

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1889.

ART. I.—HOME REUNION.

1. *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth Palace in July, 1888.* London: S.P.C.K. 1888.
2. *Ecclesiastical Union between England and Scotland.* A letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of St. Andrew's. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace. London: Macmillan and Co. 1888.
3. *Report of the Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, October 31, 1888.* Winnipeg. 1888.

OF all the subjects which occupied the attention of the assembled bishops at Lambeth last year, there is not one which is surrounded with greater difficulties, but which, at the same time, if brought to a successful issue, would be fraught with greater blessings, and would more tend to advance the cause of Christ in the world, than the question of the reunion of the various bodies into which the Christianity of the English-speaking races is divided; or, as it is called for the sake of brevity, Home Reunion. The divisions among English Christians which sprang up shortly after the final settlement of the Reformation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, which were accentuated in the reigns of her immediate successors, and which have largely developed during the last three generations, have wrought an amount of harm which it is impossible to estimate. For a long time the evil was confined to sharp dissensions, attended often with intolerance and persecution, among those who ought to have been brethren. But during the last hundred years the mischief has gone deeper, and has threatened to endanger the maintenance of Christianity itself. Vast as is the injury which has resulted in our own country it is as nothing compared with that which has been inflicted on our colonies. In Great Britain itself we are seriously threatened with the secularization of education and the national repudia-

tion of our holy religion. But in not a few English-speaking communities beyond the four seas these are already accomplished facts. Here we have a provision of the means of grace not, indeed, adequate to the population, but still not grossly disproportionate to it. Even here, however, the efforts of Christians of different communions not unfrequently overlap each other or clash with one another, instead of being marshalled to contend together against vice, indifference, and unbelief. On the other hand, in the United States of America and in the vast areas of Canada, Australia, and the Cape Colonies, the aggregate of the available spiritual resources falls miserably short of the wants of the people, and is recklessly frittered away by the rivalry of conflicting sects instead of being consolidated and economized with a view to being laid out to the best advantage.

The bishops at Lambeth raised the subject of Reunion to a prominence and importance which it could have attained in no other way; but they cannot claim the merit of having initiated the idea. As long ago as 1861 a resolution was carried in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury praying the bishops to commend the matter to the prayers of the faithful. And in 1870 the House appointed a committee upon it which reported in favour of communicating on the subject with the chief Nonconformist bodies. In 1887 another resolution was passed requesting the Archbishop to appoint a joint committee of both Houses to consider and report on the relations between the Church and those who are in our own country alienated from her communion, and to suggest means which might tend towards the union of all among our countrymen who hold the essentials of the Christian faith. In the Northern Convocation, also, similar proceedings have taken place. It should, moreover, be mentioned that shortly after the Wolverhampton Church Congress of 1867, and in consequence of a suggestion made in the course of it by Bishop Lonsdale, a society was formed to promote the union of Christians on the basis of the Church of England. This was afterwards merged in the Home Reunion Society, which was constituted in London about the year 1875, and has for its object "to present the Church of England in a conciliatory attitude towards those who regard themselves as outside her pale, so as to lead towards the corporate reunion of all Christians holding the doctrines of the ever-blessed Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Nor has the idea been confined to the south of the Tweed, For upwards of forty years the venerable Bishop of St. Andrew's, Dr. Charles Wordsworth, has been labouring to bring about a reunion between Episcopalians and Presbyterians in

Scotland. Again and again has he referred to the subject in his charges; and in the spring of last year, in view of the impending Lambeth Conference, he addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury the letter of which the title is inserted in the heading of the present article. The bishop reminds us that the establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland at the Revolution was occasioned by the refusal of the Scotch bishops to recognise the political situation and pay allegiance to William and Mary. To repair the disunion in British Christianity which resulted from that step would be worth any amount of labour and of legitimate sacrifice. We ought not to shrink from the consequence which it would involve of admitting the existing ministers of the Church of Scotland to be ministers of the United Church on the strength of their Presbyterian orders alone, and without episcopal reordination.

While, however, Home Reunion has thus already secured a considerable amount of support in Great Britain, its more strenuous advocates, as might be expected, are to be met with in other countries to which our race has spread, and in which the disease to be remedied is more prominent and productive of more disastrous consequences. Previously to the Lambeth Conference the General Synod of the Church in Australia and Tasmania, the Provincial Synod of Rupert's Land, and the General Synod of New Zealand passed resolutions deploring the evils which result from the unhappy divisions among professing Christians, and requesting the bishops, when they should assemble at Lambeth, to consider how steps could be taken to promote greater visible unity among those who hold the same creed. The Canadian Church and the Church in the United States have gone still further. In 1886 the Provincial Synod of the former appointed a committee to meet any committees which might be appointed by other religious bodies, and to confer on possible terms of union. In the same year the General Convention of the American Church adopted a formal declaration on the subject, which was submitted to them by a committee of bishops. This declaration set forth that the Church sought not to absorb other communions, but to cooperate with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, and to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ, and that she was prepared to make every reasonable concession on all things of human ordering and of human choice. It affirmed, however, the duty of the Church to preserve, as inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church, and as therefore essential to the restoration of unity: (1) The Holy Scriptures as the revealed Word of God; (2) the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith;

(3) the two Sacraments, ministered with un failing use of Christ's words of institution and the elements ordained by Him; (4) the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church. The declaration concluded as follows :

Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, as soon as there shall be any authorized response to this declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.

The convention proceeded to appoint from among their number a commission of five bishops and five clerical and five lay deputies, with authority to communicate the declaration, at discretion, to the organized Christian bodies of the country, and to be ready to confer with any of such bodies which might seek the restoration of the organic unity of the Church.

Such was the position of the question when the Lambeth Conference assembled in July, 1888. At one of their earliest sittings the bishops appointed a committee to consider "what steps (if any) can be rightly taken on behalf of the Anglican Communion towards the reunion of the various bodies into which the Christianity of the English-speaking races is divided." This committee presented an impressive report on the subject. They had found a strong *consensus* of authoritative opinion from various branches of the Anglican Communion that the time for some action in the matter, under prayer for God's guidance through many acknowledged difficulties and dangers, had already come; and that the Conference should not separate without some utterance which might further and direct such action. They at the same time called attention to the necessity, in dealing with the question, of putting aside all consideration of the Roman Church, since it was clear that no proposals for reunion would be entertained by the dignitaries of that Church without our complete submission to their claims of absolute authority, and to other errors against which we had for three centuries felt bound to protest. In accordance with the recommendations of the committee, the Conference passed the following resolutions:

(i.) That in the opinion of this Conference the following articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion :

(a) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(b) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(c) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

(d) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

(ii.) That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our communion acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.

(iii.) That this Conference recommends as of great importance, in tending to bring about reunion, the dissemination of information respecting the standards of doctrine and the formularies in use in the Anglican Church; and recommends that information be disseminated, on the other hand, respecting the authoritative standards of doctrine, worship, and government, adopted by the other bodies of Christians into which the English-speaking races are divided.

The Encyclical Letter also contained important paragraphs on the subject to a similar effect.

Among the most earnest members of the Home Reunion Committee was the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land, and the subject occupied a prominent place in the address which, after his return from England, he delivered to the synod of his diocese at its meeting in the following October. In that address he gave some very interesting and important details respecting the proceedings of the committee, which are not disclosed in the authorized "Report of the Acts of the Conference." It appears that besides the three resolutions which, as already stated, were adopted by the whole body of bishops, the committee, by a very large majority, determined to recommend a fourth resolution, to the effect that God had been pleased to bless the ministrations of ministers of non-episcopal bodies in the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom, and that therefore a ministerial character should be recognised in them, and provision should be made in such a way as might be agreed on for the acceptance of such ministers as fellow-workers with us in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ. Bishop Machray states that the rejection of this resolution arose in part from a feeling that its terms were ambiguous, and he admits that this feeling was shared by not a few of its supporters themselves. No attempt was made to define what should be considered as constituting a valid claim to the recognition of a ministerial character, nor how the persons who were to be recognised as ministers should be admitted to work as such in the Church. As regards the principle of the resolution, the Bishop of Rupert's Land makes out a clear and unanswerable case for its adoption.

A wide and general application of it would, no doubt, be beset with difficulties; but with respect to the great body of Presbyterians, at any rate, he shares the views of the Bishop of St. Andrew's, and would advocate a temporary suspension of the law of episcopal ordination for the sake of effecting an union with them. And in so doing he relies on the authority of Hooker, who affirms that "There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination without a bishop;" of Bishop Andrewes, who said, "A man must be blind who does not see Churches standing without episcopacy;" and of Bishop Cosin, who observed, "I love not to be herein more wise or harder than our own Church is, which has never publicly condemned and pronounced the ordination of the other Reformed Churches to be void." Besides adducing these utterances on the subject, Bishop Machray points to the practice of our Church up to the Restoration. Before that date ministers not episcopally ordained were frequently recognised as fit to hold office in the ranks of her clergy. In the year 1610 Spottiswood was consecrated Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and two other persons were consecrated bishops of Scottish sees, without any of them having previously had more than Presbyterian ordination. On their return to Scotland these prelates consecrated the other bishops, and the beneficed Presbyterian ministers who conformed were accepted as priests of the episcopalized Church without further ordination. Again, on the attempted revival of episcopacy in Scotland after the Restoration, conforming beneficed ministers who had Presbyterian orders were accepted as priests without episcopal reordination.

In making this historical sketch, and urging these precedents as authorities for dispensing at a critical juncture with episcopal ordination, the Bishop is careful to guard himself against being misunderstood.

I do not (he says) question the irregularity, but a choice has to be made; and the healing of a great schism, the meeting of our Lord's last wish and prayer, "that all may be one," the inexpressible advantages to the Church, as we in this province can readily understand, seem far to outweigh a loss that can be but temporary.

He endorses and adopts the words of the Bishop of St. Andrew's, who maintains—

It is not a question of the obligation of the law of the threefold ministry or of episcopal ordination. That law has been handed down from the beginning, and will continue to exist to the end of time. But the question is of the power and wisdom of the Church to dispense with the law *pro tempore* in a particular case and for a special end, an end unspeakably great and important.

It is quite clear that unless the Church is willing to exercise her dispensing power by admitting as ministers, upon reunion, those who before that event have received non-episcopal orders,

no corporate reunion with Presbyterians or with any other body of Nonconformists is possible. What orders, if any besides those of Presbyterians, could be regarded as valid would be a difficult question of detail, but one not incapable of a satisfactory solution. It would, of course, be an inexorable condition of reunion that all future ordinations must be episcopal. That is involved in the principle of the historic episcopate which was insisted on by the Lambeth Conference. Happily, however, this condition need not be a hopeless stumbling-block to Presbyterians. For according to our Ordination Service the order of priest is conferred by the laying on of the hands of the bishop jointly with those of the priests who are present; and the conscientious Presbyterian may, therefore, if he pleases, ascribe the virtue of the ceremony to the part taken in it by the latter.

But, besides the temporary and exceptional recognition of non-episcopal orders, it would doubtless be necessary to make some permanent modifications in our Church law before amalgamation could take place on a large scale. This necessity has been generally and frankly admitted by all Churchmen who have seriously considered the subject. The Committee on Reunion which was appointed by the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation in 1870, while not recommending that we should at the outset propose alterations of our existing formularies of faith and worship, contemplated that concessions might subsequently be made as the consequence of negotiations carried on in a spirit of love and unity. The Church in America and the bishops at Lambeth have laid down the Scriptures, the Nicene Creed, and the two Sacraments duly administered as the essential bases of any scheme of reunion; but they do not regard any further concurrence in doctrine or uniformity in ritual as necessary conditions to it. As a matter of fact, we could not hope to effect any considerable reunion without a repeal of the Acts of Uniformity or a considerable modification of their provisions. The prospect of this, however, if rightly considered, may be viewed with acquiescence, if not positively welcomed. For three centuries we have been so accustomed to the idea of uniformity in worship, that we are liable to overrate its theoretical importance. Yet of late, in our mission-rooms and open-air gatherings—aye, and in our very churches themselves—we have quietly set aside the principle, and ignored the strict letter of the law. Apart from the excesses indulged in by Ritualists, the deviations from the old orthodox standard of services which are to be met with in our non-Ritualistic churches are such as would have caused steady-going Churchmen of the last century, or even of fifty years ago, to stand aghast. The change of practice has been resorted to on the ground of the exigencies of the times; and, having gone so far, the path of further development

is made easier for us. It is exactly two centuries ago that a Bill "for the uniting their Majesties' Protestant subjects" was carried by Lord Nottingham in the House of Lords, though it never succeeded in passing the Commons.¹ This Comprehension Bill, as it is called, proposed, among other things, to legalize the black gown as an alternative for the surplice in Divine Service; to render optional the use of the sign of the cross in Baptism; to permit the reception of the Lord's Supper in a pew, without kneeling; and to dispense with god-parents if the parents themselves would answer for the child in baptism. The last of these points has in our day been practically conceded. Possibly the others might not all be now insisted on by Nonconformists as conditions of their return to the Church. But it is evident that no one of them is necessarily excluded by the terms of reunion propounded at Lambeth; and, distasteful as they may be to us personally, we are bound to pause long before we reject them as inadmissible.

There are, however, two other concomitants of Home Reunion which we must be prepared to face. In the first place, it would be no less unreasonable than hopeless to expect that permissive modifications should be made in the ritual of the Church in a direction acceptable to the Protestant Nonconformist bodies, without a corresponding legalization of practices of an opposite tendency which the Final Court of Appeal has decided to be at present inadmissible. To some persons who consider that individual members of a Church are responsible for what that Church permits others of her members to do or to hold, though she does not enforce it upon themselves, this contingency will appear shocking. It is well, however, to remember that this view of duty was not that of our English Reformers. While steadfastly declining to be themselves parties to doctrines and practices which in their conscience they believed to be erroneous, they did not leave the Church on account of the toleration or prevalence of those doctrines and practices within her. Their expulsion from her fold by excommunication, or their (humanly speaking) premature exaltation into the ranks of the Church triumphant, was on their part involuntary. Happy would it have been for the religious history of our country if their example had been followed in succeeding generations. While, however, we cannot recall the past, it is essential to realize that reunion will be impossible unless the principle is admitted that, so long as the Church does not enforce on her members individually adherence in word or in deed to doctrines or practices

¹ The Bill is printed at length and discussed in an article by the Rev. T. W. Jex-Blake (now D.D.) in *Macmillan's Magazine*, March, 1873, entitled "Church Reform by Comprehension, A.D. 1689 and 1873."

with which they cannot conscientiously comply, they have no right to leave her communion because she may tolerate those doctrines and practices in others of her members.

In the second place, however, it is equally clear that a comprehensive measure of Home Reunion would necessitate a considerable inroad upon our parochial system. This, again, may appear shocking to those who have been accustomed, and with justice, to regard the parochial system as one of the distinctive excellences of our Church. So it has undoubtedly been; yet, like uniformity of ritual, it may have had its day. One thing, at any rate, is clear—that, unless we are prepared to relax something of its rigidity, it is hopeless to expect a general reunion. If all Nonconformist ministers and places of worship are to become amenable to Church law, it will be manifestly intolerable that the incumbent of a parish shall have the exclusive right of regulating all public worship and religious teaching within its limits, and prescribing by whom they may be conducted. It would probably be necessary to create a Standing Diocesan Council in each diocese, which should regulate upon broad and enlightened lines the supply of divine service and of pastoral ministrations throughout the diocese according to the requirements of each parish. Such councils already exist in the American Church, and their establishment amongst ourselves has been advocated for other purposes than that which is here suggested. Wherever a sufficient number of persons were unable to obtain accommodation in their parish church, or were dissatisfied with the ritual or teaching which they found in it, and were prepared to maintain separate spiritual ministrations for themselves, the council would sanction an independent place of worship. Thus the great majority of the existing Dissenting chapels would continue open as before, only in communion with, instead of outside the pale of, the Church of England. At the same time, this incident of reunion will obviously supply an antidote to any practical grievance which might arise from the toleration of excessive ritual which, as already observed, would inevitably accompany it. For Churchmen who disapproved of the mode of conducting service in their parish church would be enabled to set up a separate place of worship for themselves without severing themselves from the National Church or violating her laws.

