

THE
CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1888.

ART. I.—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Pulpit Commentary, Hebrews : Exposition, by Rev. J. BARMBY, B.D.,
Vicar of Pittington. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., London. 1886.

Apologia ad Hebræos, The Epistle (and Gospel) to the Hebrews. By
ZENAS. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. 1887.

Wolverhampton Church Congress : Papers by Canon WESTCOTT, Pre-
bendary GIBSON, Canon PAGET, Canon HOARE, Rev. F. J. CHAVASSE.
Guardian, Oct. 19, 1887 ; *Record*, Oct. 14, 1887.

IN the time of Clement of Rome, whose episcopate is usually dated from 91 to 100 A.D., a treatise was already familiar which is known to us as the Epistle to the Hebrews. It had been addressed to a circle exclusively composed of Jewish or Hebrew Christians, and probably living at Jerusalem, though threatened with the loss of home and country. Their Bishop, James, was dead ; for had he been alive it would have been contrary to the practice of the age to address such a letter to his Church. James was stoned in the year 62 or 63, on the inauguration of the high-priest Annas the Younger, after the departure of the Procurator Portius Festus, and before the coming of his successor Albinus. Timothy is still alive, and has only lately been set at liberty ; this may very likely have been at the time when St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome came to an end in 64. The full Jewish worship and system are clearly still going on at Jerusalem ; so that the writing probably reached its destination before the year 67, when the Jewish wars began, which ended in 70 in the destruction of the temple.

These Jewish Christians had not themselves been disciples of the Lord, but had received their confirmation of the Word from them that heard Him. In former days, after their illumination in the Gospel, they had endured a great fight

of afflictions; partly as themselves a gazing-stock by reproaches, partly as companions of them that were so used. Of the writer himself they had compassion when he was in bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of their goods. But these persecutions had stopped short as yet of actual martyrdom. In former days, too, they had exhibited commendable work and labour of love, which they had showed towards the name of Christ, in ministering to His saints; and these practices had not ceased. But they had become timid, despondent, and feeble in faith and action. Although they themselves ought now to have become teachers, they needed teaching what were the first principles of revelation. They stood in actual risk of losing hold of the meaning of the Incarnation, the eternal Sonhood of Christ, and His sacrifice for the sins of the world. Some of them, Pharisees by origin, were inclined to confuse Him with a mere angelic presence; some of them, who must have been Sadducees, made little of that glorious hope of immortal life and eternal rest which was the great motive power of Christianity. All of them were beginning to see that there must soon be a choice between following Christ entirely, and their beloved and beautiful ritual; and their enthusiastic loyalty to their ancient symbolical religion, combined with their patriotism, their adversities, their doubts, and their want of skilful and able teachers, made them more than inclined to fall away. Instability of faith had brought its usual accompaniment in symptoms of sensuality and avarice.

When they were in this critical condition, there came to them, in God's good providence, from a hand which they knew, but which has never since been fully disclosed to the Church, this sublime treatise. As it was a time of persecution, the writer may have thought it wiser to send his name and salutation by word of mouth only. Or in the dispersion which must have happened very soon after its reception, it may have been thought better to remove its title and heading. Pantænus and Clement of Alexandria suggest other reasons connected with the belief in the authorship of St. Paul. The scattering of the Church to which it was addressed will also account for the slowness of its general recognition and adoption. The fugitives would not have that time and composure for making and transmitting copies, which would be enjoyed by more stationary, prosperous, and peaceful Churches.

The Epistle goes straight to the great point which its readers seemed ready to neglect, and on which the whole of Christianity depended. The voice of God speaking by Jesus of Nazareth was in fact speaking by His only-begotten Son, and must be placed at least on a level with any of His various

revelations to the Jews or to the world in the books of the Old Testament. That Son cannot be described in language too exalted. He is Heir of all things. By Him He made the worlds. He is a ray of His own glory, the express image of His Person. He upholds all things by the word of His own personal power. The object of His coming was to make atonement for our sins. Having accomplished that, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty in the highest heights of heaven. It was useless to compare Him with angels, for none of the prophetic language about His Person could be applied in the slightest degree to them. The Old Covenant had been given by the agency of angels; how much more important it was to attend to the New Covenant, spoken by the Son, the Father Himself bearing witness with signs and wonders and manifold miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit! Angels, again, had nothing to do with the future world except as inhabitants, and on that future world all the hopes and considerations of Christians depended. But of that future world the Son was declared to be the Lord, both by prophecy and by fact. The reason for His humiliation and suffering had been the vanquishing of the devil, the release of mankind from the fear of death, and His manifestation as a pitiful and faithful High-Priest to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

