are huge indeed. Those who come from the provincial and country towns will be startled to hear of the enormous difficulties with which the West End clergy of London have to contend. Among the parishes of the Middlesex Archdeaconry there are 67 with a population over 8,000, each of them equal to the population of a town. Those between 8,000 and 9,000 are 9; over 9,000, 13; over 10,000, 9; over 11,000, 3; over 12,000, 7; over 13,000, 5; over 14,000, 3; over 15,000, 6; over 16,000, 2; over 17,000, 4; over 18,000, 2; over 20,000, 1; over 21,000, 1; over 32,000, 1. And in spite of the very large staff of clergy at some of the wealthier churches, such as Kensington, St. Peter's, Eaton Square, St. Augustine's, Kilburn, Holy Trinity, Chelsea, and the like, the average proportion of clergy working among these vast masses is only one to 4,000. We cannot maintain that in these 67 parishes, except the few wealthy ones, the equipment is anything like adequate for the work of the Church. The successive Bishops of London, and the suffragan Bishop of Marlborough who assists in the West, are constantly urging the extraordinary and lamentable needs of West London; but adequate help does not come. Very few realize the actual state of the case.

The fact is that the population is increasing with such enormous rapidity that we are never able to overtake the neglect of a hundred years ago. In 1818, indeed, Parliament voted £1,000,000 for building churches in London and the great towns; but much of the money was wasted on the costliness of the buildings. The same year the Incorporated Church Building Society was founded. In 1836 Bishop Blomfield inaugurated the Metropolis Churches Fund. During his episcopate of 28 years he consecrated more than 200 churches. Besides the Metropolis Churches Fund, there were in those days local efforts, such as the Islington Church Extension Society, the Bethnal Green Ten Churches Fund, the Westminster Spiritual Aid Fund, the St. Pancras Fund, and the like. In 1854 the Metropolis Churches Fund was reconstituted as the London Diocesan Church Building Society. In 1857 Bishop Tait inaugurated the Bishop of London's

Fund. Noble work has been done in 42 years by that great institution; but it does not grow; for the building operations of the whole Diocese, as well as the increase of the staff of living agents in the western half, it does not produce much more than £20,000 a year, the inadequacy of which sum for the wants of the Diocese is absolutely appalling.

For the people go on multiplying whether we are ready for it or not. In 1836 Bishop Blomfield had to complain that in London and its suburbs the entire population of 34 parishes amounted to 1,137,000, while there was church room for only 101,682, and but 139 clergymen. In 1854 it was computed that the population had increased by 600,000 in 18 years. Between 1831 and 1841 it increased by 30,000 a year. Between 1841 and 1851 the rate was 40,000. That was for all London, the rate is now 40,000 for the more restricted Diocese of London alone. In 1881 the population within the Bills of Mortality was 3,815,000. In 1891 it was 4,211,000. In 1896 it was 4,411,000. The Diocese of London shares in this increasing rate.

Now, the result of all this is that religious influence is at a low ebb. We do not underrate the Christian work of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists; but we do not make anything like provision for our own people. It is impossible for one clergyman to exercise pastoral care over 4,000 souls, many of whom are frequently shifting from one parish to another. Bishop Tait used to aim at one clergyman for every 2,000. The standard looked for now is 1 to every 3,000; but 1 to 4,000 is far below the level of possibility. What did Bishop Temple tell us in his last charge from the pulpit of St. Paul's? That on the previous Easter Day, out of a population of 3½ millions in the Diocese, only 110,000 had presented themselves for Holy Communion. A church and a staff of clergy working amongst a population of 32,000, 20,000, 18,000, 15,000, and the like, are not much more than beacon-lights, casting a gleam, but not illuminating the surrounding country; they influence personally a very small proportion of the people. It is difficult, I said, to realize this. The rich people who come to London for the five months of the season live in a very small area—Mayfair, Belgravia, Kensington, and so forth. They see fine churches, find them well attended, and suppose that it is the same all over the Diocese. They do not know the deplorable needs. The pathetic thing is that a parish when well supplied can achieve wonders for Christian civilization. Mr. Charles Booth, the statistician, in preparing his wonderful books on "Life and Labour in London," said that (in spite of all the difficulties and drawbacks) the one thing that had struck him was the unsus-

pected influence of the parish system of the Church of England.

