

THE DOCTRINE OF "THE PRESENCE." THE COLLOQUY OF POISSY, 1561.

BY W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

IN the January (1920) number of the *CHURCHMAN* the present writer endeavoured to show that the divergence of our Articles from the Wurtemberg Confession on the question of the "real" presence, is proof that the English formulary—unlike the German—was not designed to shelter, or rather was designed not to shelter, that teaching. The Articles, while following the guidance of Wurtemberg in most of the doctrinal amendments made in 1563, diverged from it in this matter. The purpose of the present paper is to supply evidence that our formularies adopted the characteristic language recognized at the time as distinctive of the "Reformed," and therefore as excluding the Lutheran and Romish view of the presence.

A wealth of illustrative evidence has been accumulated during the last seventy years to prove the identity of the sacramental teaching of the Church of England with that of the foreign Reformed Churches. Mr. Gorham—of the "Gorham case"—was one of the first to cultivate this fruitful field of argument in defence of the doctrinal standards of our Church, against "non-natural" perversions of their meaning; and possibly many who are familiar only with his name would be not a little surprised to discover the remarkable learning possessed by this able if somewhat peculiar divine. Dean Goode pushed the argument still further; but it is most aptly and fully and persuasively employed in the works of the late Rev. N. Dimock. In the writings of such men, students may find that passages in the Church formularies, which are often regarded as teaching "high" doctrine of the Sacraments, are no "higher" than, and often not so "high" as, some which occur in the confessions of the Continental "Reformed" Churches, or in the works of Calvin, Bullinger and other opponents of the "mechanical theory" of Regeneration in Baptism, and of the "real" presence in the Lord's Supper. But even on a well-reaped field there are gleanings which will repay the trouble of gathering them; and in this case the history of the "Colloquy of Poissy" appears to cast a very

strong light upon the meaning to be attached to the eucharistic Articles of the Church of England.

In 1561 the Venetian ambassador in England reported to his Government that "religious affairs will soon be in an evil case in France" owing to the rapid spread of "heresy," which would result either in its toleration, or that to "enforce obedience to the Pope and the Catholic rites" Romanists would "*have to resort to violence and embroil our hands in noble blood*" (*State Papers, Venetian, 1558-80, No. 272*). The callous savagery of this remark would be surprising if history had not all too terribly informed us that murder, wholesale and ruthless, was in fact the means employed for Rome's deliverance. At least, what our Protestant prejudice calls "murder"; for those who take their moral principles from the Canon Law will know that the killing of "heretics" by those who are "burning with the zeal of the Catholic Mother," is not to be regarded even as "homicide."

It must be confessed that at the time of which we write, Rome was in a desperate plight. Scandinavia had been Protestant for a generation. The greater part of Germany had flung off the "Interim" and secured the legal establishment of Lutheranism. Bohemia and Moravia were practically "Waldensian" or "Wycliffite"; Hungary had gone over to Calvinism. In Poland, Lutherans and Calvinists had reached an amicable understanding and were entering into negotiations with the (Greek) National Church; so that they threatened not merely to conquer this wide realm for the Evangelical Faith, but even to carry the Reformation into the bosom of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In Western Europe the accession of Elizabeth had dealt a staggering blow to Romanism.

The young sovereign met Papal diplomacy with an astuteness at once more able and more honest than its own, and with an inflexible determination (despite all that has been written to the contrary by those who should have known better) to defend the faith of the Gospel. Principally by dint of her own personal exertions, she beat down the solid opposition of the Marian Bishops, Universities, Convocations and House of Lords, and secured the passing of Acts restoring the Reformation as it had stood "at the death of" her brother, Edward VI. By swift energetic action she wrested Scotland from the Papacy, and ere she had been two years on the throne, she had united Great Britain in firm alliance for the

defence of the Reformation. Such had been Elizabeth's work in 1559 and 1560. If 1561 was to see Huguenotism tolerated in France as a preliminary to supplanting Romanism altogether, Rome would be well-nigh driven from the central and northern European fields to cower behind the ramparts of the Pyrenees and the Alps.