What the writer, therefore, asked his readers to do was thoroughly to look into the position of Jesus Christ, the Apostle and High-Priest of their confession. He was greater than Moses; Moses represented an institution, Christ was God Who had made that institution. Moses was a servant, Christ was a Son. And the analogy between Moses and Christ suggested an analogy between the contemporaries of Moses and themselves. The contemporaries of Moses had been destroyed through their unbelief, and had fallen short of the rest which Moses had been sent to proclaim. Did they run no risk of the same failure? The rest spoken of in *Psa. xcvi.* was not merely the entrance into Canaan; it represented a far more glorious reality in the spiritual kingdom of God. The Word of God was not a dead historical letter; it was a living principle, with a message for each one of them, of which they must find the meaning. Everything of value in the Old Testament had its real essence in the kingdom of the Son.

Jesus, then, the Son of God, was the true and great High-Priest, Who had entered into the heavens. Relying on His knowledge of their infirmities and His sinless perfection, let them hold fast their confession, and obtain help from Him Who had Himself been tried. Everything which was of value to them in the Aaronic priesthood, their old time-

honoured system, had its living spiritual reality and counterpart in Christ. Christ had not taken this honour to Himself; the Father had given it Him, when He proclaimed, "Thou art a Priest for ever." Christ could feel for the people as a Man, but He needed not to offer sacrifices for Himself. As the High-Priest made Atonement, so had Christ in the tears of Gethsemane and the sacrifice of Calvary.

It was the highest and loftiest theme on which man could discourse, about which he wished to instruct them; but great difficulty was placed in his way by their doubtfulness, their backwardness, their retrogression. A very special and solemn warning was needed by them against falling away from Christ. From the awful consequences of such a lapse, he felt persuaded that God in His mercy would save them, as He had formerly permitted them to advance so far in the Christian life. Let them only have patience as great as that of Abraham, and they would obtain as good a promise as he. Just as the rest promised by Moses represented a reality only in Christ, so the blessing guaranteed to Abraham meant in its completeness that hope which the Christian had as a sure anchor of the soul. That hope was theirs through Jesus, Who had entered within the veil, the true High-Priest after the eternal order of Melchisedek.

The impressive figure of Melchisedek, with his symbolical name, his sudden appearance and disappearance from patriarchal history, represented to them a wider principle of priesthood than that to which they clung with such passionate loyalty in Aaron. To this solemn and sacred personage Abraham himself paid tithes. From him he received a blessing. In Abraham, Levi himself might be described as acknowledging a local and tribal inferiority to that which was natural and universal. Did they not remember that psalm of David, which they had always considered Messianic, which addressed the Messiah as a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek? Did they not see that this foreshadowed the ultimate obliteration and absorption of all the Aaronic and Mosaic arrangements? Did not even the very form of the institution of the wider priesthood in the psalm of David, with its infinitely significant oath, show them its superiority over that of Aaron? One eternal Priest, against many that were mortal; one complete sacrifice, against many that were temporary and imperfect.

Jeremiah, too, had warned them not to consider the Old Covenant indelible. He had prepared them for that very change which was now staggering them. It would be a covenant, not of external obedience, but inward loyalty. The ministry of Jesus, so superior to that of Aaron in so many

different ways, was superior also in the superiority of the covenant which He administered. All that was arranged for the tabernacle, the outward symbol of the Old Covenant, was made after the pattern of spiritual realities, which were at last revealed in the kingdom of Christ.

Everything in the first tabernacle had a spiritual meaning, and another time he might explain it; but he wished for the moment to point out the evidence of transitoriness in the first tabernacle, seen in the fact that into the holiest of holies the high-priest was alone allowed to enter, and that not without an offering for sin. Jesus had made the true Holiest of Holies open for ever by His eternal and all-sufficient Sacrifice. The Mosaic sacrifices had had their proper office by way of type, prophecy, and discipline; but how could they be compared in moral beauty, grandeur, and effectiveness with the sacrifice of Himself by the Son of God to put away sin? To the shedding of that precious blood, every act of Moses in sprinkling blood in the various rituals of purification and atonement had borne witness.