Why are not the new churches which the Bishop of London asks for built, and the old parishes newly equipped? Why are there hardly any imitators of the thirty separate benefactors who each built separate churches in London in the middle of the century? The problem, I feel sure, only needs to be known in order to be solved. The result of the Church Congress in London should be that the Bishop of London's Fund should at once be raised from £20,000 to £100,000 a year. The spirit and the power are still with us if only the need could be realized. London raises upwards of £3,000,000 every year for charitable purposes, and every part of the kingdom and empire is vitally connected with London. If London suffers in the faith, the rest will suffer in response. Each county of England sends her multitudes to London: Kent, 100,000; Essex, 80,000; every county in proportion. It is from the country that the wealthy come up every year. God grant that the hearts of all England may be warmed to feel the spiritual necessities of the capital of the Empire, and that all may take their share in the hard but hopeful campaign which the scanty clergy of London are waging against ignorance, suffering, and sin.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Reviews.

De Saint Paul à Jésus-Christ. By the RÉVÉREND PÈRE H. CLÉRISSAC Paris: Librairie Plon. 1899.

THE works of Père Didon have of late attracted much interest amongst English readers. We do not remember having seen a previous work by Père Clérissac, who is also a member of the Preaching Order of the Dominicans. It cannot be said that it is likely that Anglican readers will derive much real information, anything that is new, or even agreeable comments upon what is ancient. The opportunity was a great one, for to thoughtful minds the evolution in the teaching of St. Paul from the plain statements of our Lord is a matter of deep interest and wonder; and it is no doubt quite possible that the "young men" in France and Italy to whom the Dominican Father dedicates his book will be presented with many fresh thoughts; but to English students, besides the shortcomings we have hinted at, the essay is marred by uncalled-for innuendoes and suggestions against Protestantism. Where the worthy Père Clérissac, in his own statement, is labouring to edify young souls who have lost their faith altogether, it is surely not necessary for him to diverge into remarks directed against that faith which is Protestant.

The main argument of the book is sound. The difference that is so often noticed between the Gospels and the Epistles is that Jesus Christ

makes statements, and St. Paul argues. Hence, of course, some people—many we think nowadays—are content with attaching a very great respect, even a credence, to the simple, golden sayings of our Lord, and will at the same time gaze on the Epistles with a bland stare of non-recognition. Too often in a lax, sentimental religion, which detests teaching and defies comprehensiveness, the cry of "Back to Jesus" includes "Away from Paul." Of course, the point to be settled is, Did Paul draw simply on his own resources for his body of doctrine, or did he elaborate it under a Heaven-sent guidance?

Père Clérissac answers by saying that Jesus Christ used Paul as His mouthpiece. Being Himself God, He could not argue, could not discuss, could only state, and He therefore employed Paul, who was a man, to make those deductions and arguments which He Himself did not. Thus, the doctrine of Paul is the completion of the doctrine of Christ. As we said, this is sound and good; the more the pity that side-thrusts at Protestants should disfigure a spiritual inquiry.

To give some details about the volume. It falls into four divisions. The first includes a brief biographical sketch of St. Paul's life, well and clearly done. The author thinks that there can be "no serious dispute" that he visited the South of Gaul and Spain, and finally died by the sword in Rome. He next discusses, in the second division, St. Paul's character, which, as he rightly says, personifies the religious genius of Israel in its three great characteristics of exact doctrine, extreme zeal, and fervent hope. Even in St. Paul's persecuting days his fury was perhaps less that of fanaticism than that against the supreme danger with which he clearly saw Judaism was confronted. And after the conversion on the road to Damascus Paul's character was directed into new channels, but possessing the same attributes, and he personifies the genius of the Christian apostolate. The third division points out the nature and value of St. Paul's testimony to Jesus Christ. We may observe that Père Clérissac includes the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Pauline Epistles. We may mention, too, that he insists very justly that it would be inexact to say that St. Paul's apostolic life was determined exclusively by the miracle on the road to Damascus; subsequent revelations and the guidance of the Holy Spirit must never be forgotten. In the concluding chapter the author sums up his argument—viz., that the human soul desired a fuller and more complete knowledge of God's attributes and wishes, and God responded to this desire by His revelations to St. Paul, who embodied them in his doctrine, which is thus a completion and expansion of the teaching of Christ. There is an appendix on St. Paul at Athens.

Père Clérissac's arguments are very clear and easy to follow. They contain nothing that is particularly original or brilliant, but perhaps fulfil their purpose all the better for being simple, and tersely stated. But evidently Protestantism has been to him what King Charles was to Mr. Dick.