The death of Francis II of France on December 5, 1560, by separating the crowns of France and Scotland was yet a further weakening of the Romish party in those countries. Therefore, it is not surprising that at a Council of State held at Rheims after the coronation of Charles IX, May 15, 1561, sweet reasonableness prevailed so far as to cause the Cardinal de Lorraine, then chief prelate of the Gallican Church, to suggest that a conference on the disputed points should be held between the Bishops and the representatives of the "Reformed." The Huguenots accepted with alacrity, the Council agreed unanimously, and Poissy was selected as the place of meeting. The Bishops, however, viewed the assembly with well-grounded forebodings, and out of the 130 of them summoned to attend, not more than fifty were present when the young king opened the "Colloquy" on July 30.

All Europe watched the proceedings with keen interest. Our own Archbishop Parker wrote to Cecil on August 11—

"Upon hearing of a diet for a conference of learned men appointed in France, I wished that Mr. Martyr or Calvin, or both, could be procured thither. . . . It could not but turn out to our own quiet at home to have more friends in conjunction in religion" (*Correspondence*, p. 147).

"Mr. Martyr" was, of course, the famous Italian Reformer who came to England in 1547, and was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford the following year. Holding this office he naturally and fitly gave his assistance to our own Reformers in their purification of the Church; and when after the accession of Mary, the slander had been circulated that Cranmer had again set up the Mass in Canterbury Cathedral, the Archbishop indignantly repudiated the accusation, and, defending Peter Martyr from the charge of being "unlearned," offered "with the said Mr. Peter Martyr and four or five others whom I shall choose" to defend the religion of the Edwardine Reformation as "more pure and according to God's Word, than any that hath been used in England these thousand years" (Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, iii. 17: E.H.S. edit.). Ritualists are often disposed to over-rate Martyr's influence in order

to depict Cranmer as a weakling who was almost bullied out of holding the "real" presence by "foreign Reformers." The truth is more nearly the reverse of this, for Strype gives good grounds to believe that Cranmer converted Martyr from that error (*Ibid.*, ii. 324).

However this may have been, Martyr was a warm admirer of the English Reformation with which he had been so intimately connected. Just after the Second Prayer Book had been enacted, he wrote to Bullinger, June 14, 1552—

"The Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and Administration of the Sacraments is reformed, for all things are removed which could nourish superstition. . . . As far as regards transubstantiation or the real presence (so to speak) in the bread or wine, thanks be to God, concerning *these things* there seems to be now *no controversy* as it regards those who *profess the Gospel*" (Gorham, *Ref. Gleanings*, p. 281).

On the accession of Mary, Martyr was again driven into exile, but was given the professorship of Hebrew at Zürich. When Elizabeth came to the throne he wrote her a letter of congratulation (*Ibid.*, pp. 389-90), which he followed up by dedicating to her his work on the Lord's Supper, in which he assures the royal theologian—

"It has been my chief object to defend nothing which . . . (or lastly) has not been approved by the *public profession of your Church of England* in the good time" (*Ibid.*, pp. 381-2).

The Queen was greatly pleased with the treatise, and even desired Martyr's return to England to resume his professorship, but he steadily declined the repeated overtures made to him, feeling that he could not in honour disregard his obligations to the Church of Zürich (which had befriended him in adversity (*Zürich Letters*, i. 81 n. ; ii. 57)). The English Reformers esteemed him greatly and held much intimate correspondence with him, so that Parker's mention of him before even Calvin for the Colloquy was natural. Though he was unable to be at the opening, he intervened very effectively at a later stage of the proceedings, in which, with Calvin's great pupil and successor, Theodore Beza, and Nicholas des Gallars, minister of the French Church in London, he was one of the principal representatives of the Reformed.

The English Reformers were peculiarly well informed as to the deliberations there, for Jewel writes to Martyr on February 7, 1562—

"Though the affairs in France were made known to us by report, as usual, and by the couriers, yet the information seemed both more certain and far more agreeable when communicated by yourself, and more especially as I know you have had much to do with them. . . . That disputation of

yours, however, has of necessity much advanced the Gospel and discomfited the adversaries. . . . We do not *differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth*, for as to the Ubiquitarian theory, there is *no danger in this country*" (*Ibid.*, i. 99, 100).