It remains to consider how far the present attitude of Nonconformists renders the prospects of Home Reunion hopeful or the reverse, since it is obvious that the advances of the Church in that direction are useless unless the desire is reciprocated on their part. It must be confessed with sorrow that as yet there has been no public utterance on the part of any non-episcopal communion indicating a general aspiration for reunion. The

fact, however, can scarcely occasion surprise, for the same spirit which led to the original act of severance conduces to acquiescence in a continued state of separation. Last April the Archbishop of Canterbury, on behalf of the English bishops, sent to Dr. Oswald Dykes, the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in England, a copy of the encyclical letter and resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, with a letter assuring him that the aspirations for reunion expressed in them were heartfelt on the part of the whole assembly. Dr. Dykes, in acknowledging the communication, promised to bring the matter to the notice of the Church which he represented, and added that whatever opinions might be expressed respecting the sufficiency of the basis on which the Lambeth Conference declared itself prepared to confer with other Churches on the subject of reunion, he could assure the Archbishop that his Presbyterian brethren would appreciate and reciprocate those fraternal sentiments which had inspired the assembled bishops. The subject was accordingly brought before the English Presbyterian Synod at their meeting on May 3rd, when they contented themselves with approving Dr. Dykes' letter, and deferred the question of taking any further action in the matter. Among individuals a more appreciative disposition is here and there apparent. During the many years which the Bishop of St. Andrew's has devoted to the promotion of ecclesiastical union in Scotland numerous letters in reference to it have passed between him and the leading Presbyterians north of the Tweed. The stringent promise to uphold Presbyterianism which ministers of the Church of Scotland have been required to make on their ordination has operated as a powerful obstacle to their openly espousing the cause. But here and there notable exceptions have occurred. As long ago as 1872 Professor Milligan, the foremost member of a delegation from the Church of Scotland to the General Assembly of American Presbyterians sitting at Detroit, after referring to schemes for the reunion of the different bodies of Presbyterians, informed the assembly that there were many in the Church of Scotland who looked forward to a still more comprehensive union, which should include the Scottish Episcopalian Church. Other utterances of prominent Presbyterians in a similar strain are recorded in Bishop Wordsworth's letter to the Primate, which has been already referred to. Moreover, it is a significant circumstance that overtures have of late been made for a union between the Congregationalists and the Baptists. These proposals have not as yet assumed any definite shape; but the fact of their having been made indicates that a desire for combination is abroad which, if rightly directed, may promote that reconciliation of our non-episcopalian brethren with the

Anglican Communion which in the interests of Christianity among all English-speaking races—aye, and throughout the world—is most to be longed after and prayed for. The effect of such a reconciliation upon our conflict with infidelity at home, upon our assaults on Mohammedanism and heathenism abroad, upon the irreconcilable Church of Rome, and upon the degenerate, but improvable, churches of the East, would be simply incalculable. On the other hand, great as are the risks to which we have been hitherto exposed through our unhappy divisions, their continuance in the future appears likely to plunge us into more serious dangers, and to imperil the very maintenance of Christianity as our national religion. May He Who alone can order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men inspire the hearts of Churchmen and Nonconformists alike with a desire for union, and enable the desire to take effect in a wise and prosperous conclusion!

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.



ART. II.—THE THEOLOGY OF BISHOP ANDREWES.

(Concluded from the July CHURCHMAN, p. 537.)

II.

AND now, having shown how inconclusive is the language so often quoted from Bishop Andrewes in support of the doctrines of our opponents, we proceed to show how thoroughly conclusive is language which may be quoted from him in support of the true Reformed doctrine of the Church of England.

It will probably be allowed that there is hardly a more conclusive evidence of adherence to the Reformed theology on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence than the figurative interpretation of the words of the institution.

By Lutherans and Romanists alike, by all who maintained the Corporal—or, as it is now called, the Real Objective—Presence, it was consistently maintained that no figurative sense was admissible in understanding the words of our Blessed Lord, "This is My Body." That solemn words, uttered on such an occasion, must be interpreted "ut verba sonant," and must not be allowed any metaphorical meaning—this was the very strong fortress of their position. To admit that such words could admit of a figurative interpretation—this was, in their view, to abandon the true faith of the Eucharist, to renounce a very true part of the faith of the Christian Church.

It would be an error, indeed, to speak of the interpretation

of our Lord's words in the upper chamber as a crucial test of Eucharistic doctrine. There have been, and there are, those who reject the figurative sense, while rejecting also the Real Objective Presence. But in vain, we believe, will any example be sought of any divine in our own or in former days (since the Reformation),¹ who upheld a figurative sense of the words, and yet maintained the doctrine of the Corporal Presence.²

How stoutly Lutheran theology set itself against such an interpretation is matter of history. How strongly such a sense of our Lord's words is opposed by the teachers of the new theology in the Church of England may easily be gathered from their writings. In his "Real Presence from the Fathers," Dr. Pusey has inserted a note "Against the attempt to explain away the force of the words 'This is My Body,' by the introduction of a figure." Let the reader be asked to read attentively the following quotations from this note:

God does not leave us doubtful whether, in Holy Scripture, He is speaking to us plainly or figuratively. Where there is a figure, God shows plainly that there is one. In the passages commonly quoted by Calvinistic interpreters to prove that the Holy Eucharist is a mere figure, Holy Scripture itself determines that there is a figure wherever there is one. Thus Gen. xli. 26, "The seven good kine are seven years: and the seven good ears are seven years." It is the explanation of a dream, in which Joseph said, "God hath showed unto Pharaoh what He is about to do." Ezek. xxxvii. 11, "These bones are the whole house of Israel," is the explanation of a vision. Matt. xiii. 38, 39, "The field is the world," is our Lord's exposition of a parable. And Rev. i. 20, "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches," are our Lord's exposition of a vision (pp. 64, 65).

In other places which these interpreters allege they have simply misunderstood Holy Scripture . . . Gen. xvii. 10, it is not said "Circumcision is My covenant;" whereas in verse 11 circumcision is expressly called the "token of the covenant." . . . Exod. xii. 11, "It is the Lord's passover" does not mean, "It is the sign of the Lord's passing over" (pp. 65, 66) . . . The argument from language is conclusive. There would be endless confusion, and our whole faith might be turned into a figure, if men might assume as they pleased that this or that, which they did not like to take literally, was a figure (pp. 65, 66, 68).

Now let the reader be asked to put beside this teaching the following from Bishop Andrewes, and to mark how clearly the Bishop comes under the condemnation of Dr. Pusey:

¹ Reforming divines frequently appealed to *earlier* writers who had taught that (but for the definitions of the Church) the words of the institution might very well have been understood in another sense than that of the Church of Rome. See, *e.g.*, Jeremy Taylor, Works, edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 12; and Andrewes, "Ad Bell. Resp.," pp. 12, 13, A.C.L., and especially Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 262.

² Picherellus (Opuscula, p. 23) may perhaps be quoted as an exception. And it would be satisfactory to learn that others have followed the example of his candour. But his Eucharistic doctrine will hardly (we suppose) be recognized as Romish by Romanizers.

Possumus . . . ut in aliis Sacramentis, ita et in hoc, Figurate : et nihil coactivum appareat, ut aliter intelligamus" ("Ad Bell. Respon.," p. 13, A.C.L.).¹

Porro, negotium sibi facit, de Scripturarum sensu, Novatores (ubi Scriptura propriis verbis loquitur) pro nihilo ducere. Imo, pro nihilo non ducere, sed quod propriis verbis loquatur, negare. Nec tropos quaerere, sed, de Sacramento uno loqui ad morem reliquorum. De circumcissione, Hoc est factus meum in carne vestra. De Agno, Hoc est enim Pasche, id est, transitus Domini. . . . Tum, nec mille figuris rem agunt. Una modo ; nec alia, quam qua vos ipsi explicatis illud, Hic est calix, qui effunditur ; quem nec vos expedire potestis sine tropo. Denique, vestri homines, dum figuram unam fugiunt, mille se questionibus involvunt (*Ibid.*, pp. 213, 214).

(By the side of this last quotation should be read the margin, "Scripturæ sacræ sæpe figurate sunt intelligendæ.")

Is it possible, we ask, for any to read these extracts with ordinary attention, and not to see distinctly that these two divines are opponents coming from two hostile camps, and joining issue on this vital point? Will any, after this, be persuaded to believe that, on the matter of the Eucharistic Presence, the teaching of Bishop Andrewes was ever meant to give support to such teaching as that of our new theology?²

Not less strong and decided is the opposition of this new

¹ The Bishop is referring to the language of Cajetan : "Non apparet in Evangelico coactivum aliquod, ad intelligendum hæc verba proprie, nempe, Hoc est corpus meum."

It must not, of course, be supposed that Bishop Andrewes meant to reduce the sacramental elements to bare signs, or to give to the words of institution nothing more than what is commonly called the Zwinglian interpretation. He is, with the whole body of our Reformed divines, very strong in the repudiation of such a notion. Witness his words : "The truth is, Zwinglius was more afraid than hurt. It is well known whither he leaned ; that, to make this point straight, he bowed it too far the other way. To avoid *Est* in the Church of Rome's sense, he fell to be all for *Significat*, and nothing for *Est* at all. And whatsoever went further than *significat* he took to savour of the carnal presence. For which, if the Cardinal mislike him, so do we" ("Answer to Perron's Reply," Minor Works, A.C.L., p. 14).

Compare Bishop Morton : "Protestants do teach (as then Cardinal Bellarmine truly witnesseth) that in these words of institution ['This is My Body'] the bread is called Christ's Body *figuratively*, as being a sign or figure of Christ's Body ; yet such a figure as doth truly convey unto us the thing signified thereby ; for the which truth's sake Christ said not 'This bread is a figure of My Body,' but 'It is My Body.' Wherein we see two things plainly professed by all Protestants ; first, that the words of this Sacrament are not to be expounded according to the literal and proper sense ; secondly, that the matter of this Sacrament is the very Body and Blood of our Lord truly offered and exhibited unto us" ("Catholic Appeal," ii., ch. ii., § 24, pp. 121, 122. London, 1610).

² The Real Presence in the elements was certainly not the belief of one who could write of the Romanist as "Pretium Redemptionis suæ ita temere inter calicis labra positurum" ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 6, Ox., 1851). These words alone might have sufficed to clear the memory of Bishop Andrewes from the erroneous doctrines which have been so frequently imputed to him.

school of theology to the teaching of the Reformed, as to the Real Presence being the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the condition of death. There were not wanting, indeed, some among Lutheran divines who even maintained that faith which believes in the omnipotence of God, may very well be taught to believe in the very Corporal Presence in the elements of the dead body of the Saviour, or, at least, of the Body and Blood of Christ in a state of present separation.¹ But generally, we believe, it has been felt by our opponents, that the Real Objective Presence which they conceive to be upon the altar, cannot be believed to be the presence of that which now is *not*. Therefore they would have us believe that, though represented as in the condition of death, and perpetuating, in some sort, the victim condition, the Body and Blood of Christ which are really present are the Body and Blood of the living and glorified Redeemer.

What contempt is now being poured on what is called the *Cadaver* theory of the Eucharistic Presence!

It is well known to theological students how distinctly our old English divines have taken their stand with the teaching of the Reformed² in this matter—following the examples of the ancient Fathers, and maintaining, as with one voice, that the true *res sacramenti* of the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, not as in heaven, but as on the cross, not as glorified, but as crucified.

Now what was the teaching of Bishop Andrewes on this

¹ Witness the following: "Quod in decimo articulo dixerunt, si modo inibi factum est, corpus Christi sine sanguine et sanguinem ejus sine corpore esse non posse, plane est rejiciendum ac repudiandum, siquidem nugæ et fabulæ ipsorum cum primo fidei nostræ articulo, qui Deum omnipotentem adserit et confitetur, manifeste et ex diametro pugnant. Deus igitur cum sit omnipotens corpus sine sanguine, et sanguinem sine corpore nobis præbere potest, vivo nihilominus Christo, et salva corporis ac sanguinis Ejus substantia" ("Apologia Osiandri," in "Cælestini Historia Comitiorum MDXXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," tom. iii., fo. 86 b).

So certain Romanists also have maintained: "Corpus posse per Divinam potentiam simul vivum et mortuum in diversis locis esse" (see "Alberlinus, De Euch.," i., cap. xii., p. 76, edit. 1654).

Bellarmino, however, declares: "Ille autem non facit, nec est facturus in æternum, ut Christi corpus aliubi reperiatum mortuum" (De Euch. Lib. iv., Cap. xxi., c. 869).

² It may be true, indeed, that (as Waterland thinks) Calvin's teaching did not sufficiently clear the distinction between the *Crucified Body* as eaten by, and the *Glorified Body* as *united* to the Christian man. And possibly this may be a weak point in some teachings of Laudian theology also. But it should never be forgotten that (as Waterland himself has expressed it) "We eat Christ crucified in the Sacrament, as we partake of the merits of His death; and if we thus have part in His *Crucified* Body, we are thereby, *ipso facto*, made partakers of the Body *glorified*" (see Waterland's Works, Ox., 1843, vol. iv., p. 609; also pp. 570, 579, 601).

most important point? Does he in anywise separate himself from the teaching of other English divines in this matter? or does he stand on the same side, and join his voice with theirs? Let the following extract answer our inquiry:

He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve. Christ offered is it. Thither we must look. To the Serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver* ("Sermons," vol. ii., p. 302, A.C.L.).

Again, "We are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering. So and no otherwise doth this text teach; so and no otherwise do we represent Him"¹ (*Ibid.*, pp. 301, 302).

Let the reader judge for himself whether the force of these quotations can be broken by alleging that Andrewes was too great and good a divine to mean what his words so obviously and plainly seem to say?² What the Bishop here says is perfectly consistent with all his other teachings. And we are at a loss to know how he could have spoken more unequivocally on this crucial question.

Elsewhere the Bishop has said, "Accipite Spiritum Accipite Corpus And no more need the bread should be changed into His Body in that, than His breath into the Holy Ghost in this both truly said, truly given, and truly received, and in the same sense without any difference at all" ("Sermons," vol. iii., p. 272, A.C.L.).³

The real difference between the two great contending schools on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence should be traced up to the difference of view in respect of the sacramental union. It must never, indeed, be supposed

¹ So again the Bishop says: "He left us the gifts of His Body and Blood: His Body broken, and full of the characters of love all over; His Blood shed, every drop whereof is a great drop of love" (Sermon VII., A.C.L., vol. iii., p. 233).

² Archbishop Wake says: "Whatever Real Presence this Bishop believed, it must be of His Crucified Body, and as in the state of his death; and that I think cannot be otherwise present than in one of these two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge: either figuratively in the elements, or spiritually in the souls of those who worthily receive them" ("Discourse of the Holy Eucharist in Gibson's Preservative," vol. x., pp. 69, 70).