The Christian view of the Law, in short, was that in itself, and in every part, it had but the shadow of good things to come. The temporary and preparatory nature of sacrifices and burnt-offerings had been strikingly indicated in one of the most important of the Messianic psalms. Nothing could be clearer than that Jesus was the Messiah, "taking away the first that He might establish the second." The long-expected Remission of Sins had at length indeed taken place in the one Offering of Calvary.

It was a new and living way which had been opened to them: let them take the fullest advantage of it. The Precious Blood had cleansed their consciences; the Holy Spirit had regenerated their natural being. Away with all wavering! Let there be a race and rivalry in good works. Dreadful was the case of apostasy. Sore was the punishment of the despisers of Moses; but far worse would be the condition of those who scorned the realities of which the ordinances of Moses were but the shadows and the preparation. Would they not revive that ancient spirit of loyalty and enthusiasm which had brought them through so great a fight of affliction?

It was very important that they should remember that it was faith they needed, and not demonstration. If they looked for demonstration, they must necessarily be disappointed. That their hold on the New Covenant should be one of faith, was part of their discipline. So it had always been, if they would but think. Even natural religion, the creation of the universe by a Divine Being, could not be proved; it was a matter of faith pure and simple. On faith had depended the

spiritual life, the glory and the triumph of each one of the long series of their national heroes, from Abel to the Maccabees. Faith, trust, expectation made the proper atmosphere of their spiritual being.

Again, therefore, for the eighth time, the writer most earnestly exhorts them to seriousness, courage, self-discipline, self-denial and patience. Let them never take their eyes off Jesus, Who stood waiting at the end of the long race to give them the prize. Once more let them thoroughly look into the character and power of Him Who had endured far more contradiction and difficulties than themselves. Chastening was a sign of the loving, Fatherly care of God; it showed them that God had not given them up. All this should revive their fainting hearts and drooping spirits, and encourage the stronger among them to take difficulties out of the way of the weak, rather than to exaggerate or create them. Let them think more about peace and holiness, and less about the fading importance of Mosaic ritual. Let them be on their guard against roots of bitterness, fornication, worldliness, and indifference. It was not to the terrible Mount Sinai that they had been called, but to the heavenly, peaceful, calming, encouraging blessings of Mount Sion—the spiritual City of the Living God, the kingdom whose inhabitants were an innumerable company of angels, the festal assembly and throng of the heirs of God, whose names were written in heaven; to God Himself, the Judge of all, to the spirits of the innumerable just, who had been perfected by the new Sacrifice, and above all to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant.

God had once said that yet once more He would shake not the earth only, as at Mount Sinai, but the heavens also. He meant that all the visible creation, and its transitory methods and means of discipline, would be removed. The realities would alone remain. Those realities were contained in the kingdom of Christ. That kingdom was theirs. All that they had to think about was how they could serve that omnipotent and awful Being acceptably with reverence and godly fear.

With a few minor practical exhortations he concludes. He reminds them of the importance of brotherly love and of hospitality. Marriage could not be spoken of too highly, but adultery and fornication were incompatible with the Christian life. A free, happy content and independence should drive out all avarice. Let them remember James and their other pastors who were dead, paying deep attention to the glorious ending of their career, and imitating their faith.

Jesus Christ never changed; let them not, then, whirl round like weathercocks with new-fangled, fantastic, many-coloured

doctrines. The old Mosaic distinctions of meats and sacrifices had had their day, and could do nothing to strengthen the heart. The heart must be strengthened by grace. Christians had, indeed, an altar, but it was of the altar of incense that it was the real representation, and when that altar of incense was sprinkled with blood, the Mosaic priests were not allowed to eat the sacrifice upon it; that is to say, that altar of incense had nothing to do with the eating of sacrificial meats—it had to do with blood-sprinkling for sin. That was the altar of which the Christian altar was the true representation; and the Christian altar was the Cross of Calvary. Christ offered His Body on that altar outside the city, just as the priest took the victim from the altar of incense and burnt it without the camp. Let them not shrink, therefore, from going forth to Him out of the city, whether it were that they were to be expelled from their beloved country, or to give up their beloved ritual. Nowhere on earth could they have a continuing city. On that Cross of Christ, the Christian altar, they could offer the sacrifice of praise continually—a sacrifice infinitely transcending the sacrifices of the old dispensation. And what was that sacrifice of praise? The fruit of their lips giving thanks to His Name.