In des Gallars our Reformers had even a better source of information than in Peter Martyr himself. When the former first came over to minister to the French Church here, he wrote to Calvin, June 30, 1560, mentioning his very cordial reception by Grindal, Bishop of London, who had said, "I might have familiar access to him whenever I wished"; and when he left England, the Bishop wrote a letter of commendation for him to take to Calvin, June 19, 1563, saying that he had not only composed the differences in the French Church, "but has also by his advice and prudence been of great use both to myself and to our churches" (*Ibid.*, ii. 50, 96). Now des Gallars himself published in London in 1562 *A Brief Rehearsal of the Acts of the Synod of Poissy*. This book is extremely rare, for there is no copy of it in the British Museum, though one happily exists in the Rylands Library at Manchester. Des Gallars wrote it in Latin, and it was translated into English by "J.D."; if the Latin original still survives, possibly in the archives of Geneva, it would afford a most interesting study. However, des Gallars collaborated with Beza in the production of the history of the Reformed Church in France, first published in 1580, and there the Colloquy is dealt with very fully. All that is necessary for our present purpose is to show that the English Reformers were in possession of accurate information with regard to the proceedings at Poissy *before* the revision of the Articles in January, 1563.

Beza, the chief Reformed disputant, contended that—

"This transubstantiation doth not agree with the analogy and proportion of our faith, because it is *directly contrary to the nature of the sacraments*: in which it is necessary that the substantial signs remain in order to be true signs of the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and it in like manner *overthroweth* the truth (*et c'est pareillement RENVERSER la verite*) of His Human Nature and Ascension" (*Beza and des Gallars*, i. 281: Toulouse, 1882).

Hardwick mentions that Beza's argument, which unfortunately he does not quote, "excited the deepest indignation" in Romish circles (*Articles*, p. 128 n. 2: London, 1876). In passing, it may be mentioned that the French Church in London conformed in 1662, and in its translation of Article XXVIII now uses the very word "renverse" for our "overthroweth."

When revising the Articles, Archbishop Parker had before him

in various forms this argument against transubstantiation from its *anti-sacramental* character. For example, in the Wurtemberg Confession it was "non constaret veritas sacramenti"; in the English *Reformatio Legum* it ran, "a natura sacramenti *discrepat*"; in the "Exiles' Confession" of 1559 it was "doth utterly *deny* the nature of a sacrament." When, therefore, we find Parker employing the *exact word* which Beza had used to express the idea that had so disconcerted the Romanists, it is hardly possible to doubt the source of this phrase in the Article.

Against the "real" presence Beza argued—

"We say that His body is distant from the bread as far as the most high heaven is distant from the earth. . . . And if any willeth to conclude from this that we render Christ *absent* from His holy Supper, we say that it is ill concluded; for we do this honour to God, that we believe according to His Word, that although the body of Christ *is in heaven and not elsewhere*, and we are in earth and not elsewhere, yet this notwithstanding, we are made partakers of His body and blood by a *spiritual manner*, and FAITH BEING THE MEAN" (*moyennant la foy*).

This expression is repeated often by the Reformed; for example, by Beza himself in a letter to Catherine de Medici on September 10—

"His body now dwelleth *in heaven and not elsewhere*, but this nevertheless, by His *spiritual virtue*, and a true *faith being the mean*, we . . . are made partakers of His true body and of His true blood" (*Beza and des Gallars*, i. 281, 284).

The Romanists found themselves so sorely handled in the debates that they adopted a stratagem not unknown to our own days. Appeal to reason by way of argument was abandoned in order to see whether the contending parties could not agree together upon some form of words which would express their agreement on positive truth without raising questions upon which they disagreed. For this purpose five deputies from each side were to meet in a sort of "round-table conference." The Romanists were two Bishops, Montluc of Valence and Duval of Seez, with three divines, Despence, Salignac and Bouthillier. The Reformed were represented by Beza, Martyr, des Gallars, Marlorat and de l'Espine. On October 1, 1561, the deputies signed the following formula—

"We confess that Jesus Christ in His Holy Supper presenteth, giveth and proffereth (*exhibite*) to us truly the substance of His body and blood, *by the operation of His Holy Spirit*, and that we receive and eat sacramentally, *spiritually and by faith* this very body which died for us (*ce propre corps qui est mort pour nous*) that we may be bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh, to the end that we may be vivified by it, and receive from it all that is requisite for our salvation. And for that the faith which is stablished on the Word of God, doth make and render present unto us the things that are promised,

and that *by this faith* we do take verily and indeed (*vraiment et de fait*) the true and natural body and blood of our Lord, *by the virtue of the Holy Spirit*, in THIS SENSE (*en cest esgard*) do we confess the presence of the body and of the blood of our Saviour in the Holy Supper " (*Ibid.*, i. 330).