³ If further evidence were needed as to the doctrine of Bishop Andrewes on the Real Presence, it might be found in the answer to Cardinal Du Perron, written by Casaubon, "rege dictante," which is found among the works of King James, edited by Bishop Montague (See Pattison's "Casaubon," pp. 347, 348). There it is said of the dogma of Transubstantiation: "Istud non est rei veritatem pie credere: sed importuna curiositate modum decernere: quod Rex cum ecclesia sua nunquam est facturus numquam probaturus. . . . Ut igitur certo cognoscas, quid in hac Ecclesia super illa re credatur, quid doceatur, describam hic Reverendissimi viri Domini Episcopi Eliensis locum integrum, e libro quem

that the *unio sacramentalis* was rejected by the theology of the Reformed. Unguarded statements may doubtless be quoted from some perhaps hasty utterances in the earlier stages of the controversy. But it is a serious misrepresentation to speak (as Dr. Pusey has spoken) of Calvinistic interpreters as desiring to prove that the Holy Eucharist is a mere figure. The giving of the sign with the name of the thing signified for solemn purposes of donation, makes the sign itself an effectual sign—a sign effectual for the giving and receiving of that very thing the name of which it bears in the transaction. And the thought of reducing the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to bare signs was constantly and strongly repudiated by Reformed theologians, abroad as well as at home. The *unio sacramentalis* was upheld by divines of both schools alike. But there was a wide difference in their teaching as to the question—wherein this sacramental union consists. On the one side were those who taught that by this union the *res sacramenti* and the *sacramentum* were made on the altar into one compound adorable whole; on the other side were those who held that the union consists in that relation, in virtue of which the giving (by the minister), and the taking and eating of the *sacramentum* (by the body) is accompanied by and in union with the giving (by Christ), and the taking and eating (by the soul) of the *res sacramenti*. It is well expressed by Bishop White thus :

The bread may truly be termed the Body of Christ, because of a relative, pactional, and sacramental union and donation of the thing signified, together with the signs worthily received. . . . The object or thing carnally and bodily received is the elemental creature. The object and thing received spiritually and internally is the Body and Blood of Christ crucified upon the cross. The donor and distributor of this inward gift is the Blessed Trinity, the Son of God Himself, and by appropriation the Holy Ghost. The eating and drinking of it is by faith ("Reply to Fisher," pp. 405, 406; London, 1624).

So Perkins writes: "This sacramental union . . . is respective, because there is a certain agreement and proportion of the external things with the internal, and of the actions of one with the actions of the other" (Works, vol. i, p. 72; Cambridge, 1616).¹

paucos ante menses adversus Cardinalem Bellarminum edidit." Then, after quoting the words of Andrewes, it is added: "Hæc fides Regis, hæc fides Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ: Quæ ut brevi compendio rem omnem complectar, in cœna Domini, realiter participem se fieri credit corporis et sanguinis Christi, ut patres Græci dicunt, et quod Bellarminus ipse fatetur, spiritualiter. Per fidem enim Christum apprehendunt et manducant: creduntque nullum aliud manducationis genus ad salutem utile esse posse. Quod et omnes vestri semper fassi sunt" ("Principis Jacobi Opera," Francofurti ad Mœnum, 1689, p. 188).

Now, from these two different views of the sacramental union there results of necessity a difference of regard in respect of the sacramental signs. Those on the one side will naturally be led to an adoration which, however explained, to those on the other side, will seem to border at least on idolatry. Those on the other side will naturally be led to the use of language which (notwithstanding their desire to be reverent) will seem to their opponents as bordering, at least, on the profane. And we cannot do better than conclude this paper by setting before our readers two quotations, one from Bishop Andrewes, the other from Dr. Pusey, asking to have their repugnance one to another well marked, and their significance fairly estimated, in view of this difference of doctrine concerning the sacramental union.

Thus, then, wrote Bishop Andrewes: "*Crustaceus panis pro Deo non sine sacrilegio summo adoratur*" ("Tortura Torti," p. 135). "*Fiat, quod fieri voluit Christus, cum dixit, Hoc facite; nihil reliqui fiet, quod monstret Sacerdos, quod adoret populus, de pyxide*" ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 267, A.C.L.).¹

And thus wrote Dr. Pusey: "The question, then, as to the adoration of our Lord present in the holy Eucharist, should be considered apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. People have profanely spoken of 'wafer-gods.'² They might as well have spoken of 'fire-gods.' . . . Much more might they have used the title 'Infant God,' as a term of reproach against the Holy Child Jesus. The simple question is, 'Is our Lord and God present there?' If, or rather since, He

¹ The saying of Bishop Andrewes—"Ubi corpus, ubi sanguis, ubi Christus"—may have been suggested by the words of Florus Mazister, "Ubi Corpus Ejus, ibi Jesus est" (De Expos. Miss. § 67), on which it may suffice to refer to "Eucharistic Worship," p. 34. Andrewes certainly did not mean to indicate any real presence of Christ to be worshipped on the altar (see above, p. 537). It was well said by Bishop Morton: "I may ask any ingenuous man whether he ever heard (I do not say our Church, but) any approved Doctor therein, teach that we do or ought to kneel before the sacrament, that *by it*, or *in it*, we may personally worship Christ, as if He were really present" ("Defence of Ceremonies," p. 235. London, 1619. "Published by Authority").

² Dr. Pusey could hardly have been aware how completely Bishop Andrewes was lying under the lash of his condemnation—the condemnation of the good Bishop's profaneness. In truth, Andrewes appears to have had a certain peculiar fondness for the forms of expression which to Dr. Pusey were so peculiarly abhorrent. Witness the following:

"Memoriam ibi fieri sacrificii, damus non inviti. Sacrificari ibi Christum *vestrum de pane factum, nunquam daturi*" ("Ad Bell. Responsio," p. 251, A.C.L.).

"*Missam privatam Patribus ignotam asserit, asserit et non privatam qua scilicet panem illum transubstantiatum adoratis*" (*Ibid.*).

"Let them adore the Divinity concealed under the species and made from the bakehouse [*de pistrino factum*]. Sion would have without doubt shuddered and started back from this" (Opuscula, p. 92, A.C.L.).

is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us than the dress which He wore as man" ("Real Presence," p. 329).

We make our appeal to the candour and common-sense of intelligent and earnest-minded Churchmen. Let them judge: Does the doctrine of Bishop Andrewes support the teaching of Dr. Pusey? Does the school of ultra-Church theology among us rightly claim to be following in the steps of the great Anglican divine?

We feel persuaded that many in this matter have been unwittingly misled. We venture to hope that some will be led to study afresh the writings of Bishop Andrewes, and will rise from the study convinced, not only that the good Bishop was thoroughly free from all Romanizing tendencies in his teaching, but also that his Reformed theology is a true reflection of the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.

And now, having discharged the unwelcome task of showing the misconceptions which have been made to support the dangerous innovations which have been introduced among us, let us, in conclusion, acknowledge very frankly that those misconceptions are not (as we believe) to be put down all and altogether only to the account of those who so widely and seriously differ from us. At least, we will venture to submit for serious consideration the following inquiry: Have not many of those who have been persuaded, and rightly persuaded, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained, not merely for a figurative memorial of Christ's death, and a figurative teaching that His atonement should be the food of our spiritual life, but also for a real *κοινωνία* of the Body and Blood of Christ, been repelled, and perhaps drawn towards the teaching of the so-called Real Objective Presence, by the over-cautious avoidance of the teaching of what really is objective (according to the use of modern philosophical language)¹ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? And might not these, many of them, have been attracted, rather than repelled, if—instead of taking so much pains to insist on the truth (a mere

¹ In the sacramental controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the words *objective* and *objectively* were used in a sense in which they stood opposed to *real* and *really*. Thus, e.g., the Saxon theologians in 1530: "Quod aliæ res, quia habeant loca dissita, tamen præsentem sint corpõri non realiter, sed *objective*. Ita disputat tantum imaginariam esse præsentiam. Sed Bucerus decipitur hac imaginatione. Quia nunquam concedit *realem* et *veram* præsentiam" (See Hospinian, "Hist. Sacr.," in Works, 1681, vol. iv., p. 183b). So Bishop Morton: "We say . . . the same Body, as the same death; but it cannot be the same death, but *objectively only*. Ergo, can it not be the same Body, but *only objectively*?" ("On Euch.," Book VI., chap. vii., § 4, pp. 473, 474).

truism, acknowledged even by Romish doctors) that the inward and spiritual grace may be received without and apart from the outward Sacrament, and seeming sometimes to lay themselves open to the charge of setting faith to create, by imagination, a presence which is not a true presence at all;—if, we say, instead of this, our Evangelical clergy had taken pains, after the example of Bishop Andrewes and other Reformed theologians, to insist upon the truth of the real giving (only after a heavenly and spiritual manner), and the real taking and receiving verily and indeed of the true *res sacramenti*, by the faithful, to the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine?¹

We desire, indeed, to give all honour to faithful men whose godly zeal constrains them to use great plainness of speech in testifying against the revival of errors which have been carefully eliminated from the teaching of this Church of England. How shall we dare to make light of those dangerous deceits from which our Church was purified at the cost of blood? Nevertheless, we are persuaded that, in dealing with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it behoves us to beware of dealing too much in negations.

It is fully in accord with the theology of the Reformed to dwell rather on what we *do* receive, than to be ever insisting on what we do *not* receive in the Supper of our Lord: even as it is fully in accord with the same theology to wish that men should direct their thoughts more to what they *have* in that holy Sacrament, and less to the *mode* in which they have it. Surely it were well if the words of Hooker were ever present to the hearts of those whose minds are exercised on this Eucharistic controversy:

Shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how? . . . Let it be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's Table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise. . . They are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb and made joyful in the strength of this new wine: this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold; this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare of soul and

¹ Well does Bishop Andrewes insist on the partaking of the bread as "the partaking of Christ's true Body (and not as a sign, figure, or remembrance of it), 1 Cor. x. 16," adding: "For the Church hath ever believed a true fruition of the true Body of Christ in that Sacrament; ("Sermons," vol. v., p. 67). But, observe, the Bishop did not write "a true *fraction* of the true Body of Christ," as his words have been quoted in error by Mr. Russell, in "Life of Bishop Andrewes," p. 38.

body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving. With touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief; it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ. What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not; it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness hereof sufficeth; His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this—O my God, Thou art true! O my soul, thou art happy! (E. P., V., lxxvii. 3, 12).

N. DIMOCK.

ART. III.—PROFESSOR HUXLEY'S SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.

IN an article which appears in the April number of the *Nineteenth Century* Professor Huxley shows us how men of science, as represented in this particular instance by himself and the Tübingen theorists, deal with the subjects to which they apply their informed intelligences. He is not very complimentary to English theologians. In his opinion the methods of our poor "counsel for creeds" are so antiquated, so prejudiced, so hopeless, that he has been impelled out of sheer benevolence to make effort to arouse those of us who are still lying under the spell of their soothing sophisms from our "dogmatic slumbers." He tells us that "the serious question is whether theological men of science, or theological special pleaders, are to have the confidence of the general public," implying, of course, that he and all who agree with him are theological men of science, and all who think with us are theological special pleaders. What, I think, strikes one, in reading his rejoinder to Dr. Wace, is the boldness of his assertion rather than the reasonableness of his argument. His article savours too strongly of complacency. We do not seriously complain of that. If Mr. Huxley thinks that all the wisdom is with him, he is welcome, so far as we are concerned, to whatever amount of satisfaction he may derive from the reflection. But if he imagines that our faith in his powers is likely to be measured by his own estimate of their value, then I am afraid his expectations will hardly be realized.

With a view to obtaining as much benefit as may be derived from a study of the "scientific" methods of our Agnostic opponent, let us examine that part of his argument which affects to supply us with what he terms "the key to the comprehension of the problem of the origin of that which is now called Christianity." He essays to prove to us, with the aid of witnesses whose testimony will be received as unimpeachable by both sides, that that

which was matter of faith in the middle of the first century had developed into something quite different by the middle of the second; and has still further expanded or contracted in the intervening time, until it has assumed the features and the proportions of modern orthodoxy. The overwhelming influence of St. Paul transformed the creed of St. Peter and St. James; the more enlightened Justin improved slightly upon St. Paul; whilst modern Christianity is something different to both or all three of the primitive modes of faith.

He tells us that

By far the most important and subsequently influential steps in the evolution of Christianity took place in the course of the century, more or less, which followed upon the Crucifixion.

It is almost the darkest period of Church history, but most fortunately the beginning and end of the period are brightly illuminated by the contemporary evidence of two writers of whose historical existence there is no doubt, and against the genuineness of whose most important works there is no widely admitted objection. These are Justin, the philosopher and martyr, and Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles.

It is true we had supposed that the problem had been solved long enough ago; that the fact of a resurrection life had been demonstrated by its power; that the reality of the existence of a living Saviour had been attested as well by the experience of released, redeemed, and regenerate men, as by the sure and certain witness of the written Word.

He tells us that all the while we have been labouring under a most unfortunate mistake. The founder of our faith and all His followers have been under the influence of a powerful illusion. It is the Professor's mission to undo the spell, to liberate our consciences, and to enlighten our beclouded intellects. The resources of science can show us something better than that which is merely the product of the historical "want of sense and the dogmatic tendencies" of the compilers and editors of our so-called sacred records, and will conduct us by a more approved method to the goal of a refined and beneficent Agnosticism.

Let us see what he makes of the testimony. He takes Justin first, and he uses him to prove what was the state of opinion with regard to Christianity somewhere about the year 140 A.D. He tells us that Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, enumerates certain categories of persons who in his opinion will or will not be saved. They are:

1. Orthodox Jews who refuse to believe that Jesus is the Christ. *Not saved.*
2. Jews who observe the Law, believe Jesus to be the Christ, but who insist on the observance of the Law by Gentile converts. *Not saved.*
3. Jews who observe the Law, believe Jesus to be the Christ,

and hold that Gentile converts need not observe the Law. *Saved* [in Justin's opinion; but some of his fellow-Christians think the contrary].

4. Gentile converts to the belief that Jesus is the Christ, who observe the Law. *Saved* [possibly].

5. Gentile believers in Jesus as the Christ, who do not observe the Law themselves [except so far as the refusal of idol sacrifices], but do not consider those who do observe it as heretics. *Saved* [this is Justin's own view].

6. Gentile believers who do not observe the Law except in refusing idol sacrifices, and hold those who do observe it to be heretics. *Saved*.

7. Gentiles who believe Jesus to be the Christ and call themselves Christians, but who eat meat sacrificed to idols. *Not saved*.

8. Gentiles who disbelieve in Jesus as the Christ. *Not saved*.

There is a foot-note appended to the page which contains this enumeration, in which we are informed that "it is to be understood that Justin does not arrange these categories as I have done."

Having thus set forth what he affirms to be eight categorical statements of Justin, he forthwith proceeds to manipulate them for his own ends. For the present we will leave his conclusions, and examine his categories. I do not know whether the Huxleian method demands that authorities should be themselves consulted, or whether it has permitted the Professor to accept his information at second-hand; but it is almost inconceivable that anyone who had read Justin could so express the statements contained in 5 and 6 of his categories. In the first place, Justin makes no categorical statement in these respects at all. They are simply Mr. Huxley's own deductions from what he assumes that Justin intended to say in the course of his argument. In the second place, these deductions are wrongly made and improperly stated.

Now let us see exactly what Justin does say. In the course of his argument with Trypho two important questions arise at different points. The first is dealt with in chapter xxxv. At the end of the preceding chapter, in order to prove that a certain prophecy relates, not (as the Jews supposed) to Solomon, but to Jesus Christ, he points out that Solomon's behaviour forbids any such interpretation, for to please his wife he committed idolatry at Sidon; and he adds, by way of contrast, that the Gentiles who through Jesus have attained to the knowledge of God "endure not to do this, but rather undergo every torture and punishment, even to death, than commit idolatry or eat of idol sacrifices." To this Trypho at once rejoins (chapter xxxv.)

that there are many who "affirm themselves to confess Jesus, and who are called Christians, but who eat of idol sacrifices, and maintain that there is no harm in so doing." To this Justin replies (and we shall have something more to say about this later on) that

Even from the fact of there being such men who affirm themselves to be Christians, and confess the Jesus who was crucified to be both Lord and Christ, yet who *teach not His doctrines, but those which proceed from the spirit of falsehood*; we, who are the disciples of the true and pure teaching of Jesus Christ, are made both more rooted in the faith, and more firm in the hope which we have received from Him; for the events which He foretold as about to come to pass in His name we see to be actually fulfilled. For He said, "Many shall come," etc. . . .