Obedience to spiritual rulers is then enjoined, and prayer for the writer: all the sooner would he be restored to them. An exquisite petition for them follows, and then a touching appeal that they would permit the advice of the letter. Information is given them of the release of Timothy. The writer hopes soon to see them. He sends salutations to the rulers of the Church and to all its faithful members. Salutations are also conveyed from some friends who either were in Italy or had come from Italy.

The fate of this invaluable exposition of apostolical Christianity was exceedingly curious. Nobody to this day can pronounce with indisputable authority by whom it was written. Never doubted as to its canonicity by the Greek and Eastern Churches, it was not received as authoritative in the West till the fourth century. This is the more singular, as in apostolical times, as Canon Westcott says, it was absolutely transfused into the mind of Clement of Rome. But it was anonymous. The Church of Jerusalem was dispersed at an early date. Heretics, such as the Novatianists, misinterpreted some of its expressions. Not being much brought before the notice of the Western Churches, it was not until Jerome and Augustine claimed it as the work of an inspired writer of the apostolical age that the West followed as a whole the example of the East. The third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, and a decretal of Innocent, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 416, set the matter at rest.

Meantime it had been quoted quite in the same way as the other New Testament writings during the first century after its composition, not only by Clement of Rome, but by Justin Martyr; by his contemporaries, Pinytus, the Cretan Bishop, and the predecessors of Clement and Origen at the catechetical school of Alexandria; and by the compilers of the Peshito Version of the New Testament. Two early heretical teachers—Basilides at Alexandria, and Marcion at Rome—added to its evidence by singling it out for rejection.

Clement of Alexandria succeeded to the headship of the Alexandrian School A.D. 189. It had been founded by Pantænus about nine years before. Pantænus, in his lectures, used to ascribe the Epistle to the Hebrews to St. Paul, and to say that he did not give his name to it out of modesty, both from reverence to the Lord Himself (Who was the true Apostle of God to the Hebrews), and because, being the Apostle of the Gentiles, his writing to the Hebrews was a work of supererogation. Clement himself held that it was St. Paul's, but that it was written in the Hebrew language, and that St. Luke translated it carefully, and published it to the Greeks; that consequently it is in style like the Acts; and that St. Paul's reason for not putting his name at the head of it was that the Hebrews had an original prejudice against him, and he did not wish to repel them at the very beginning.

Origen was born A.D. 185, and at the age of eighteen was appointed head of the Alexandrian School. His evidence carries us back a long way, for in speaking of the Epistle he distinctly says that "the men of old handed it down as Paul's." Origen had his own view. He remarks that the Epistle has not the rudeness in speech of the Apostle, who acknowledged himself to be "rude in speech"—that is, in diction; but that the Epistle is more purely Greek in composition every judge of style would acknowledge. And that the thoughts of the Epistle are wonderful, and not second to the acknowledged apostolical writings, everyone acquainted with them would agree. He himself, to declare his own opinion, would say that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the diction and composition those of some writer who recorded from memory the Apostle's teaching, and, as it were, wrote notes on what had been spoken by his master. "If, then, any Church receives this Epistle as Paul's, let it not on this account lose credit as a witness to the truth; for not without reason have the men of old handed it down as Paul's. But as to who wrote the Epistle, the truth God knows. The account which has reached us is, on the part of some, that Clement, who became Bishop of the Romans, wrote the Epistle; on the part of others, that Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts, did so."

The Pauline origin was held without dispute by Dionysius of Alexandria, who died A.D. 264, the Bishops who succeeded him, and all the ecclesiastical writers of Egypt, Syria, and the East. While Arius so accepted it, the later Arians rejected it for their own reasons. "It is no wonder," wrote Theodoret, "that those who are infected with the Arian malady should rage against the apostolic writings, separating the Epistle to the Hebrews from the rest, and calling it spurious." Eusebius, the historian, places it among the undoubted writings of St. Paul. He has the same view as Clement of Alexandria, but thinks that the translator may rather have been Clement of Rome.