The Queen and the Cardinal both expressed their delight at receiving this confession, the latter indeed remarking that it contained what had always been his own belief. But those who are familiar with the eucharistic controversy will perceive that the document—though employing language necessarily included if the Romanists were to sign—gives away the entire case to the Reformed. It testifies only to a true reception by the faithful from Jesus Christ Himself of His body and blood, through the operation of His Spirit. The word "presence" is only admitted in such sense as expresses the idea involved in such reception; the "presence" depends on the "reception," not the reception on the "presence"; and the reception depends on no priestly act of consecration or administration, but on the work of the Saviour by His Spirit, through faith as the mean.

The question is not whether the "inward part or thing signified" is the "true and proper natural body of Christ"; for we contend that He has only one real body, which "is in Heaven and not here," because it cannot lose its truth and proper nature so far as to be present "invisibly" and "supernaturally" in many places at one and the same time. The question is not whether we believe in a real donation of Christ's body and blood to the faithful in the Lord's Supper, for we believe that this veritable bestowal of the Crucified is made to believers even apart from the Holy Supper. The true question is whether that donation is the act of Christ alone working by His Spirit in our spirits, and whether the reception of the Things Signified is performed only when we "lift up our hearts" to the heavenlies where Christ dwelleth, and there feed on Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving. Or, whether there is *also* a bodily giving of the "inward part," by the bodily act of the priest in giving the outward part, so that with our bodily mouths we also eat and drink Christ in a bodily manner here in earth? On these points the formula surrenders the question to the Reformed.

There does, however, occur in it one word ("substance") which may seem to favour Popery. Calvin himself used it, and it had been employed in the Reformed French Confession of 1559, in a sound sense, so that it did not present any difficulty to the Huguenots.

But the English Reformers had unsparingly removed any such entangling words from our formularies ; and Peter Martyr, faithful to his training, would not suffer the perilous term to pass, without disencumbering it, as far as he could, of any erroneous meaning.

On September 25 the conference was very near reaching an agreement, when Martyr entered a strong protest. In order that there might be no possibility for present mistake or future misrepresentation, he reduced his doctrine of the Supper to writing, and the next day read it to the conference, saying that he had

" resolved to read it from writing that I may so make it more clear and distinct to you.

" I hold, therefore, that the real and substantial body of Christ is *only in Heaven*, but yet that faithful communicants do, *by faith and in a spiritual manner*, verily receive His very body and very blood which were delivered for us on the Cross. Wherefore I can by no means admit either transubstantiation or consubstantiation in the Lord's Supper.

" Next, I affirm that local distance is no obstacle to our union with the body and blood of Christ, since the Lord's Supper is a *heavenly* matter ; and although we receive on earth bread and wine with our bodily mouth, yet *by faith* and with the help of the Holy Spirit, our souls (to which this *spiritual* and divine food specially belongs) being raised to *Heaven*, enjoy the present body and blood of Christ. . . . And therefore I admit the formulæ of agreement which have been introduced, in that construction whereby they are referred or may be accommodated to the meaning I have now expressed. . . . And when mention is made in these formulæ of the '*substance*' of the body of Christ, I understand by that name or word *nothing else than the true body of Christ*" (*Ref. Glean.*, p. 425).

In the face of this protest even the word "substance" could prove of no service to the Romanists, however much it might please such as the Cardinal. Nor were the trained Romish theologians slow to discover the trap in which their representatives had been caught. When the confession was referred to the Faculty of Divines at the Sorbonne, they promptly condemned it (October 9) as guilty of three "heresies" as well as of "fallacy" and "insufficiency."