There both are, and have been, oh my friends, many who have come and taught men to speak and act *atheistically and blasphemously* in the name of Jesus; and they are *known amongst us by the name of those from whom the doctrine and opinion of each of them first arose*; for each has his own way of teaching how to blaspheme the Creator of all things, and the Christ who was foretold by Him as about to come, and the God of Abraham, and of Isaac and of Jacob. With none of these do we hold communion, knowing them to be atheistical, irreverent, unjust, and lawless, who instead of worshipping Jesus confess Him only in name; and these call themselves Christians in the same manner as that in which the Gentiles inscribe the name of God upon their images, and are partakers of unlawful *and atheistical rites*; of these some are called Marcionites, some Valentinians, some Basilidians, and some Saturnilians.

I have quoted the passage at some length in order to show more clearly than I could have done by a short extract what was in Justin's mind.

It would perhaps, on the strength of this, be too much to charge our opponent with positive misrepresentation; but it is evident that his category will have to be considerably modified to bring it into accordance with Justin's real views. The instances quoted by the Apologist, and his language throughout the passage, show that the case is essentially different from that dealt with by St. Paul. The latter was purely a question of conscience; here the practice complained of is a part of a formulated system, or rather of formulated systems.

Later on in the dialogue another problem is propounded by Trypho (chap. xlvi.). He says to Justin:

Suppose anyone even now wishes to live in the observance of the law of Moses, and yet believe on Jesus who was crucified, and acknowledge that He is the Christ of God to whom it is given to judge all men universally, and whose is the everlasting kingdom; can he be saved?

It was a not unnatural question for a Jew to put, and Justin is particularly careful about his answer. He does not reply directly, nor at once. He shows, first of all, that since the destruction of the Temple there are certain of the Mosaic ordinances which the Jews cannot obey, however much they desire to do so; as, for instance, the sacrifice of the paschal

lamb, the offering of the goats on the day of atonement, nor any of the sacrifices. Then he points out that all Abraham's descendants who lived between that patriarch and Moses kept none of those observances which were of the latter's ordering; and urges finally upon Trypho that

For the hardness of your hearts God gave you all such commandments by Moses that you might by these numerous ordinances in every act have Him before your eyes, and not begin to act either unjustly or impiously. . . . We know that the commandments which were given you on account of your people's hardness of heart do in no wise conduce to righteousness or to holiness.

Thus pressed by Justin, Trypho puts his question in another way. He asks :

Suppose anyone (any Jew, that is) has gained a knowledge that these things are so, and besides holding for certain that this is the Christ, has in fact both believed in and obeyed Him, yet *wishes to keep* these ordinances as well; shall he be saved?

To this Justin says in his opinion he will, if he do not insist on the Gentiles keeping them also. Trypho then shrewdly says :

Why do you say "in my opinion" . . . Are there any then who hold the contrary?

Justin's answer is to the effect that there are some believers who think that all Jewish converts should give up Mosaic ordinances, and "who are bold enough to refuse to hold communion, either in conversation or domestic life, with men of this description;" but he says he does not agree with them.

But if any through weakness of judgment wish to keep as many of these ordinances of the Mosaic law as possible . . . and choose to live with those who are Christians, and faithful, as I said, without persuading them to be circumcised like themselves or to keep the Sabbaths and other similar observances, I consider that we ought to receive them, etc.

I take it that this answer of Justin's is Mr. Huxley's ground for his categories 5 and 6. But it will be seen at once that Justin is not referring particularly to Gentile, but to orthodox opinion. Believers generally were divided in opinion as to how weaker brethren amongst the Jewish converts should be treated. Justin and the Church generally apparently inclined to leniency; but *there were some* who were *bold enough* to treat them with great severity.

There is absolutely nothing in this passage or its context to show that the Professor's inference that Justin is referring exclusively to Gentile in contradistinction to Jewish opinion is correct.

For the purpose of his argument, and in order to accentuate his assumption of a considerable shifting of the centre of gravity of orthodoxy, he ignores the notion of a great central body of orthodox believers consisting of Gentile and Jewish converts, or the descendants of Gentile and Jewish converts alike. So

he quietly allots all believers in Jesus to one of the extreme sections into which, by a simple process of begging the question, he assumes Christians to be more or less sharply divided. I do not know on what scientific principle he makes his deduction. As a matter of fact, the words of Justin require us to believe that the great body of Jewish converts and the descendants of Jewish converts were at one in creed and practice with their Gentile brethren; and that it was only in the exceptional case put by Trypho that any difference of orthodox opinion on the subject of this relationship could arise.

For his opponent's further edification Justin then goes on to discuss other cases of relationship which are suggested by Trypho's question, and expresses his opinion that if those Jewish converts, who prefer to observe Mosaic ordinances themselves, carry their prejudices so far as to induce Gentiles to be circumcised, and to observe them in like manner, they cannot be saved; but he adds that Gentiles who after accepting Christ have been persuaded to adopt the observance of the Mosaic Law may possibly be saved; and, to make his argument complete, he appends as corollaries two positive statements to the effect that Christians (whether of Jewish or Gentile origin he does not specify) who apostatize to pure Judaism, denying Christ (especially those who curse both Him and every means by which they may obtain salvation and escape the punishment by fire), cannot be saved.

I have quoted Justin somewhat more largely than I should otherwise care to have done, because he is not easily accessible to the ordinary reader. Our quotations, however, do not quite include all the cases cited by Mr. Huxley. He states baldly that Justin's belief was that all the Gentile heathen who are not Christians are alike unsaved. It is not a matter of very great importance as affecting the question under discussion; but it is worth noting that Justin's views on this point were precisely those of the Apostle St. Paul as set forth by him in his Epistle to the Romans. He says in the "Apology" (chap. xlvi.):

We are taught that Christ is the first-born of God, and we have shown above that He is the Word of whom the whole human race are partakers, and those who lived according to reason are Christians even though accounted Atheists. Such among the Gentiles were Socrates and Heraclitus, and those who resembled them.

So it would seem that Justin made a distinction between those Gentiles who lived sensuous, carnal and immoral lives, and those who, "without Law, did by nature the things contained in the Law."

It will be seen, then, that Justin's categories are something essentially different from those enumerated by Mr. Huxley, To put the matter exactly, they are as follows:

1. *Jews or Judaists*, consisting of :
 - a. Christians (Jews or Gentiles) who have apostatized to Judaism, denying Christ.
 - b. Jews who refuse to accept Christ, especially those who curse Him.
2. *Judæo Christians*, consisting of :
 - a. Those who, accepting Christ as Messiah, insist on Gentile converts keeping the Law.
 - b. Those who wish to retain the Mosaic ordinances ; but who have gained a knowledge that these things are of no account in themselves, and so do not insist on the Gentiles observing them also.
3. *Orthodox Christians*, holding different opinions as to the salvability of the class last enumerated :
 - a. The main body who hold that there is no necessity for all Jewish converts to give up Mosaic ordinances.
 - b. A bold faction, who decline to hold communion with those Jewish converts who still cling to their early prejudices.
4. *Gentile Christians*, consisting of :
 - a. Gentiles who have accepted Christ, and still believing in Him, have been persuaded to adopt Mosaic ordinances.
 - b. Gentiles who, together with a profession of faith in Christ, still observe certain idolatrous practices and partake of idol sacrifices ; such as the followers of the heretical sects of the Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians, and Saturnilians.
5. *Gentiles* who do not believe in Christ, consisting of :
 - a. Gentiles who reject Jesus, or who, not knowing Him, are living immoral lives.
 - b. Gentiles who, not knowing Christ, yet lived according to reason ; as, *e.g.*, Socrates and Heraclitus.

It is not necessary to deal very seriously with Professor Huxley's baseless assertion that Justin regards Jesus—the Logos—"to be a second God, inferior to the first unknowable God, with respect to whom Justin, like Philo, is a complete Agnostic." The error is so monstrous as to be positively grotesque. Anyone who has studied Justin knows how repeatedly he affirms Christ to be God—the Son of God, first begotten of the Father, pre-existing before all ages, revealing the Father, put forth from Him "as fire is lit from fire," and being of His substance (*ὁὐσίας*).

The divinity of Jesus is set forth by him almost in the words of the Creeds recited by all Christians in every branch of the Catholic Church to-day. As Petavius puts it :

What can be added to this (Justin's) profession of faith,¹ and of the Trinity? or what has been set forth more express, more significant, or more effectual in the assembly of Fathers at Nice or after it? For the formula which was there settled, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God," was anticipated so long before by the sentiment of Justin, from which the consubstantiality also is established—that is, the communion and identity of substance without any partition.

But to return to our categories. Let us arrange them after Mr. Huxley's fashion, though with more regard for actual facts than he has shown. We obtain then a series thus:

JUSTIN'S EXTENSION.				
1	2	3	4	5
JUDAISM.	JUDÆO CHRISTIANITY.	ORTHODOXY.	GENTILE CHRISTIANITY.	PAGAN.
a. b.	a.	b. ²	a. b.	a. b. ³

Turn we now to our other witness—St. Paul, who is summoned by Mr. Huxley to prove that the main body of Christians in his day was altogether opposed to his way of thinking. The assumption is that believers were split into two hostile camps, of which St. Paul was the leader of the minority in opposition. He asserts that, just before the middle of the first century, the party of St. James, St. Peter, and St. John, and their followers constituted the whole church founded by Jesus and the Apostles; whereas, in the time of Justin, the party which represented their views, although tolerated, was considered unorthodox; whilst in our own days the holders of such views would be regarded as "damnable heretics."

We shall certainly not be disposed to disagree with him in his estimate of the critical value of the testimony of the Epistle to

¹ Dialogue 61: "As we see one fire kindled from another without that from which it is kindled being diminished, which in fact continues the same, whilst that which is kindled from it does really exist and shine with no diminution of that from which it is kindled."

² Regarded as orthodox by main body of believers.

³ As I have already hinted, I do not think that we are in a position to say exactly what Justin's opinion was as to the eating of meat offered to idols viewed absolutely as a question *per se*. The point is not so submitted to him; at any rate, he does not so deal with it. He limits his position by defining his objection as relating to certain "atheistical" sects which he specifies by name, of which the conscious partaking of idol sacrifices was only part of an idolatrous system. St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 21) speaks quite as strongly as Justin: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be a partaker of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." St. Paul saw the danger, and forbade the practice of the conscious partaking of meat offered to idols. With him the matter is regarded generally as one of expediency, and so he expressly declares it to be (ver. 23). In this, as in other, similar matters, the principle to apply is, "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God . . . that all may be saved" (ver. 32, 33).

⁴ Mercifully dealt with according to Justin,

the Galatians. It is in the interpretation that he puts upon the evidence that his "scientific" method leads him so far astray. This Epistle, he says, reveals

a bitter quarrel, in his account of which Paul by no means minces matters, or hesitates to hurl defiant sarcasms against those who were reputed to be pillars ;

and further, that

there is but one conclusion to be drawn from Paul's account of this famous dispute. . . . It is that the disciples at Jerusalem, headed by James, our Lord's brother, and by the leading Apostles, Peter and John, were strict Jews, who objected to admit any converts to their body unless these, either by birth or by becoming proselytes, were also strict Jews.

It is almost inconceivable that anyone, with pretensions to common-sense, even without the possession of a supposed gift of intellectual pre-eminence, should so misread or misrepresent plain statements of fact. There is not only no evidence whatever of the defiant sarcasm of which the Professor speaks, but it is clear St. Paul wishes to make it plain that the most complete unanimity on the disputed points existed between himself and those whom he refers to as "pillars," and "persons of reputation." It is true that once, parenthetically, he disclaims his intention of basing his argument on the mere fact of the reputation of those whom he quotes in support of it; for, says he, "God accepts no man's person"; and, however high may be the estimation in which his correspondents may hold his authorities, his appeal is not finally to them, but to the revealed will of God. Yet, for his present purpose of convincing the Galatians of their folly, he tells them that the very men, whose names had been so freely misused by the "false brethren crept in unawares," had nothing whatever to add by way of correction, or limitation to the Gospel which he preached. On the contrary, when his doctrine and practice had been fully explained to them, they had given to himself and to Barnabas the right hand of fellowship.

St. Paul states that on his arrival at Jerusalem, on the occasion referred to, he at once privately communicated the substance of his preaching to Peter and James and John, "lest by any means I should run, or had run in vain." [It must have been very difficult for the Professor to reconcile this statement with the defiant sarcasm theory.] He tells us, moreover, what was the practical outcome of that, and of his more public declarations. The authorities at Jerusalem entirely agreed with him. They added nothing (*οὐδὲν προσανέθευον*) to that which he communicated (*ἀνεθέμην*). They gave to him the right hand of fellowship. And, as substantial evidence of the agreement between them, the Apostle mentions the very remarkable fact that Titus, who was with him at the time, being a Gentile, was not compelled by them to be circumcised.

We are far from contending that in these early days there was no crux. The bare historical fact that the Gospel emanated from, and was first preached to so prejudiced a people as the Jews, is sufficient evidence of the difficulties with which its earliest promoters had to contend.

But every scrap of testimony that can be adduced on the subject of the relation that subsisted between Jewish and Gentile believers in Jesus goes to show, that the authorities on both sides—the chief pastors of the Jewish and Gentile sections alike—were in perfect agreement as to the methods to be pursued; and that the principles of the Gospel were so thoroughly apprehended by them, that they were enabled to overcome, though not without difficulty, the obstacles imposed by selfish and bigoted factions.

The fact is, that in St. Paul's days, the Church had not been sufficiently long established to enable the formation of a central orthodox body, consisting indifferently of Jewish and Gentile converts, observing identically the same ritual practices. The most that could be hoped for was a hearty confederation—a concession, on the part of Jewish believers, to the non-necessity of ordinances, which, so far, had differentiated them from all other nations on the face of the earth—and an allowance on the part of Gentile converts for prejudices in favour of habits, which centuries of use had led their Jewish brethren to regard as second nature.

It must be borne in mind, in connection with St. Paul's statement to the Galatians, that "if they were circumcised, Christ should profit them nothing," that he was contending on their behalf, not with the views held by the Apostles at Jerusalem, but with the mischievous dogma laid down by the "false brethren crept in unawares." How far that statement of his would have been modified under other circumstances may be gathered from his conduct in another place. On the occasion of a visit to Lystra and Derbe, where the peace of the Christian community was not as yet disturbed by false brethren, he came across a young Jewish convert named Timothy, whom he wished to associate with himself in the work of preaching. His father being a Gentile (although his mother was a Jewess), he had not yet been circumcised. That he might have more influence with the Jews who resided in those parts, St. Paul took and circumcised him, on the principle, which he enunciates in another epistle, that "he might give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God."

With regard to the incident narrated in the Acts (xxi. 20-26), of which Mr. Huxley makes so much, it may be sufficient to observe generally that St. Paul's conduct, as it is exhibited in his epistles and in the narrative of St. Luke, is

consistent throughout. It is based absolutely on the principles enunciated by the president of the conferences at Jerusalem. Gentiles are permitted to dispense with the observance of Jewish ordinances. Jews are permitted to keep them. To the Jews at Jerusalem he becomes a Jew. To the Gentiles in Galatia he becomes a Gentile.¹ But the aim which he keeps steadily in front of him all through is this—that he may win all, over whom he is able to exert any influence, whether Jew or Gentile, to faith in the Saviour—the Son of God—who is to all alike the power of God and the wisdom of God.