W. A. PURTON.

Authority and Archæology, Sacred and Profane. Edited by D. G. HOGARTH, M.A. London: J. Murray. Price 16s.

This work is described on the title-page as being a collection of "Essays on the Relation of Monuments to Biblical and Classical Literature, by S. R. Driver, D.D., E. A. Gardner, M.A., F. Ll. Griffith, M.A., F. Haverfield, M.A., A. C. Headlam, B.D., D. C. Hogarth, M.A.; with an Introductory Chapter on the Nature of Archæology by the Editor."

It is a book to be read indeed with caution (so far as Professor Driver's share in it is concerned), but never without interest. Not that the Professor's treatment of his subject is altogether alluring: his style is not

popular; it is thoroughly scientific; but the subject-matter dealt with is in itself of profound interest. To sum up his position in a sentence, it may be enough to say that Dr. Driver's essay ("The Witness of the Monuments: Hebrew Authority") is a covert attack on Dr. Sayce's well-known writings on the same subject. Paradoxically stated, the object of Sayce is to discount the verdict of the Higher Criticism; that of Driver to minimize the witness of the Inscriptions. Perhaps the truth will be found, as elsewhere, to lie midway between these two positions. Of one thing we are certain: that it is our duty to steer clear of all critical "etiquette" on matters affecting historical and theological questions, because a rigid adherence to "etiquette" in these important matters both stifles the life of free inquiry, and renders barren and useless the truly critical faculty, which depends for its effectiveness on the untrammelled right to doubt, as well as to accept, the current hypothesis or theory of the hour.

It is quite impossible, within the brief limits at our disposal, to attempt to criticise this work in detail, involving as it does specialized knowledge of several branches of archæology. We are satisfied, by our perusal of the book, that it will supply a real need; not only so, it will afford the careful student the material necessary for forming his own judgment. Neither Dr. Driver nor any other of the able contributors to this work appear, knowingly, to shirk a difficulty or to suppress facts; these facts are usually given with great clearness, and we may form our own conclusions independently. This is as it should be.

The book might possibly have been improved by the addition of some illustrations and facsimiles; but the index is as good as could be desired. Not the least interesting chapters in the work—which is, above everything, scholarly and scientific in its methods—are those devoted by Mr. A. C. Headlam to the Early Church and the Catacombs at Rome. Nor should the editor's "Forewords" be forgotten; they admirably sum up the standpoint aimed at by the various writers in the ordering of the book as a whole. E. H. B.

Short Notices.

The Exiles' Book of Consolation, contained in Isaiah xl.-lxvi. A Critical and Exegetical Study. By Ed. König, M.A., D.D. Translated from the German by the Rev. J. A. Selbie. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1899. Price 3s. 6d.

A BOOK suitable only for critical students possessing a fair acquaintance with the original Hebrew. Dr. König is a learned commentator, but we cannot say his book is interesting. It is difficult reading, and drier even than the majority of German disquisitions. The index of Scripture passages quoted in the course of the work is exhaustive.

Studies in Church Dedications; or, England's Patron Saints. By Frances Arnold-Forster. Three volumes. Skeffington and Sons. Price 36s.

This great work has been carried out with immense patience, care and sympathy, and will take its place as the standard authority on the subject. The historic faculty of Dr. Arnold has been revived in his grand-daughter. The first two volumes contain critical and historical biographies of the different saints to whom our churches are dedicated, classified in an admirable way in groups according to their character, nationality, and position in the Church. The third volume contains a statistical summary

of dedications, an index of parishes, with their dedications, and a corresponding index of saints, with their parishes. The whole work is one of profound interest, an invaluable contribution to English Church History, excellently conceived and most ably and successfully executed.

England and the Age of Wycliffe. By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. Longmans and Co. Price 15s. Pp. 380.

This is one of the most important contributions to English history of recent years, and it is interesting to see that it is written by the eldest son of Sir George Trevelyan (the biographer of Fox and Lord Macaulay), and the great-nephew of the Historian of England, who is also a Fellow of Trinity. The picture of English life in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is extremely vivid; but the great value of the book is its impartial account of the state of religion in England which roused the reforming spirit of Wycliffe, its identity with the Roman system, its ignorance, degradation and superstition. If these chapters could be published in the *Times*, they would shatter many fond ideals of the Middle Ages which are now working mischief in the English Church. The style is so brilliant and the book so interesting that it is difficult to lay it down.

A Name to Conjure with. By JOHN STRANGE WINTER. F. V. White, 14, Bedford Street, Strand. Pp. 302.