The growth of the revival of its authority in the West remains to be briefly sketched. The Muratorian fragment of a canon (about 170 A.D.) is very defective, but it is clear that it does not accept this Epistle among the acknowledged writings of St. Paul. Hippolytus (200 A.D.) declared that it was not St. Paul's, and Irenæus is said to have been of the same opinion. Between 211 and 217 A.D. a certain Caius delivered at Rome a dialogue in which he mentioned only thirteen Epistles of St. Paul. Tertullian accepted it as sufficiently authoritative, but attributed it directly to St. Barnabas. Eusebius, the historian, and Jerome both notice that it was not universally received by the Latin Churches. But in their day the recognition in the West was growing. They were beginning to understand the slender reasons why its acceptance, so universal in the East, had been accidentally retarded amongst themselves. "Athanasius (died 373), Cyril of Jerusalem (died 403), Gregory Nazianzen (died 389), the Canon of the Council of Laodicea (364 A.D.), reckon fourteen Epistles of St. Paul. So also the Council of Carthage (419), of Hippo (393), Innocent (405), and Gelasius (494). Ambrose (397), Rufinus (411), Gaudentius, and Faustinus refer to this Epistle as St. Paul's. Thenceforth the Epistle retained its place in the Canon as St. Paul's without dispute till the question was again raised in the sixteenth century." Jerome parallels the slowness of its reception in the West by the slowness of the reception of the Revelation of St. John in the East.

In the sixteenth century a Spaniard, Ludovicus Vives, and Cardinal Cajetan, in controversy against Luther, revived the doubts of its authorship. The Council of Trent sanctioned, by an anathema, its attribution to St. Paul. Erasmus, like Jerome, thought the actual authorship of little importance, but did not think it St. Paul's. Luther suggested Apollos. Calvin and Melancthon agreed with Erasmus. Until quite recent times there has been a general acquiescence in the received opinion that it was written by St. Paul. Few of the

modern German writers accept that opinion. Bengel is an exception. Forster, Stuart, and Wordsworth argue with great care and minuteness for the Pauline authorship. Davidson inclines to the Alexandrian view that it was translated by St. Luke. Alford agrees with Luther that the author was probably Apollos. Mr. Barmby, in the "Pulpit Commentary," after setting out at great length, and with admirable clearness, all these different facts and views, remarks that the reasons for assigning the Epistle to Apollos are very plausible, but that the fact that none of the ancients, who may be supposed to have known more of the probabilities than we do, seem even to have named him, remains a serious objection to the theory.

For ourselves, it is enough to remember that during the first three centuries it was the East which was the most important and vital part of the Church, not the West; that by the East the Epistle from the first was never doubted, and that when the West was in a position to judge of the evidence, it readily and thankfully accepted this glorious portion of the Word of God. Little would St. Paul himself have been interested in the question whether we should be likely to believe it to be by himself, by Apollos, by Barnabas, or by Clement. In the spirit of St. Paul, we may say that whether the writing be of Paul or of Apollos, it is God Who gave the message. As the inspired Word of God, it has been handed down to us from the very beginning by those to whom it was written, and by those who knew most about it. The West only hesitated because it did not know it.

And what is that message to us? The actual form of the argument may not, perhaps, appeal to us as it appealed to the Hebrews; but the facts of the argument are the same. We have not been brought up in the same ingrained familiarity with the Mosaic ritual. To us the details of that ritual are matters of history, of prophecy, of type, rather than of daily spiritual life. But the actual sacrifices themselves are of the highest importance to us as ordained by God in the early ages of His inspiration of revealed truth, as the perpetual witness to the necessity of the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. And the use which the writer makes of his quotations need not appear to us in any case strained or Rabbinical. Not so were they to his readers; and the literary methods are, after all, but the vehicle of the real message. This message is that the written Word of God is living, of eternal and ever-present moment to the world, and that it is from beginning to end an anticipation of the true Word of God made flesh. It is that every part of the Old Testament is valuable because replete with the expectation of the Saviour of mankind. It is to show us the full meaning of the life of