Let us now point out, with a view to comparison with results already obtained from a critical investigation of Justin's evidence, what was the state of belief in the early Church, as it is revealed in the evidence of witnesses, whom Mr. Huxley himself acknowledges to be worthy of credence. Categorically stated as before, the results are as follows:

Society in apostolic days was composed of:

1. *Jews*, who rejected Jesus as the Messiah.
2. *Judæo Christians*, consisting of:
 - a. Jews who accepted Jesus as Messiah, but who insisted on Gentile converts being circumcised. These are the "false brethren crept in unawares."
 - b. Jews who accepted Jesus as the Messiah, retained Mosaic ordinances, yet did not insist on Gentile converts observing them. These are the orthodox body of Jewish converts.
3. *Gentile Christians*, consisting of:
 - a. Gentiles who refused to eat meats sacrificed to idols. These are the main body of orthodox Gentile converts.
 - b. Gentiles who ate meats sacrificed to idols (excused under certain conditions).
 - c. Gentiles who were persuaded to be circumcised and observe Mosaic ordinances (blamed under certain conditions).
4. *Gentiles*, consisting of:
 - a. Gentiles who reject Christ.
 - b. Gentiles who, unacquainted with God's revealed will, do by nature the things of the law.

Expressing these in a series as before we obtain:

¹ St. Paul's rule, which he says he "ordained in all the churches," was this: "Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God" (1 Cor. vii. 18, 19).

ORTHODOX, ¹					
1	2		3	4	
JEWS.	JUDEO	CHRISTIANS.	GENTILE	CHRISTIANS.	GENTILES.
Rejecting Jesus.	a.	b.	a. b.	c.	a. b. ²

It will be seen, then, that the orthodox view at the close of the period indicated by Mr. Huxley is, in effect, precisely the same as that held by the responsible heads of the Church at its commencement. The sole difference is the apparent exclusion by St. Paul from hope of salvation of Gentile converts persuaded to be circumcised, and to keep the Mosaic ordinances. But even this must be qualified by a consideration of the special circumstances under which he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, as well as by his conduct in the case of the circumcision of Timothy, whose father was a Gentile, although his mother was a Jewess.

The conditions under which we are now privileged to live render comparison somewhat difficult; but writing as, I hope, an orthodox believer of the present day, I do not hesitate to say that the views of St. Paul and of Justin on the points enumerated above would, if the questions were seriously raised, be held by the vast majority of thoughtful believers to-day. It is probably quite true that an English missionary would not trouble himself whether the materials of his dinner had been previously offered to idols or not; but, for all that, under certain circumstances, it might, as a matter of expediency, be necessary for him to insist on heathen converts abstaining from such participation. On the other hand, I doubt if any clergyman would deem the observances of Mosaic ordinances by a Jewish convert an insuperable bar to salvation, provided that he believed in Jesus as a Saviour in the New Testament sense, as the only Saviour from sin; accepted baptism in the name of the Trinity, as the sign of the New Covenant inaugurated by Jesus; and the Holy Communion, as the divinely appointed means of commemorating and being made a partaker of the one only Sacrifice by which the Lamb of God took away the sin of the world.

In fact, if we compare modern views with each of the series set forth above, we should discover that they included in the categories of those in the "way of salvation" all so included both by the early Church and by Justin; whilst they would as certainly exclude all that are there positively excluded.

Be that, however, as it may. We are not so much concerned with conclusions as with methods. What we complain of is the manner in which Professor Huxley deals with the evidence. There can be no objection whatever to the application of the

¹ Orthodoxy arrived at by convention.

² Mercifully dealt with according to St. Paul.]

most rigidly scientific methods in the examination of testimony. But it is not scientific to try and make it square with preconceived views; to misquote or to misrepresent authorities; and to suppress passages which modify, elucidate, or explain excerpts, which, in an English translation, appear *prima facie* to give some sort of colour to Agnostic perversions of truth.

WILLIAM KERR-SMITH.

ART. IV.—THE LANGUAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART II.

BEFORE discussing the languages *written* by the Apostles and the Evangelists, which will form Part III. of this series, it will help the reader, desirous to obtain a full grasp of the subject, if we cast a glance back on the annals of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, and mark the contact which Abraham and his descendants had with individuals and nations speaking other languages. It is one of the most remarkable evidences of the *absolute* truthfulness and genuineness of the Old Testament Record, that no modern philological or palæographical discovery shakes the credibility of the record, if erroneous conceptions, based upon imperfect knowledge of linguistic phenomena, are removed, and the subject is regarded in the same spirit, and from the same point of view, that other records of antiquity are examined. The reader must bear in mind that I write, not as a theologian (for which I have no capacity), but as a linguist. I accept, as an undoubted fact, the inspiration of the contents of the books of the Old Testament. My remarks apply solely to the linguistic vehicle of words and sentences, and forms of written character.

A Syrian (Abraham), 1921 B.C., crossed from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan. He spoke Aramaic; he came into contact with kindred Semitic tribes, who inhabited the land. He was aged seventy, and not likely to change his language; he was accompanied by his wife Sara and his brother's son, and the large number of upwards of 300 purchased, or home-bred slaves. He went down into Egypt, at that time ruled over by a powerful dynasty, and the documents of stone and papyrus certify that the language was totally different from Hebrew or Aramaic, being Hamitic. Pharaoh is described as conversing with Abraham, presumably through interpreters; the words of the conversation are given in Hebrew. Canaan was invaded by Chederlaomer, who spoke a totally different and Altaic language; but no conversations are recorded. In Melchisedek we have a Semite beyond doubt, as, if anyone wished to

express the idea of a King of Righteousness, he would use those very words to this day in Arabia, Persia, and India. The King of Sodom conversed with Abraham; we may presume that he also was a Semite. Hagar was an Egyptian girl, who had probably accompanied Sara from Egypt, and adopted the language of her mistress, but her son Ishmael married an Egyptian, and adopted some early form of the Arabic language, which his descendants speak to this day. Rebecca came to Isaac from Aram, speaking the language of her country. Their son Jacob, at the age of seventy-seven, went across the Euphrates, and married four Aramean wives, and his father-in-law is described as "the Syrian." The language had even then differentiated, for when Jacob and Laban raised a heap of stones, Laban called it *Jegar-sahadutha*, and Jacob "Galid." The word used by Laban for "witness" is still used in a kindred form in Persia, and India, and Arabia, "shahid," as a "witness and a martyr to the faith." The whole of Jacob's large family must have spoken the language of their respective mothers, when they returned to Canaan, and with the exception of Joseph they found wives among the people of the land. The Hebrew language thus began to form itself. The Ishmaelites from Gilead, to whom the sons of Jacob sold Joseph, were, if descendants of Ishmael, their own first cousins. They are called also Midianites, but if descendants of Ketura, they stood in the same relationship, and probably spoke mutually intelligible languages. But Joseph, when he arrived in Egypt, had to learn an entirely new language, and he did so, for it is particularly mentioned, that he spoke to his brethren through an interpreter. He had married an Egyptian wife, and his children were certainly bilingual. The descendants of Jacob dwelt a long time in Egypt, and during that period, free from all Aramaic influences, and singularly free from Egyptian taint, the Hebrew language acquired the form, which is known to us. Still, they must have acquired some knowledge of Egyptian, as at any rate they could understand the orders of their taskmasters, and they were able to borrow gold and silver and raiment from their Egyptian neighbours.

Moses was brought up in Pharaoh's daughter's house, as her son, and an Egyptian. He was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; if he had picked up Hebrew from his nurse, it was his second, or alternative, language. At the age of forty he fled to Arabia, and was introduced to Jethro, as an Egyptian, probably from the style of his dress, or his language. He spent forty years in the desert, speaking the language of the Midianites, whatever that was. At the age of eighty he led the Hebrews out of Egypt, 1491 B.C., and, for the first time in his life, lived in familiar intercourse with his relations, using the Hebrew language. Forty years more he spent in the desert in

their midst, having his wife and her relatives with him: his children must have been bilingual, while he himself was trilingual. In his old age he married a Cushite (Ethiopian) woman, who must have spoken a Hamitic language, akin to Egyptian. A few words, and some proper names, in Exodus record his knowledge of the Egyptian language. But he was chosen to be the historian of his people, and must have collected the traditions, and teledoth, of his ancestors from the graybeards and recorded them in the language then used by the Hebrew people. The grave question now arises, What written character did he use? The Hieroglyphic, and Hieratic, characters were both in existence, and must have been known to Moses, who was a learned man; on the other hand, no allusion to the art of writing occurs in the Book of Genesis. We find the letters K T B applied to writing then, and they have the same meaning in Arabia, Persia, and India to this day. The oldest record of the Phœnician alphabet, which was the one used by the Hebrews, dates 900 B.C., or 600 after the Exodus. There is little doubt, that the Phœnicians derived their famous alphabet, the mother of all the alphabets in the world, from the Hieratic ideographs of Egypt; but with our present limited information we cannot explain, how Moses, with his antecedents of forty years in Egypt, and forty years in the desert, became acquainted with it. No document of stone or papyri, so abundant in Egypt, has survived as evidence. It is most unfortunate, that, while the surrounding nations, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, the Moabites, the Phœnicians, and the Hittites, have all left stone inscriptions, the Hebrews were at no period of their history a monumental people. It need scarcely be said that all manuscripts have perished: the oldest Hebrew MS. in existence is not earlier than 800 A.D. Still, in this age of wonderful discoveries, we may anticipate the production of earlier stone monuments, and must hesitate before we arrive at final opinions.

It has often been wondered, how the Hebrew language, from 1451 B.C., the date of the death of Moses, to 500 B.C., the time of Ezra, exhibits no material change, such as would be expected in the lapse of one thousand years. How different is the language of the age of King Alfred from that of Queen Victoria! It is supposed that, as time went on, the Hebrew language, as known to us, stiffened into a written language (an instance of which process we have to this day in Latin), while the vernacular underwent gradual changes from century to century; at any rate, Ezra and Daniel commenced their books in Hebrew, and ended them in Aramaic. Such books as the Kings and Chronicles were compiled from contemporary documents.

Returning to the time of Moses, to consider the vernacular spoken, it is clear, that Balaam and Balak could not have been

acquainted with the Hebrew language, and yet the gleaming words of the former reach us in that vesture. From a linguistic point of view the Book of Job has no interest, as, admittedly, it is a beautiful dramatic poem, such as Milton's "Paradise Lost." When the spies entered Jericho, they were kindly treated, though in secret, by Rahab: there could have been no interpreter there. Women in the East are not often bilingual. The spies had been forty years in the desert, and their ancestors centuries in Egypt; yet somehow or other they held communications with a Canaanitish woman. Soon after the occupation of Canaan, we find a divergence of pronunciation betwixt the dwellers on east side of Jordan, betraying the residence of the speaker, in the Shibboleth story. Ruth the Moabitess could hardly have acquired Hebrew, living among her own people; it is more probable, that Naomi acquired the Moabite language. In that case, the beautiful expression of love to her mother-in-law is only a translation from Moabite; but the words are as musical in English, the second translation, as they are in Hebrew, the first. It is a matter of uncertainty, who the Philistines were, but they could scarcely have been Semites: they were probably from Egypt. It is obvious that Delilah did not speak to Samson in Hebrew; and when the giant Goliath taunted David, a mere shepherd lad, he could hardly have used Hebrew, as he treated the whole nation with scorn, and swore by his own gods; and no interpreter was possible on such an occasion, but David understood the drift of his boasting threats, and answered him. Among David's servants was Uriah the Hittite; this language is still an unrevealed secret, but it was not Hebrew. It is probable that, as a mercenary soldier, he knew Hebrew, and he married a Hebrew woman. With Hiram, King of Tyre, David contracted a friendship, and the Phœnician language, being closely allied to the Hebrew, was no doubt mutually intelligible. With Solomon we find an Egyptian wife, followed by Egyptian-speaking attendants, settled at Jerusalem. And to Solomon came the Queen of Sheba from the uttermost parts of the earth, as One, who cannot err, tells us; and, if the map of the known world of that period is examined, it is literally true; but we have no hint as to the language she spoke, and by what means she conversed with King Solomon. And the memorable words, uttered by her, could not have been spoken by her in Hebrew. Jeroboam, the first King of Israel, had been a sojourner in Egypt, and Shiskak, king of that country, came and plundered Jerusalem in the time of Rehoboam. If we are to believe the Egyptian Chronicles, these invasions were frequent; and the Egyptian language must have been known to individuals. Ahab, King of Israel, married Jezebel, daughter of the King of Tyre, speaking the Phœnician language: she was

accompanied by the priests of Baal. The cries of these priests to their gods on Mount Carmel must have been in Phœnician; and the language of Elijah, "the Tishbi," from Gilead, east of the Jordan, must have been something different from Hebrew, probably Aramaic. According to the universal practice of all Oriental chroniclers all the sayings, both of Elijah and the priests, are recorded in the conventional Hebrew of the Book of Kings. When we come to reflect upon the language spoken by Jezebel, we have to face new phenomena. She was the daughter of Ethbaal, King of Tyre, and priest of Astarte: of the same family, in the next generation, came Belus and Dido, also called Elissa, who founded Carthage. We have to thank these two women for the names of Isabel and Elisa. We know what the Phœnician language was from inscriptions, such as that on the sarcophagus of Esmunazar in the Gallery of the Louvre. If anyone were to doubt, that Carthage was a Phœnician colony, the stones with Punic inscriptions would cry out to correct him. Some such language was spoken by Jezebel and her followers; and it was not Hebrew. Athaliah, her daughter, probably took it with her to Jerusalem. The discovery of the Moabite Stone has revealed to us the language of Moab; it is the oldest specimen of alphabet-writing in the world, 900 B.C.: and it records the defeat of King Ahab by the King of Moab. In the time of Elisha we find the conversations of the King of Syria at Damascus, and Naaman the Syrian, and a letter to the King of Israel, all in Hebrew, as if textually quoted; but we feel instinctively, that the language of the Hebrews could not have been used by these speakers, whose vernacular was Aramaic.

The prophet Isaiah wrote about 750 B.C. In chapter xix., verse 18, he writes: "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan," or, in other words, the Jewish settlers in Egypt shall speak the language once spoken by the Canaanites, but "which" (to quote the Speaker's Commentary) "had been sanctified by being employed as the vehicle for the commemoration of God's purposes to mankind, and was called Hebrew."

The power of Assyria, with its capital Nineveh, on the Tigris, began now to be known; and in the reign of Hezekiah Jerusalem was besieged, about 725 B.C. We find the servants of Hezekiah upon the walls of the beleaguered town, beseeching Rabshakeh not to speak in the Jews' language, or Hebrew, but in Aramaic, the language of Damascus, in order that the common people might not understand his words. The language of Assyria itself has now been revealed by inscriptions as Semitic, but distinct from both the above. Then came the captivity at Babylon, 588 B.C., and the Jews had to listen to another

Semitic language, the Babylonian, of which we have ample information from cuneiform inscriptions; and the Hebrew language, which had been formed during the captivity in Egypt, received its death-stroke during the captivity at Babylon. Here, however, they were destined to come into contact with a new people, speaking an Aryan language, the Persian. One word of that language had crept into the Song of Solomon, "pardes," which has become one of the notable words of the Eastern and Western worlds as "fardus," or "Paradise." The Persian is one of the most illustrious of the Aryan languages, as it passed from Zend into Pahlavi, and from Pahlavi into Persian. If on the one hand it was strengthened by contact with, and absorption of, Semitic elements from the Arabic, on the other hand it has, from its own resources, lent strength to the Aryan Hindustani, and the Altaic Turki. It stands by the side of the English as one of the two Aryan languages, which have had the strength in themselves to free themselves from the tyranny of inflections and grammatical gender. We know the language, in which Cyrus and Darius spoke to Daniel from the inscriptions upon Cyrus's tomb at Persepolis, and the stately tablets of Darius's inscriptions at Behistun.