Mrs. Stannard has risen in this pathetic story to the level of tragedy. Happily it ends wells; but the note of struggle and sorrow all through is strong and touching. Nobody could depict a popular authoress better than Mrs. Stannard; but she has added to her own experiences the conception of a high-minded woman gradually overcome by the temptation to use excessive stimulants in order to stir an over-wearied brain. Though not intended as a temperance story, but rather as a psychological problem, this work will be immensely popular amongst those interested in temperance work.

Wine on the Lees. By JOHN A. STEUART. Hutchinson and Co., Paternoster Row. Pp. 347.

The author of "A Minister of State," who in that work drew on his recollections of life in the Scottish Highlands, has in this very touching and interesting novel made a study of the drink question as it affects the lower strata of society. The second important character of the book is a good-humoured ex-soldier, who is a leader in public-house circles and the lower adherents of the turf and ring. The hero is the eldest son of the greatest brewer of the day, who is led by his own observation to give up the trade. The various aspects of the beer and whisky industries are touched with penetration and fidelity. The book is a profoundly interesting study, and though, like "A Name to Conjure with," not intended as a contribution to temperance literature, cannot fail to be heartily welcomed by all interested in temperance reform.

Boy's Own Paper. Annual Volume. R.T.S. Office, 56, Paternoster Row. Price 8s. Pp. 840.

This is the twenty-first volume, and we heartily congratulate this excellent periodical on coming of age. The present handsome edition maintains the high reputation of its predecessors. Adventures, the Aquarium, the Aviary, Birds, the Magician, Competitions, Correspondence, Cricket, Monthly News, Electricity, Fowls, Gardening, Indoor Amusements, Interviews, Kites, the Microscope, the Notebook, Pets, Photography, Poetry, Rabbiting, What shall I be? and Words of Cheer, make capital serials, and there are the usual stirring stories and charming illustrations.

Girl's Own Paper. Annual Volume. R.T.S. Office, 56, Paternoster Row. Price 8s. Pp. 848.

There can be nothing but praise for this interesting and charming serial. Variety is secured by a number of continued papers on different subjects: Answers to Correspondents, Bee-keeping, Competitions, Cookery Recipes, Dressmaking, Girls' Employments, Household Hints, International Correspondence, Letters from a Lawyer, the Lily Garden, Things in Season in Market and Kitchen, Medical Correspondence, Study and Studio, Varieties, Village Architecture, and the like. The stories and illustrations are, as usual, very happily appropriate to their object.

The Sunday at Home. Annual Volume. R.T.S. Office, 56, Paternoster Row. Price 7s. 6d. Pp. 812.

Our old friend maintains perpetual youth and vigour. The special features this year are Biographies, Varieties for the Young, Handwriting of Famous Divines, Homespun Homilies, Music for Sunday Mornings, Physical and Spiritual Harmonies, Poetry, and Far and Near (monthly notes). The whole volume is an admirable companion for "the day of rest," and should be a most acceptable Christmas gift.

The Leisure Hour. Annual Volume. R.T.S. Office, 56, Paternoster Row. Price 7s. 6d. Pp. 812.

It is always a pleasure to turn over the pages of "The Leisure Hour." This year the fare is as excellent and wholesome as usual. Biographies are always a feature; and here are twenty-four of persons of whom everybody would wish to know something. "The Fireside Club" contains acrostics, prize paragraphs, etc. "Oversea Notes" gives information about foreign countries. "Science and Discovery" gives a long series of things worth knowing and curious. There are also Second Thoughts, Sketches, and Varieties. The Serial Tales and the Illustrations are of a high order.

His Brother's Keeper. By CHARLES M. SHELDON. Ward and Lock. Pp. 320.

A striking companion to "In His Steps." The story is one of a young proprietor of mines brought face to face with a strike. The rights and wrongs and conflicting motives connected with the intricate questions involved are worked out with fearless truth.

St. Kilda, and Psalms of Life. By WALTER J. MILLER. London: Elliot Stock. 1898.

Although very unequal in merit, there are yet phrases in this slender volume which ring true. "Two States" is a pretty poem; and the "Lines to a Young Man on leaving a Public School," if not particularly original, are well turned. The principal fault we have to find with Mr. Miller's book is the rigour with which he emphasizes his opinions. This does not imply that we do anything but agree cordially with the opinions, but merely that we do not think poetry the best medium for their expression.

The New Home. By Mrs. C. S. PEEL. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co. 1898. Price 3s. 6d.