The first "heresy" was in the restraint of the whole formula by the final clause, "*En cest esgard*"; which the Faculty maintained was proof that "the presence can be understood by them *only* as one by *virtue and efficacy*." The second "heresy" was that "They do place (the presence) *only* in the *usage* of the sacrament, as this word *Supper* doth declare, and some words following, to wit, *proffereth, presenteth, giveth, receive, eat*." The third "heresy" was "When they say that *by this faith we take* . . . it doth appear that *without this faith*, one doth *not* take neither receive (*on ne prend ni reçoit-on*), the true and natural body of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The "fallacy" was that the Reformed "captiously" made use of language resembling that of Rome, but meaning thereby a contrary doctrine; and—

"It is also *insufficient*, in that it doth not contain the *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ *under the signs*, and doth attribute no efficacy or operation to the *sacramental words*, neither to the *priest* any ministry in the *consecration* and *exhibition* of the aforesaid body and blood; and that they say merely that *Jesus Christ presenteth and giveth unto us*: the which omissions are not without manifest suspicion of a desire to *deny the real presence* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ *under the forms* (of bread and wine) by *virtue of the words* (of consecration), and by *the ministry of the priests*."

The Faculty added a "Confession Catholique" in these words—

"We believe and confess that by the *priest*, minister ordained of Jesus Christ of the holy sacrament of the *altar*, the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are made really and solemnly *present under the forms of bread and wine*, by virtue and power of the Divine Word *pronounced by the priest*."

The Bishops subsequently issued a similar statement, in which they use the words "really and *transubstantially*." The Reformed then re-stated their own position in a declaration that—

"The Supper of the Lord is a *heavenly thing*, and although on earth we take with the mouth only bread and wine . . . being by the mean of *faith* (*moyennant la foy*) through the virtue of the Holy Spirit . . . uplifted to *Heaven*, we there receive (Christ's) body and blood, that is, Himself entire. . . . This faith being the mean, they there receive truly and *spiritually* this *spiritual eating* of the flesh of Christ."

Comparing all this with the third paragraph of Article XXVIII and with Article XXIX, both of which were introduced in 1563, it seems impossible to doubt that the language of our formularies was adopted to prove to the world that indeed the English Church did not "differ by a nail's breadth" from the French and Swiss Reformed Churches in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

The "Reformed" representatives had contended that the partaking of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is effected in a "spiritual manner," "spiritually," that is to say by the Holy Spirit uplifting the souls of the faithful to Heaven, "faith being the mean," and causing them there to feed upon Christ, for which reason they called the Supper "a *heavenly thing*." Article XXVIII takes up the words in the phrase "heavenly and spiritual manner" with the decisive addition of "*only*"; and it exactly hits off "*moyennant la foy*" in the sentence "The mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." Here and in the (Latin) title to Article XXIX are the only places where our Articles employ the Protestant Gallicism of calling this Sacrament "the Supper"

(*la Cène*) without the addition "of the Lord." Doubtless this was done in compliment to the lynx-eyed Romish Faculty, which had so cleverly detected the "heresy" which lies in God's name for His own Sacrament.

Comparison with the condemnation issued by the same authority, is even more productive of evidence. The *first* of the heresies is adopted by the Article declaring "faith" to be not "a" but "*the mean*"; a statement which serves, like its equivalent in the Poissy formula, to fix the sense of all the other statements on the subject,—a giving *to* and a taking *by* "faith."

The *second* heresy lay in the word "Supper" with its correlatives, "proffers, gives, presents, receive, eat." We find all of them in the two short sentences of the English Article, except "proffers" and "presents," which we wisely avoid as seeming to add to the Scriptural word "give" some vague idea of an outward and ceremonial bestowal. The words "Supper," "receive," "eat," used by the Reformed to limit the "presence" solely to the act of reception, are all found twice repeated; but "given" only once. A sad fact for those who argue desperately from this word to prove that there must be a "presence" outside of the act of reception. Even when such a trivial thing as the use by the Reformed of the two (almost) synonyms "prenons" and "recevons" was picked up by the Romanists in their "on ne prend ni reçoit-on," the English Article retaliates by rendering the same Latin word (*accipitur*) first by "taken" and then by "received," a duplication which the Catechism has since made very familiar to us.

The *third* heresy was that the doctrine of reception by faith *implied* a denial of the "reception by the wicked." This Roman challenge was accepted in both branches by our Articles. *Positively* they affirm that faith is "the" mean, but they do not leave it to be gathered as a mere though inevitable inference from this, that those void of a lively faith "eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," for this *negative* position was embodied in a fresh Article (XXIX) whose only possible *raison d'être* is to exclude any variant of the "real" presence from the Church of England.