The remnant of the Jews returned, under Zerubbabel, to Jerusalem in 536 B.C. The prophets Haggai, Malachi, and Zachariah still wrote the conventional Hebrew. Artaxerxes, 467 B.C., sent Ezra to Jerusalem: his book commences in Hebrew and ends in Aramaic. In 445 B.C., Nehemiah arrived at Jerusalem. His book lets side-lights in upon the language spoken by the people he saw. "Jews apparently at Jerusalem, who had married wives of Ashdod (Philistines), of Ammon and Moab, and their children spoke half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the language of the Jews, but according to the language of each people." Daniel had commenced his book in the Hebrew, and finished it in the Aramaic language. The teaching of the prophets had ceased: the Hebrew language was no longer spoken. Like Sanscrit and Latin, it had done its great work, and died away. In the Book of Esther, of the same period, we read of the one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, to the inhabitants of each of which the great King wrote *according to their writing and their language*, from India in Further Asia to Ethiopia in Africa. All have passed away, language and written character, save Hebrew and Greek, for to them were committed the oracles of God. As time went on, the Jewish nation had to receive its orders in Greek, and then in Latin, and under the fiat of the latter ceased itself to exist, A.D. 70; for the nation, also, had completed the task which was given it to do, when Abraham was called two thousand years before.

In Part I. I stated that it was not the *same* Aramaic which was spoken by Abraham, and by our Lord, but it was *similar*. This cannot be brought home more strongly than by considering in a reverential spirit what is told us with regard to the Transfiguration. St. Luke tells us, on the authority of Peter and John and James, who were eye-witnesses, that Moses and Elijah talked with our Lord, and spake of His decease, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. Now the epoch, at which Moses lived, is distant from that of Elijah by the interval of five centuries, and that of Elijah from that of our Lord by an interval of nine centuries. The Apostles heard with their ears and comprehended with their understanding the solemn purport of the words uttered by each speaker, all of whom used the Aramaic language. But we cannot shut our eyes to the great fact that, judging human phenomena in the ordinary way, the form of Aramaic words and sentences used by Moses must have differed materially from that of Elijah, and that of Elijah from that of our Lord, and the Apostles, who understood them. It is difficult to suggest a solution.

One word on the subject of "bilingual" individuals and populations. In the new Oxford English Dictionary it is interpreted as speaking, reading or writing, in two languages, but in linguistic works it has a narrower sense. Every young girl who learns French in the schoolroom, and boy, who learns Latin at school, is, according to the Dictionary, "bilingual." Every inscription with the text translated into a second language is bilingual. But, when a traveller reports that the uneducated inhabitants of an island, or region, are bilingual, or in a linguistic work we read that a belt of country is occupied by a *bilingual* population, something very different is intended to be implied. It means that the men, women and children, without receiving instruction, but under the influence of the circumstances which surround them, unconsciously get into the habit of speaking (not necessarily writing or reading) two languages. In Switzerland, overlapped by their great French, Italian, and German neighbours, nearly every one is bilingual. On the borders of England and Wales we find the same phenomenon. In large belts of country in British India, which lie betwixt great linguistic regions, such as Tamil-land and Telugu-land in the one case, and Bengal and Behar in the other, the populations speak indifferently both languages. This is Provincial, or National, bilingualism. But there may be also "Family or Tribal" bilingualism, the result of intermarriages betwixt persons speaking naturally different languages. Purchased slaves learn to speak the languages of their masters, without forgetting their own. The same thing is happening with

regard to immigrants into a strange country; the first generation in such cases is bilingual; the second adopts exclusively the new language. There is no rule absolute. Many Persian immigrants into India centuries ago still speak Persian in their families, and elsewhere the languages of India. The Jews, wherever settled, have an alternative language in reserve. On the other hand, the French Huguenots, who went out to the Cape Settlement, became blended with the Dutch Boers, and have lost their French, as the Huguenot families have in England.

It is maintained in this series of essays, that our Lord and His twelve Apostles *were not* "bilingual," either on account of their Province or Family. It will hardly be asserted, without actual proof, that there were schools for teaching Greek in Nazareth or Capernaum, and that our Lord, and the twelve attended them. No doubt they used Latin and Greek loan-words, the names of particular places, such as Dekapolis, or of particular things, such as *χῆρος*, *δηνάριον*, just as to this day the English-speaking populations use French and Latin words, but nothing more.

ROBERT CUST.



ART. V.—THE REMUNERATION OF THE CLERGY.

"I WOULD have stuck to the curacy," said an experienced clergyman, commenting upon the news that his younger friend had accepted a certain living. The criticism was no doubt a contradiction to some current modes of thinking and wishing, but it was not altogether unjustified. As a curate, he meant, his friend would at least get that which it was agreed he should get; he would get it, too, in all probability paid with tolerable punctuality, and to a certainty he would get it without any considerable drawback. Nothing, as the phrase is, was expected of him. On the contrary, many generous persons would feel themselves at liberty, and some, perhaps, would even feel themselves bound, to help him. But directly he passed from the class of the "poor curate" into the class of the so-called "fat rector," all this would be changed. He would not, perhaps, even nominally be the recipient of a much larger sum than he had before; but the calls and drawbacks would be cruelly multiplied. The income he would really receive would be found to be far below its reputed value; whatever it might be, it would in most cases be paid, not with the old punctuality, but with delay, with irregularity, often with

grudging; the out-goings and drawbacks would prove to be far beyond what he had ever calculated in the greener days of his curacy; and, as to what might be expected of him, no one would feel called upon to show him any mercy in forming an opinion as to what a beneficed clergyman ought properly to do.

There are probably few statements that are presented in a form so misleading to the popular mind as the reputed incomes of the clergy. It is not generally realized how heavily they are affected by taxation. In one respect the position of the clergyman is unique—in the sense that no other professional man is placed in the same position. The peculiarity is this: the whole of his professional income is in many cases taxed for the local rates. The lawyer does not pay upon his gains, but upon the house or property that he occupies. So with every other profession or calling. The clergyman, however, cannot complain of this as being an injustice. It is his misfortune that his professional earnings, in the case of most beneficed clergy, take the form of an ownership in land. As a rector, he owns land, or a rent-charge, or both. And in that character he is theoretically treated for the purposes of taxation precisely as any other owner of land or rent-charge is treated. There are several heads under which the pressure of taxation upon this scale is severely felt. There is the poor rate, there is highway rate, there is school rate—a contribution which is practically obligatory, even where there is no School Board; while in the field of imperial taxation there is the land tax and the income tax. These being all levied upon a man's whole professional income, and not upon the mere rental of his house or property, will be found to amount to about 20 per cent. of the whole. There are, indeed, many cases where, owing to the magnitude of the poor rate, this amount would be very much higher. The reader has only to remember that owing to the agricultural depression there is at the present moment a fall in tithe-rent-charge of another 20 per cent.; and without being overburdened with figures, he will see at a glance that every clergyman's income is from these two causes alone at once cut down to 40 per cent. below its apparent value. But let him see what this means. It means that a clergyman who is reputed to have a good living of (say) £700 a year, has in reality only £420 to handle; and a man who has a medium living of (say) £300, has in reality only £180 from his benefice. There are, indeed, several other outgoings besides those which have just been enumerated—payments which a clergyman is legally bound to meet, and which go to reduce his nominal income still further. There are the payments which are the property of the Crown, there is the payment of the agent for collecting his income, and there is the

insurance and the repair of his buildings. Let all these things be put together, and the reader will find no difficulty in crediting the accounts which clergymen in different parts of England have published in the London newspapers in the course of the last few months. One rector in Hampshire says that he has a living of £620 nominal value; but he submits a detailed account which shows that he receives only £352 as net income. Another from Cambridgeshire has a rectory, which in days of agricultural prosperity was worth about £500 a year, but is now worth £104 in gross. From this the outgoings which have been enumerated above have to be deducted, and he is left with £56 as the income of his benefice. The same results come from other directions. "Fat livings," indeed, as people say! It would not be too much, perhaps, to say that from one end of England to the other there is no such thing as a "fat living." The term is simply an anachronism, a thing entirely out of date, a survival of what were for the clergy indisputably better times than these.

An ominous sign of the times in connection with this subject is the increasing frequency with which men, who are anything but superannuated, are resigning benefices which once no doubt they regarded as the prizes of a legitimate ambition. The present writer is acquainted with one district which enjoys the exceptional advantage of being near to London in one of the home counties, but within which—in a ring of ten or eleven miles diameter—no less than eight incumbents have resigned their benefices within the last year or two. These have not been worn-out men, who could have no reasonable hope of doing further work, and accordingly resigned under the Act. They have not been promoted men, who have gone to a better appointment, for in every single instance they have gone from their benefice to nothing; but what is most striking of all is that the benefices which they resigned are not poor ones, but, on the contrary, are in several cases what used to be considered the "good livings" of the district. The commuted rent-charge of one of them, for example, is over £400, besides land and good house, while the population is extremely small; of another, it is over £400, with very small population and good house; of a third, it is over £600, besides land and good house; whilst another, alike for its income, its patronage, and the eminence of the men who have held it, has always been regarded as quite a prize, and has a commuted rent-charge of considerably over £1,000 a year, with very easy duty. It would have been an unheard-of thing in former days for men to abandon such appointments as these; but such a pass have things come to now, that their fortunate possessors simply think them not worth holding, and prefer to leave the ranks of the benefited

clergy altogether rather than continue their tenure. There will, of course, be an abundance of candidates who would only be too thankful to get possession of such appointments as these; but an actual experience of what they covet would, under the same conditions, probably bring them to the same conclusions as their predecessors have expressed in these resignations; and, meantime, the thoughtful observer can but wonder at the immense change that has taken place in the practical valuation of what many a flippant writer scornfully parades as "the loaves and fishes," the "fat livings" and the "good things" of the English Church.

It is quite evident that there are some mistaken notions current upon this question. It often seems to be fancied that, whatever embarrassment there is arises from some mismanagement or some fault of distribution; and it is insinuated that, if the clergy only had the will, they already have the power to cure all the evils under this head, of which they are so bitterly complaining. In the columns of that caustic and clever journal, which is supposed to be ironically entitled *Truth*, there was lately an example of the blunders which even a capable writer is liable to make when he is handling a subject of which he cannot be presumed to have more than a superficial experience: "The return of the property and revenues of the Established Church," said this writer, "respecting which Mr. Channing, M.P., recently inquired in the House of Commons, will, when published, reveal much more than is generally known about the very large funds which the beneficed clergy are in the enjoyment of." It may reveal much "to the general"—that is, "the general" (in Shakespearian phrase) does not know much which it might already know, and which it will not think worthy of notice until it appears in a Parliamentary Return. But as to "revealing" anything which is at present inaccessible, or which at present is designedly suppressed, there is substantially nothing to reveal. It is all published over and over again, not only in mass, as in several of the lists and directories, but actually in detail in some of them; published, too, not only in bulk for the whole English Church from some irresponsible office in London, but published in the calendar of every diocese in England and Wales, with all the advantage and, let us add, with all the responsibility of local knowledge, and published, as regards the largest item of the Church's property—the commuted rent-charge—under official and legal guarantee, for the official schedule of the property lies in every parish-chest throughout the land for the inspection of all whom it may concern. All, in fact, that the expected Parliamentary Return can do is to present in a collective and authoritative form facts which individually are perfectly well known at present to those whose business it is to know them.

We move in the same atmosphere of mistake as that article proceeds. "Few have any idea," continues the writer, "of the number of good livings in country districts which are held by well-to-do incumbents whose circumstances are not brought prominently before the eyes of the public. Our agricultural counties abound with benefices possessing incomes of from £500 to £1,000 per annum and upwards." The picture is overdrawn in almost every particular. To test the word "abound," let the reader open a page of any one of the Diocesan Calendars and see how many of the thirty or forty benefices cited in the page reach the high figures which are alleged to be so common. He will find one or two such every here and there; but his conclusion will have to be that they are sporadic rather than abundant. It is quite true that there are in most districts a number of well-to-do incumbents; but they are generally well-to-do by virtue of their private fortunes, and not by virtue of their professional gains. It would be truer to say that "few have any idea" what a large proportion of the Church's work is being carried on by the private fortunes of the clergy. There are multitudes of curates being kept whose pay never would be forthcoming if the incumbents did not dip into their private purse to find it. So general is this fact that in one of the recent Diocesan Conferences a return was actually moved for with the view of exhibiting its prevalence to the public eye. An incumbent who can be said to be "well-to-do" on his professional earnings is a *rara avis* indeed. Even in the case of a benefice whose revenue is nominally considerable, the income is too often subject to such heavy charges and drawbacks that after all it is a comparatively trifling amount which finds its way into the beneficiary's pocket. Moreover, while we are debating these worldly questions, it is only fair to recollect that the holders of the large benefices are in a worldly sense amongst the successful men of their profession. And then, what is £500 or £1,000 a year as the equivalent of professional success in a learned and, it must be said, a costly profession? What would a lawyer think of it? What would even a prosperous country doctor say to it as the ultimate limit of all possible ambitions?

But we have not come to the end of the misleading statements put forward in this manifesto yet. It says that "the rank and file of the clergy will be found to be in possession of a revenue which, if it were anything like fairly distributed, would supply ample remuneration for every clergyman engaged in parochial work in this country." The figures for making this calculation are already before the world. The calculation has in point of fact been made, and the result has proved that if all the property of the clergy were thrown into a common fund,

that fund would not be sufficiently large to supply every employed clergyman with even so modest an income as £200 a year on the principle of equal distribution. Then, moreover, who is going to carry into effect such a scheme as that? Most friends of the Church would welcome it if it were practicable. The largest incomes are at the present time often to be found in the smallest, the most retired, and the least important places; whilst the large towns are often in possession of endowments so small as to be out of all proportion to the work and responsibility of the position. This operates disastrously for the Church in several ways. To mention only one of its results—it tempts some of the ablest men into the smallest places, where the Church is very far from getting all that is to be got out of such men. It is not only the critics of the English Church, but its best friends also, who would be glad to have this changed. But how is the cure of the evil to be effected? Where is the statesman who would be sufficiently influential to secure the necessary consents? For though we speak of redistributing the property of the Church, there is a touch of inaccuracy—a fatal inaccuracy—in this case, about the phrase. There is no such thing as the property of the Church. It has been laid down by the highest legal authority that the property of the Church is a phrase unknown to the law of England. The so-called property of the Church is a number of separate properties belonging to separate corporations which are resident in the various parishes throughout the country.