The aim of this book is "not only to show how comfort, beauty, and fitness may be brought about, but also how they may be brought about with economy." It appeals "to the average man and woman possessed of moderate income who desire as healthy, comfortable, and artistic a home as their means will permit." So Mrs. Peel says in her preface, and she has achieved her purpose. This is a sensible and well-arranged book, full of good suggestions and practical advice. For people who are about to start housekeeping, and are inexperienced as to what to get, and where to get it, this is one of the most useful books we have come across.

Unpainted Pictures. By HUGH NICHOLAS BURGH. London: Elliot Stock. 1899.

Impressionist sketches in blank verse of pictures impressed upon the mental retina of a man who has not learned to paint on canvas, but who has a keen sense of natural beauty. An interesting experiment fairly justified by the result.

The Month.

THE Archbishop gave a characteristically manly address at a public meeting held in the Birmingham Town Hall in connection with the Worcester Diocesan Conference. Among other things, he challenged the popular notion that it was not necessary for a clergyman to be a learned man. He had known, he said, men who had neglected study, and who began by being effective preachers, but who ended by being failures, as they had exhausted their knowledge and experience. As an old schoolmaster, he said that what was wanted in a teacher was knowledge, accuracy, and, above everything else, freshness. No man could go on long teaching who had ceased to be a student. It is not, says the *Spectator* in a note on the subject, the conventional thing to say that a man can only keep his freshness of mind by study, but it is nevertheless absolutely true. Quite so. And one of the things that is causing anxiety now to wise Churchmen is the fact that so many of the recruits to the ranks of the ordained within our Church are men whose learning is superficial and inadequate. "There needeth a change" here, as well as in other directions.

War with the Transvaal has begun fiercely. Already two British victories have been chronicled; that of Glencoe was announced on Trafalgar day. Our hope is that England will rapidly secure the end in view—which is justice all round in the Transvaal—and that this war will not be prolonged unduly.

Darjeeling, the sanatorium of Bengal, has met with a grave disaster through the slipping away of the sides of the hills at various points, owing, no doubt, to the heavy rains. Nearly 400 people have perished, and vast damage has been done everywhere.

The Prison Commissioners pay a very warm tribute in their annual report, just published, to the work carried on throughout England and Wales by the Church Army Prison Missioners, and also to the work carried on by the Society's Labour Homes throughout the country in helping discharged prisoners. Eight-days' missions are conducted in the prisons by a special staff, while arrangements are in operation for at once receiving into the Society's Homes prisoners direct on their discharge.

The Local Government Board have just sent to the hon. chief secretary (the Rev. W. Carlisle) an official expression of their warmest goodwill in the mission work which is being carried on in the workhouses of England and Wales by the Church Army Workhouse Missioners. Three, four, and eight days' missions are being conducted by a special staff.

The Queen has graciously given the sum of £400 from her Privy Purse to the father of the young French fisherman who was killed while fishing in British waters by a shot from the gunboat *Leda*.

The Venerable J. M. Wilson, Archdeacon of Manchester, has been appointed Lady Margaret's Preacher at Cambridge.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

For the first time since Church Congresses were established has London been chosen for the meeting-place. The novelty of the experiment has been justified by the remarkable (financial) success of the Congress itself, which was held in the Albert Hall under the presidency of the Bishop of London. Everyone is full of praise for the Bishop's tact as a chairman. His presidential address, delivered on Tuesday afternoon, October 10, was an admirable and clever discourse, though how the Bishop could allow himself to describe the present "crisis" (as it is the fashion to call it) as "petty" it is hard to explain—doubly hard when we consider Lord Halifax's speech at the great E.C.U. meeting on October 9, and his outspoken words to the Congress itself on Thursday, October 12. These two speeches, and, above all, perhaps, the temper of the E.C.U. meeting itself, and its attitude to Canon Body's remarks, are so significant, that we do not think the word "crisis" at the present juncture is quite wide of the mark.

The mass meeting at the Albert Hall on the Wednesday evening during Congress week was not particularly noteworthy. The Archbishop, who looked as well as felt ill, spoke a few forceful words; Dean Farrar's speech was excellent in matter and tone, and courageous, too, in the face of an audience not over-partial towards the *wider Churchmanship* (as we should venture to term it); and Sir Edward Clarke made a manly and temperate speech, which was listened to with the respect it deserved. On Thursday morning Dr. Wace read a valuable paper, albeit somewhat too statistical to be followed easily. In the afternoon came off the "ritual" debate, though of course it is now abundantly clear to every sensible person that not *ritual* at all, but *doctrine*, is at stake. The Albert Hall was crowded in every part.