The "fallacy" of the Reformed was their employment of accommodating language for the benefit of the Romanists. The Articles, not having been drawn up to include Romanists, avoid this

mistake. In them there is no misleading ambiguity about "truly exhibiting" the "substance" of Christ's body, or of "eating sacramentally" His "true and proper natural body" of which we wisely decline to "confess the presence."

The "*insufficiency*" of the Reformed was their omission of all language conceded to be the distinctive livery of the "real" presence, while they did use accommodating phrases which could be accepted by either side. Our Articles are equally "insufficient," for they say nothing of a "real" presence residing "under the forms of bread and wine," effected by the words of "consecration," pronounced by the "priest," whose "ministry" is both the cause of the "presence" and the means of its "exhibition." Where, however, the Romanists dared to place the ministry of the priest in contemptuous competition with the act of our Lord (*ne disent autre chose sinon que Jesus Christ nous presente et donne*), the Article puts in a magisterial "ONLY" in order to shut out any earthly and bodily giving by the priest, and to leave revealed in its unique dignity and glory the "heavenly and spiritual manner" of giving, whereby the Crucified Redeemer bestows Himself upon the faithful through the operation of the Holy Ghost.

One other fact should be mentioned. Beza wrote a "Confession of Faith," the dedicatory epistle to his master Wolmar being dated "quarto idus Martii, 1560," in which he uses the very phrase of the English Article with "modo" for "ratione" —

"As in a natural manner we receive, eat and drink the natural symbols . . . so also *in a heavenly and spiritual manner* (coelesti et spirituali modo) Jesus Christ, Who is now in Heaven and not elsewhere according to the flesh, is truly communicated to us" (Beza, *Tract. Theol.*, i. 31 : Genevae, 1582).

If we may hazard rather more than a guess as to whose was the hand that with Cranmerian skill framed the doctrine of the Reformed into the crystal sentences of our Article, we shall name Grindal. Proof has been given that to him we can trace the connection between the Articles and the Wurtemberg Confession, the main source of their revision in 1563; and that he was in close personal touch with one of the leaders at the Colloquy of Poissy which supplied hints for the language of the Articles on the one important doctrine where they diverge from the German document. This idea becomes more insistent when we find in his *Dialogue between Custom and Verity*, written probably early in 1559, the following teaching—

" Christ's body is food not for the body, but for the soul ; and therefore it must be received *with the instrument of the soul which is faith*. . . . The food of your soul must be *received by faith*. . . . The mouth of the spirit is *spiritual*, therefore it receiveth Christ's body *spiritually*. . . . Christ's body must be *received and taken with faith*. . . . This is the *spiritual*, the very true, the ONLY eating of Christ's body " (Foxe, vi. 338-9).

Hence it would appear that the English Articles employ the words which were the very *tesserae* of the Reformed at Poissy for the exclusion of the " real " presence, the precise watchwords which Rome's technical experts at once denounced as conveying the doctrine of the Reformed, and that they were put into their exact shape by Grindal, who was recognized by the Romanists themselves as the typical example of those Englishmen who were distinguished by their resolute opposition to any theory of a " real " presence in the sacramental elements (Dorman, *Disproove*, foll. 52, 103 : Antwerp, 1565).

W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

WEALTH AND POVERTY.

PERILS OF WEALTH AND POVERTY. By the late Canon Barnett, M.A., D.C.L. With Preface by Mrs. Barnett, C.B.E. *George Allen & Unwin*. 2s. 6d. net.

The Rev. V. A. Boyle, who was closely associated with Canon Barnett at Toynbee Hall, has edited this book which will be welcomed by many who admired the splendid work Canon and Mrs. Barnett did among the poor of London. Of course " cruel cheapness " is now a thing of the past and a " cruel dearness " has taken its place. Anyhow the sweating with which Canon Barnett and other workers were familiar in the old days is now practically a thing of the past. May it remain so ! But this fact of course means that we must take the figures of Sir L. G. Chiozza Money (quoted so freely by the Canon) *cum grano salis*. Even allowing for the fact that these figures cannot apply to present conditions, for wealth has been, and is, still undergoing a process of redistribution, yet there remains much that is sadly too true, and every one who is interested in social reform will find many aspects of the subject considered by one who had unique qualifications for such a discussion and whose work will long remain in grateful recollection.