What argument would induce a small country parish with a relatively rich endowment to consent to the alienation of a large slice of its revenues in order to provide a better income for the clergy of the county town? The inhabitants of such a parish have their expectations in connection with the revenues of their Church. If by the bounty of their ancestors their Church has an income of (say) £700 a year, to put it bluntly, they expect a £700 man; broadly speaking, they get him at present. And they are not likely to rise to such a level of unselfishness as to consent to be put off with a £150 man. But to take their property from them and to give it to someone else without their consent would be an act of spoliation, and, in the strictest sense of the old Westminster proverb, would be a flagrant example of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Sooner or later there must come upon the English people a day of awakening upon this subject. The sooner it comes the better for the Church. But it is a dream to imagine that the evil can be cured by any re-arrangement or disclosure. Handle them as you will, the endowments of the Church of England are, in their existing state, hopelessly insufficient to do the work of the present day. There is not money enough to pay the men

even while they work; and still less is there money enough to pension off those who are no longer able to work. There is, of course, a higher platform on which such questions can always stand. It is not exclusively a matter of wages. The English people may decide, if they are so pleased, that they will have a mendicant ministry for their Church. There will be plenty of men—and some of them men of the highest stamp and capacity, too—who will come forward to take their places in the ranks of such a ministry. But that is just what English people will not decide to have. They prefer, and they are likely to go on preferring, to have a ministry composed of men who live upon the same average level as themselves, who have had the best and most expensive education, and who have acquired experience of all the varied sides of family life. If that is a luxury, they cannot enjoy the luxury and save the money too. It was laughingly said by a great statesman that England was too poor to build herself a picture-gallery, and so an anonymous donor had kindly undertaken to build one for her at his own sole expense. It will have to be something of this kind that the Church of the future will have to look to. There must have been an immense wave of pious generosity sweeping over the country in those early centuries when rich men were giving to the Church her title to those endowments, which have, in part at least, survived down to the present moment. The cause is just as good now as it was then. The appeal which religion makes is never threadbare. Display the need, and the resources will come. Disendow to-day, and re-endowment will begin to-morrow. No sane person is likely to contend that, with society constituted as English society is constituted in the nineteenth century, the Church can do her work to the highest effect unless she has command of ample resources. And perhaps the first step towards getting those resources consists in evaporating that mischievous idea which infests the popular mind at the present day, that the Church has all she could require if she only chose to use it. Rich and thinking men will begin to think, if the real facts are not distorted and obscured. No man, perhaps, might have been less expected to speak favourably to us than Thomas Carlyle; but "there is not a hamlet," he says in one of his essays, "where poor peasants congregate but, by one means and another, a Church apparatus has been got together: roofed edifice, with revenues and belfries, pulpit, reading-desk with books and methods—possibility, in short, and strict prescription, that a man stand there and speak of spiritual things to men. [It is beautiful . . . Whom have we to compare with him? Of all public functionaries boarded and lodged on the industry of modern Europe, is there one worthier of the board he has? A man even professing, and never so languidly making still

some endeavour, to save the souls of men : contrast him with a man professing to do little but shoot the partridges of men."

H. T. ARMFIELD.

Reviews.

The Ministry of the Christian Church. By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House. London : Rivingtons.

WE have here a work of great learning and research, very able, and, on the whole, fair and convincing. We may not be able to accept all Mr. Gore's positions, certainly not all the arguments by which he supports them ; but, with him, we fully believe that the three orders of the ministry have existed in the Church from the earliest days, and are in accordance with the will of the great Head of the Church. At first probably there were no local dioceses, except, perhaps, St. James's at Jerusalem. The first true "Bishops" seem to have had a *roving* commission (if the expression may be forgiven), as the Apostles had before them. This view appears to satisfy the conditions of the case, and to explain the statements of early writers, and it is confirmed by the case of Titus, first appointed to Crete, and then (2 Tim. iv. 10) going to Dalmatia, presumably with the like commission.

Mr. Gore's work is in some parts rather heavy reading, owing to the lengthy quotations from the Fathers which he thinks it necessary to give to establish his argument. This, however, shows his painstaking research into the subject. The three following passages give a not unfair summary of Mr. Gore's views :

(1.) The ministry advanced always upon the principle of succession, so that whatever functions a man held in the Church at any time were simply those that had been committed to him by some one among his predecessors who had held the authority to give orders "by regular devolution from the Apostles" (p. 343).

(2.) That it was by a common instinct that the threefold or episcopal organization was everywhere adopted ; that it was a law of the being of the Church that it should put on this form . . . and that this fact seems to speak of a Divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of Church government (p. 343).

(3.) The individual life can receive this fellowship with God only through membership in the one body, and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution, of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments. A fundamental principle of Christianity is that of social dependence (p. 94).

Surely in this third passage Mr. Gore goes beyond the teaching both of Holy Scripture and of experience. Surely the latter shows that God has been pleased to bless the ministrations of ministers of non-episcopal bodies, irregular though they be, in the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom, and that the individual life has received fellowship with God, though there has been no recognition of these "social sacraments." We agree that a fundamental principle of Christianity, too often lost sight of, is "that of social dependence" ; but "the wind bloweth where it listeth," and unless all the teaching of experience is to be ignored, many who have never been confirmed, and who recognise no "social sacrament of absolution," have that true spiritual life which is "hid with Christ in God."

We cannot accept Mr. Gore's statement of the power of absolution as we find it on p. 94, nor his statement of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist on p. 226. We also disagree with his explanation of *ἐκχυρόμενον* on p. 227. This is spoken by our Lord; it cannot in His mouth refer to a future constant celebration of the Sacrament and outpouring of the wine; this must have been a future participle. It must, therefore, point to the blood-shedding *imminent* at that time upon the Cross. To enter, however, upon these controversial topics—to discuss the subject of absolution and the true nature of the Eucharist—is outside our present purpose. We are content once more to record our dissent from views, which the CHURCHMAN has never accepted, while we recognise most fully the ability and the fairness with which Mr. Gore once more advocates them.

Mr. Gore's able work reached us about the same time as the opening address of the truly Apostolical Bishop of Rupert's Land to the Synod of his diocese, which met on October 31st of last year, in which he deals from a *practical* point of view with the same question as that treated theoretically in the work before us. The whole address is full of wise and weighty utterances, and it is especially interesting because the Bishop had recently returned from the Lambeth Conference, and gives his impression of the results and value of the discussions that there took place. The Bishop, as many know well, took an active part in that Conference, and, as a Metropolitan, was placed on no less than four of its committees. The committee, however, in the deliberations of which he took the most active part was that of Home Reunion. It was a subject, he tells us, very near his heart. "Many of the evils and weaknesses of which the Church and its members have to complain are attributable to our unhappy divisions. If we are separated by essential differences, or what are felt as such, then we must remain separated; but if we are separated by what is non-essential, then the question of unity in the body rises to such importance as to demand a first attention."

We need not go into the history of the deliberations of this committee, or the fate of the report which its members, under the presidency of Bishop Barry, then of Sydney, drew up. The story formed the subject of many articles in Church papers at the time, and is tolerably well known. The crucial subject was the historic episcopate. Granted that it should be accepted as the future rule of the United Church, the difficulty remained of bringing those ministers who had not received Episcopal Orders into harmony with it. The greatest care must be taken if ever the problem comes up for practical solution, that it does not form a fatal obstacle to union.

A resolution was proposed in that committee: "That provision should be made in such way as may be agreed on for the acceptance of such ministers (*i.e.*, ministers of non-episcopal bodies) as fellow-workers with us in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ." Upon this we quote the wise and liberal words of the Bishop:¹

"The non-acceptance of this resolution arose in part from a feeling of ambiguity about its terms—a feeling shared by not a few of its supporters themselves. The resolution, while recognising a ministerial character, left it perfectly undetermined, both what that meant and how the ministers of other bodies were to be received as fellow-workers. For myself, I have no hesitation in saying that, if in God's Providence such a blessing were vouchsafed to the Church as the opening of a way to the reunion with the great Presbyterian body, I share the views of Bishop Charles Wordsworth of St. Andrews. That prelate, in a late address to his Synod, said, 'You will all, I think, know how assiduously,

¹ Report of the Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 1888, pp. 17-20.

“during a long series of years, I have laboured to establish the law of the threefold ministry and of Episcopal ordination, and in advocating, as I now do, a temporary suspension of that law for the sake of union, I believe I am taking the best possible course to prevent it from falling into disrepute; whereas, they who would insist upon the observance of the law without exception, are putting upon it a strain which it will not bear, are exposing the Church to the stigma of assuming an unreasonable “non possumus” attitude, of being unable to see things as they really are, and of violating the spirit, while they worship the letter, of a Divine ordinance.’ I cannot forget that in very early years I became quite convinced that the threefold order of the ministry had been the normal rule of the Church from the beginning. I believe the Church was guided by the Holy Spirit in the establishment of these Orders, and that until the Reformation this rule was practically uninterrupted. But though I hold this very clearly for myself, still I believe God has not withheld His blessing from ministrations not according to the order, which I believe He led the Church to adopt.”

The Bishop then referred to Hooker, Cosin, and Andrewes, proceeding as follows:

“Again at the Restoration, as only one of the old Scottish Bishops survived, four Bishops were consecrated in England. Two of these, who had only Presbyterian orders, were ordained privately deacons and priests very much against their wish. They went down to Scotland and forthwith consecrated other six Bishops. Again it is believed that with the exception of some perhaps in the Diocese of Aberdeen, under Bishop David Mitchell, all conforming beneficed clergymen, who had Presbyterian orders, were accepted as priests. In England itself, indeed, at this time one of the effects of the rebound from the excesses and hardships of the Commonwealth was that the requirement of Episcopal ordination was made in the preface of the ordinal more stringent, but the action of the Scottish Bishops could have hardly been taken without the assent of the authorities of the English Church, who gave them the Episcopate—at any rate we hear of no remonstrance. In making this historical sketch I wish not to be misunderstood. I do not question the irregularity, but a choice has to be made—and the healing of a great schism—the meeting of our Lord’s last wish and prayer—‘That all may be one’—the inexpressible advantages to the Church, as we in this province can readily understand, seems far to outweigh a loss that can be but temporary. Besides, though I hold Apostolical Succession in the Church most fully, I do not think that we are so bound by words and actions, that the Church is not competent to accept such presbyters, if it so ordains, as presbyters or priests. At any rate, there is nothing novel for an English Churchman in this view, nothing inconsistent with the deepest attachment to Episcopacy and belief in its being the order of the Church by Divine guidance. In the words of Bishop Wordsworth, ‘it is not a question of the obligation of the law of the threefold ministry—or of Episcopal ordination—that law has been handed down from the beginning and will continue to exist to the end of time. But the question is of the power and wisdom of the Church to dispense with the law *pro tempore* in a particular case and for a special end, an end unspeakably great and important.’ Our Lord has not bound the Church in the exercise of its authority derived from Him. I believe, then, that it has this power. Many of my brethren, who yield to none as Churchmen, hold these views. I trust I violate no confidence when I tell that dear Bishop Whipple, having to leave the committee-room from his infirm health, placed his hand on my shoulder and said, ‘My whole spirit goes with that resolution.’ Many others, whose hearts yearn for the healing of the divisions that are the weakness of the Church, and

"that almost in these days of gathering doubt threaten a temporary disaster, have much sympathy with them. When the Bishop of St. Andrews put out his pamphlet in support of his views just before the Conference, we learn that the Archbishop of Canterbury requested the Bishop of Salisbury to write to the Bishop of St. Andrews and inform him with his thanks 'that he had read the pamphlet over twice with great interest, and very full and hearty sympathy.'"

We offer no apology for this lengthy quotation: not only the views here enunciated by the Bishop, but also the interesting personal allusion which it contains justify us in giving it a wider circulation than the report of the Synod is likely to have.

The Lambeth letter justly says, "We gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake." We trust and pray that at no distant day some serious effort will be made to promote reunion *at home*. We trust that while the Church maintains the historic Episcopate as one of her marks, some means may be devised of recognising the position of non-episcopally ordained ministers; if need be, allowing in the words of Bishop Wordsworth "a temporary suspension" of the law of episcopal ordination to be recognised, if so be the great blessing of union may be thereby promoted. As Mr. Bartlett emphasizes in the Lectures recently noticed in our pages, it is absurd to recognise as branches of the Holy Catholic Church the most corrupt and degenerate of Eastern churches, and to refuse to acknowledge Christian communities as rich in good works as the National or Free Church of Scotland, or some of the Nonconformist communities in England.

Surely the great principles for which Mr. Gore so ably contends, and which in the main we accept, would not be violated (care being naturally and properly taken that Bishops in the future, as they have been in the past are canonically consecrated); surely no effort is too great, no sacrifice of feelings too large, which would further the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer "that they may be one," help to restore unity and peace to Christians separated by minor differences, or by past prejudices and animosities, and so make our National Church far more than she is at present co-extensive with the English nation. May God hasten this consummation in His time!

C. ALFRED JONES.

Outlines of Christian Doctrine. By the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THESE "Outlines," by the able and pious Principal of Ridley Hall, are sure to meet with acceptance from a large number of readers; they are written, as we may well suppose, on evangelical lines, but are by no means narrow. The author divides his work into three grand divisions: (1) The Doctrine of the Godhead; (2) The Doctrine of Man; (3) The Doctrine of the Church.

The first division occupies by far the largest part of the volume, in fact, more than one-half. In it the true orthodox teaching on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the attributes and work of the Three Persons of the Godhead is very powerfully upheld, and a survey of the views which have been dominant in divers periods of the Church is also brought under review. To do full justice to this part of the work is not possible without a careful analysis, which would be necessarily a presentation of the work itself in miniature. We have noted, however, a few passages, which have specially struck us.

On the difficult doctrine of election which has in all ages so divided the

Church of Christ, we find the following remarks, which are worthy of deep attention :

It is only to illustrate this to say that the Scriptural Christian should be, and will be, a "Calvinist on his knees and an Arminian on his feet." For himself and for others he will pray to, and trust in, a God, who has all wills in the hand of His will. To himself and to others he will appeal as to those whose wills and responsibilities are realities indeed. Not that truth lies equally in the systems associated with the names of Calvin and Arminius. But there is that in Scripture which responds from its depth to emphatic points in both. And the full secret of the harmony lies with God.

In a later page a very wide distinction is drawn between the teaching of election in the "Institutes" of John Calvin and in his commentaries. Speaking of the tendency of the leaders of the Reformation "to put the facts of sovereignty into the foreground, and to follow them logically into remoter conclusions," we read :

The "Institutes" (1538) of the great Frenchman, John Calvin (1509—1564), do this certainly beyond Scriptural warrant ; while in his admirable commentaries, written later, he shows a full sense of the solemn mysteries of the subject, and the desire to take practically the plain lines of revealed love and promise.

We are glad to note these words, as there is on the part of many a strong prejudice against anything that bears the name of Calvin, which can only proceed from ignorance of the nature of his writings.

On "the Descent into Hell" our author's remarks are somewhat brief, but the following words specially commend themselves to us :

The substance of the doctrine, then, relates to our Lord's submission to all the essentials of the separate state for our sake. As His human body entered a grave, His human spirit entered hades. Whatever awfulness that entrance had for any of His saints it had for Him.

Had due attention been paid to the truth underlying these words, the notion that the Lord preached to the lost souls could not have been maintained, inasmuch as the saints of God do not enter their abode, but are in paradise ; and our Lord was subject to the laws of our humanity till His resurrection from the grave (1 Peter iii. 18-20). Christ preaching "to the spirits in prison" is brought under review, and some wise cautions are appended. We do not gather whether the able treatise of Dr. C. H. Wright, a late Bampton lecturer, in "Biblical Essays," has been seen by Mr. Moule ; if not, we venture to commend it to his attention as one of the most able and satisfactory we have perused for a long time.

The subject of our Lord's return, and the question of the Millennial reign is dwelt upon in due course. It will hardly yield satisfaction to those who hold strong views on the subject, for the scales are held in a very impartial hand ; yet the presentation of the divers theories respecting the millennium, and the arguments by which each view is supported, is surely not without its merit ; and the following words will be accepted unhesitatingly by all Christians :

Amidst the divergency of interpretation it is an important and happy reflection that all those we have sketched leave possible a profound agreement on those central truths which concern the Person of Christ, His sacrificial and sanctifying work, and the "blessed life" of His personal, glorious coming and triumph.

If we were to take any exception to the above paragraph, it would be to the use of the word *possible* ; for assuredly it is not only possible, but *certain*, that with diversity of views as to the future kingdom, there is an essential unity on all real fundamentals of faith in the case of true Christians.

The second portion of the "Outlines"—The doctrine of man—is well

and carefully handled. On the question of the definite creation of man the remarks are sound and to the point :

What Scripture does none the less assert is a mysterious new departure when the first human pair was produced. There was not a dislocation of immaterial design, but a break of mere material continuity when there was to appear the creature, at once spiritual and material, who should resemble, know, and love the Creator.