The President of the E.C.U., Viscount Halifax, received a perfect ovation both before and after reading his paper, which was (briefly) a eulogy of the thirteenth century, so far as English Churchmanship is concerned. The paper was in every way an able and interesting one, but wholly unconvincing in several important particulars. Unfortunately, when Prebendary Webb-Peploe was reading his paper—an exceedingly uncompromising one—the audience (or perhaps we ought to say a section of the audience) behaved with a discourtesy which brought down a rebuke from the chairman.

The various Congress meetings have been so fully described, and the papers so fully discussed in the press, that we do not propose to enter into details here. Our impression is that a good number of people took tickets because they are disposed to regard Congress week as a chance for a big ecclesiastical picnic, and that those who did attend the meetings religiously came away somewhat disappointed. There was a noticeable lack of enthusiasm in some of the meetings, yet many of the papers read were valuable and solid—perhaps a trifle too solid for the digestion of the multitude.

The Ecclesiastical Art Exhibition was very interesting indeed from a number of points of view, and the large space devoted to matters musical was quite a feature of the Congress generally. The special musical service in the Abbey was a source of unique enjoyment and instruction to those who were able to attend.

The chief Congress sermons were of course that of the Archbishop (at St. Paul's Cathedral), who made an earnest appeal for unity in the Church; and that of the Bishop of London at the close, who spoke of the ideal temper for the Christian minister.

A number of Evangelical clergy and laymen attending the Congress were invited by the Church Pastoral-Aid Society to breakfast at the Imperial Institute. Mr. John Henry Buxton presided, and after breakfast an informal meeting was held. Mr. Buxton welcomed the guests, and referred to the present condition of things in the Church as affording a great opportunity for the C.P.A.S.—"a Society which many are feeling they can safely help." Their income of £60,000 was little enough as things were, but with the ever-increasing population it was altogether inadequate for the work before them. There was demand for great self-sacrifice on the part of Evangelical Churchmen for the C.P.A.S. Let them help the society to the best of their power, and God would give them His blessing.

THE PUBLISHING SEASON.

NEW BOOKS.

Church and Faith: Being Essays on the Teaching of the Church of England. By

Dr. WACE.
Dean FARRAR.
Dr. C. H. H. WRIGHT.
Rev. R. E. BARTLETT, M.A.
Principal DRURY, M.A.
Canon MEYRICK, D.D.
Professor H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.
Chancellor P. V. SMITH, LL.D.
MONTAGUE BARLOW, LL.M.
Sir RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart.
E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A.
J. T. TOMLINSON.

With Introduction by the Lord BISHOP OF HEREFORD. W. Blackwood. Post 8vo. Price 7s. 6d. net.

Early Christianity Outside the Roman Empire. By F. C. BURKETT, M.A. Cambridge University Press. Price 2s. 6d.

Lectures on the Oxford Movement. By the Rev. Canon C. T. CRUTTWELL. Skeffington. Price 3s. 6d.

History of the Jewish People. By C. F. KENT, Ph.D. Vol. I. Smith and Elder. Price 6s.

Texts Explained. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D. Longmans. Price 6s.

Life and Letters of John Donne (Dean of St. Paul's). Edited by EDMUND GOOSE, M.A. Heinemann. Two vols. Price 24s. net.

Idealism and Theology. By Rev. C. F. D'ARCY, B.D. (Donnellan Lectures). Hodder and Stoughton. Price 5s.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

SONNENSCHEIN.—*Phenomenology of the Spirit.* By HEGEL. Translated by J. B. BAILLIE.

History of the Christian Church. Vol. III. (1517-1648). By the late Dr. W. MOELLER. Translated by J. H. FREESE.

BELL AND SONS.—*Corpus Poetarum Latinorum.* Part III. Edited by Dr. PORTGATE.

Gray's Letters. Edited by Rev. D. C. TOVEY.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON.—*Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.* By Professor W. M. RAMSAY.

The Philosophy of Religion. By Dr. FAIRBAIRN.

Moral Order of the World. By the late Professor BRUCE.

Aspects of Protestantism. By Rev. A. H. GRAY.

NISBET.—*The Church, Past and Present:* A series of papers by various writers. Edited by Professor GWATKIN.

The Higher Criticism. By Rev. Dr. SINKER.