the Son of God as we find it in the Gospels; and that can only be seen by looking deeply into the past, and earnestly and eagerly into the future. Here, in a writing familiarly established in the days of Clement of Rome—clearly the work of an apostolical author—we have the full doctrine of the Mediatorial Sacrifice of Christ displayed with the unhesitating certainty of inspiration as the central doctrine and purpose of Christianity. Jesus, Who had left the earth but thirty years, was He of Whom every Psalm, every Type, every Prophecy spoke. He was the Apostle and High-Priest of God, the Son of God, the Heir of all things, the Brightness of the Father's glory, the express Image of His Person, upholding all things by His own power, God Himself as the Builder of the institutions of Moses, humiliated for a time to destroy the power of death by His propitiation, and to win mankind by His sympathy. His offering was once made, by the sacrifice of Himself on Calvary. The offering which we can make is by Him, the sacrifice of praise continually, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name.

The practical parts of the Epistle are of no less importance. There is no part of Christian duty the principle of which is not implied in these strenuous, eloquent exhortations by which the writer repeatedly stirs up his faltering readers. No part of Holy Scripture abounds more in passages of consummate beauty and far-reaching thoughtfulness.

The early date of the Epistle is additionally evidenced by the pure spirituality of its level. Dealing frequently with the truths which are implied by the ordinances of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—with the cleansing of the conscience, that is, and the remission of sins—with spiritual union with Christ, and life by grace, it never mentions the ordinances themselves. The expressions "Your bodies washed with pure water" and "We have an altar" are clearly and necessarily figurative. Several times mentioning the heads of their Church, it merely calls them leaders and rulers, never once priests. The expression "We have an altar" has already been fully explained. Our altar is the one which is not concerned with meats, but with blood-sprinkling; it is like the altar of incense, and carries us on to the death of Christ without the camp. It is, in short, His Cross. To bring in the Communion Table spoils the argument entirely, and is an anachronism. At that early age the breaking of bread was from house to house as a solemn consecrated meal; there is no evidence that as yet there was either ecclesiastical building or furniture. But neither does Canon Hoare's interpretation carry conviction. The expression "We have an altar" cannot but be parallel to the expression "We have an high

priest." It cannot mean "We Hebrews have an altar." The reference to the Cross of Calvary is entirely consonant with the whole tenor of the argument. The suggestion of "Zenas" ("Apologia ad Hebræos"), that the Altar is the place where St. Paul was about to be martyred, is, like much of his book, artificial in the extreme.

The volume of "The Pulpit Commentary" which contains the Epistle to the Hebrews maintains the reputation of the series as a store-house of inquiry and illustration. The Prolegomena are clear, sensible, careful, and abundant. We do not agree with the interpretation of the Altar, but there is much that is valuable in the notes. The Homiletics, as might be expected in the case of so doctrinal a writing, are extremely voluminous. The subjects suggested for sermons are no fewer than three hundred and six. The scope of the "Apologia ad Hebræos," by "Zenas," may be gathered by the fact that it is an elaborate life of St. Paul, with analysis of his Epistles, and preparatory disquisitions on contemporary conditions, written with a controversial purpose against the doctrine of Vicarious Sacrifice.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.



ART. II.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

IN addition to the old and stale heads of indictment, which were common, we suppose, to England as to Wales, we have been lately introduced in the Principality to a strange and singularly unscrupulous charge against the ancient historic Church of the country. It has been broadly asserted that she is an "alien" Church. It might have been believed that such a charge lay beyond the bounds of possibility for anyone to make; but it has nevertheless been made, and made, too, by some men who wish to be accepted as leaders of public opinion and national progress, and it is now repeated constantly on the platform and in the press as an undoubted truth, as it is certainly found to be one of the most effective means of rousing the animosity of those among us who would otherwise be indisposed to join in any revolutionary changes.

Some of our readers may perhaps have seen the feeble justification of the charge made by Mr. Stuart Rendel, M.P., in the *Contemporary Review* some months ago. It is remarkable that he and the principal agents of the Liberation Society, who have been most active in fomenting and directing the agitation against the Welsh Church, are either Englishmen or Scotchmen, who must be practically unacquainted with our