A little further on we read :

Another and far more significant certainty is that man, amidst his many variations, is found to be everywhere, even at his lowest, capable of loving and obeying God ; a gulf between him and the highest lower animals which has neither bottom nor bridge. The exceptional origin of such a creature is the reverse of an anomaly.

The phrase *highest lower animals* seems to us not quite happy, but perhaps we may be regarded as hypercritical. On "the fall of man" and "man restored" we have the orthodox view of the Church strongly maintained and enforced. At the close of the chapter on the former our readers will, we think, feel that the following remarks justify our bringing them under their notice :

The greatest force of thought has been spent in the study and discussion of this mystery for fifteen centuries. And in the study and thought of an Augustine, an Anselm, a Bernard, or a Calvin, the student will surely gain spiritual as well as mental benefit. But after all they leave us in the face of the mystery as a mystery still. We need less to analyse than to advise and act. We return to the Scripture and to the awakened soul, and there, as we believe, are found affirmed and confessed the universality of sinfulness, the solidarity of the race in guilt (*reatus poenæ*), and in pollution (*macula*), the totality of the distortion of the fallen being from the holy will of the true God as such ; and so the absolute need of a mercy which man cannot claim, and of a power not his own for his recovery.

The third grand division, "The Doctrine of the Church," including in it the "Ministry of the Word" and "Sacraments," exhibits a wide branch of reading, and will amply repay diligent study. On the question of Episcopacy the opinions of many of the leading Anglicans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are adduced as exhibiting a spirit of liberal toleration towards those who were not one on this question ; and here we may add our decided opinion that the more the leading divines of the Church are studied, the less will they be found to favour the teaching of the advanced school of the present day. On the Sacraments we agree with the learned author of the "Outlines" in his statement : "We may put aside, by the words 'beyond doubt,' the discourse of our Lord in John vi., a passage about which wide differences of interpretation have existed in all periods (Waterland, 'The Eucharist'), and which cannot be proved exegetically to refer directly to the Eucharist." We also are completely one with him in his following remarks : "We cannot similarly exclude (as has been done) John iii. as not referring to literal Baptism in the word 'water.'" And the words in which the chapter concludes may well be remembered in these days of so great warmth of opinion.

We conclude our general treatment with the confession of belief that in the whole study two great drifts of opinion are to be watchfully, while in a spirit of holy charity, avoided. One goes towards making them the means of grace *sui generis* for the infusion of divine nature and life. The other goes towards making them mere symbols, illustrations, occasions of recollection. It is not so. They are not creative, but obnoxious. They are not human, but divine.

We must now part with the "Outlines." It has been both a pleasure and a privilege to peruse them, and we can assure all our readers that they will find the work one of the highest value, a very useful one to place in the hands of all those who desire carefully to study the grand doctrines of the Christian Church, and yet have not time or leisure to give to the

reading of more elaborate works, which, whatever be their merits, cannot be more satisfactory in their tone or treatment than the one before us.

W. E. RICHARDSON.

Essays in Biblical Greek. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1889; pp. x, 293, 8vo.

THIS work is marked by the characteristics which distinguish Dr. Hatch's writings, independent research and original opinions combined with rather excessive ingenuity and confidence. It is, as he tells us in the preface, "almost entirely tentative in its character," and it is, therefore, quite possible that the author himself will be led by further study to abandon some of the provisional conclusions which are here put forward; but meanwhile, even those who are most distrustful as to the soundness of the conclusions will be grateful to the writer for the industry with which he has collected materials, and for the clearness with which he has arranged them. The book will be welcomed by every student of the Septuagint and of the New Testament as affording substantial help, both in suggesting methods of inquiry, and in supplying important items of evidence.

In two particulars Dr. Hatch seems to the present writer to overstate the case: first, in assuming that the amount of difference between classical Greek and Biblical Greek is so immense; and secondly, in treating the condition of the study of Biblical Greek as being so utterly unsatisfactory. It would require a treatise longer than the volume before us to prove the first point; if, indeed, *either* side of the position *can* be proved. But certainly the *onus probandi* rests with those who maintain that the difference between the two forms of Greek is so enormous. As regards the second point, Dr. Hatch's strong language is best interpreted as indicating the very high ideal which he sets before himself and others in the construction of the apparatus of study: otherwise it might appear to savour of arrogance. "The language of the New Testament," he tells us, "has not yet attracted the special attention of any considerable scholar. There is no good lexicon. There is no philological commentary. There is no adequate grammar." These words have probably been read with surprise by nearly everyone who is accustomed to the study of the Greek Testament. The explanation of them no doubt lies in the fact that, rightly or wrongly, most of us are much more easily contented than Dr. Hatch is. We should certainly think that Thayer's Grimm and Cremer might, without exaggeration, be called "good" lexicons; and that at least Ellicott's commentaries, not to mention others which rank still higher in other respects, might fairly be called "philological"; while Moulton's "Winer" is not wholly inadequate as a grammar. Besides these, which are within the reach of everyone, there is that exquisite fragment (would that we had more of it!) Field's "*Otium Norvicense*," and the treasures, from which everyone borrows, which are stored up in the pages of Wetstein; to which some would doubtless add the commentaries of C. F. A. Fritzsche. Trench, in his "*Synonyms of the New Testament*," works on lines which Dr. Hatch disapproves, because of the too frequent appeals to classical usage: but frequent appeal there must be, as the work before us shows; and it remains to be seen whether truer results can be obtained by trusting less to the light which classical Greek affords. Some of the new results, which Dr. Hatch puts forward as the outcome of his own method, are by no means convincing. They are a little too ingenious; and in some cases assume that language is a much less elastic instrument than it is. Language was made for man, and not man for language: and human beings use this great gift, not indeed with caprice, but with a great deal of freedom. Language has its laws; but

they are not mechanical, and do not operate with iron regularity. They are conditioned by man's intelligence and free will. Differences between words of similar meaning *tend* to become less sharp, and metaphors which are trite *tend* to lose their original meaning; but the tendency is not invariably carried out into effect, and it works very unevenly in different cases. Moreover, the processes are sometimes reversed; old distinctions are sometimes revived, and the original signification of figurative expressions is sometimes recovered, *because* experience has taught speakers that "the old is good." Usages expire because they have ceased to be needed, but when the need is felt again the usages may return. Moreover, several shades of meaning for one and the same word may be current at one and the same time. To prove that *πειρασμός* in some places certainly means "trial and affliction" rather than "temptation," and that in other passages "trial" makes better sense than "temptation," is very far short of proving that in Biblical Greek the meaning of trial "will be found to be more appropriate than any other in instances where the meaning does not lie upon the surface" (p. 73). Dr. Hatch would have it that our Lord was led up into the wilderness "to be *afflicted* by the devil," and that in the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer we ask God to "bring us not into *tribulation*." Is it too much to say that the three recorded solicitations of the evil one are conclusive as to the meaning in the one case, and that the context is conclusive in the other? No doubt the devil did afflict the Christ in the wilderness, but the chief part of the affliction was the prolonged attempt to induce Him to *sin*. And "forgive us our *trespasses*, and lead us not into *temptation*, but deliver us from *the evil one*," seems to indicate that "temptation" means spiritual dangers rather than earthly troubles.

With Dr. Hatch's remarks on the word *παράκλητος* it is much more easy to agree, and without reservation. "This word," he says, "is found in the New Testament only, in the Gospel and first Epistle of St. John. The facts upon which any induction as to its meaning there (*sic*) must be sought in the first instance in contemporary writings cognate in character to those of St. John. They are found in Philo in sufficient numbers, and in a sufficiently clear connexion to render the induction from them free from doubt. They show that Philo used the word (*a*) in a sense closely akin to its Attic, of one who helps or pleads for another in a court of law, and hence (*b*) in the wider sense of helper in general." After quoting instances from the *De Josepho*, *Vit. Mos.*, *De Mund. Opif.*, etc., Dr. Hatch continues: "The meaning which is thus established in Philo must be held to be that which underlies its use by St. John. The meaning 'consoler' or 'comforter' is foreign to Philo, and is not required by any passage in St. John. It may, indeed, be supposed that 'comforter,' in its modern sense, represents the form only, and not the meaning of *comfortator*." (p. 83). He might have added that "comforter," or "consoler," is an impossible meaning in 1 John ii. 1, and therefore a highly improbable meaning in John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7. St. John *might* use the word in a sense different from that which it commonly has in Philo; he is not likely to have used it in one sense in the Gospel and in another in the Epistle. But it would require more quotations than can here be given to convey a fair idea of Dr. Hatch's useful book.

A. PLUMMER.



Short Notices.

Two Kings of Uganda. Life by the shores of Victoria Nyanza. By ROBERT P. ASHE, M.A., F.R.G.S. With map and illustrations. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington.

THIS "account of a residence of six years in Eastern Equatorial Africa" is very well written, and will doubtless be widely read. From beginning to end the book is full of interest. The chapters on "Manners and Customs" have a value of their own.

The Voice from Patmos. Notes on the Book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine. By MARTHA BLAKENEY. Pp. 290. Nisbet and Co.

It is some time since our pages received a contribution from the Vicarage, Sheffield. Few dignitaries know as much about the working-classes, and the real work and needs of the Church in the great towns of the North, as Dr. Blakeney, who has laboured with such devotedness and success in Sheffield; and *THE CHURCHMAN* has been enriched on several occasions with practical papers by the honoured Vicar and Arch-deacon. Many of our readers will remember a paper on Bible Classes for young ladies, by Mrs. Blakeney, which appeared in a recent *CHURCHMAN*, and, as far as we know, is decidedly the best paper of the kind. The book before us, the preface of which bears date March, 1889, contains Notes prepared for Mrs. Blakeney's Bible Class, and printed at the request of the members. With these three characteristics, simplicity, suggestiveness, and spirituality, it is likely to prove exceedingly useful, and we heartily recommend it. It is printed in clear type.

Hymns and Meditations. By A. L. WARING. Pp. 194. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is a delightful little book. It has the old favourites and some new pieces. The author of that very helpful hymn—

Father, I know that all my life
Is portioned out for me,

is, in her own way, second to none.

We have received from the Religious Tract Society a very good edition of St. Patrick's writings, by Dr. C. H. Wright.

Among some new books received from the S.P.C.K. we may mention *Everyday Heroes*, stories of bravery; cheap and attractive; good as a prize-book; or for a parochial library.

In *Cornhill*, always bright and fresh, appear several interesting papers. *Murray's Magazine* is, as usual, informing as well as attractive.

The *Art Journal* is a capital number. The coloured picture alone is worth the money.

The *British Weekly Pulpit*, vol. i., contains many sermons by eminent Nonconformists (*British Weekly Office*).

We gladly invite attention once more to *Light for India* (Elliot Stock), the quarterly record of the Christian Vernacular Education Society for India. The July number contains a report of the annual meeting, Lord Northbrook in the chair.

July *Blackwood* contains Part IV. of the very interesting "Scenes from a Silent World," by a Prison Visitor. An article on the critical position of Europeans in Central Africa is well worth reading even now. As to the Zanzibar littoral, the writer heartily supports the advice given by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords on the 28th of May, to the effect that the agents of the Universities Mission should withdraw for a brief space.

Those who have been disturbed by the writings of Professor Huxley and Mrs. Humphrey Ward in the *Nineteenth Century* and elsewhere will do well to read attentively the valuable paper by Professor Sanday in the July number of the *Contemporary Review* on "The Future of English Theology." Like everything which comes from his pen, it is both temperate in expression and solid in matter. While paying a high compliment to much that is praiseworthy in Mrs. Ward's March paper, he shows that her confidence in her position is altogether misplaced; because (1) some of her data are seriously incorrect, and (2) her conclusion would not follow from her data, even if they were correct. She is one more illustration of the familiar saying that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Unfortunately she has the ear of a number of people who do not see the defects either in her knowledge or in her reasoning.

An admirable gift-book or prize is *To the Lions*, a pleasing and highly informing tale of the Early Christians, by Professor Church, (Seeley and Co.). The Professor's historical Tales are well known. This tasteful volume has sixteen illustrations.

The second number of *Church and People* is bright and full of interest. It shows signs of vigorous life, and will, we hope, do right good service for that most valuable Society, the G.P.A.

It is a pleasure to praise the first number of *Dignitaries of the Church* (Hatchards); an excellent design which will evidently be well carried out. The three "dignitaries" whose photographs are now before us, are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Truro, and Dean Gott.

The new *Quarterly Review*, while it has no article likely to be called "brilliant," has several papers which are interesting and rich. "Shakespeare and Venice" is very readable; so is "Duelling"; and we are much pleased with the paper on Virgil. "Old Age" will be a favourite with many. What the *Quarterly* finds to say on the American Commonwealth and its Lessons will be easily understood; it is a valuable paper.

* * * The promised paper on the Prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln, a reply by Mr. Sydney Gedge, M.P., is unavoidably postponed.

THE MONTH.

IN the Upper House of the Southern Convocation it was decided to reprint the Book of Family Prayers. In the Lower House Archdeacon Farrar, in a remarkable speech, moved the adoption of the following resolution, which was carried :

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when the Church can, with advantage, avail herself of the voluntary self-devotion of Brotherhoods, both clerical and lay, the members of which are willing to labour in the service of the Church without appealing for funds to any form of public support.

Canon Girdlestone, the learned Principal of Wycliffe Hall, has received some tokens of the "universal respect and veneration" for the work so quietly and efficiently done during his twelve years' residence in Oxford.¹

The New Code, we gladly note, has been withdrawn. Next year its objectionable details will probably be modified.

At the annual meeting of the Home Reunion Society, the Bishop of Carlisle presided, in the absence of the President, the Bishop of Winchester. Professor Sir George Stokes, M.P., moved the second resolution, as follows :

That the Home Reunion Society deserves the support of all Churchpeople in its endeavours to carry out the wishes expressed in the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, for closer intercourse with all those who are bound together by indissoluble bonds in a common belief in the Incarnation.

The Bishop of Manchester, at his Primary Visitation, spoke, as one would expect, of his predecessor (Bishop Fraser), and Canon Bardsley. The Charge is to be published, and we shall quote his Lordship's words.

Dr. Taylor succeeds Mr. Lefroy as Archdeacon of Warrington.

The venerable F. C. Cook, Canon of Exeter, Editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*, has entered into rest.

Another contributor to THE CHURCHMAN, the Rev. J. M. Braithwaite, Vicar of Croydon, a most earnest and efficient worker, in the prime of manhood, died suddenly in his study. At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference, Canon Elwyn (Master of the Charterhouse) moved :

That this conference desires to record its deep sense of the irreparable loss that the conference and the whole diocese have sustained in the sudden removal from his important sphere of duty of the Rev. J. M. Braithwaite, late vicar of Croydon. That his Grace be humbly requested to communicate to the family of Mr. Braithwaite the deep sympathy of the conference with them in their sad bereavement.

The *Guardian* says :

The revolt of the Radicals from Mr. Gladstone is certainly the most notable event in the present session. It is attended, indeed, with profuse assurances of undiminished allegiance—assurances which are so far made good that they are still willing to follow him when he goes a way they like. But the substance and essentials of leadership have vanished. His opinion goes for nothing ; his decision is not taken as final ; his nominal followers speak against him in debate, and vote against him in divisions. There is no question on which Mr. Gladstone holds so exceptional a position as the question of grants to members of the Royal Family. His unequalled Parliamentary and Ministerial experience, and the wonderful memory which keeps the results of that experience constantly within call, give him an authority on the subject which might have been supposed to lie beyond all risk of dispute. . . . The distinctly Republican note which ran through the Radical speeches yesterday week—Mr. Bradlaugh's only exception—marks the appearance of a new motive in English politics.

¹ *Record*, July 12.